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Preface

This thesis is about governance in the public sector and the topic “The Influence of Political Actors on Problematic Aspects in Government” relates to executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in government influencing problematic aspects in government for prominence of issues on the political agenda, policy generation and alternative selection in policy formation processes. The purpose of writing this thesis is the finalization of a master program in public administration. The context of the study is the agenda setting process of issues in government and the public policy process. How ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) affect policy formation processes in the public sector and how political actors influence such problematic aspects for prominence of issues on the agenda, policymaking and alternative selection. The departure of the study is the policymaking approach of John W. Kingdon (1984) and the liberal democratic context of government in the U.S.A. where this approach came about. This theoretical approach facilitates the empirical study of the pre decision processes of the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten.

My interest in the topic relates to stagnation in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten. I wished to explore problematic aspects that cause stagnation policy formation processes and determine how such processes complete. In doing so, it becomes clear how policy cycles complete to obtain outcomes for citizens. Policy cycles must complete in order to obtain favorable outcomes.
Summary

This thesis in public governance concerns problematic aspects in government that stagnate policy formation processes of issues that are on the agenda. These problematic aspects are ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) that prevent policy generation and alternative selection from coming about in policy formation processes. The introduction of the thesis looks at the central research question of the research, what problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed, and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines. How do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence these problematic aspects and how can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on St. Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines? The thesis determines how stagnated policy formation processes complete to produce policy and bring about decision-making in government. The Multiple Streams Framework of Kingdon (1984) is the perspective of the research to do so. The trigger for this research is the stagnated policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten. The objective of the research is to present an analysis of the central research question via literature research and a case study empirical analysis of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten and in doing so confirm or not confirm the argument of Kingdon (1984). The relevance of this thesis relates to defining how policymaking and alternative selection come about in government; how policy cycles depend on the completion of policy formation processes to bring about favorable benefits for citizens in communities; and how relevant actors in government can resolve problematic aspects for successful policy formation- and policy cycles. The following sub-questions of the research relate to the theoretical- and empirical part of the central research question: What are the three streams of Kingdon (1984) and which feature of his argument indicates an issue rising to a prominent position on the political agenda? What is agenda setting in government? What is the political agenda in a policy process and how does this agenda defer from the public agenda? What are the problematic aspects of policy formation processes that prevent issues from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy coming about? How do executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence problematic aspects in policy formation processes according to the argument of Kingdon (1984)? How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue? What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about? How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)? Finally, how can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

The theoretical perspective of the research relates to the mentioned framework of Kingdon (1984). This argument assumes that serious attention of politicians and key personnel in the administration to problematic aspects in government help issues rise to prominent positions on the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. The theoretical propositions of the research come from this
argument about policy generation and decision-making in government. The theoretical part of the thesis established that the problematic aspects that stagnate policy formation process in government are ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972). In the ‘Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice’, Cohen, March & Olsen see government organizations as organized anarchies characterized by ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’. ‘Problematic preferences’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), refer to difficulty in choosing urgent problems to push for decision-making in government. ‘Unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) refers to unclear processes in government. The literature research results determine that, the three separate areas in government relate to politics, problems and policy that must combine to affect a rise of an issue on the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. Key to this coupling is the occurrence of a policy window and a policy entrepreneur coupling the different activities in the separate streams. Agenda setting is the process that identifies recognizes and defines certain public problems. It generates, considers and attaches solutions to the problem Kingdon (1995). The political agenda contains the problems that officials in government must look into for decision-making and differs from the public agenda because it is not dependent on the influence of the media for awareness of issues as is the case with the public agenda. Problems are on the political agenda for policy generation and alternative selection in government, while issues are on the public agenda to build public awareness of problems. Government officials decide which problems reach the agenda, while the media generally sets the public agenda via an agenda building process. Issues must receive prolonged public attention to receive significant attention from officials in government, while issues make it more easily onto the public agenda. Issues can remain for a long period on the agenda in government, while issues disappear quickly from the public agenda. Government officials generate problems for the political agenda, while the public is generally dependent on the media for awareness of problems.

The methodological approach concerns the parameters of the research, the mentioned literature research and the empirical analysis. The objectives of this analysis relate to establishing findings for the four mentioned empirical research questions. This approach determines five important aspects for the research. 1. What is the research design, how to conduct the research, the data collection and analysis, and the development of conclusions. 2. It looks at the protocol of the research with the overview of the research objectives, topics under investigation and issues that relate to the research and the reporting. These are subjectivity, linking data to the theoretical propositions and findings, external validity, the reliability of the research, field procedures and multiple data sources of the research questions. 3. It establishes the strategies of quality assurance and quality control of the data collection. 4. It looks at the use of theoretical propositions and content analysis of the empirical data as the analytical strategy for data analysis. The coding system and the comparison of the summaries of the data with the research propositions for drawing conclusions are also determined. 5. Conclusions and reporting relate to the review of the following aspects with the research mentor(s), misrepresentation of data, and selectivity of reporting data, publication bias, reporting conclusions not supported, construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability of the research.

The empirical research objective is to present an analysis of the empirical part of the central research question. This analysis consists of interviews analysis and the analysis of additional data sources. Both
relate to the last three sub-questions of the empirical part of the research. The findings of the first sub-question show agenda setting period 1988-1990: 1. Government provided no solution for homeless squatters in this period. 2. The media covered the dispute between government and homeless squatters and brought awareness about their living conditions. Agenda setting period 1997-2003: 1. Government renovated an abandoned building on the outskirts of Philipsburg for homeless squatters in two abandoned buildings after a dispute broke out between homeless squatters and government about their eviction. 2. Government built emergency homes (social housing) and the Belvedere housing project (low-income housing) for residents. 3. Not enough social housing and low income housing was built to suit the increased demand for this type of housing. 3. The media brought awareness of the conditions of homeless squatters and others without proper housing in this period. Agenda setting period 2007-2010: 1. Government hardly built social housing to suit the very high demand for social housing in this period. 2. Not enough appropriate housing is available to suit the high demand of low and middle incomes for affordable housing. 3. The media gave homelessness attention in this period and set the public agenda.

Residents demanded that government do something about visible homelessness. The three interview questions show that the majority of respondents see ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government as the problematic aspect that prevents the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy from coming about. The policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten does not receive serious attention from political actors. The policy process is stagnated. They chose the approach of Kingdon (1984) to impact ‘problematic preferences,’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government for prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda, bringing about policy, and related decision-making, by 1. Paying serious attention to problematic aspects in government and influencing other governmental actors and various interests groups to help find solutions for the issue of homelessness. 2. They influence the budget in government to help shape the agenda in government. 3. Adopting problem indicators and taking heed of focusing events in choosing policy alternatives. 4. Seriously, considering policy alternatives that are compatible with existing policies and regulations in government, if the processes are clear and the alternatives are attractive. 5. They look at criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability, and future constraints of policy alternatives. 6. Building consensus in the political system to bring about decision-making concerning the issue of homelessness, the issue of homelessness figures prominently on the agenda, a policy alternative is available and decision-making completes the policy formation process. Additional empirical research questions and findings reveal that government focuses primarily on trade and related decision-making for development. The construction sector is one of the biggest sectors on St. Maarten and produces the third biggest amount of gross GDP on the national account. The investment in the construction sector does not pertain to affordable housing for the lowest incomes. Bad to very bad quality housing exists on the island. Government preference is to focus on trade and in the construction sector, only the highest income categories receive appropriate housing via private investment. Government investment in affordable housing does not suit the demand for low-income and social housing of the lowest incomes.

The ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen March & Olsen (1972) play a role in government concerning the sectors to push for attention in government. This aspect also plays a role in the construction sector where government only focuses on investment in housing for the highest incomes.
The conclusion of the research: 1. the problematic aspect in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten is ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government. 2. The policymaking approach of John W. Kingdon (1984) is the approach to impact ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government on St. Maarten for relevant policy- and decision-making. Serious attention of political actors in government to ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) can help resolve the problem. 3. The issue of homelessness then rises to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making related to sufficient social housing for the lowest incomes on St. Maarten, which include the homeless. The adopted approach of this research outlines this, the Multiple Streams Framework of John W. Kingdon (1984). 4. The policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten completes to allow the rest of the policy cycle of the issue to take place. This makes it possible for the policy cycle to attain beneficial outcomes for homeless citizens on St. Maarten. 5. Executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten can impact/influence ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in this manner.

The conclusion of the research: 1. Political actors and other stakeholders in the policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten have relatively more influence in shaping the agenda in government than the media. Political actors in government can act alone or employ support of influential interests groups to help set priorities and bring about decision-making for policy alternatives. 2. Budgetary considerations and various forms of feedback to local government would enhance the prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda in government on St. Maarten in setting policy priorities. They are relatively more important for issue prominence and setting policy priorities than objective problem indicators and focusing events. 3. Policy alternatives related to the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten that are not in conflict existing policies and regulations in government are more likely to be accepted for decision-making. 4. Political actors within government on St. Maarten can use consensus- and coalition building to build priority on the agenda for the issue of homelessness or related policy alternatives. Outside of government interest groups, public partners and civil society on St. Maarten can also use consensus- and coalition building to help shape the agenda for decision-making. The research report contains no specific problems related to misrepresentation of data, selectivity of reporting data, publication bias, and reporting conclusions not supported in the research. The construct validity, internal validity, and the reliability of the research presented no problems. The external validity is limited and the research results only extend to populations of countries of liberal democracies similar in context to government of the U.S.A. This does not include e.g. St. Maarten. Countries with systems that are not liberal democracies cannot adopt the results of this research for their populations.
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1. Introduction

In this chapter paragraph, 1.1 gives the background and trigger of the research. Paragraph 1.2 outlines the relevance of the research in the sequence of theoretical relevance, societal relevance and practical relevance. In paragraph 1.3, the objective of the research comes up and this paragraph outlines the central research question and the sub research questions. Paragraph 1.4 gives an overview of the structure of the thesis.

1.1 Background and trigger of the research

1.1.1 Background

Via several newspaper articles and public outcries of concerned citizens during radio programs, the issue of homelessness received attention on Sint Maarten. Citizens voiced their opinions about homelessness in the media. The media gave the issue attention in a newspaper and radio programs. Citizens saw the issue as a problem that was getting bigger and did not like the image that this was giving the island. They demanded that government do something to solve this problem.

The media set the public agenda on the issue of homelessness and the outcry of the public created a window of opportunity for agenda setting of the issue in government. Then the attention shifted away from the issue quite quickly and it did not receive significant attention on the political agenda, after the relevant parties in the government administration indicated the decisions directions to government.

1“The public agenda is defined as the agenda that is made up of issues that have achieved a considerably amount of public interest and visibility”.

The problem of homelessness was on the political agenda, but did not receive significant attention. The issue did not rise to the top of the agenda in government due to the lack of attention and constraints in government. The policy formation process stagnated, and policy generation and decision making on the issue did not happen in government.

2“The political agenda is the list of problems that authorities in government and groups outside of government pay attention to at a particular moment”.

---


1.1.2 Trigger

The stagnation of the policy process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten is the trigger for the thesis. Homelessness does not place high on the political agenda. This homelessness is the absence of an adequate dwelling over which a person and his/her family can exercise exclusive possession, not being able to maintain privacy and enjoy relations, and not having a legal title of occupation.

This stagnation in the policy formation process of the issue homelessness leads to the following central research question:

What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed, and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines? How do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact (influence) these problematic aspects, and how can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

This thesis in public governance looks at problematic aspects in policy formation processes after agenda setting of issues and key actors in government influencing (impacting) these constraints for prominence of issues on the political agenda.

It specifically looks at constraints related to problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) and ‘unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in policy formation processes. It concerns difficult choices between issues to push for decision-making and unclear processes that government is involved in at once in different important aspects of governing. An eventful constitutional change agenda, unclear transition processes from the central level of governing, processes within the administration that must coincide with the last mentioned developments in a timely fashion that are rather unclear and the search for finances to operate change and support vision.

Executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in the stream of politics bring attention to issues based on their interest and capacity to handle issues, and use their political knowledge in policy processes to gain both support and ground in handling constraints they encounter in policy formation processes. The mentioned actors play an important role in helping issues rise on the political agenda after agenda setting, enabling policy generation and alternative policy specification, thus completing the policy formation process as the theory of Kingdon (1984) outlines.

---

This research has this multiple streams approach of Kingdon (1984) as its theoretical underpinnings and empirically sets out to test the research question. This concerns how the relevant actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present can resolve problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines.


4"Onderzoekers die werken vanuit een rationalistisch perspectief zien beleid als een middel om bepaalde doeleinden te realiseren Hoogerwerf (1987). Beleidsvorming is een rationeel-cognitief process, aangestuurd door een centrale actor die de doelen van andere beleidsactoren kent “.

Teisman (2001) also looks at the policy formation process of the phase’s model in agreement with the description of Bryson en Crosby (1992):

5“Het fasenmodel beschouwt een beleidsproces: “as the succession of different situations in the formulation, adaptation, implementation and evaluation of a policy Bryson en Crosby (1992)” Er wordt gebruik gemaakt van een a priori typering van opeenvolgende inhoudelijke activiteiten”.

The approach of Kingdon (1984) in contrast to the traditional approach focuses on the flow of policy action in the policy process and centers on policy action in three separate streams in government.

### 1.2 Relevance of the research

#### 1.2.1 Theoretical relevance

The research theoretically presents the argument of Kingdon (1984) and explains how according to this argument relevant actors in the stream of politics resolve problematic aspects in policy formation processes for issues to rise on the political agenda enabling policy generation and alternative specification. When policy formation processes and -cycles in the public sector complete, the outcomes can prove favorable for citizens in their communities.

The approach of Kingdon (1984) focuses on research carried out by Cohen, March and Olsen (1972). This research agrees with the stand that the more

---

4 Abma, T. & in ’t Veld, R. 2001, Vijf beleidswetenschappelijke perspectieven Handboek beleidswetenschap blz 29

5Abma, T. & in ’t Veld 2001, Handboek Beleidswetenschap, perspectieven op beleidsprocessen: over fasen, stromen en rondenmodellen, pp. 303
The traditional approach does not do justice to the empirical reality of the topic. Teisman (2001) in chapter 22 of the book “Handbook of Policy Sciences” agrees with Torenvlied (2001) of chapter 4 of this handbook on this aspect:

6“Alom bestaat het inzicht dat beleidsprocessen niet mooi gefaseerd verlopen, sommigen menen daarom dat het indelen van beleidsprocessen in fasen niet zinvol is. Daarom is Torenvlied (2001) van mening dat het indelen van beleidsprocessen in fasen de complexiteit van de empirie te veel geweld aan doet”.


The argument of Kingdon (1984) looks at the possibility of completing policy formation processes and –cycles. It is relevant theory that assumes that actors in the stream of politics affect rises of issues on the political agenda and enable policy generation and alternative specification (Kingdon, 1984). This argument is the theoretical basis of the research. The research carried out will contribute to a better understanding of how the stagnated policy formation process of the issue homelessness on Sint Maarten can come to a completion and produce policy outcomes that enhance the lives of citizens. The use of this argument to achieve this outcome in the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten adds to the theoretical achievements of the argument within the public policy sciences. This is the theoretical relevance of the research.

The approach of Kingdon (1984) received support and criticism over the years. In the theoretical development of agenda setting theory, critics of the model of Kingdon wondered if the model can be successfully implemented internationally.


(not only in the USA) in other systems. They questioned this international implementation in other systems as a possible limitation to his model. Yu (2004) of the study “Agenda setting and the Zhigang Sun Case” looks at the criticism of Mucciaroni (1992) to the model of Kingdon (1984) and the successful use of the theory by several others.

"Logically, subsequent theoretical development of the agenda setting theory should go beyond the locus of Kingdon’s research, health and transportation policy at the federal level of the US, to test its applicability in different policy areas at different government levels and in different countries with distinct political systems. Recently McLendon (2003) researched agenda setting in education policy at the state level, the results of which supports Kingdon’s theory. Some critics, like Mucciaroni, wonder if Kingdon’s garbage can model can be implemented internationally because it is based on the politics of a plural, liberal democratic country, the USA, which is characterized by institutional fragmentation, plural and fluid participation, and temporary collusion Mucciaroni (1992); Howlett and Ramesh (2003). While Kamieniecki (2000) has utilized the theory to analyze forest policy change in British Colombia, Canada (2000) and Zahariadis (1995) has successfully extended the theory to explore the politics of privatization in Britain and France in three sectors: oil, telecommunications and railroads, those arguments of critics still cannot be overthrown. Canada, Britain and France are still in the category of liberal democracy, though with different traditions and different manifestations. There is no doubt that the applicability of Kingdon’s theory will be significantly improved through testing it in a much more centralized and integrated polity, like China”.

Most of the aforementioned researchers have successfully utilized the theory of Kingdon (1984).

1.2.2 Societal relevance

Successful policy formation processes realize relevant changes in our societies and bring about favorable benefits for citizens in their communities. Such policy formation processes are vital for the enhancement of lives of citizens in communities on Sint Maarten and realizing sustainable change in their benefit. This refers to having adequate housing that is accessible and affordable for citizens in general on Sint Maarten. It refers especially to vulnerable groups that are in need of social housing. It also refers to dealing with care issues related to

---

housing citizens of different categories, especially the elderly and the disabled and marginalized groups within society.

1.2.3 Practical relevance

This research brings attention to the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten and the need to generate policy and specify alternatives in order to achieve outcomes. It addresses the need for policy related to achieving adequate, affordable and accessible housing and tackling care issues related to housing. The research addresses the problem of homelessness on Sint Maarten.

Defining how relevant actors can resolve problematic aspects of the policy formation process for successful policy formation and policy cycles, is the answer to move the stagnated policy formation process of the issue of homelessness forward for completion.

It empirically looks at how relevant actors in the stream of politics can resolve problematic aspects in government for issues to rise on the political agenda and thus enable policy generation and alternative specification. It does this in line with the argument of Kingdon (1984).

1.3 Objective and research questions

1.3.1 Objective

The objective of the research is to present an analysis of the research question via literature research and a case study empirical analysis of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten and in doing so confirm or not confirm the argument of Kingdon (1984). His argument relates to actors affecting rises on the agenda and the coupling of the three streams for significant policy generation and alternative policy specification in the policy process after agenda setting.

Actions of executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in the government affect rises of issues on the political agenda, which result in policy generation and alternative specification in the policy process. This brings about outcomes that can benefit citizens in their communities and realize sustainable change.

Theodoulou & Cahn (1995) state that there is a difference between dynamics and roles of governmental- and non-governmental actors in the policy process,

with governmental actors having more authority and those higher up in authority being closer to the most influential persons in government”.

1.3.2 Research questions

Central research question

What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed, and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines? How do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence these problematic aspects and how can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Sub research questions

Research question 1

What are the three streams of Kingdon (1984) and which feature of his argument indicates an issue rising to a prominent position on the political agenda?

Research question 2

What is agenda setting in government?

Research question 3

What is the political agenda in a policy process and how does this agenda defer from the public agenda?

Research question 4

What are the problematic aspects of policy formation processes that prevent issues from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy coming about?

Research question 5

How do executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence problematic aspects in policy formation processes according to the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

Research question 6
How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

Research question 7

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

Research question 8

How do problematic aspects in government impact/influence the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

Research question 9:

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

1.4 Structure of the thesis

A preface, summary of the research, and the table of contents precede the introduction and other chapters of the research.

Chapter 1 is the introduction of the research. This chapter deals with the background and the trigger of the research in paragraph 1.1. Paragraph 1.2 looks at the relevance of the research and specifically states the theoretical-, societal-, and practical relevance of the research. The objective of the research and the presentation of the central research question and the sub questions come up in paragraph 1.3. Paragraph 1.4 gives the structure of the chapters of the thesis.

Chapter 2 is the theoretical framework of the research. Paragraph 2.1 gives the theoretical assumption of the research. The theoretical propositions of the research are next in paragraph 2.2. Then the literature research questions and findings come up in paragraph 2.3.

Chapter 3 concerns the methodology of the research. Paragraph 3.1 explains the case study research design. The logic linking the data to the theoretical propositions is in paragraph 3.2. Paragraph 3.3 deals with the data collection; first explaining the methodology and findings of research questions 6, 7 and 8 and then the methodology of the empirical research question 9. It also gives relevant information about this research question. Paragraph 3.4 outlines the analytical strategy with mention of the type of strategy, the four principles of the analysis, and the preparation for the analysis.
Paragraph 3.5 is about how to conduct the research. Paragraph 3.6 gives the data analysis results in data tables, and summaries of the findings. Paragraph 3.7 is about the development of conclusions of the research and the reporting.

Chapter 4 is about the empirical research. Paragraph 4.1 gives an outline of the empirical research. The empirical research questions and findings come up in paragraph 4.1. Paragraph 4.2 gives the empirical research questions and findings. Paragraph 4.3 gives the empirical conclusion of the research. Paragraph 4.4 gives the additional empirical research sources questions and findings. Paragraph 4.5 gives the empirical research findings of the research. Paragraph 4.6 concerns the logic linking the data to the theoretical propositions of the research.

Chapter 5 gives the conclusion of the research with the answer to central research question. Paragraph 5.1 looks at the conclusion of the central research question. Paragraph 5.2 gives the conclusion of the research. Paragraph 5.3 contains the report of the research results.

Chapter 6 gives the references of the research. Paragraph 6.1 gives the references of chapter 1. Paragraph 6.2 gives references of chapter 2. Paragraph 6.3 gives the references of chapter 3. The references of chapter 4 are in paragraph 6.4.

Chapter 7 is a compilation of the empirical research interviews information, coding system and data tables. Paragraph 7.1 concerns the interviews information sheet. Paragraph 7.2 gives the research instruction sheet. Paragraph 7.3 contains the interviews forms. Paragraph 7.4 concerns the coding system of the research. Paragraph 7.5 contains the data tables of the research.
2. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework deals with the assumption of the research in paragraph 2.1 and then presents the theoretical propositions of the research in paragraph 2.2. Paragraph 2.3 deals with the literature research questions and the findings of the five questions.

2.1 The assumption of the research

The research looks at problems in policy processes in government and particularly focuses on policy formation processes of problems on the agenda in government and the impact of key political actors in policy formation processes. It is concerned about how policy comes about and how decision making comes about in such processes. The research employs the argument of Kingdon (1984) to explain how the two aspects come about in the beginning of the policy cycle.

"Kingdon (1984) multiple streams approach is an extension of the “Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice”, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972). His approach emphasizes the fact that political actors can impact systemic problems in government for issues to gain prominence on the political agenda and be some of the few issues at the top of the agenda for which policy is likely to be generated and decision-making in policy formation processes in government will come about. It is a lens that explains how policies are made under the conditions of complexity in organizations”.

The influence of different persons in government on pre decision processes and the combining of three different activities in government are the factors that are vital to policymaking and decisions coming about in policy formation processes in government. The different persons in the political system are executives in the cabinet, legislative members and key personnel in the administration. The different areas in government relate to the influence of politicians in this system, key administrative personnel executing duties, and political stakeholders in problem examination and policy makers in the policy formation process of a problem on the agenda in government. It involves politicians paying attention to the problem, others looking at ideas in government that await a link to a particular problem definition, and policy entrepreneurs linking politicians, problems and policy in the policy formation process for policymaking and alternative specification.

The argument of J.W. Kingdon (1984) provides the theoretical perspective of the research. The propositions of the research come from his argument on policymaking and alternative selection in policy formation processes in government. These propositions focus on activity in the pre decision process in government after the agenda setting.

"The Multiple Streams approach is based on the concept of bounded rationality, Simon (1957), and organization theory. Political actors are limited for problems they can consider for policymaking and the amount of decisions that they can bring about. The lens theorizes at the systemic level or looks at a separate decision as the unit of analysis”.

Kingdon’s (1984) concern is how problems become agenda points in government. He explains that indicators for particular situations, feedback from existing programs and dramatic events or crises determine which problems draw attention in government for decision making. His argument explains that serious attention from politicians to a problem allows it to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection. He explains that both policymaking and alternative selection in government are dependent on significant attention of politicians and key personnel in the administration. Attention of these actors not only helps issues make it unto the agenda in government, but also help problems reach the top of the agenda in government. The focus here is on affecting rises on the agenda. Many problems on the agenda compete with each other to rise to the top of the agenda in government; some problems push others further down the agenda to affect the rise on the agenda.

As previously noted, affecting a rise on the agenda in government require significant attention of politicians; this more often refers to executives in the cabinet, but the influence of opposition parties in the legislature is also important.

The significant attention of the mentioned actors is essential to certain activities occurring in the policy formation processes in government. The argument teaches us that politicians use their knowledge of problems on the policy agenda to promote their positions on the problems and they form coalitions within the political system in support of their positions. They aim for consensus in decision making, but attaining majority support for their positions on issues also works.

The argument distinguishes three different types of activities of separate actors within government. Each activity of the different actors within the pre decision process has a particular function and the combining of the different activities results in policymaking and alternative selection taking place in the policy formation process. This policymaking and alternative selection signifies the completion of the policy formation process in government.

---

11 Zahariadis, N. 1999, Theories of the Policy Process, Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams, University of California, West View Press, pp. 74
government. The completion of the entire policy cycle then stands a chance of coming about. The attainment of beneficial policy outcomes might happen in the policy cycle.

The propositions of this research relate to these important aspects of the argument of Kingdon (1984) and in the following chapter on methodology, they will be linked to relevant empirical data for comparison with the results of the empirical research question.

2.2 The theoretical propositions of the research

The theoretical propositions are specific statements that are relevant in this research. These statements range from agenda setting of problems to decision making in the policy formation process. They represent what is likely to happen for both policymaking and alternative selection to take place in the policy formation process of problems on the agenda in government.

The different statements (propositions) that form the basis of the argument of this research are the following aspects:

Societal demands directed to government concerning a problem that citizens view as a problem and executives in the cabinet, members of the legislature, and key administrative personnel pay attention to the problem for agenda setting to occur in government. This attention to the problem is significant enough for the problem to make it unto the agenda in government.

The problem makes it unto the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection based on the attention it receives in the political system; the attention the problem receives from executives in government is not significant enough to affect a rise to the top of the agenda in government. There is a possibility to generate policy and select a policy in government if the problem moves to the top of the policy agenda.

The systemic constraints of ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government affect the policy formation process in question. These problems must be resolved as they affect the saliency of problems on the agenda. These constraints also need attention in government. Government must be consistent in choosing urgent problems to push for attention in government. Unclear processes in government are reason for stagnation in the decision-making; such processes must find resolution via effective governing regulations that are transparent. This takes place and the focus is then again on the saliency of the problem. Serious attention from politicians and administrative support helps the problem rise to the top of the agenda in government.

The problem is at the top of the agenda in government. Three different types of activities, that involve particular professionals in each area, take place separately in
government. The continued interests of politicians and key administrative personnel in solving the problem, the political stakeholders in government that are involved in the problem examination, and policy makers that separately generate ideas for policy are the different relevant areas of the policy formation process that are important to solving the problem. The parties carry out their duties independent of each other. Policy entrepreneurs make use of the period that the problem receives attention (policy window) to help bring about policy. They must now link the three separate areas in government for them to combine.

Policy entrepreneurs bring politicians in touch with the problem examination in the system and the ideas that exist in government about policy. This linking of the three different activities in government by policy entrepreneurs leads to the activities combining. Politicians now use their knowledge of the problem, their familiarity with procedures in government, and strengthen their ties with other politicians in the political system to obtain consensus for decision-making. Alternative comes about, politicians decided on the solution for the problem. The policy formation process successfully completes based on the choice of the parliamentarians.

Policy is available in government. Executives in government and the administrative staff must now look into the implementation of the policy.

The policy will be implemented, monitored and evaluated in the coming period. There is a chance that the policy cycle will produce policy outcomes that prove beneficial to citizens within the community. The policy cycle now has a chance to complete due to the success in the policy formation process.

2.3 The literature research questions and findings

2.3.1 What are the three streams of Kingdon (1984) and which feature of his argument indicates an issue rising to a prominent position on the political agenda?

The Multiple Streams Framework of John W. Kingdon (1984) comes from the Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice of Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) that view organizations as:

\[12\] The Garbage can Model of Organizational Choice views organizations as organized anarchies, where collection of choices look for problems, issues and

---

feelings look for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions look for issues to which they might be an answer, and decision makers look for work”.

Such organizations are also characterized by ‘problematic preferences, unclear technology and fluidity’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972). Kingdon (1984) adapted this model.

His model recognizes three separate streams flowing through government that are essential to policymaking and alternative selection in the policy formation process of the policy cycle. His focus is this pre decision process in government; how the problem identification takes place in government and how alternative specification comes about in this part of the policy cycle.

The three streams of Kingdon (1984) relates to three different areas in government where specific professionals carry out certain duties. Their activities are collectively responsible for policymaking and alternative selection within the policy formation process. Significant attention of executives in the cabinet, other parliamentarian in the governing system, and key administrative personnel in government help the problem rise to the top of the agenda in government. This rise on the agenda makes policy generation and decision-making in the pre decision process possible. The attention of the mentioned persons to the problem is one area in government. There is also an area in government where policy stakeholders examine problems that receive attention from politicians. In this area, the problem definition comes about by relevant stakeholders in the policy process. Government also has another area that generates policy ideas. These ideas generate separately, without links to the problem examination section of the political system.

Policy entrepreneurs make use of the short period that politicians pay keen attention to the problem (policy window) to help find a solution for it. They link the attention of the political actors to the problem examination and the policy ideas in government and the combining of the three areas in government affects the rise on the agenda, generate policy and a policy alternative become specified in the pre decision process of the policy cycle. The combination of the three areas or is essential for problems rising to the top of the political agenda and the subsequent actions taking place.

Findings of research question 1:

The three streams of Kingdon (1984) are three separate areas in government where professionals carry out duties that result in policy generation and alternative selection in the pre decision process of the policy cycle. Executives in the cabinet, members of parliament and key administrative personal are
professionals in one area that help problems rise on the agenda in government by paying significant attention to a problem. Through debate and political alliances, they also help resolve problematic preferences and unclear processes in government. Relevant stakeholders in a policy process examine particular problems and they define problems in the governing system. Policy makers look at the ideas in government and are responsible for policy making in government. Policy entrepreneurs link these separate areas and the combining of the different areas is essential for affecting a rise of the problem to a prominent position on the political agenda for decision-making.

2.3.2 What is agenda setting in government?

John W. Kingdon (1984) has written his first book on agenda setting in the year 1984. The book “Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policy” is an award-winning book with more than one revision. His agenda setting theory comes from large-scale qualitative interviews carried out in the period of 1976-1979 in the United States. He interviewed congressional staff, executive branch politicians, upper level civil servants, and presidential staff for his research. He looked at how issues come to the attention of officials, how the alternatives generate, and how the governmental agenda is set.

He views agenda setting as:

13“Agenda setting in government according to Kingdon (1995) is a process that identifies, recognizes, and defines certain public problems. It generates, considers, and attaches specific solutions or alternatives to these problems. The interaction of the three streams enables agenda setting in government”.

In the agenda building process public issues that have gained a great amount of public attention, also captures the attention of executives in government. Members of parliament and especially members of the opposition party or parties also pay attention to public issues that have gained a lot of public attention. Public issues that citizens regard as problems (clearly viewed as problems government officials must attend to) sometimes gain significant attention from the executives in the cabinet. They make it unto the agenda in government for policy generation and alternative selection. This problem agenda has many other issues that must gain enough attention to rise to the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection in government.

The role of opinion and the moulding of public opinion by the media in agenda setting of issues in government is a contested matter. The media is effective in moulding public opinion (Dearing & Rogers 1996; McCombs & Shaw 1972). Research outlines that the effect of the media is less important on central decision making of political actors (Strobel 1997; Strömbäck 2000).

The first research question determined how issues rise to a prominent position on this political agenda. Agenda setting of public issues is much like this process. Public issues need significant attention from executives in the cabinet, members of parliament, and key administrative personnel to make it unto the agenda in government. Once on the agenda in government the problem must be salient enough to place at the top of the agenda. A crisis for instance pushes all other problems down the agenda and the focus of officials is primarily on this problem. If the problem is not at the top of the agenda in government, then policy generation and alternative selection will not come about. A rise of the problem to the top of the agenda comes about as previously outlined. Affecting a rise on the political agenda and agenda setting involves the same process. Politicians in office, others in parliament and key administrative personnel must pay significant attention to the problem for it to rise to the top of the agenda, problem examination must be the focus of relevant stakeholders in the policy process, and policy makers must generate policy based on ideas in the system. The activities in the separate areas then combine with the help of policy entrepreneurs. Issues then rise to the top of the agenda in government, policy comes about and alternatives become specified in the pre decision process of the policy cycle. Agenda setting is thus the process of public issues becoming regarded as problems, and making it unto the agenda in government for policy generation and alternative selection. This is how Kingdon (1995) defines agenda setting.

“McCombs and Shaw (1972) investigated the agenda setting function of the mass media during the presidential election of the year 1968 in the USA. They looked at the relationship between what voters in a community said where important issues and the actual message of the media. Their conclusions showed

---

14 Eriksson, J. & Noreen E. 2002, Setting the Agenda of Threats: An Explanatory Model, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Upp Sala University, peace research papers no. 6, pp. 17

that the media exerted significant influence on what voters saw as the major issues of the campaign”.

The finding of the research question 2:

Agenda setting is a process that can occur after the agenda building process of issues. An issue that gains significant public attention receives recognition as a problem by the public. They demand that government do something about the problem. Officials in government pay attention to problems that gain a lot of attention from the public. The demand of the public has their attention. Some of these problems make it unto the agenda in government. Those problems that gain significant attention of government officials make it to the top of the agenda for policy generation and alternative selection. This is not always the case. Some issues do not receive enough attention from elected officials and they must compete with other problems on the agenda to make it to the top of the agenda in government. Agenda setting of issues in government and affecting a rise of an issue on the problem agenda are very similar. Both entail a process in which politicians and key administrative personnel must pay significant attention to the problem for it to make it unto the agenda or rise to the top of the agenda, problem examination must be the focus of relevant stakeholders in the policy process, and policy makers must generate policy based on ideas in the system. Policy entrepreneurs must help link the activities of the three mentioned areas and the activities in the separate areas then combine. Issues then rise to the top of the agenda in government, policy comes about and alternatives become specified in the pre decision process of the policy cycle. The definition of Kingdon (1995) on agenda setting entails issues making it unto the agenda for this process.

2.3.3 What is the political agenda in a policy process and how does this agenda defer from the public agenda?

The political agenda is the agenda in government that contains problems that officials in government must look into for decision-making. Some of the problems made it onto this agenda based on public demands for government to seek solutions for them. Others generate within the organization.

Kingdon (1995) describes the political agenda as:

16“The agenda, as I conceive of it, is the list of subjects or problems to which government officials, and people outside of government closely associated with those officials, are paying some serious attention at any given time”.

16 Kingdon, J. 1995, Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policy chapter 1 pp. 3
This agenda contains a large number of problems with the most salient ones at
the top of the agenda. Further down the agenda the problems are less salient
and do not have the immediate attention of government officials.

Problems do not remain at the top or bottom of this agenda. They move up or
down the agenda. The problems that receive significant attention from
government officials push others down the agenda.

Problems on this agenda have the attention of those officials in government for
policy generation and alternative selection. Some problems remain on the
political agenda for a very long time without decision-making. Alternative
selection comes about for some problems and others disappear from this
agenda.

Issues that have the attention of the public do not make it onto the agenda in
government quite easily. They must receive significant attention from elected
officials to do so. Public issues must have the attention of the public long
enough or make a tremendous public impact for officials in government to place
them on the agenda.

The number of potential public issues far exceeds the capabilities of decision
makers to process them. Public issues must all compete for a chance to make it
unto the agenda in government. Various groups within communities deal with
public issues that compete for a place on the agenda in government. These
groups are vying for serious attention of decision makers in government for
their issues of concern. Activists groups and platforms with specific concerns
deal with different types of problems. Some groups look at the same problems,
but have different approaches in championing their cause. Gaining the attention
of political actors is crucial to politics and policymaking. Gaining their attention
is a prerequisite for public issues to reach policy agendas. The media, political
parties, activist groups, and other platforms can help set the political agenda, if
their promotion of certain issues gains prominent news coverage. The public
becomes concerned with those issues and this has the attention of elected
officials.

The political agenda defers from the public agenda primarily in the manner in
which issues make it onto the agenda. The media plays a major role in agenda
setting of the public agenda. Issues make it onto this agenda via an agenda
building process. The public must become aware of issues and voice their
concern or opinion about them. The public must see the issues as problems.
Government officials play the major role in agenda setting of problems on the
political agenda. They decide which issues to give significant attention to and as
a result, these issues make it onto the agenda in government.
The public agenda is the agenda that the media influences via an agenda building process. The public becomes aware of issues and responds to the coverage in the media. The public regards issues as problems and directs public demands to government for solutions to the problems.

Cobb, Keith-Ross and Ross (1976) define the public agenda as:

17“*The public agenda is the agenda that consist of issues which have achieved a high level of public interest and visibility. The media sets the public agenda*”.

Issues make it unto the public agenda via coverage in the media. The lengthier the news coverage, the more attention issues receive from the public. The amount of media coverage and attributes of the issues displayed in the media, determine which issues are important to the public and how they think about the issues. Issues on the public agenda remain there for a short while and then the attention shifts to other issues that the media cover. The attention of the public shifts with the media agenda. Attention to issues shifts back in the event that some event focuses the attention of the public on the issue again. The issue then returns for a short while to the public agenda.

The findings of research question 3:

The political agenda is the agenda in government that contains problems that officials in government must look into for decision-making. Some of the problems made it onto the agenda based on public demands for government to seek solutions for them. Others generate within the organization.

The public agenda is the agenda that the media influences via an agenda building process. The public becomes aware of issues and responds to the coverage in the media. The public regards issues as problems and directs public demands to government for solutions to the problems.

The political agenda defers mainly from the public agenda by the following aspects:

Problems are on the political agenda for policy generation and alternative selection in government; the media puts issues on the public agenda to build awareness of these issues and for the public to regard issues as problems. This is the primary distinction between these agendas.

---

Government officials in office decide which problems will reach the agenda in government and groups outside of government try to influence this agenda; the media sets the public agenda via an agenda building process.

The political agenda is tough to conquer. Issues must receive prolonged public attention and must be of a dramatic or crisis nature for them to gain significant interest of officials in government; issues make it onto the public agenda via coverage in the media more easily than the political agenda.

Issues can remain for a long period on the political agenda and rise and fall on this agenda. Some disappear and do not return. Issues remain for a short period on the public agenda and then disappear. They can return to the agenda.

Government officials are not dependent on the media for awareness of all issues that should reach the policy agenda. The system generates issues for the agenda. The public is generally dependent on the media to bring awareness of issues. These issues then become public issues via the agenda building process.

2.3.4 What are the problematic aspects of policy formation processes that prevent issues from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy coming about?

This thesis looks at problematic aspects of policy formation processes after agenda setting of issues on the political agenda. It specifically looks at ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government. Both aspects are the reasons why formation processes of issues stagnate. Clarity concerning the position of government on political issues and the urgency to solve certain problems within the shortest possible period must come about. Clarity must come about for relevant processes in government are unclear. They impede other decision-making from coming about. Regulating matters with a certain degree of clarity benefits other processes in government.

In the “Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice” Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) state:

18 “Organized anarchies are characterized by ‘problematic preferences, unclear technology, and fluid participation’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972):

• The organization operates based on a variety of inconsistent and ill-defined preferences. It discovers preferences through action more than it acts on the basis of preferences.

• Although the organization manages to survive and even produce, its members do not understand its own processes. It operates based on trial and error procedures, learning from accidents of experiences and pragmatic inventions of necessity.

• Participants vary for time and effort they devote to the different domains; involvement varies from one time to another. As a result the boundaries of the organization are uncertain and changing; the audiences and decision makers for any particular kind of choice change capriciously”.

In this thesis ‘problematic preferences’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) refer to the fact that at times government select certain problems for policymaking and alternative selection above other problems that are thought to be more urgently in need of solutions. They are not consistent enough in selecting the most urgent problems for decision-making. Example: Investment in low-income public housing should have figured more prominently on the policy agenda, than others issues that have received decision making in the last decennia. It is inconceivable that such an urgent problem could not place higher on the policy agenda. The choices of problems that politicians seek decision making for are sometimes problematic.

Processes are unclear or regulation is nonexistent to govern processes that government has decided on. Government can decide to decentralize tasks to a lower government body, but if government does not adequately define and regulate the decentralization process to determine how to govern the process, then civil servants will not know how to decentralize tasks efficiently. There will be problems carrying out the decision. The problems that they encounter related to the tasks are part of political debate and relevant decision making in the political system. Additional regulations must bring clarity and transparency to the process.

19 "Rose (1999) reflects on Morgan (1986) concept of learning to learn in connection with responsive public services and states that systems are often able to detect and correct errors. They are able to learn to learn and self-organize
based on their self-questioning ability that underpins the activities of the systems”.

‘Problematic preferences and unclear technology’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government prevent problems from rising to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection. Problems must receive significant attention from officials in government for them to reach the top of the agenda. Politicians must decide to give the most urgent problems attention above others and they must regulate certain processes sufficiently to avoid stagnation in policy formation processes that depend on specific regulation that govern the processes.

The relationship between ‘problematic preferences, unclear technology’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) and the argument of Kingdon (1984) is clear. Both aspects impede problems from rising to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection.

Findings of the research question 4:

‘Problematic preferences and unclear technology’ (1972) Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) are the problematic aspects that prevent issues from rising to the top of the agenda for decision-making.

‘Problematic preferences’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) refer to the fact that at times government select certain problems for policymaking and alternative selection above other problems that others see as more urgently in need of solutions. Public officials are not consistent enough in selecting the most urgent problems for decision-making.

‘Unclear technology’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) is unclear or nonexistent regulations that should govern processes that government has decided on. Government must regulate exactly how to govern the processes.

Both aspects are the reason for stagnation in policy processes. These constraints must be resolved for activity in particular policy formation processes to proceed based on clarity. Affected problems on the agenda do not rise to the top for policymaking and alternative selection according to the argument of Kingdon (1984).

2.3.5 How do executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence problematic aspects in policy formation processes according to the argument of Kingdon (1984).
Executive-, legislative-, and key administrative personnel impact problematic aspects in policy formation processes through the attention they give these aspects.

Executives in government and their administrative support staff look at the stagnation that both aspects cause in the proper functioning of government and the implications of this stagnation for government. They take into consideration the effect for citizens. How other politicians, that are not part of the cabinet, would conceive non-action on their part appears too. They must be credible and move towards resolving the constraints in government. Problems that are urgent and should have received more attention in government now receive attention. They make up for the inconsistency of the choices that made in government. They look at the reasons why politicians did not tackle the problems sooner and instead opted to solve other problems. They tackle present and past bottlenecks related to the problem.

The attention of political actors to problems related to unclear processes in government help resolve these problems through regulation. Significant attention indicates serious consideration for possible solutions of the stagnated policy formation process.

20 “The task of legislatures is to make sure that the democratic system of government functions effectively. Legislatures represent the needs and wishes of citizens in policymaking. Their activities summed up are identifying problems, formulating and approving laws to address them, and overseeing the implementation of policies. They monitor, review and investigate government activities to ensure that they are transparent, efficient and consistent with existing laws and regulations”.

Legislative parties that not part of the sitting government pay significant attention to stagnation within policy formation processes. They criticize the fact that the governing program is not reflective enough of urgent problems on the agenda in government and that the choice of problems that the governing party wishes to focus on is too problematic. They point out that urgent problems are not attended too while others receive attention. They also point out the consequences of the cabinet’s actions for citizens. They question the representation that the persons who elected these politicians are receiving. This is their role as opposition party within the political system. Their focus is on putting pressure on the cabinet to move in the right direction. The opposition

20 Inter American Development Bank 2008, Political Parties, Legislatures and Presidents, Legislatures, chap. 3, pp. 9
gives their positions on the problem of choices of problems to solve. They indicate which problems are urgent and presently in need of decision-making. They look for support in numbers in the system to ensure that their views find support. The cabinet must take decisions of the parliament into consideration. They also urge the cabinet to solve processes that prove unclear for the civil service and the legislature based on the principles of good governance.

21“It is crucial for government to seek innovative methods to make government work better and to serve society better. Government must do so, even if faced with complex problems and citizens that do not recognize or appreciate their efforts”.

Key personnel in the administration have a support role in government. They support the sitting government in carrying out their plans and upholding laws and procedures in government. They take into account the direction that the cabinet intends to take and help make this happen. The entire administration is at their disposal in doing so. They also assist the opposition in carrying out their duties. Access to the relevant information and advice on procedures are key areas in which they give the opposition support. Key administrative personnel help opposing parties in the political system carry out their tasks. They assist them in representing the electorate.

Stakeholders involved in problem examination in policy formation processes, policy makers in government that are looking at ideas in the system and policy entrepreneurs that are aware of increased attention to problems in policy formation processes all have their roles to play in government. They focus on their tasks. This means that policy entrepreneurs are aware of the fact that problems will place higher on the agenda with the resolution of constraints in government. Problems that rise to the top of the agenda in government receive attention for decision-making in government. The problem identification takes place and policy alternatives are available for decision-making.

Findings of research question 5:

Executives in the cabinet, legislative members and key personnel in the administration resolve the problems of problematic preference and unclear processes Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) that are reason for stagnation within policy processes in government. They do so by paying keen attention to these problems. They do so under pressure of the opposition in the legislature that focuses on the effects for citizens and the ill representation that citizens receive.

by the sitting government. The cabinet must move to resolve the problems. Key personnel in the administration support the cabinet in their choices of problems to resolve and their approaches to bring clarity to processes. Once the problems are resolved, then the issues that are now at the top of the agenda in government can receive decision-making. The argument of Kingdon (1984) says that activity also take place in two other areas in government. The areas of problem examination and policy ideas have their particular ongoing tasks taking place and policy entrepreneurs take in all that is happening in the political system. When the constraints are resolved, the problem rises to the top of the agenda in government. The different areas come together, combine to produce policy and an alternative become specified.
3. Methodology

This chapter on methodology deals with the empirical analysis of the research. Paragraph 3.1 looks at the goal of the research in relation to the empirical part of the central research question. Then paragraph 3.2 reviews the objectives of the empirical research, which relates to answering four research questions. Paragraph 3.3 determines the methodological approach or the plan for the empirical research. Paragraph 3.4 looks at the study design. Paragraph 3.5 Looks at how the researcher conducts the research. Paragraph 3.6 looks at the analysis of the case study evidence. Paragraph 3.7 looks at the conclusions and reporting of the research.

3.1 The goal of the research

This thesis investigates the following central research question: What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed, and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines? How do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence these problematic aspects and how can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

"The advantages of the case study methods are its applicability to real-life, contemporary human situations and its public accessibility through written reports".

The following sub questions analysis represents the research question:

Research question 6

How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

Research question 7

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

Research question 8

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

---

Research question 9

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Investigating this central research question involves a literature research aspect that sheds light on the theory of the research as previously stated. The empirical investigation of this central research question is in this chapter on methodology.

The theoretical argument of the research is that serious attention of executives in government, legislative members and key administrative personnel impact problematic aspects in policy formation processes for issues to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection.

The goal of the study establishes the parameters of the research. The literature aspect involves theory and the other part is the empirical study. The goal of this empirical part is to carry out an investigation that establishes the problematic aspects in policy formation processes. How actors in government impact problematic aspects in policy formation processes according to Kingdon (1984) and also to determine how these actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present can impact problematic aspects as Kingdon (1984) outlines? The research will compare the theoretical propositions of the research to empirical data that the research establishes. The analysis will determine whether the research confirms or rejects the theory of Kingdon (1984).

“Qualitative research mostly seeks to generate theory from data. The data grounds the theory. However, there is no reason why a researcher cannot start with a theory which they aim to test”.

3.2 The objectives of the empirical research

The research outlines a set of objectives that entail a search for information related to the empirical part of the central research question.

“The richness and diversity of overall design strategies in qualitative research are evident in the literature detailing specific studies”.

---


The first objective is to determine how agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occurred in local government on Sint Maarten from the perspective of the different groups involved in the agenda setting. Secondly, to determine the problematic aspects in government that prevents the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government. The third objective is to determine how these problematic aspects affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984). The fourth objective is to determine how the actors in government can impact/influence the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness at present as Kingdon (1984) outlines.

The first objective of the empirical investigation addresses the research question number 6 of this study: How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

The second objective of this investigation addresses the research question number 7 of the study: What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

The third objective of the empirical investigation addresses the research question number 8 of the study: How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

The fourth objective of the empirical investigation addresses the research number 9 of this study: How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

3.3 **The methodological approach of the research**

The main aspect of this chapter on methodology is to determine how to meet the four previously outlined objectives. How to go about finding accurate answers to the research questions? Another point worth mentioning is how to conduct the investigation in such a manner that the results of the study are reliable? The conclusions of the research must be accurate and useful to others and this demands a properly conducted investigation. The research protocol will ensure the integrity of the research.

It was imperative to decide on an approach to carry out the study. This plan entails carrying out research to obtain data and analyze the data for comparison with the theory and finally, conclusions. Qualitative research in the form of a single case study suits this investigation. The methodological approach of the case study consists of following aspects:
1. Design the case study  
   a. Determine the required research design  
   b. Develop the protocol of the research  

2. Conduct the research of the case study  
   a. Prepare for data collection  
   b. Distribute interview questionnaire  
   c. Conduct interviews  

3. Analyze the case study evidence  
   a. Apply the analytic strategy  
   b. Prepare an outline and format for the report  

4. Develop conclusions of the research based on evidence  
   a. Draw the conclusions based on the evidence from the empirical research  
   b. Prepare the report with the conclusions  

3.4 Design the case study  

3.4.1 Determine the required study design  

“Yin (1994) researched case study methodology and determined that case studies designs depict the study’s questions, its propositions, its units of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions and the criteria for interpreting the findings”.

The first aspect of the research design for this investigation is the fact that the study employs qualitative research to carry out the investigation. It is more appropriate than the quantitative methodology for retrieving the data of this study. Quantitative methods do not offer the same flexibility to establish the perceptions of the actors as qualitative methods do. Qualitative research offers a better chance of obtaining the type of information that is the focus of the study.

Secondly, the research design is a single case study. It concerns a study that looks at homelessness on Sint Maarten. The investigation examines the political system on Sint Maarten, where the focus will primarily be on executives in government, legislative members of the opposition, and key administrative personnel that support government and the legislature.
Thirdly, also relevant for the research design is the construction of theoretical propositions of this study based on the argument of Kingdon (1984). These propositions relate to the objectives of the empirical study that address the four empirical research questions. They are statements ranging from agenda setting to identifying problematic aspects in policy processes and influencing them to affect a rise on the agenda in government for policy generation and alternative selection. Linking these propositions to the data takes place for comparison with the theoretical pattern.

The theoretical propositions that form the basis of the argument of this research are the following aspects:

- Societal demands directed to government concerning an issue that citizens view as a problem and executives in the cabinet, members of the legislature, and key administrative personnel pay attention to the issue for agenda setting to occur in government. This attention to the problem must be significant enough for the problem to make it unto the agenda in government.

- The problem makes it unto the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection based on the attention it receives in the political system; the attention it receives on the agenda must be significant enough to affect a rise of the problem to the top of the agenda in government. Only then will policy be generated and decision making come about in a policy formation process. This serious attention of the mentioned actors to the problem signifies a policy window occurring. There is a possibility to generate policy and select a policy in government; policy entrepreneurs play their role in first linking the different areas in government for them to combine.

- The systemic constraints of ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government that affect the policy cycle in question, also receive attention in government to increase the saliency of the issue on the agenda. The problem receives preference above others on the agenda to affect the rise to the top of the agenda in government. Unclear processes in government that are reason for stagnation in the pre decision process also find resolution due to the significant interests of the political actors in this particular problem.

- The policy formation process of the problem that is at the top of the agenda in government knows different types of activities that involve particular professionals in each area. The continued interests of politicians and key administrative personnel in solving the problem, the
stakeholders in- and outside government that are involved in the problem examination and policy makers that separately generate ideas for policy are the different areas of the policy formation process of the policy cycle. Policy entrepreneurs must now link the three separate areas for them to combine.

- Policy entrepreneurs bring politicians in touch with the problem examination in the system and the ideas that exist in government about policy. This linking of the three different activities in government by policy entrepreneurs leads to them combining. Politicians now use their knowledge of the problem, their familiarity with procedures in government, and strengthen their ties with other politicians in the system to obtain consensus for decision making on the salient issue on the agenda.

- Policy is available in government and decision making comes about in the pre decision process. Parliamentarians decide on the choice of policy that government implements to solve this particular problem.

- The policy will be implemented, monitored and evaluated in the coming period in government. There is a chance it will produce policy outcomes that prove beneficial to citizens within the community. The policy cycle now has a chance to complete due to the success in the pre decision process, the policy formation process.

The fourth aspect of the research design is that the research is causal or explanatory research. Actors in government influence problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness, for the issue to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection according to the argument of Kingdon (1984). The impact of the actors is responsible for the rise of the issue to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection. Their impact determines a certain action. This cause- and effect pattern signifies causal research.

The theoretical research determined that the problematic aspects in government that affect policy formation processes are ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972). It also determined that serious attention of the actors in government to these problematic aspects affect the rise of an issue on the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection. The empirical research will look at how the actors in cabinet, the legislature and key personnel in the administration impact/influence problematic aspects of policy formation processes. Then it will determine how these actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten can at present impact problematic
aspects of the issue of homelessness for the issue to reach the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection.

The fifth aspect of the research design is that the independent variables of the research are the executive-, legislative, and key administrative personnel in government that impact/influence problematic aspects in policy formation processes in government. The dependent variable is the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten that rises to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection due to the impact of the actors in government.

The sixth aspect of the research design is that the units of analysis are the executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government; they are the primary units of analysis. Data comes from these actors for the last part of the central research question or the empirical part of the study. Other stakeholders in the policy process of homelessness on Sint Maarten will also supply data for the research. These are secondary units of analysis.

The seventh aspect of the research design is the fact that the unit of analysis of the research questions is a system of action, instead of an individual or group. They are the political system, the media, the public, and the stakeholders of the problem definition outside of government. In addition, another aspect is that the focus of the empirical research is on two topics. How the actors in the political system impact/influence problematic aspects of policy formation processes and how can these actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

The case study suggests a logic linking the data to the theoretical propositions of the research. This concerns serious attention of executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government on Sint Maarten to ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in the policy formation process of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present, help the issue rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection according to Kingdon (1984).

The eight aspect of the research design is the criteria for interpreting the findings of the research. Comparison of the theory (theoretical propositions representative of the theory) and the empirical data takes place.

The abovementioned suggestion of the case study is the criteria for interpreting the findings of the research. The following questions are also part of the criteria for interpreting the findings. How does the empirical data match up to the theoretical propositions? Is the suggested logic linking the data to the propositions the same when data from the empirical research matches up to the theoretical propositions? Yes confirms the theory of Kingdon (1984). No rejects this theory.
3.4.2 Develop the protocol of the research

The research protocol establishes the reliability of the research. The components of the research protocol save guard the integrity of the research. 25“Yin (1994, pg. 64) states that the research protocol consists of an overview of the project objectives, topics being investigated and issues. Also, field procedures, the case study questions that require data collection and the guide for the case study report outline”.

The research objectives and the investigation of the topic received elaboration in the aforementioned research design phase. Important issues in case studies must now receive attention.

Case studies must deal with certain issues that can affect the validity and reliability of the research. The researcher must show how the research dealt with these issues to ensure that the findings are accurate and reliable. These issues are:

3.4.2.1 Subjectivity

The case study has a tendency to confirm the researcher preconceived notions; the subjectivity of the researcher affects the construct validity of the research

26“Yin (1994) recommends using multiple data sources of evidence on which to base the conclusions of the research”. This is triangular investigation, in which the researcher considers the theory and data from multiple sources; this research will establish data based on various interviews and several types of documentation.

3.4.2.2 Linking data to propositions and the findings

Linking data to the propositions of the research and the criteria for interpreting the findings are the least developed in case studies. This presents a problem to establish the findings of the research in causal case studies in an accurate manner. The internal validity of the research is a reason for concern.

This means that in this study the researcher cannot ascertain that the actors in government are responsible for the impact on problematic aspects in the policy formation process and it cannot be established with certainty how they impact problematic aspects. It also means that the investigator could not say with a good degree of certainty that the actors in government impact/influence the

---


26 Tellis, W. 1997 Introduction to case study, the Qualitative report, Fairfield University, CT, U.S.A., volume 3, no 2, July 1997, pp. 6
problematic aspects in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness for the issue to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection. It could not relate how they do so with certainty.

27 *Yin (1994) recommends using a pattern matching technique to (Campbell, 1975) to link the data to the propositions of the research. Information on the problem or issue relates to the theory to form theoretical propositions. They form the logic linking the data to the propositions. Comparison with the data of the research will establish the same logic or not. In both ways, quality assurance of the internal validity of the research comes about. Campbell (1975) recommends using a pattern and a rival pattern in his research; the data will match one pattern better than the other*”. Two rival theories are part of the research alongside the theory of Kingdon (1984). The primary units of analysis then choose one of these approaches. Comparison of the theory of choice with the propositions of the research determines the findings.

3.4.2.3 The external validity

The single case study relies on a single case as the basis for generalizing the conclusions. The dependency of the single case renders the case study incapable of providing a generalizing conclusion. The establishment of the external validity of the research is problematic in the single case study.

The research data of the various interviews and additional research sources relate how the actors in government impact/influence problematic aspects in policy formation processes. Additionally, how the actors in the policy process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present can impact/influence problematic aspects for the issue to rise to the top of the agenda in government. However, the conclusions of the research would not be reliable enough to generalize from this case to other cases.

28 *Yin (1994) points out that analytical generalization are the basis for generalization in case studies and not statistical sampling*”.

Theory is a template against which to compare the empirical results. The case study consists of a whole study in which data comes from various sources and conclusions concern facts. The single case study confirms a theory or rejects it”.

3.4.2.4 The reliability of the research


The problems with the construct validity, internal validity and external validity of research in case studies affect the reliability of the research. The answers to the how questions of the empirical investigation would not be accurate or reliable. They would not be useful to others.

"Yin’s (1994) position is that case study methodology requires a research protocol to ensure that the findings of the research are reliable. It helps render the conclusions of the research generalizable to other cases”.

We move on to the other aspects of the research protocol: Field procedures, case study questions that require data collection and the guide for the case study report outline need elaboration.

3.4.2.5 Field procedures

Data selection: The primary objective of the data selection is to determine the appropriate data type, data sources, and suitable instruments to collect the data of the research. The data selection should help provide adequate answers to the research questions.

1. In selecting data type, data sources and research instruments ensure the integrity of the research

   Method:

   Consider the following points:

   a. Look at the research questions
   b. Look at the scope or parameters of the study; selected data should not go beyond the scope of the study
   c. Consider the most appropriate data to collect based on what the literature established
   d. Look at the data type choice.

2. Selected choices for the data

   a. Data type

   Qualitative search in the form of a single case study

   b. Data of multiple data sources

---

29 Tellis, W. 1997 Introduction to case study, the qualitative report, Fairfield University, CT, U.S.A., volume 3, no. 2, July 1997, pp. 5
Documentation: articles in newspapers:

Newspaper articles of twenty years ago from several newspapers

Reports on homelessness in the past years

Newspaper article of the Daily Herald:

The homeless woman who is living on the street

The lead reporter of the Daily Herald notes and analysis:

Analysis of the stakeholders search for solutions after agenda setting

Newspaper article of the Today newspaper:

The former Lt. Governor commenting on affordable housing after the series of articles on homelessness

Statistics on the problem of housing on Sint Maarten:

Central Bureau of Statistics

VSA report on homelessness:

Baseline study on priority needs households on Sint Maarten, which households need housing urgently.

Documentation: Letters

Social Services letters

Communication between the stakeholders to find a solution for the housing problem of the woman living on the street, Social Services, Mental Health Foundation St. Martins Home and Sint Maarten Housing and Development Foundation

Mental Health Foundation

Communication on the problem of housing patients that are living on the street

Statement St. Martins Home

Documentation: An empirical study of the year 2009:
Xinsheng Liu, Eric Lindquist, Arnold Vedlitz & Kenneth Vincent: Understanding local policymaking: policy elite’s perceptions of local agenda setting and alternative policy selection:

This study examines the key forces and factors, as well as their relative importance, in local agenda setting, problem identification, and alternative selection. Data comes from 271 in-depth interviews with local policy stakeholders in three Golf Coast areas. The study focuses on capturing stakeholder’s perception of the key elements and forces in local policy dynamics. It uses the theoretical approach of Kingdon (1995) to carry out the study.

The findings of the study relate to the empirical research. They offer the research points to explore in the study of homelessness on Sint Maarten. Political actors in the system of government and administrative support can impact/influence problematic aspects in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present as Kingdon (1984) states by considering such findings. They are the following aspects:

1. Governmental actors and interests groups play a major role in shaping the agenda in government
2. Budgetary considerations are a key element in shaping the agenda in government
3. Adopting objective problem indicators and focusing events aid in setting priorities in government
4. Seriously, considering policy alternatives that deemed compatible with existing policies and regulations can facilitate policymaking and alternative selection
5. Seriously, considering criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability, and future
constraints can aid in developing policy approaches deemed less problematic.

6. Building consensus in the political system about how to resolve problematic aspects in policy formation processes is always a good way to bring about policy and decision-making in government.

Documentation on two rival theories:

Source: Journal of Higher Education, article ‘Setting the governmental agenda for state decentralization of higher education’, September 1st, 2003

1. The rational approach to agenda setting, policy generation and alternative selection, Simon (1957)

2. The incremental approach to agenda setting, policymaking and alternative selection, Lindblom (1959, 1968)

Interviews: Primary and secondary units of analysis

1. Primary units of analysis are the executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government

2. Secondary units of analysis are the stakeholders in the problem definition and search for the solution to the homelessness of a woman living on the street. Social Services, Mental Health Foundation, St. Martins Home, Public Health Department and Sint Maarten Housing and Development Foundation are the secondary stakeholder.

3.4.2.6 The multiple data sources of the research questions

Research question 6

How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

Data sources:
Documentation: articles in newspapers

1. Newspaper articles of twenty years ago from several newspapers
   Reports on homelessness in the past years

2. Newspaper article of the Daily Herald
   The homeless woman who is living on the street

3. The lead reporter of the Daily Herald notes and analysis
   Analysis of the stakeholders search for solutions after agenda setting

4. Newspaper article of the Today newspaper
   The former Lt. Governor commenting on affordable housing after the series of articles on homelessness

5. Central Bureau of Statistics
   Statistics on the problem of housing on Sint Maarten

6. VSA report on homelessness of 2009
   Baseline study on priority need households of the Ministry of Health, Labor and Social Development

Research question 7

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

Data sources:

1. Interviews with primary units of analysis:
   An executive member of the cabinet, Minister in charge of housing
   A member of the legislation (opposition party), parliamentarian
   A key administrative person, the Department Head of Housing

2. Interviews with the secondary units of analysis
Research question 8

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

Data sources:

1. Interviews with primary units of analysis;
   
   An executive member of the cabinet, Minister in charge of housing
   
   A member of the legislation (opposition party), parliamentarian
   
   A key administrative person, the Department Head of Housing

2. Interviews with the secondary units of analysis

   Stakeholders in the problem definition and search for solutions for the homeless woman
   
   A social worker at the Department of Social Services
   
   A director of the Mental Health Foundation
   
   A director of the St. Martins Home
   
   A housing manager at the Sint Maarten Housing & Development Foundation
   
   A department head of Preventive Health Care

Research question 9
How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

1. Interviews with primary units of analysis:
   - An executive member of the cabinet, minister in charge of housing
   - A member of the legislation (opposition party), parliamentarian
   - A key administrative person, the Department Head of Housing

2. Understanding local policymaking: policy elite’s perceptions of local agenda setting and alternative policy selection by Xinsheng Liu, Eric Lindquist, and Arnold Vedlitz & Kenneth Vincent, 2009

3. Journal of higher Education article: Setting the governmental agenda for state decentralization of higher education, September 1st, 2003
   a. The rational approach to agenda setting, policy generation and alternative selection
   b. The incremental approach to agenda setting, policymaking and alternative selection

3.4.3 Data collection

This is the process of gathering and measuring information on the variables of the research. Ensuring accurate and appropriate collection of the data is important for the integrity of the research. If the integrity of the research is not good, then the researcher cannot answer the research questions accurately. The study is not of value. The issues distort the findings of the research. Issues that occur in the data collection phase of the research need correction.

To avoid issues with the collection of data and the processes that come after the data collection the research employs two strategies.

Methods employed to ensure the integrity of the research:

1. Quality assurance
2. Quality control
1. Quality assurance
   
a. Assignment of an experienced researcher is part of the research to monitor the empirical part of the study. The objective is to ensure the integrity of the empirical research.

b. This person will review the research project and give useful feedback concerning the processes from data collection to reporting the findings of the research project.

2. Quality control
   
a. During and after the data collection monitor sessions will assess the work carried out and address errors in the research or violations of the protocol.

b. In each phase of the empirical research, monitor sessions held with this mentor to review the work carried out and to ascertain compliance with the research protocol takes place. Issues relating to data collection and data analysis need mentioning in discussion in the monitor sessions. When issues arise with the research tasks, errors need correction before moving on.

c. In the data collection phase, problems associated with data collection could relate to:
   
   - Errors in individual data
   - Systematic errors
   - Violation of the protocol
   - Scientific misconduct

The research instruments of the research questions.

Research question 6
How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

Research instrument:

Document analysis from newspaper on articles about the homeless woman and homelessness on Sint Maarten takes place. Analysis of letters of the stakeholder organizations about the problem of the homeless woman, personal notes of the lead reporter on the case of the homeless woman, the problem of social housing on Sint Maarten based on a newspaper article, statistics on housing on Sint Maarten, a VSA report on vulnerable groups that need social housing.

Points for the analysis:

- How did agenda setting occur and did the issue return to the agenda in government
- How did the media contribute to agenda setting now
- How did the public contribute to agenda setting now
- Who are the other stakeholders in the problem definition and solution in- and outside of government
- What is the problem of homelessness of the woman living on the streets
- Why is a solution not found
- Are there possible solutions

Write an overview of agenda setting of the problem in government that relate to the mentioned points.

The structured interviews provide answers to the research questions. Each respondent will receive an information form with instructions for the interview and the actual interview form. They will circle the answer of their choice for the research questions 7, 8 and 9. Two forms with the questions and answer categories for the respondents, one for the primary units of analysis and the other for the secondary units of analysis, make their choices possible.

Research question 7

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?
Research question 8

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

Research question 9

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Structured interview form for primary units of analysis

Argument of Kingdon (1984) states that serious attention from executives in the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to issues in policy formation processes, help issues rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection.

Please read the research question and circle the answer(s) your choice.

Question one:

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

A. ‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) of issues to push for policymaking and alternative selection in government

B. ‘Unclear processes”, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government that stagnate the policy formation process

C. Both aspects

D. None of these aspects

E. This aspect or aspects: ____________________________

Question two:

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?
A.

The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

B.

The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and the issue is at the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

C.

The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is at the top of the agenda, housing development plans and policy otherwise cater to persons living on the street. There is no stagnation of the policy process by problematic aspects in government.

D.

The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is not at the top of the agenda in government, housing development plans and policy otherwise do not cater to persons living on the street as yet. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

Question three:

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

A. Actors pay serious attention to problematic aspects in government that affect the issue of homelessness. They impact/influence other governmental actors and various interests groups to help find solutions. They impact/influence the budget in government to help shape the agenda in government. Adopting problem indicators and taking heed of focusing events are ways to do so. Seriously, considering policy alternatives that are deemed compatible with existing policies
and regulations, the processes are clear and the alternatives are attractive; by looking at criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability, and future constraints of the issue of homelessness; and by building consensus in the political system on how to resolve the problematic aspects of the policy formation process. Serious attention to all of these aspects would help the issue of homelessness rise to the top of the agenda in government, and three separate streams in government will combine for policy generation and alternative selection in policy formation process. These measures will help resolve the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness.

B. Governmental decision-makers can seriously consider a series of sequential problem identification and solution generating processes in government to resolve problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness for prominence on the agenda, and policy- and decision making in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness. Policymakers identify problems by articulating goals and setting levels of achievement for those goals that satisfy them. They then conduct analyses of the costs and benefits of alternative problems to determine which problem they should consider; they select the problem; they generate solutions to the problem; they systematically collect data; they systematically analyze the data about the policy options; and then they select the optimal alternative. Serious attention to the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness by means of these sequential stages will help generate policy and select an alternative in government. The problematic aspects in government concerning the issue of homelessness find resolution by his stages approach.

C. By policymakers gradual interest in the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness, only considering the immediate problematic aspects and making modest changes over time. A gradual emergence of aspects that are problematic and finding solutions for them will take place; a pattern of marginal steps taking annually in response to the existing problem will resolve the problematic aspects for policy generation and alternative selection in government.

Structured interview form for secondary units of analysis
Question one:

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

A. ‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) of issues to push for policymaking and alternative selection in government

B. ‘Unclear processes’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government that stagnate policy formation process

C. Both aspects

D. None of these aspects

E. This aspect or aspects: ____________________________

Question two:

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

A. The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

B. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and the issue is at the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

C. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is at the top of the agenda, housing development plans and policy otherwise cater to persons living on the street. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.
The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is not at the top of the agenda in government, housing development plans and policy otherwise do not cater to persons living on the street as yet. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

3.4.4 Data analysis

Yin (1994) states that case study research must have an analytical strategy. This strategy leads to the conclusions of the research.

3.4.4.1 Analytical strategy:

1. Make use of the theoretical propositions of the research for the analysis. Determine how the choice of research data concerning the three theories match up with the propositions of the research in research question 9.

The study will deal with the theory of Kingdon (1984) and two rival theories, the rational approach and the incremental approach to policy making.

They are three different lenses of policy formation in political systems that provide competing explanations of the same phenomenon. They offer different answers to the same question.

The theoretical propositions that form the basis of the argument of Kingdon (1984):

- Societal demands directed to government concerning an issue that citizens view as a problem and executives in the cabinet, members of the legislature, and key administrative personnel pay attention to the issue for agenda setting to occur in government. This attention to the problem must be significant enough for the problem to make it unto the agenda in government.

---

30 Tellis W. 1997 Introduction to case study, the qualitative report, Fairfield University, CT, U.S.A., volume 3, no. 2, July 1997, pp.9
The problem makes it unto the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection based on the attention it receives in the political system; the attention it receives on the agenda must be significant enough to affect a rise of the problem to the top of the agenda in government. Only then will policy be generated and decision making come about in a policy formation process. This serious attention of the mentioned actors to the problem signifies a policy window occurring. There is a possibility to generate policy and select a policy in government; policy entrepreneurs play their role in first linking the different areas in government for them to combine.

The systemic constraints of ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government that affect the policy cycle in question, also receive attention in government to increase the saliency of the issue on the agenda. The problem receives preference above others on the agenda to affect the rise to the top of the agenda in government. Unclear processes in government that are reason for stagnation in the pre decision process also find resolution due to the significant interests of the political actors in this particular problem.

The policy formation process of the problem that is at the top of the agenda in government knows different types of activities that involve particular professionals in each area. The continued interests of politicians and key administrative personnel in solving the problem, the stakeholders in- and outside
government that are involved in the problem examination and policy makers that separately generate ideas for policy are the different areas of the policy formation process of the policy cycle. Policy entrepreneurs must now link the three separate areas for them to combine.

- Policy entrepreneurs bring politicians in touch with the problem examination in the system and the ideas that exist in government about policy. This linking of the three different activities in government by policy entrepreneurs leads to them combining. Politicians now use their knowledge of the problem, their familiarity with procedures in government, and strengthen their ties with other politicians in the system to obtain consensus for decision making on the salient issue on the agenda.

- Policy is available in government and decision making comes about in the pre decision process. Parliamentarians decide on the choice of policy to implement in government to solve this particular problem.

- The policy will be implemented, monitored and evaluated in the coming period in government. There is a chance that policy come about that prove beneficial to citizens within the community. The policy cycle now has a chance to complete due to the success in the pre decision process, the policy formation process.

2. Analyze the empirical data based on content analysis

The analysis of the mentioned data sources for research question 6 will rely on the following points:
a. How did agenda setting occur and did the issue return to the agenda in government?

b. How did the media contribute to agenda setting now?

c. How did the public contribute to agenda setting now?

d. Who are the other stakeholders in the problem definition and solution in- and outside of government?

e. What is the problem of homelessness of the woman living on the street?

f. Why does a solution not come about?

g. Are solutions to problem possible?

The research data analysis takes place and the data oversight is in tables for the questions 7, 8, and 9. Data tables come about for each research question. The information in the tables will be in concise formats based on the research coding system. Three summaries will be made of the data tables. The coding system facilitates the construction of to make the data tables.

3.4.4.2. The coding system for the data

Each research question will have a separate data table with the data of the research. The coding system for the data tables is the following:

G= governmental actors that are executive members of the cabinet, legislative members and key administrative personnel

G1, G2, G3= the respondents that are primary units of analysis

S= stakeholders in the problem definition and solution of the policy formation process of homelessness

S1, S2, S3, S4= the respondents that are secondary units of analysis

R1= the total of scores that relate to ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972)

R2= the total score that relates to ‘unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972)
R3= the total score that relate to both ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972)

R4= the total score that relate to none of the concepts

R5= the total score that relate to another or other concepts

V1= the total score that relate to the issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive-, legislative-, and key administrative members in government for the issue to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy making and alternative selection

V2= the total score that relate to the issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive-, legislative-, and key administrative members in government and is at the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection

V3= the total score that relate to the issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive-, legislative-, and key administrative members in government and is at the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection, but housing development plans do not cater to persons living on the street as yet

V4= the total score that relate to the issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive-, legislative-, and key administrative member in government and the issue is not at the top of the agenda in government, housing development plans do not cater to persons living on the street

The total scores relating to:

W1= the theory of Kingdon (1984)

W2= the rational approach of Lasswell (1956); Brewer (1974, 1983); Deleon (1983)

W3= the incremental approach of Cobb & Elder (1984)

A, B, C, D, E= answer categories

X= choice of the respondent for a category

K1= total score supporting the theory of Kingdon (1984) of research question 9

K2= total score rejecting the theory of Kingdon (1984) of research question 9
3.4.4.3 Compare the summaries with the proposition and establish the finding.

The logic linking the data to the propositions of the research (what the research suggests) is the criteria for interpreting the findings of the research. How does the empirical data match up to the theoretical propositions? Is the suggested logic linking the data to the propositions the same when the data from the empirical research matches up to the theoretical propositions? These questions are part of the criteria for interpreting the findings of the research.

1. Plan a monitor session with the senior mentor researcher that will review the analysis, findings and conclusions

2. Apply the method to ensure the quality of the research:
   Monitor:
   a. Show that the analysis relied on relevant evidence
   b. Show that the analysis addresses the most significant aspect of the case study
   c. Show that the integrity of the research is in order

3. After the monitor review session, and the recommendations of the mentor are part of the research, then the researcher moves on to finalize the research.

4. Prepare the findings and conclusions coming out of the analysis based on the monitor session review

5. Store the research data, analysis, finding and conclusions on the computer and backup the information on an external hard drive.

3.4.5 Data conclusions and reporting

This is the process of preparing and disseminating research findings to the scientific community. Reporting accurate and honest data is important. The focus in this stage is also ensuring the integrity of the research.

Method to ensure the integrity of the research: Conduct a monitoring session with the senior researcher that monitors the empirical research.
Issues directly related to the research integrity are in the research report. These issues are part of the discussion in a monitoring session with the senior researcher to ensure that reporting meets the proper standards for responsible reporting of quality research.

The review of these issues takes place with the senior researcher that monitors the empirical part of the research.

1. Misrepresentation of data

The true scope of the data findings remains hidden from relevant persons that read the report due to problems with the data collection. Accurate assessment of the validity of the findings is not possible.

2. Selectivity of reporting data

The practice of using data that supports one’s research hypothesis and ignoring or omitting data that does not. The true scope of the data findings remains hidden from the relevant persons that read the report. The readers are unable to make an accurate assessment of the validity of the findings. It involves inaccurate reporting of missing data.

3. Publication bias

This concerns the unwillingness to report findings that fail to demonstrate an intended effect or yield an expected result. Relevant persons that read the report have no awareness of the negative findings and other researchers cannot avoid the pitfall.

4. Reporting conclusions that are not supported

Faulty data collection, inappropriate analyses, gaps in logic, and unexplained deviation from accepted methods of interpretation can result in conclusions that are not valid. Relevant persons that read the report would not be able to assess the validity of the conclusions for themselves. The necessary information needs honest reporting.

The review will then focus on the following aspects of the research:

1. The construct validity of the research
2. The internal validity of the research
3. The external validity of the research
4. The research findings
5. The research conclusions and the research report of points 1-5.
3.5 **Conduct the research of the case study**

**Research question 6**

How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

Measure the answer to this question

Research instrument: Conduct the analysis of the additional research sources.

**Research questions 7, 8 and 9:**

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Measure the answer to the questions

Research instrument: Distribute the Interview forms and administer the research

Measure the answer of the additional research sources

Research instruments: Conduct the analysis of the additional research sources

3.6 **Analyze the case study evidence**

**Research question 6:**

How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?

1. Document the analysis of several empirical sources in tables

2. Establish the finding of the research question
3. Make a summary of the finding

Research questions 7, 8 and 9:

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Interviews

1. Collect the data from the interview forms
2. Analyze the data of the primary and secondary units of analysis
3. Code the data of both categories according to the data system
4. Create data tables that give an overview of the findings for both categories
5. Prepare summaries of the findings of the interviews and establish if research question 9 confirms or not confirm the approach of Kingdon (1984).

Additional research sources

1. Document the analysis of the additional research sources
2. Establish findings for each research question
3. Prepare summaries for the findings of the research questions
4. Establish the findings of the empirical study
5. Establish the overall empirical findings of the research.

3.7 Develop the conclusions of the research based on evidence

Draw the conclusions of the research
1. Make use of the theoretical propositions of the research to help draw conclusions

2. Make use of the findings of research question 9

3. Make use of the overall empirical research finding

4. Determine how the research data of research question 9 matches up to the propositions of the research. Is the suggested logic linking the data to the propositions the same when data of the empirical research matched up to the theoretical propositions? Does the research establish a rival pattern?

5. Determine the conclusion of the literature research

6. Determine the conclusion of the empirical research

7. Determine the conclusion of the report

8. Prepare the research report based on the prior determined points.
4. The empirical research

Chapter 4 of the thesis gives an oversight of the empirical research and the findings. Paragraph 4.1 explains the empirical research. The paragraph 4.2 looks at the research interview questions and the findings. Paragraph 4.3 gives the conclusion of the research interviews. The additional research sources and findings are in paragraph 4.4. Paragraph 4.6 deals with the empirical findings of the research. Paragraph 4.6 relates the logic linking the data to the theoretical propositions.

4.1 The empirical research

The central research question of the thesis is as follows:

What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines, how do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact these problematic aspects? How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

The last part of this central research question relates to the empirical part of the research. Four sub questions of the empirical analysis are representative of the empirical part of the central research question.

The objective of this chapter of the thesis is to present an empirical analysis of the outlined part of the research: how can the executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government on St. Maarten affect problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness according to Kingdon (1984)?

The strength of this analysis depends on three different aspects of the research. The aspects that provide the analysis with substance are interviews held with relevant respondents that can impact/influence problematic aspects in government, play a role in policy generation and help in selecting policy alternatives. The interviews held with respondents on St. Maarten to obtain data for the empirical analysis are two politicians and a policy advisor in government, two policy stakeholders in government of the issue of homelessness and three policy stakeholders outside of government of this issue. Additional research resources of St. Maarten related to the issue of homelessness also provides extra substance to the interview findings. Relevant data sources provided data for this part of the analysis. It concerned different research resources of importance to the empirical analysis. The data areas are population size, gross GDP growth and the quantity of appropriate housing. Finally yet importantly, an empirical study on agenda setting and alternative policy selection helped give the analysis substance. The findings
of this empirical study on agenda setting and alternative policy selection, \(^{31}\) “Understanding Local Policy Making: Policy Elites Perceptions of Local Agenda Setting” by Lui, Lindquist, Vedlitz, and Vincent (2009), was used in relation to the empirical research analysis of the other two mentioned sources.

The review of the research questions concerns the establishment of findings on the different sub questions of the research. These questions deal with a range of aspects concerning the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten. How agenda setting of the issue came about and how the media and the public contribute to agenda setting. How problematic aspects in government affect the issue of homelessness and how can executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in government impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

The chapter concludes with the empirical findings based on the research interviews and additional research sources.

### 4.2 The empirical research questions and findings

#### 4.2.1 How did agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occur in the policy process in local government on Sint Maarten, how did the media and the general public contribute to agenda setting of the issue?


---


See footnotes for the abbreviations of political parties in government on St. Maarten during the periods of agenda setting.

The agenda setting periods in this research came about based on highs and lows in attention that the issue of homelessness received on St. Maarten by the media, the public and government.

The period 1988-1992 is the first awareness that the media brought to the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten. The year 1988 represents the year the media covered the dispute between the residents of the abandoned ‘Princess Quarter Hotel’ and government about closing off the structure. Government contemplated this until about 1992 and then abandoned the idea. There was no social housing available for the residents in the old structure. The media did not cover the issue after that year.

In the year 1997, homelessness returned to the agenda in government. The media covered the same issue of homelessness in another derelict building, the ‘St. Maarten Beach Club Hotel’. The problem of homelessness was bigger now and government took measures to alleviate the problems of homelessness. By the year, 2003 housing development plans and rebuilding programs alleviated homelessness to an extent and provided residents with better quality housing. The attention shifted away from homelessness for a period.

In the year 2007, the attention shifted back to the issue of homelessness after the media heightened the awareness of the public about visible homelessness. Government looked into the problem of a very visible case and did not find a solution for this person or others that the media brought to the attention of the public. The media stayed with the topic and covered the problem identification and the solution that came about in the year 2010.

The given periods represent heightened attention by all three parties to the issue of homelessness. The years in between these periods represent time-spans that all the three parties paid little or no attention to homelessness on St. Maarten. The problem received no specific attention in government and no solutions came about. No newspaper articles about the issue stood out in these years.

**Agenda setting period 1988-1990: the public and agenda setting in government**

---

33 Democratic Party, St. Maarten Patriotic Alliance, Progressive Democratic Party, Serious Alternative People’s Party, National Alliance, and United People’s Party.
Agenda setting of homelessness in government on St. Maarten first occurred in the year 1988. The issue was on the agenda for a period and then it disappeared from the agenda. No solutions came about for citizens that needed housing in this period. The media gave the issue coverage and brought public awareness of the problem of homelessness. Government gave the issue some attention for a short period.

34 Homeless people were living in an old abandoned “Princess Quarter Hotel” outside of Philipsburg. Citizens and government were concerned about the situation of these people. Their living conditions were far from good. There was no possibility of obtaining water and electricity connections due to the condition of the structure and the fact that they occupied the building illegally.

The structure housed different types of people. Families with young children were living under these circumstances; also other individuals without families. Some of the people were unemployed and could not afford housing. Others had employment, but could not find affordable housing with their monthly income. Drug addicted individuals also lived among the families residing in this structure.

Crime related to drug addiction was a concern in the community and residents voiced their concern in the media about this particular type of living arrangements and conditions. The different concerns led to agenda setting of the issue in government. Government wanted to evict the residents and close off the hotel. This enraged the people living in this old abandoned hotel. They had no place to go and they could not afford to pay for suitable housing. Some residents found solutions for themselves, but government did not solve the problem. The homeless people remained in this old abandoned structure. The media (newspaper and news coverage on the radio) brought their stories to the public.

Government provided no housing solutions for homelessness during this period. There were no social housing and low-income housing built for the lower incomes. These incomes had problems attaining affordable housing that was suitable for living.

**Agenda setting period 1997-2003: the public and agenda setting in government**

34 Newsday January 22nd, 1988 and June 16th, 1988 (vol. and no. information not available)
The issue of homelessness reappeared on the agenda in government in the year 1997. 35 Homelessness worsened due to a major hurricane that occurred in the year 1995. The destruction of the hurricane affected most residents and their homes needed repairs or complete rebuilding. People were living with others until their homes were ready. People living in housing that was not up to standard were hard hit. Government arranged for them to live in temporary housing on private property, until government could find a solution for them. Government leveled housing in areas where inadequate structures existed and set new building regulations for these areas, in an attempt to encourage better living arrangements and conditions. Government also wanted residents to build structures that could withstand disasters and complied with the basic requirements for living.

36 During this period, some citizens were living in a closed down hotel, “St. Maarten Beach Club”, in the heart of Philipsburg. Again, the lower incomes decided to move into another abandoned structure to live. The building had no water and electricity connections. Families with young children were living under bad conditions among other people with social problems.

The public and government were concerned about issues related to sanitation, public safety, and crime. It was very evident in this period that the community was dealing with a growing problem of drug addiction.

The public wanted government to do something about the situation of the people in the damaged hotel in Philipsburg and these people wanted suitable housing. Government decided to evict the people living in this structure. 37 The residents voiced their opinions about this in the press. They related that government should find a solution for them first and then close off the structure. 38 Professionals dealing with the issue of homelessness also talked about the issue in the press. They related that the problem was possible bigger than the two known causes of homeless people housed in old structures. It was not limited to this. They also thought that the situation was a breeding ground for different problems; government should find a solution for these people.

Government then decided to renovate the old hotel on the outskirts of Philipsburg and move the homeless people from the old structure in Philipsburg.

35 Daily Herald March 16th, 2001, vol. 10, no. 249
36 Daily Herald April 8th, 1997, vol. 6, no. 275
37 Daily Herald April 8th, 1997, vol. 6, no. 275
38 Daily Herald April 8th, 1997, vol. 6, no. 275
to this renovated structure. They implemented this plan to solve the problems of inadequate housing for residents in both structures.

39 Gradually, old structures in Philipsburg that drug addicted individuals inhabited were also close off or torn down to avoid similar problems. Some residents with small incomes found adequate housing during the rebuilding phase after hurricane Louis. 40 The government built 200 emergency houses for temporary housing of residents with low incomes. 41 The Belvedere housing project also provided 481 houses for low– and middle incomes. The Red Cross also built houses for seniors in this project. 42 The Red Cross and “Reda Social” (funding agency) also rebuilt houses or upgraded housing for the lower incomes during the rebuilding period. This development in housing provided the lower incomes with a better quality of housing.

43 Government established a housing vision for the island in the year 2003. This document determined that government should provide about 500 to 1230 social housing units by the year 2010 and that development plans must provide this housing. The residents that needed social housing had incomes between 1200 and 1300 guilders (Naf.) per month and sometimes lower incomes. The maximum rent that they could afford was 400 to 600 guilders (Naf.) per month.

44 The Central Bureau of Statistics of the Netherland Antilles showed during this agenda-setting period that economic activity on St. Maarten increased in the year 2005 in the construction sector by 10%, financial services by 9% and business sector by 9% in comparison to the year 2004. This increased economic activity did not translate into the realization of social housing for the lower incomes by government or the private sector initiatives.

The Central Bureau of Statistics of the Netherlands Antilles reported on December 31, 2006 that statistics at the Census Office showed that 50334 persons were living on the island. The population grew at a rate of 3.4%. The registered population grew by 35% in comparison to ten years ago. The population growth was due to new births and immigration. The estimation of

39 Daily Herald, April 14th, 1997, vol. 6, no. 271

40 St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation information, 2007

41 St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation information, 2007

42 St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation information, 2007

43 Government of St. Maarten Housing Vision of the year 2003, pp. 16

44 Table 10 of the appendix, CBS statistical yearbook 2009 on economic activity in three sectors
the illegal population (not registered at the Census Office) was about 10,000 to 20,000 persons.

**Agenda setting period 2007-2010: the public and agenda setting in government**

Residents grew more aware of the problems of homeless people in the year 2007. The public was familiar with bad living conditions of residents in particular housing areas, but now the newspapers brought the plight of homeless people more to the fore. This concerned people that had no roof over their heads. They were living on the street, in old cars, or in the bushes. The public was concerned about this visible homelessness and voiced their opinions on radio programs. Some people with social problems do not have a solution to their homelessness. They live on and off with relatives, on the streets or in places unfit for human beings. The public demanded that government do something about people living on the street.

The problem returned to the agenda in government, because of concerns related to people living without a roof above their heads. A host of different and combined reasons caused this homelessness. Housing factors, mental health problems, drug addiction, unemployment and family breakdown were overall responsible for this visible homelessness. During this period, residents learnt of the situation of a woman living on the street. The newspaper “The Daily Herald” covered her story and this coverage led to a wide public response about her living conditions. This homeless woman was highly visible in Philipsburg and attracted much public attention due to public disorder. Her frustration with the lack of housing and the bad living conditions, contributed to her diminished mental state. She kept getting into problems with the public and government agencies and this led to incarcerations for brief periods. During her period on the streets, she received treatment for mental problems and upon release, she returned to the streets again due to the continued lack of housing. Her condition deteriorated again. She once again became confrontational on the streets due to her frustrations. A vicious circle ensued.

The public demanded in the media that government do something about such cases of homelessness. People voiced their opinions in the media about concerns for the woman, and public safety due to her mental state. The public did not like the image that such problems create for the island. They thought that government was responsible for visible homelessness. The fact that other extreme cases appeared in other articles in the newspaper and the fact that people began reporting cases to the media, made the public even more

---

45 Daily Herald, April 14th, 2007, vol. 16, no. 276
concerned about the situation. They saw the problem as a growing one that needed a solution.

The public was now more aware of the problem of homelessness and conditions that contributed to this. People were unemployed and did not have a home anymore. They could not find affordable housing with seasonal employment, short-term labour contracts for six months or less, and minimum wage incomes. Outstanding rental arrears led to the eviction of tenants of the emergency homes and Belvedere Housing project. Other people living on the streets were persons with mental health problems and problems related to drug addiction. Residents saw government as the one responsible for a solution and made this clear via the media.

Low-income housing- and social housing development needed attention in government. Government tackled inadequate housing conditions in the previous agenda-setting period of the issue of homelessness, built housing for the residents of low- and middle incomes and repaired homes that did not meet quality standards. This effort was not sufficient to solve the problems of affordable housing that is suitable for human beings. Residents continued to build new inadequate structures. There was no constant effective control by government on the building of inadequate structures.

Residents also complained about infrastructural problems related to sewage disposal, rainwater run-off, improper housing structures and areas, the quality of the roads, traffic congestion and improper zoning conditions. All of these problems were constantly in the media during this agenda-setting period of homelessness. The public demanded that government do something about these problems too. Government is looking for a comprehensive way to address these challenges now.

46 The Central Bureau of Statistics of the Netherlands Antilles showed a drop in population registered at the Census Office of St. Maarten in the period 2007 and after this year, in comparison to December 31st, 2006 (2006: 50334). This was due to decreased economic activity in this period. The amount of persons registered on the island on January 1, 2007 was 37629. See table 1 of the appendix.

47 The world financial crisis of the year 2009 slowed the economic growth on the island. Economic activities decreased with 0.9 percent in 2009 compared to the

46 Table 1 of the appendix, CBS statistics 2010, population on januari 1st

47 Table 2 of the appendix, CBS of the Netherlands Antilles, CBS St. Maarten economy press release, July 26th, 2010
year 2008 as measured by the real Gross Domestic Product. Trade still plays a major role in the economy with a gross share in GDP of about 25 percent. Economic activity in the hotel and restaurants sector decreased by 6%, in the trade sector decreased by 3% and in the sector transport and communication by 0.2%. See table 2 of the appendix.

Government began looking into the revision of the housing vision for the island in this agenda-setting period due to the problems with affordable housing. The lowest incomes need social housing via housing development plans. The middle incomes are also in need of low-income housing. This effort is part of the Social Economic Initiatives projects of government to prepare the island for development in the coming years.

The agenda-setting period 1988-1990: the media and agenda setting in government

48 The local newspaper, “Newsday”, published an article about homelessness on the island on January 22, 1988 in which they interviewed local professionals in the field of law enforcement and social affairs. They also interviewed homeless people. Residents living in extreme social conditions in an abandoned hotel outside of Philipsburg (Upper Princess Quarter Hotel) gave the press a look at the living conditions and related their problems to the press. Homeless families with young children and other individuals were living without water and electricity in the old structure. These residents had problems finding affordable housing.

Government decided to evict them, without a solution to their problems and this enraged them. In the end government decided to let them stay there. The problem of homelessness was on the agenda, but no measures came about to tackle the problem. The attention of the press shifted to other problems on the island and in government.

The agenda-setting period 1997-2003: the media and agenda setting in government

49 The newspaper “The Daily Herald” interviewed homeless people living in the “St. Maarten Beach Club Hotel” that was closed down due to the destruction caused by a major hurricane in the year 1995. The press also interviewed the Commissioner of Social Affairs, Mr. E. Lynch, after government sealed off the structure in Philipsburg (St. Maarten Beach Club Hotel) where homeless people

48 Newsday January 22nd, 1988 and June 16th, 1988 (vol. and no. information not available)

49 Daily Herald, April 8th, 1997, vol. 6 no. 275
where living. The “Chronicle” newspaper also paid attention to this problem. In contrast to the previous period, another government was in office and this government gave the housing situation of the tenants more attention. The old structure outside of Philipsburg, that housed homeless people, received repairs to house the homeless of the two structures. This government also began looking into the problems of drug addicts living in old structures. The problems of related to drug addiction were now very evident in the community. Government moved to tear down old structures in Philipsburg where this was possible. The media also covered the developments related to this. Crime, sanitation and public safety concerns demanded action in this period for developments related to drug addiction. The media informed the public about these actions of government.

The agenda-setting period 2007-2010: the media and agenda setting in government

Visible homelessness was now a problem on St. Maarten and it received attention in the media. The media set the public agenda on the issue of visible homelessness and the public demanded that government do something about the problem.

The “Today” newspaper also reported on the problem of insufficient social housing on St. Maarten for the lower incomes during this agenda-setting period.

The “Daily Herald” newspaper gave the issue of homelessness attention for a more prolonged period now. The agenda-setting article of a homeless woman living on the street remained the focus of this newspaper. It also looked into reported cases of visible homelessness or printed images sent to the newspaper on the topic. The public was engaged on the issue and demanded solutions via the media. The inadequate living conditions of the homeless woman received attention from this newspaper. The fact too that the stakeholders in- and outside of government looking into the problem were not solving it.

This newspaper also reported the temporary sponsorship of a hotel, offering the woman board until the stakeholders arranged social housing. It also looked into the housing solution of the stakeholders, when the woman failed to receive social housing. In the end, it reported the fact that a private citizen along with two businesses paid a quest house for the woman to have a place to live, until the Mental Health Foundation newly bought building can house her.

---

50 Today, May 23, 2008, vol. 9, no. 112

51 Daily Herald, April 14th, 2007, vol. 16, no. 276
4.2.2 What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy from coming about?

S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5 are stakeholders in- and outside of government that are responsible for the problem identification and solution process, they help identify problems or produce policy alternatives.

G1, G2 and G3 are political actors in government that are responsible for getting policy proposals into the legislative process, so that relevant bodies can assess the proposal and help get them into parliament for the decision-making. This pertains to the Council of Ministers, the Cabinet of the Governor and the Advisory Council. They resolve problematic aspects in government to enable proposals to reach the necessary legislative bodies that are responsible for procedures related to checks and balances of governing.

Table 3: Data collection on problematic aspects in government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP UP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP RS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Table 3 shows what the primary and secondary units of analysis consider the problematic aspects in government that affect the prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda in government and prevent policy from coming about. This data collection comes from the interviews of the research.

Table 4: The findings on research question 4.2.2

---

52 pp is problematic preferences, up is unclear processes, rs is resources, g1-3 are political actors, and s1-5 are stakeholders in the problem definition and solution process inside- and outside of government. See data collection and analysis codes of the research. Concepts of the theory of Cohen, M., March, J. and Olsen J., 1972 Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1

53 G1, G2 and G3 are political actors. S1 –S5 are stakeholders inside- and outside of government of the problem identification and solution process of the issue of homelessness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>PP + UP</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>PP + RS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 - G3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 - S5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Analysis:

Eight respondents answered this question. Three respondents in the category of executive-, legislative-, and key administrative personnel in government and five respondents in the category of stakeholders in the problem definition and solution process in- and outside of government.

‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government received the most support as the variable responsible for problematic aspects in government. The combination of this variable with the variable ‘unclear processes’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) and the choice of one respondent to name the variable resources, also show considerable support for ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy from coming about.

Summary:

The majority of respondents see ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government as the problematic aspect that prevents the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy from coming about. Three respondents support ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972,) in government and one respondent support ‘unclear processes’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government. The combined variables show more support for ‘problematic preferences’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972).

4.2.3 How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?
Table 5: Data collection on how problematic aspects affect the issue of homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA/S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/HD/P/NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/NHD/NP/S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Table 5 shows that the majority of the respondents of the interviews think that the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention and is stagnated.

Table 6: The findings on research question 4.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA/S</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/NS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/HD/P/NS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/NHD/NP/S</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Analysis:

Eight persons responded to this question. Three respondents were in the category of executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in government. Five respondents were stakeholders of the problem definition and solution in- and outside of government.

The majority of the respondents believe that political actors do not pay serious attention to the issue of homelessness. The policy process is stagnated and some respondents know that there are no housing development plans or

---

54 NA/S is no attention, stagnation. A/NS is attention, no stagnation. A/HD/P/NS is attention, housing development plans, policies, no stagnation. NA/NHD/NP/S is no attention, no housing development plans, no policies, stagnation. G1, G2 and G3 are political actors.
policies for the homeless. The respondents that are stakeholders of the problem definition and solution process are aware of this last aspect. Seven respondents agreed that there is no serious attention to the issue on the agenda in government and that the policy process is stagnated. Three of these respondents stated that no housing development plans or policies cater to the homeless. This finding corresponds with the theory of Kingdon (1984) about prominence of issues, policy generation and alternative selection in government.

Summary:

The empirical research results show that the majority of the respondents believe that executive-, legislative-, and key administrative personnel in government do not pay serious attention to the issue of homelessness and that the policy formation process is stagnated, the issue is not at the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making in government. This is in line with the argument of the research.

4.2.4 How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

Table 7: Data collection on how political actors impact problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORIES</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMSA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Table 7 shows that the Multiple Streams Approach of Kingdon (1984) received the most support of the political actors in government.

Table 8: The findings of the research question 4.2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

KMSA is Kingdon (1984) multiple streams approach, RCA is the rational choice approach and IA is the incremental approach. G1, G2 and G3 are political actors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMSA</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Empirical research interviews thesis 2011

Analysis:

Three persons in the category of executive-, legislative-, and key administrative personnel responded to this question.

Executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors can impact the problematic aspects in government of the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten for prominence on the agenda, policy generation and alternative selection by employing two approaches:

1. The Multiple Streams Approach of Kingdon (1984) received support from two actors
2. The Rational Approach to policymaking, Simon (1957), received support from one actor

The approach to policymaking of Kingdon (1984) received the most support. These actors would influence (impact) problematic aspects in government as Kingdon (1984) outline in his theory on agenda setting and alternative selection in government.

Summary:

Executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of political parties and key administrative actors in government would influence (impact) problematic aspects in government concerning the issue of homelessness, by paying serious attention to the issue. This would enable the issue to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy generation and alternative selection. The stagnation in the policy formation process would not be the case anymore.

4.3 Conclusion of the research interviews

The majority of the respondents see ‘problematic preferences,’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government as the aspects that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy from coming about. The policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten does not receive serious attention from political actors. The policy process is stagnated. They chose the approach of Kingdon (1984) to impact ‘problematic preferences,’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in
government for prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda, bringing about policy, and related decision-making.

How can the political actors influence (impact) problematic preference in government according to Kingdon (1984)?

1. By paying serious attention to problematic aspects in government and influencing other governmental actors and various interests groups to help find solutions for the issue of homelessness

2. Influencing the budget in government to help shape the agenda in government

3. Adopting problem indicators and taking heed of focusing events in choosing policy alternatives

4. Seriously, considering policy alternatives that are compatible with existing policies and regulations in government, if the processes are clear and the alternatives are attractive

5. Looking at criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability, and future constraints of policy alternatives

6. Building consensus in the political system to bring about decision-making concerning the issue of homelessness, the issue of homelessness figures prominently on the agenda, a policy alternative is available and decision-making completes the policy formation process.

4.4  Additional empirical research sources of the interview questions and findings

4.4.1  What are the problematic issues in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy from coming about?

Analysis:

National Accounts of St. Maarten: these areas receive attention in government and the economic activity in the sectors reflect the importance attached to the sectors and attention paid to investment and policy development over the years on Sint Maarten that lead up to the present ratio in the different sectors of economic activity reflected in gross GDP.

\[
\begin{align*}
ABC &= \text{Agriculture, fishing and mining}, \\
D &= \text{Manufacturing}, \\
E &= \text{Electricity, gas and water}, \\
F &= \text{Construction}, \\
G &= \text{Trade}, \\
H &= \text{Hotels and restaurants}, \\
I &= \text{Transport, storage and communication}, \\
J &= \text{Financial intermediation}, \\
K &= \text{Real estate, renting and business activities}, \\
M &= \text{Private education}, \\
N &= \text{Health and social work and} \\
O &= \text{other community, social and personal activity.}
\end{align*}
\]
The economic activity per sector on St. Maarten in the year 2008 based on gross GDP in millions Naf, value added, gross, market prices differs with some sectors mainly producing the overall growth. The economic activity in the other sectors does not match up with the few sectors that are responsible for the overall gross GDP growth. See table 9 of the appendix of the research on gross GDP growth in the sectors.

This picture of economic activity in the different sectors and the amount of gross GDP generated in the sectors is a constant factor in government throughout the different agenda setting periods. See all gross GDP information of CBS in the appendix of this research.

The pattern of economic activity in the different sectors and gross GDP growth shows e.g.:

The trade sector is the most important sector on St. Maarten; it generated Naf 273.4 million in the year 2008. Government focuses primarily on the trade sector.

The gross GDP of the sector transport, storage and communication was Naf 142.4 million in the year 2008.

The gross GDP of the construction sector Naf 137.4 million in the year 2008.

It is important to note that the construction sector is an important sector to the economic development of the island. CBS statistics show that economic activity increased in this sector between the years 2005 and 2008. In this period, the construction of affordable housing did not receive relevant attention in government during increased economic activity in this sector. Homelessness was on the agenda in government in three different agenda setting periods over the years. Residents still cannot access affordable housing. CBS statistics show that bad to very bad quality housing still need attention on the island. CBS statistics on the migration pattern of the island over the last years shows an increasing amount of immigration and considerable less emigration. See table 10 dealing with the construction sector on the island, table 11 relating to the quality of housing and table 12 outlining population growth based on the migration pattern of St. Maarten in the appendix of the research.

Summary of finding:

---

56 Table 9, CBS Netherlands Antilles statistical orientation 2009 on St. Maarten on gross GDP growth in different sectors
Government focuses primarily on trade and related decision-making for development. The construction sector is one of the biggest sectors on St. Maarten and produces the third biggest amount of gross GDP on the national account. The investment in the construction sector does not pertain to affordable housing for the lowest incomes. Bad to very bad quality housing exists on the island. Government preference is to focus on trade and in the construction sector, only the highest income categories receive appropriate housing via private investment. Government investment in affordable housing does not suit the demand for low-income and social housing of the lowest incomes. The ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen March & Olsen (1972) play a role in government concerning the sectors to push for attention in government. This aspect also plays a role in the construction sector where government only focuses on investment in housing for the highest incomes.

4.4.2 How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

The majority of respondents of the interviews see ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government as the aspects that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda in government and policy from coming about. Homelessness does not receive serious attention on the agenda in government. Government pays attention to other issues and homelessness does not receive serious attention to rise to the top of the agenda. Needed policy does not come about to deal with homelessness. The majority of the respondents said that the policy process is stagnated.

The basis for the findings of the additional research sources for this question is the following premise:

Population growth and gross GDP growth of economic activity in several sectors on St. Maarten during the three agenda-setting periods did not move government to provide a sufficient quantity of appropriate housing for the lowest incomes. There is no social housing for the homeless. Government primarily paid attention to trade and related decision-making in government. The policy formation process of homelessness faces stagnation due to

---

57 Table 9, Economic activity per sector in 2008, CBS Netherlands Antilles statistical orientation 2009 on St. Maarten

58 2011 Central Bureau of Statistics Netherlands Antilles statistical info on population 1998 to 2010

59 Central Bureau of Statistics Netherlands Antilles statistical info on gross GDP of different economic activities from the year 1996 to 2008, national accounts statistical yearbooks 2003 to 2009
'problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government. Government pays no serious attention to the issue to affect a rise on the agenda for policy generation and decision-making in government. This decision-making must relate to sufficient availability of social housing for the lowest incomes. This includes homeless people.

Classification of the variables population growth, gross GDP growth and quantity of appropriate housing for the lowest incomes will show how they relate to each other in the three agenda setting periods. It will also show what government focused on and failed to focus on.

**Analysis of the agenda-setting period 1988-1990:**

No social housing became available in the period 1988-1990. The problem of homelessness was on the agenda in government, but no solution came about for it. The problem disappeared from the agenda after the media coverage. No policies came about for the homeless. Prior to this period, the area of South Reward received a low-income project. This was the first project of low-income housing on the island. The Ebenezer housing project of the year 1991 provided housing for residents with middle incomes. No housing development plans catered to the lowest incomes or homeless people in the late eighties and early nineties. No social housing became available in this period.

Variable population growth in this period:

Only the Island Registry could provide information on the population growth on St. Maarten during the eighties. The Statistical Bureau on St. Maarten needed time do a search on Curacao at the former CBS of the Netherlands Antilles, which was not possible for this research in terms of time constraint.

The island Registry had difficulty providing information on the exact population growth in this agenda-setting period. They provided information showing that the population was on the increase leading up to this agenda-setting period. The size of the population was 1537 in the year 1959 and it kept increasing in the years after that. The population size was 23,623 in the year 1986. See table 13 on population size of the appendix of the research.

The Island Registry and CBS estimates showed that the population on St. Maarten was 30,906 in the year 1998. Population growth was evident after the

---

60 Table 13 of the appendix of the research, Island Registry St. Maarten 2011, increase population

61 Table 17 of the appendix of the research, Island Registry St. Maarten and CBS estimates 1998-2004
year 2001. The size of the population was 31.956 in the year 2002. The population size of St. Maarten on December 1, 2008 was 40.917.

The general accepted picture is that less people lived on St. Maarten in the period 1988-1990 in comparison to now. The population was smaller, but growing. More people were migrating to St. Maarten in search of work, some stayed for a period and then moved on to another place to live. Others remained on the island. The island provided residents with work and Antilleans residing on the other islands of the Netherlands Antilles migrated to St. Maarten to live. The size of the population was most likely smaller than in the year 2002 (31.956).

Variable gross GDP growth (million Naf National Accounts) in this period:

No statistics of GDP growth in this agenda-setting period is presently available at CBS St. Maarten. A search at CBS on Curacao may produce information on this period, but this search could not happen due to time constraint and the fact that census 2011 was taking place. No one could provide this information.

Generally accepted in this period is the fact that the population was growing due to economic activity on the island. There was economic activity in different sectors, with trade being the biggest sector on the island. People were migrating to St. Maarten to work. Gross GDP was increasing annually on St. Maarten. The comparison of gross GDP growth in the different agenda-setting periods should reflect a different growth for the periods, which relates to the volume of economic activity.

Variable quantity of appropriate housing in this period:

The amount of appropriate dwellings declined after the year 1985 from 84.5% to 61.6% of the dwellings on St. Maarten according to housing information received from CBS Census of the year 2001.

The amount of bad quality dwellings declined after the year 1985 from 11.2% to 8.5% of the dwellings on St. Maarten due to the demolition of shacks and the building regulations pertaining to such dwellings on St. Maarten, CBS Census of the year 2001 housing information.

The amount of very bad quality dwellings declined from 4.3% to 2.8% after the year 1985 due to the demolition of shacks and the building regulations.

---


63 Table 14-15 of the appendix, CBS population and housing census 2001
pertaining to such dwellings on St. Maarten, housing information from CBS Census of the year 2001.

Two tables show that the percentage of appropriate housing was on the decline. The comparison of the period 1940 to 1985 (84.5%) and after 1985 (61.6%) show this decline. See tables 14 and 15 of the appendix of the research.

Government did not provide any social housing for residents in this agenda-setting period. Prior to this period, government invested in low income-houses for the area of South Reward on St. Maarten. This project was social housing for the lowest incomes. Government built another housing project for middle- to high incomes in the Ebenezer area at the end of this agenda-setting period. The problems of affordable housing existed in this period; social housing was not sufficiently available on the island. People built shacks on leased private property to have affordable housing. They also leased private land to build affordable houses. Some residents were lucky to receive land from government to build a house within their means. Improper building of dwellings became a problem on the island in this period. There was no proper control on the part of government to keep with up this development. The general notion is that the population was growing due to increased immigration of people to St. Maarten and both locals and immigrants needed affordable housing.

Summary findings of the additional research sources:

Classification of the variables in the agenda-setting period 1988-1990: Possible population growth and gross GDP growth in some sectors on St. Maarten in this agenda-setting period did not move government to make a sufficient quantity of appropriate housing available for the lowest incomes on St. Maarten with the decline of the amount of appropriate dwellings in this period. ‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government on St. Maarten was the cause of this. Government primarily paid attention to trade and paid no serious attention to affordable housing for the lowest incomes on the island in the construction sector. Government paid no serious attention to the issue of homelessness for relevant policy- and decision-making in government.

Analysis of the agenda-setting period 1997-2003:

The issue of homelessness was on the agenda again in the year 1997. The problem of homelessness was bigger now, due to the passing of a major hurricane in the year 1995. Hurricane Luis made the housing situation worse. Government looked for solutions to homelessness in this period. Tent city and the container village housed homeless people for a period, until the emergency homes became available. The demolition of shacks in the different areas began and new building regulations for these areas came into effect. The emergency
homes (200) and the Belvedere Housing Project (481) provided homes for residents in the reconstruction period after hurricane Luis. The emergency homes were in the price range of social housing, but there were not enough homes built to suit the demand for affordable housing. The Belvedere Housing Project was not affordable for lowest incomes. The lowest income categories remained in inadequate housing situations or living with others. Affordable housing was still a problem for low- and middle incomes. No available housing development plans or policy related to the problems of the homeless was available.

This agenda-setting period saw a growth of the population and the gross GDP of St. Maarten that is relevant information for this research. The growth in the different sectors reflected the attention of government to development in different areas and related issues that received decision-making in government. Although the population growth showed no major declines and even grew steadily after the year 2001, government did not give affordable housing for the lowest incomes the relevant attention in the construction sector as was the case for the higher incomes. Real estate development on the island catered to the higher incomes. Homelessness was on the agenda again in the year 1997, but other issues received preference for decision-making above this issue. This concerns decision-making that involves solutions for the problem of homelessness.

Demolition clean up in shanty villages and new building regulations for shack areas impacted bad quality housing after hurricane Luis of 1995. There was a decrease in bad quality housing. Bad quality housing is, however, not something of the past due to the insufficient amount of affordable housing possibilities in the different areas of the island for the lowest incomes. In the reconstruction period, after Hurricane Luis in 1995, better quality homes rebuilding took place with monies from insurance companies. The combination of quality housing and affordable housing remained a problem for residents, especially the lowest incomes.

Variable population growth of this period:

64 Central Bureau of Statistics Netherlands Antilles statistical info on population 1998 to 2010

65 Central Bureau of Statistics Netherlands Antilles statistical info on gross GDP of different economic activities from the year 1996 to 2008, national accounts Statistical Yearbooks 2003 to 2009

66 Tables 14 and 15, CBS Census on Population and Housing 2001

66 Table 17 population growth, Island Registry of St. Maarten and CBS estimates 1998-2004
The population grew during the years 2001 to 2004. The population increased from 30,440 to 33,167 in this agenda-setting period.

Variable gross GDP growth (million Naf National Accounts) of this period:

The gross GDP of St. Maarten increased during the years 1997 to 2000. The gross GDP increased from 849.7 to 901.5 in this agenda-setting period.

During this period, the gross GDP grew based on increased economic activity:

1. In the non-financial corporation sector economic activity of trade, and real estate/renting/business economic activities grew. Economic activity based on construction grew and declined somewhat. Economic activity based on private education declined somewhat. Economic activity based on health and social work grew and declined somewhat. Economic activity based on other community, social and personal services of non-financial corporation’s grew.

2. In government the economic activity of public administration, defence and compulsory social security grew, economic activity in education declined somewhat, economic activity in health and social work declined somewhat, economic activity of other community, social and personal services declined somewhat and grew.

Variable quantity of appropriate housing of this period:

The amount of appropriate dwellings increased in the year 2001 from 84.5% to 86% of the dwellings on St. Maarten, due to increased awareness of the need for proper housing in a hurricane zone and the availability of insurance money after the passing of hurricanes, CBS Census of the year 2001 housing information.

The amount of bad quality dwellings increased from 11.2% to 12/13.6% of the dwellings on St. Maarten due to uncontrolled building of quality dwellings on St. Maarten and the fact that the lowest incomes needed some type of affordable housing, CBS Census of the year 2001 housing information.

The amount of very bad quality dwellings declined further from 2.4% to 2% due to the demolition of shacks of which the quality was not acceptable and the building regulations that were enforced. The residents of these dwellings needed low-come and social housing, CBS Census of the year 2001 housing information.

---

67 Table 20 of the appendix of the research, CBS Statistical Yearbook 2009 on GDP growth

68 Table 18 and 19, CBS Census on Population and Housing 2001
Summary findings of the additional research sources:

Classification of the variables: population growth and gross GDP growth on St. Maarten in this agenda-setting period did not move government to make a sufficient quantity of appropriate housing available for the lowest incomes on St. Maarten. The amount of appropriate dwellings available on the island for the different incomes was insufficient. ‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government on St. Maarten was the cause of this. Government primarily paid attention to trade. Government paid no serious attention to affordable housing for the lowest incomes in the construction sector. Government paid no serious attention to the issue of homelessness for relevant policy- and decision-making in government.

Analysis of the agenda-setting period 2007-2010:

Visible homelessness became a well-known problem on the island during the period 2007 to 2010. There is a high demand for affordable housing and no solutions are available for people that end up on the street. The economy grew in the different sectors on Sint Maarten, until the year 2009 of the world financial crisis. The development plans in construction in the private sector only catered to the higher incomes and government hardly built affordable housing in this period. The Hope Estate Housing project of the year 2010 consisted of 72 social housing units. Homeless people and those at risk received no attention. The large amount of housing project tenants that has rental arrears and could end up on the streets, points to the gravity of the affordable housing situation on the island. This situation still needs relevant attention from government. No policies and related decision-making came about in government on St. Maarten to deal with the scope of the problem of affordable housing.

Variable population growth in this period:

The population grew from the year 2007 to 2009 from 37.629 to 40.009. It grew steadily for some years and on January 1, 2010, the size of the population had declined to 37.427.

CBS statistics of the year 2010 showed population figures on January 1 of the years as follows: year 2007 population of 37629; year 2008 population of 38927; year 2009 population of 40009; and year 2010 population of 37427. The population grew steadily until the year 2010.

Variable gross GDP growth (million Naf National Accounts) in this period:

69 Table 1 population growth on January 1st, CBS statistics 2010
The gross GDP grew from the year 2005 to 2008, from 1175.8 to 1422.5. Economic activity declined in the sectors, hotels and restaurants (6%), trade (3%), and transport (0.2%) in the year 2009.

CBS statistics of the year 2009 showed the GDP growth of the Non-Financial Corporations in the construction sector in the period 2005 to 2008 (103.8; 120.0; 132.0; 137.4), during this period of GDP growth the lowest incomes did not receive affordable housing via housing development plans of government. No transitional housing is available for residents at risk for homelessness.

Economic activity based on trade, construction, real estate/renting/business activities, private education, health and social work and other community, social and personal services of non-financial corporation’s grew in the period 2005 throughout 2008. The economic activity in education, health and social work, other community, social and personal services in the sector government also grew in this period. The gross GDP of St. Maarten increased in the period 2005 to 2009. The St. Maarten Housing & Development Foundation Housing Allocation Information Report for the period 2005 to 2008 showed that the five biggest employment sectors of the tenants in the Emergency Homes and Belvedere Housing project are transportation (10%), sales (16%), hospitality (10%), government (8%) and food retail (6%).

Economic activity in four of these sectors decreased due the world financial crisis in the year 2009. CBS press bulletin release on July 26, 2010, showed that economic activities on St. Maarten decreased with 0.9 % in the year 2009 due to the world financial crisis. The economic activities in the trade industry dropped by 3% in the year 2009; the decrease in trade related to a drop in merchandise imports of about 10%, which influences the overall activities percentage. The economic activities in the hotels and restaurants lessened by more than 6% in the year 2009; the stay over tourism dropped in all its main markets. The economic activities in the transport and communication sector lessened with 0.2% in the year 2009; in particular, cargo activities declined.

CBS Census of 2001 comparisons of income and rent based on 15.945 persons showed that 38% (5.935) of the working population had a gross income between Naf 1000 to 2000 per month. The monthly rents amounted to Naf 300
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72 St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation allocation report of the years 2005 – 2008, pp.16
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to 600 (30% rental quota) and Naf 200 to 400 (20% rental quota) for housing. On a total of 15,945 persons, 8,991 persons of the working population had incomes of Naf 2,000 and less, and paid rents between naf 0 and 600 per month; 6,604 persons of the working population had incomes above Naf 2,000 and paid rents between Naf 400 to 1500 per month.

Tenants of the housing foundation that could qualify for rent subsidy received this reduction from their rents via the housing foundation. Government allocates housing subsidy for the lowest incomes to the housing foundation that is in charge of the management public of housing. Yearly rent subsidy is on the budget of the Department of Housing in government for tenants in public housing that qualify for subsidy. The housing foundation deducts the amount of allocated subsidy from their monthly rent. The rent subsidy budget of the Department of Housing for the year 2011 is an amount of Naf. 447,000. Government also provides financial assistance for the basic needs of persons that have no income and qualify for this assistance. This assistance amounts to Naf. 4,500 yearly and is on the budget of the Department of Social Services. Vulnerable groups, including the homeless receive this assistance. The financial assistance takes care of their basic needs and can only take care of very low rents. Most of the time, the range of this assistance cannot cover the cost for housing. It can only cover cost for food and contribute to other expenses. A single person that is homeless receives five hundred guilders (naf) per month. A family that consists of two unemployed parents with three children receives seven hundred and twenty one guilders (naf) per month. This rent subsidy and financial assistance that government provides does not alleviate the financial strain of housing tenants. The lowest incomes cannot afford public housing or qualify for this housing due to their small income.

The unavailability of social housing and decline in economic activity in 2009 made a bad situation worse in the area of housing. In the year 2009 records of the housing foundation showed problems of rental arrears of the tenants in the emergency homes and Belvedere housing project. Tenants were already had problems paying their rent and the economic decline affected tenants that worked in the four sectors where the economic activity declined. Evicted
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tenants had no place to go. The eviction category had an amount of 388 tenants listed that could end up on the street.

Information coming out of a conference on affordable housing in the year 2008 explored the problem of affordable housing and looked into a possible solution. The information conveyed here related to certain facts. 1. Families who paid more than 30% of their income for housing are cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities, such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care. 2. Low-income housing potential tenants are usually present in larger numbers than they are for other properties. 3. Land is scarce on the island and the prices of available land are increasing. Government should develop a policy, enabling landowners to receive a suitable offer for realizing housing projects. The empowerment of local and international entrepreneurship is important. Dutch housing cooperations must be able to invest in housing on the island in such a case.

Variable quantity of appropriate housing:

No new figures on housing are available for the period 2007 – 2010. These figures will become available after the census on St. Maarten that will kick off in April 2011.

The general picture of housing in the period 2007-2010 is that the amount of appropriate dwellings will continue to increase on average. This is due to increased awareness of the need for proper housing in a hurricane zone, a certain adherence to building regulations and a certain amount of effective control on building from government. Residents also contribute to this when they invest in housing. They must be able and willing to do so. Incentives from different lending institutions for the construction of private homes and commercial buildings for housing are also important for the picture on the amount of available housing that is appropriate. The trend of building for the highest incomes will not change in the construction sector. Government is not offering incentives for the building of low-income housing on the island.

The amount of bad quality housing will exist to an extent due to the insufficient availability of affordable housing on St. Maarten. Another factor is uncontrolled building of bad quality dwellings in certain areas on the island. A certain amount of migrants choose to invest only in low- to bad quality housing to be able to
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save money and avoid high rents of proper housing. The lowest incomes need proper housing that is affordable.

The amount of very bad quality housing will remain about the same due to rebuilding in certain areas of bad quality dwellings. General clean up of shanty areas takes place very sporadically. It will be about 2% or less due to the demolition of shacks of which the quality was not acceptable and general building control. Residents need low income- and social housing.

Government lack of investment in low-income and social housing for residents is very evident in the following comparison. 79CBS Population and Housing Census of the year 2001 showed that the amount of dwellings rented from the housing foundation to be an amount of 689 and from private owners to be an amount of 6809. The figure of 689 reflected government investment in housing on the island. The rents paid for this housing are cheaper than on the private market. Private owners invested heavily in housing over the years in comparison to government. The real estate housing market predominantly invested in housing for the higher incomes. Government does not offer the private market incentives to invest in housing for low- and middle incomes.

Government set out a vision for investment in housing for the lower incomes and did not meet the demands of this vision. 80The Housing Vision of the Government of Sint Maarten of the year 2003 determined that St. Maarten needed about 500 -1230 social housing units until the year 2010; government recently built 72 social housing units for independent living of vulnerable groups. This did not include the homeless and residents at risk for homelessness. Government will update this vision document to deal with the present extent of unavailable affordable housing for the lower and middle incomes on St. Maarten.

The result of not realizing social housing for the vulnerable categories in society presents a challenge now for government to do so. Different institutions have a problem housing vulnerable groups; they need social housing for independent living of their target groups. Among these target groups there are homeless people and those at risk for homelessness. The information of this vision document is now outdated based on the growth of the population and the increased demand for low-income housing over the years. 81A VSA report of the

79 CBS Population and Housing Census 2001

80 Government of St. Maarten Housing Vision, 2003, pp. 18

81 VSA government of St. Maarten, Sociale Zaken report on homelessness, 2009, pp. 46
Social Welfare Department of the year 2009 determined that nine different groups of low-income residents are vulnerable groups. This report looked at homelessness based on institutions that need social housing for target groups. It estimated that different vulnerable groups need about 1549 social housing units. These groups are institutional release categories, institutional admittance categories, housing waiting list categories and the housing eviction categories.

The St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation is the authority in the area of public housing. The housing foundation gave an overview of the shortage of social and affordable housing in the media in the year 2007. This foundation was screening the waiting-list category to update their records. About 2000 applicants applied for housing. The foundation then only managed to screen some 853 cases and of this amount, 190 families were in desperate need of social housing. The foundation reported that tenants had rental arrears payments to an amount of Naf. 500.000. The updating of the waiting list at the housing foundation during the period June 2009 to December 2009 showed that 993 applicants were on the list awaiting social housing. This reflected persons that applied for housing and the majority of them that could qualify for housing. It did not reflect residents that did not bother to apply, because no housing is available, and the fact that they have housing barriers and cannot access even housing with lower rents. Migrants have problems accessing this housing if their residence permits are not up to date or valid.

Summary of the findings of the additional research sources:

Classification of the variables: population growth and gross GDP growth on St. Maarten in this agenda-setting period did move government to make a sufficient quantity of appropriate housing available for the lowest incomes on the island. The amount of appropriate housing is still insufficient for all categories, especially the lowest incomes. Bad quality to very bad quality housing still exists on the island. ‘Problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government on St. Maarten is responsible for this. Government pays serious attention to trade and some other sectors. The construction sector is one of these sectors. Housing construction for the lowest incomes hardly receives attention in the construction sector. Government does not make building for low-income budgets a priority. There are no incentives from government for the building of low-income housing. Government paid no serious to the issue of homelessness for relevant policy- and decision-making in government.
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4.4.3 How can the political actors in government on St. Maarten impact problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness according to Kingdon (1984)?

The findings of the interviews research presented six aspects that political actors can employ to impact ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government concerning issue of homelessness. The aspects prevent stagnation in the policy formation process of homelessness. These aspects make prominence of the issue possible, also policy generation and decision-making in government comes about. Serious attention of political actors to problematic aspects in government is vital to prominence of issues on the agenda, policy generation and decision-making.

The additional research sources also include the findings of an empirical study on agenda setting and alternative policy selection. The study “Understanding Local Policy Making: Policy Elites Perceptions of Local Agenda Setting” by Xinsheng Liu, Eric Lindquist, Arnold Vedlitz, and Kenneth Vincent of the Institute for Science, Technology and public Policy and Bush School of Government and Public Service of Texas A & M University in the year 2009.

Drawing on agenda setting research and particularly the multiple streams framework of Kingdon (1995), this empirical study examined the major forces and factors in local agenda setting and alternative selection. It also looked at how the agenda-setting framework fit at the local level of policymaking. The research consisted of data collected from 271 in-depth interviews with local policy stakeholders in three U.S. Gulf Coasts areas. The protocol focused on capturing stakeholders perceptions of key elements and forces in local policy dynamics. The scientific community is familiar with the research findings and probably supports the standards of the research.

The findings of this study provided the empirical findings of the interviews with more information. The findings of this empirical study relate to the same six aspects of the findings of the interview research, as both findings relate to the same multiple streams approach to policymaking.

This additional research source gives the relative importance of the six aspects that political actors can employ in government in order to complete policy formation processes in accordance with the approach of Kingdon (1984). This information helps answer the last question. How can the political actors in
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government on St. Maarten impact problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness according to Kingdon (1984)?

The findings of this empirical study are:

1. The empirical study looked at who the major participants are on the inside and outside of government in local policy agenda and alternative selection processes and what is their relative importance among the major policy participants from a multiple streams perspective.

   It found that political actors and various interests groups are the major participants in local policy processes in- and outside of government. These actors influence decision-making in government.

2. The study also looked at important attention attraction factors that enhance prominent issue status and the relative importance of these attention attractors.

   Budgetary considerations and various forms of feedback to local government are more important than objective problem indicators and focusing events in setting policy priorities.

3. It also looked at the key attributes that enhance the survival and selection of new policy ideas and alternatives.

   Policy alternatives that prove compatible with existing policies and regulations stand more chance for selection in government than those relying on criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability and future constraints.

4. The study also looked at the most critical political factors that shape agenda priorities and affect alternative selection in local policy processes.

   Policy participants see consensus- and coalition building as the most important political factors in local policy processes.

### 4.5 The empirical findings of the research

The empirical finding of the research relate to the following research question: How can the political actors in government on St. Maarten impact problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness according to Kingdon (1984).

The policy framework of John W. Kingdon (1984) is the policy approach that political actors on St. Maarten suggest to make use of to influence (impact) problematic preferences in government on St. Maarten concerning the issue of homelessness.
Government can influence (impact) problematic preferences as follows:

1. Political actors and other stakeholders in the policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten have relatively more influence in shaping the agenda in government than the media. Political actors in government can act alone or employ support from influential interests groups to help set priorities and bring about decision-making for policy alternatives.

2. Budgetary considerations and various forms of feedback to local government would enhance the prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda in government on St. Maarten in setting policy priorities. They are relatively more important for issue prominence and setting policy priorities than objective problem indicators and focusing events.

3. Policy alternatives related to the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten that is not in conflict with existing policies and regulations in government are more likely to find support for decision-making.

4. Political actors within government on St. Maarten can use consensus- and coalition building to build priority on the agenda for the issue of homelessness or related policy alternatives on the agenda in government. Outside of government interest groups, public partners and civil society on St. Maarten can also use consensus- and coalition building to help shape the agenda for decision-making.

4.6 The logic linking the data to the propositions

The logic linking the data of the empirical research to the theoretical propositions (pattern matching technique):

1. The media set the public agenda on the issue of homelessness and citizens directed demands to government on St. Maarten concerning the issue

2. Agenda setting of the issue of homelessness occurred in the periods 1988-1990, 1997-2003 and in 2007-2010. During these periods, the Democratic Party governed the island for the longest period, but also different coalition governments from the year 1994

3. A policy window opened three times in government for the issue of homelessness, attention of politicians to the problem was evident in all periods, and problem examination happened in all periods, no significant policy or decision-making occurred during the three agenda setting periods to solve the problem of homelessness related to the lowest incomes on St. Maarten
4. No policy entrepreneur made use of the policy windows to couple the problem of homelessness to policy during the three windows of opportunity for policymaking.

5. The systemic problems of ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government affected the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness. Government paid serious attention to the trade industry and some other sectors. The construction sector is one of them. Affordable housing did not receive attention in the construction sector. Government does not give the private sector incentives to build for the lowest incomes. The preferences in government are problematic in regards to the areas that receive serious attention and not. This also pertains to the incomes that receive housing in the construction industry. The quantity of low-income and social housing does not suit the demand of the lowest incomes for appropriate housing that is affordable.

6. Political actors in government on St. Maarten did not pay serious attention to the issue of homelessness.

7. Politicians and key administrative civil servants did not affect a rise of the issue on the agenda in government; stakeholders of the policy formation process of homelessness in- and outside of government identified the problem, and only in the agenda setting periods of 1997-2003 and 2007 to 2010 did they indicate solution directions to government. In both periods policy development related to social housing for the lowest incomes on St. Maarten did not sufficiently materialize to solve the problem of homelessness. Such policy alternatives must still come about for homeless people and those at risk for homelessness.

8. Policy generation in line with the solution directions of low-income social housing, care support and regulation/legislation did not evolve and decision-making in government concerning the issue of homelessness did not come about.

9. The policy formation process of homelessness on St. Maarten is stagnated.

10. Homeless people on St. Maarten will not benefit from decision-making in government, until alternative selection on housing development takes place in government related to sufficient social housing provisions for the lowest incomes and transitional housing for at risk for homelessness categories.

The empirical research established a rival pattern based on the theoretical propositions.
5. The conclusion of the research

Chapter 5 of the research looks at the conclusion of the research. Paragraph 5.1 gives the theoretical- and empirical conclusion of the research. Paragraph 5.2 states the conclusion of the research. The report of the research is in paragraph 5.3.

5.1 Answer to the central research question

This thesis is about agenda setting, alternative selection in policy formation processes in government, and problematic aspects in government that affect the prominence of issues on the agenda, prevent policy generation and decision-making on policy alternatives from coming about. It empirically looks at the policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten in connection with policy formation and alternative selection in government on this island.

The central research question is:

What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines, how do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact these problematic aspects? How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

5.1.1 The theoretical conclusion of the central research question

The theoretical aspect of the central research question is:

What problematic aspects of policy formation processes require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines, how do executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact these problematic aspects?

The research conclusion on this question is:

The problematic aspects in policy formation processes in government are ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972).

Executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact/influence ‘problematic preferences and unclear technology’, Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) by paying serious attention to these aspects in government. These aspects cause stagnation in policy formation processes of issues on the agenda. In such cases, issues do not figure prominently on the
agenda, and no policy- and decision-making takes place in government concerning the issues.

Executives in the cabinet pay serious attention to these problematic aspects under pressure from the opposition in the legislature. The legislature focuses on the effects of the stagnation for citizens and the representation that citizens receive by the sitting government. The cabinet must move to resolve problematic aspects and help adopt a policy alternative to tackle the issue that is on the agenda in government.

Key personnel in the administration support the cabinet in deciding which issues on the agenda to support for decision-making. This also pertains to approaches to bring clarity to processes in government. Once issues related to ‘problematic preference and unclear technology’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), are resolved, then the issues in question gain prominence on the agenda in government.

The argument of Kingdon relates that activity also takes place in two others areas in government, the areas of problem examination and policy ideas. Policy entrepreneurs sense that politicians are paying serious attention to particular issues and they make use of the window of opportunity to link the politics to existing problem examination and policy ideas in government.

Executives in government look at the policy alternatives and support choices that are relevant to tackle the issues on the agenda. They look at problem indicators and focusing events to help decide on choices to support. Technical feasibility, value acceptability, future constraints, and budgetary considerations are aspects that are important to the cabinet in choosing a particular policy alternative.

The policy alternatives generated inside and outside of government receive attention from the opposition parties. They review the presented policy alternatives and give their motivation for the support of particular policy alternatives. The legislature adopts the policy alternative that receives the most support in government. Decision-making concerning an issue on the agenda in government comes about. The policy formation process of the issue completes and this allows the policy cycle of the issue to continue. There is policy available and the policy cycle is not stagnated. The policy generation came about based on the approach of Kingdon (1984) to policymaking in government.

5.1.2 The empirical conclusion of the central research question

The empirical aspect of the central research question is:
The respondents of the research determined that ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government are the problematic aspects that affect the policy formation process of homelessness. They indicated that government does not pay serious attention to homelessness and that the policy formation process of homelessness is stagnated. They chose the policymaking approach of Kingdon (1984) to influence (impact) problematic aspects for prominence of the issue on the agenda, policy generation and decision-making.

The additional research sources revealed that in the three agenda setting periods, government did not pay serious attention to solving the problem of homelessness. A steadily growth of the population and gross GDP over the years did not move government to make appropriate housing available for the lowest incomes. Government primarily pays attention to trade and related decision-making. A few other sectors also receive quite some attention; the construction industry is one of them. In this industry, affordable housing for the lowest incomes does not receive appropriate attention in relation to the demand for appropriate housing. Government does not give the construction sector incentives to invest in low-income and social housing. The housing picture is that the availability of appropriate housing does not suit the demand. Bad quality to very bad quality housing still exists on the island. Homelessness is a problem on the island.

The preferences in government for serious attention relate to particular sectors and in particular the trade sector. In the construction sector, it relates to the highest incomes. Both aspects create problems for the availability of appropriate housing for the lowest incomes on the island. They choose to live with others or in bad or very bad quality housing. Vulnerable persons end up on the street for different reasons and others are at risk for homelessness.

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

The research finding of the interviews and the additional research sources gave the same outlook on the policy formation process of homelessness on St. Maarten. It is stagnated, no policy and decision-making related to alternatives that could provide social housing for the lowest incomes is available in government. This includes the homeless. Political actors on the island paid no serious attention to the issue on the agenda. The preferences of issues to push for relevant decision-making are problematic. The attention of government is centered predominantly on trade and related areas for decision-making in government.
The research interviews findings and the additional research sources both supported a multiple streams framework for policy- and decision-making in government. The research respondents adopted the approach of Kingdon (1984) as the approach for policy- and decision-making in government. This approach relates that serious attention of political actors and key administrative personnel in government to ‘problematic preferences’ Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) can resolve such issues in government. The study, “Understanding Local Policy Making: Policy Elites Perceptions of Local Agenda Setting” by Xinsheng Lui, Eric Lindquist, Arnold Vedlitz, and Kenneth Vincent of the Institute for Science, Technology and Public Policy and Bush School of Government and Public Service of Texas A & M University in the year 2009, used the approach of Kingdon (1995) to establish those findings.

The empirical research conclusions are:

1. Political actors and other stakeholders in the policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten have relatively more influence in shaping the agenda in government than the media. Political actors in government can act alone or employ support of influential interests groups to help set priorities and bring about decision-making for policy alternatives on homelessness

2. Budgetary considerations and various forms of feedback to local government would enhance the prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda in government on St. Maarten in setting policy priorities. They are relatively more important for issue prominence and setting policy priorities than objective problem indicators and focusing events

3. Policy alternatives related to the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten that are not in conflict existing policies and regulations in government are more likely to be accepted for decision-making

4. Political actors within government on St. Maarten can use consensus- and coalition building to build priority on the agenda for the issue of homelessness or related policy alternatives. Outside of government interest groups, public partners and civil society on St. Maarten can also use consensus- and coalition building to help shape the agenda for decision-making.

5.2 The conclusion of the research

The central research question of the research:
What problematic aspects of policy formation processes of topics require such serious attention in government for issues to rise to the top of the agenda so relevant policies are developed and adopted as Kingdon (1984) outlines, how do executive, legislative-, and key administrative actors in government impact these problematic aspects? How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

1. The problematic aspect in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten is ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972), in government

2. The policymaking approach of John W. Kingdon (1984) is the approach to impact ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) in government on St. Maarten for relevant policy- and decision-making

2. Serious attention of political actors in government to ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) can help resolve the problem

3. The issue of homelessness then rises to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making related to sufficient social housing for the lowest incomes on St. Maarten, which include the homeless. The adopted approach of this research outlines this, the Multiple Streams Framework of John W. Kingdon (1984)

4. The policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten then completes to allow the rest of the policy cycle of the issue to take place. This makes it possible for the policy cycle to attain beneficial outcomes for homeless citizens on St. Maarten.

5. Executive-, legislative- and key administrative actors in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in government on St. Maarten can impact ‘problematic preferences’, Cohen, March & Olsen (1972) as following:

1. Political actors and other stakeholders in the policy process of homelessness on St. Maarten have relatively more influence in shaping the agenda in government than the media. Political actors in government can act alone or employ support of influential interests groups to help set priorities and bring about decision-making for policy alternatives

2. Budgetary considerations and various forms of feedback to local government would enhance the prominence of the issue of homelessness on the agenda in government on St. Maarten in setting policy priorities. They are relatively more important for issue
prominence and setting policy priorities than objective problem indicators and focusing events

3. Policy alternatives related to the issue of homelessness on St. Maarten that are not in conflict existing policies and regulations in government are more likely to be accepted for decision-making.

4. Political actors within government on St. Maarten can use consensus- and coalition building to build priority on the agenda for the issue of homelessness or related policy alternatives. Outside of government interest groups, public partners and civil society on St. Maarten can also use consensus- and coalition building to help shape the agenda for decision-making.

5.3 The report of the research results

Data reporting is the process of preparing and disseminating findings of research to the scientific community. Reporting accurate and honest data is important. The focus is ensuring the integrity of the research. In view of this, the researcher followed of the methodological approach to ensure the integrity of the research. The researcher first gives information on the following aspects of the research: misrepresentation of data, selectivity of reporting data, publication bias and reporting conclusions not supported in the research. Reporting on the construct validity, internal validity, external validity and the reliability of the research then follows.

5.3.1 Misrepresentation of data

The data of the research comes from directly from the sources mentioned in the research. The research used the data of the reported sources for interpretations in the research and drawing conclusions.

Data misrepresentation avoided in the research at three particular moments:

1. No data was available for the population growth and gross GDP growth of the agenda-setting period of 1988-1990. In cooperation with the Registry, office on St. Maarten the researcher decided to show that over the years, the population was on the increase and gives the general picture related to this growth. This approach found support by this researcher and the Registry researcher.

2. The researcher could not give data on gross GDP growth in the agenda-setting period of 1988-1990. The research states only a general picture of gross GDP growth based on related factors (increasing population over the years and the migration pattern). The empirical research conclusion and the conclusions of the research support this general picture of the gross GDP for the period 1988-1990.
3. The last census on St. Maarten was in the year 2001. In April of 2011, a new census will take place on the island. No recent information was available on housing at CBS St. Maarten prior to the census. In this area too, the research states a general picture of the present situation on housing. The empirical conclusion and the research conclusion support this general picture on the current housing situation.

5.3.2 Selectivity of reporting data

The researcher used data that would sufficiently answer the research questions. This was the focus of the research analysis. The selection criteria for the using data were solely this. No other motivation played a role in choosing particular data or excluding data.

5.3.3 Publication bias

This researcher does not show support for research results that support positive or negative conclusions. The conclusion of the research on homelessness on St. Maarten is a negative one and the reporting of this conclusion does not diver from reporting a positive one for this researcher. Selecting the empirical study and the findings based on this study to support the analysis of this research came about due to the appropriateness of this study for agenda setting in government and policymaking based on the approach of Kingdon (1984). There are many studies of topics related to other processes in the policy cycle and less studies on policy formation. The researcher was quite content to find this study and learn about the findings of this research. It was a good fit.

5.3.4 Reporting conclusions not supported in the research

The data of the different research sources support the conclusion of the research. The researcher can defend the quality of the data integrity of this research. The researcher conducted the research objectively and two mentors (quality assurance) helped provide sufficient objectiveness. Incorporation of the areas where they recommended changes to the research took place. The researcher also consulted the Registry of St. Maarten and CBS St. Maarten on matters concerning the unavailability of data and the integrity of the analysis. This also helped safeguard the integrity of the research. The researcher showed the relevant concern about matters that could cloud the findings and conclusions of the research. There was no publication pressure, competition with others, matter of job security, lack of formal mentioning and bad examples of mentors during the research phase.

5.3.5 Construct validity
The three matters concerning unavailable data of the first and the last agenda-setting period and using a general picture approach on population growth, gross GDP growth and the present housing situation in a realistic and logical manner proved better for the construct validity than relying on unsupported data and conflicting data. In these three cases, no exact data injection took place in the research, but realistic analysis of the situation on St. Maarten in the two agenda-setting periods came about. The research reported these matters and the consultation with the Registry of St. Maarten researcher and CBS of St. Maarten.

5.3.6 Internal validity

The reported unavailability of data and the approach to establish findings for the conclusions of the research, have very little bearing on the research results if any. The research establishes correctly what the problematic aspect in government is concerning the issue of homelessness and how executive-, legislative-, and key administrative actors can influence (impact) problematic aspects in government for the issue of homelessness to rise to the top of the agenda for policy and decision-making.

5.3.7 External validity

The results of the research are generalizable for populations in countries similar in context to government of the U.S.A. where Kingdon (1984) established his multiple streams approach. Institutional fragmentation, plural and fluid participation, and temporary collation, Mucciaroni (1992) characterize this system. Liberal democracies that are not similar in context to the political system of the United States government and other political systems that are not in the tradition of liberal democracies, cannot adopt the approach of Kingdon (1984) to influence problematic aspects in government for prominence of issues on the agenda, policy generation and decision-making in government. This includes the political system of Country St. Maarten. The results of the research are not generalizable to populations in the mentioned contexts.

5.3.8 Reliability of the research

The researcher established a sufficient degree of reliability of the research based on the quality of the analysis. The mentoring approach and consultation with two relevant instances helped further the quality of the analysis. Based on the construct validity, the internal validity and the external validity already mentioned in the research, the researcher established that the research conclusions are reliable for generalization and recommend them to other scholars in the field of public governance.
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7. Appendix of the research

7.1 The interviews information sheet

1. Topic of the research

The topic of the research is homelessness on St. Maarten at present.

2. Definition of homelessness

The situation that individuals and at times families do not have an adequate dwelling to live in and are sleeping on the street, in abandoned vehicles, or derelict buildings on the island. They are roofless and cannot exercise the right to adequate housing, privacy and a legal title to occupation of housing.

3. Background of the research

Via several newspapers articles and public outcries of concerned citizens during radio programs, the issue of homelessness received attention on Sint Maarten. Citizens voiced their opinions about homelessness in the media. The media gave the issue attention in a newspaper and radio programs. Citizens saw the issue as a problem that was getting bigger and did not like the image that this was giving the island. They demanded that government do something to solve the problem. The media set the public agenda on the issue of homelessness and the outcry of the public created a window of opportunity for agenda setting of the issue in government.

4. Agenda setting of the problem in government

The problem of homelessness is on the political agenda in government on St. Maarten. It has returned to the agenda. Homelessness has been a problem on St. Maarten in the last 20 years and government has looked into the problem. Government has asked the relevant parties in the administration to look into the problem of people living on the street.

5. Stakeholders in the problem definition and solution of the problem

Actors in the political system:

1. Executive members of government

2. Legislative members of parliament

3. Key administrative personnel in the departments of housing, health and social Services
Actors outside of the political system:

1. The media (bring awareness of the problem)
2. The public (make demands for government to solve the problem)
3. The Mental Health Foundation
4. The St. Martin’s Home
5. The St. Maarten Housing and Development Foundation

7.2 The research instruction sheet

Instruction sheet

1. Primary units of analysis have three questions to answer; secondary units of analysis have two questions to answer
2. Each question has a set of answer categories
3. Please, circle the answer of your choice
4. Only, circle one answer
5. If you circle the wrong answer, put an x through the answer and then circle the answer of your choice
6. Answer all of the questions
7. Question one:
   Circle A, B, C, D or E to answer the question. If you choose to the answer category E, please use the blank paper that is included with your instruction sheet to write down the information that you will provide for this question.
8. Question two:
   Circle A, B, C or D to answer the question
9. Question three:
   Circle A, B or C to answer the question

Thank you for participating in this research. You will receive a follow up contact at the end of the research in connection with the findings and conclusions.
7.3 The interviews forms

Structured interview form for primary units of analysis

Argument of Kingdon (1984) states that serious attention from executives in the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to issues in policy formation processes, help issues rise to the top of the agenda in government for policymaking and alternative selection.

Please read the research question and circle the answer(s) your choice.

Question one:

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

A. Problematic preferences of issues to push for policymaking and alternative selection in government
B. Unclear processes in government that stagnate the policy formation process
C. Both aspects
D. None of these aspects
E. This aspect or aspects: ____________________________

Question two:

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

A. The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government
B. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and the issue is at the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government
C. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key
administrative personnel in government and is at the top of the agenda, housing development plans and policy otherwise cater to persons living on the street. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

D. The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is not at the top of the agenda in government, housing development plans and policy otherwise do not cater to persons living on the street as yet. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

Question three:

How can these actors in the policy formation process of homelessness in government on Sint Maarten at present impact problematic aspects of the issue as Kingdon (1984) outlines?

A. By paying serious attention to problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness, By also influencing other governmental actors and various interests, groups that can help find solutions, By impacting/influencing the budget in government to help shape the agenda in government, By adopting problem indicators and taking heed of focusing events; by seriously considering policy alternatives that are deemed compatible with existing policies and regulations, the processes are clear and the alternatives are attractive, By looking at criteria such as technical feasibility, value acceptability, and future constraints of the issue of homelessness, By building consensus in the political system on how to resolve the problematic aspects of the policy formation process, Serious attention to all of these aspects would help the issue of homelessness rise to the top of the agenda in government, and three separate streams in government will combine for policy generation and alternative selection in policy formation process. These measures will help resolve the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness.

B. Governmental decision-makers can seriously consider a series of sequential problem identification and solution generating processes in government to
resolve problematic aspects of the issue of homelessness for prominence on the
agenda, and policy- and decision making in the policy formation process of the
issue of homelessness. Policymakers identify problems by:

Articulating goals and setting levels of achievement for those goals that satisfy
them,

They then conduct analyses of the costs and benefits of alternative problems to
determine which problem they should consider,

They select the problem,

They generate solutions to the problem,

They systematically collect data,

They systematically analyze the data about the policy options and then they
select the optimal alternative.

Serious attention to the problematic aspects of the policy formation process of
the issue of homelessness by means of these sequential stages will help
generate policy and select an alternative in government. The problematic
aspects in the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness in
government would resolve by his stages approach.

C. By policymakers gradual interest in the problematic aspects of the policy
formation process of the issue of homelessness, only considering the immediate
problematic aspects and making modest changes over time. A gradual
emergence of aspects that are problematic and finding solutions for them will
take place; a pattern of marginal steps taking annually in response to the
existing problem will resolve the problematic aspects for policy generation and
alternative selection in government.

Structured interview form for secondary units of analysis

Question one:

What are the problematic aspects in government that prevent the issue of
homelessness from rising to the top of the agenda and policy coming about?

A. Problematic preferences of issues to push for policymaking and alternative
selection in government

B. Unclear processes in government that stagnate policy formation process

C. Both aspects
D. None of these aspects

E. This aspect or aspects: ____________________________

Question two:

How do problematic aspects in government affect the policy formation process of the issue of homelessness on Sint Maarten at present in light of the argument of Kingdon (1984)?

A. The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government to rise to the top of the agenda in government for policy- and decision-making. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

B. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and the issue is at the top of the agenda for policymaking and alternative selection. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

C. The issue of homelessness does receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is at the top of the agenda, housing development plans and policy otherwise cater to persons living on the street. The policy formation process is not stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

D. The issue of homelessness does not receive serious attention from executive members of the cabinet, legislative members of the political parties and key administrative personnel in government and is not at the top of the agenda in government, housing development plans and policy otherwise do not cater to persons living on the street as yet. The policy formation process is stagnated by problematic aspects in government.

7.4 The coding system of the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Governmental actor, Minister of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Governmental actor, politician in the legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Governmental actor, senior policy advisor Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Data tables of the research

Table 1: Population on January 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population January 1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Decrease economic activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Decrease economic activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Hotel and restaurants</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Transport and communication</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Press Bulletin 2010

### Table 9: Economic activity per sector in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS GDP</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBS Netherlands Antilles Statistical Orientation 2009 on St. Maarten

### Table 10: Economic activity of the construction sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>137.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Statistical yearbook 2009

### Table 11: Quality of the housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1992 (%)</th>
<th>2001 (%)</th>
<th>2001 (amounts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: CBS Census 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Migration to St. Maarten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRATION</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>4057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMIGRATION</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRATION</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMIGRATION</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Statistics 2010

Table 13: Population size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>5570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>13.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>23.623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Island Registry on St. Maarten 2011

Table 14: Quality of housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Quality dwelling</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 to period</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to period 1985</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to period 1985</td>
<td>Very bad/unknown</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Population and Housing Census 2001

**Table 15: Quality of housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Quality dwelling</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After 1985</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1985</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1985</td>
<td>Very bad/unknown</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Population and Housing Census 2001

**Table 16: Gross Domestic Product, market prices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total value added gross</td>
<td>803.0</td>
<td>774.8</td>
<td>809.3</td>
<td>846.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes less subsidies on products</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP gross</td>
<td>826.9</td>
<td>849.7</td>
<td>890.5</td>
<td>901.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Statistical Yearbook 2000

**Table 17: Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>30440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Island Registry of St. Maarten and CBS estimates 1998-2004

Table 18: St. Maarten neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Maarten</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Average Household Income</th>
<th>Bad quality homes absolute</th>
<th>Bad quality homes percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philipsburg</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the Bank</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucker Garden</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Quarter</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Region</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the Pond</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorg en Rust</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentry Hill</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peters</td>
<td>2806</td>
<td>3.509</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cay Bay</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.594</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>10.790</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Census 2001

Table 19: Quality of the housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1992 (%)</th>
<th>2001 (%)</th>
<th>2001 (amounts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: CBS Census 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20: Gross Domestic Product, market prices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total gross value added</td>
<td>1120.8</td>
<td>1201.1</td>
<td>1279.8</td>
<td>1362.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus taxes less subsidies on products</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus financial intermediation indirect measures</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Gross</td>
<td>1175.3</td>
<td>1258.7</td>
<td>1340.5</td>
<td>1422.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal GDP growth</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP growth</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBS Statistical Yearbook 2009

**Table 21: Average gross income and rents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average gross income in NAF per month</th>
<th>Amount of persons</th>
<th>Rents with 30% rental quota</th>
<th>Rents with 20% rental quota</th>
<th>Percentage of the working population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>0- 150</td>
<td>0- 100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1.000</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>150- 300</td>
<td>100- 200</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000-2.000</td>
<td>5.935</td>
<td>300- 600</td>
<td>200- 400</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.001-3.000</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>600- 900</td>
<td>400- 600</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.001-5.000</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>900-1.500</td>
<td>600- 1.000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000 +</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1.500 +</td>
<td>1.000 +</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22: Average gross income and rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average gross income in NAF per month</th>
<th>Amount of persons</th>
<th>Rents with 30% rental quota</th>
<th>Rents with 20% rental quota</th>
<th>Percentage of the working population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>0- 150</td>
<td>0- 100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1.000</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>150- 300</td>
<td>100- 200</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.000-2.000</td>
<td>5.935</td>
<td>300- 600</td>
<td>200- 400</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.001-3.000</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>600- 900</td>
<td>400- 600</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.001-5.000</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>900-1.500</td>
<td>600- 1.000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000 +</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1.500 +</td>
<td>1.000 +</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** CBS census 2001

### Table 23: SMHDF Eviction category 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Outstanding balance NAF</th>
<th>Income problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social housing eviction category 1</td>
<td>500-above 3000</td>
<td>109.961.26</td>
<td>Households have begun to accumulate arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing eviction category 2</td>
<td>500-above 3000</td>
<td>147.410.97</td>
<td>Households that to some degree, are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing eviction category 3</td>
<td>16 households</td>
<td>500- above 3000</td>
<td>66.015.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing eviction category 4</td>
<td>1 household</td>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td>703.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing eviction category 5</td>
<td>76 households</td>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td>275.439.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001-3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: St. Maarten Housing & Development Foundation records July 2007