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This dissertation is the destination of a journey that took over 10 years to complete. The journey entailed doing research on a part-time basis amid rather dynamic personal and professional developments. This meant traveling alternately between a high and low pace, and with crossroads and intermittent stops along the route. I am very grateful for the wonderful companions that traveled with me during the journey and that helped me reach the destination.

A helicopter perspective with regard to the research developments shows that I started out with a fascination about the various types of processes in which cities involve citizens in the shaping of the desired future. However, after the first publications and presentations at international conferences, it became clear to me that it is not the shape or form of such processes in itself that are of decisive influence; it is the governance context in which they take place that contribute to the implementation success (or failure) of such participatory processes. It also became clear that there are tensions that arise because participatory processes take place within democratic systems where “the people” are represented by elected officials and where societies have become accustomed to democratic mechanisms that often limit democratic involvement of citizens to voting in cyclical elections. The redesign projects of the constitutions of Ireland and Iceland are a case in point, whereby deliberative and participative processes were used on a large scale. The proposed adjustments to the constitutions that had been thoroughly discussed and researched with a large amount of people representing the community still depended on the approval of the small group of elected officials. They have the power to accept, amend, or overturn the propositions that resulted from the intensive participatory processes concerning the most fundamental law of the country. This illustrates that the governance of communities seems to misfit the fast-paced developments in the knowledge era where creative citizens have a new palette of requirements towards their choice of place and involvement in the developments within their community. The expressions of the misfit between the mechanisms that determine the interplay between “government”
and “the governed” are multifold, ranging from low voter turnout and distrust of the government, to protest movements in various shapes and forms and new political movements fighting the “establishment,” that are gaining ground across the continents.

The Curaçao community where I have held citizenship since 1990 is a small community of approximately 160,000 inhabitants of various backgrounds and multicultural origin. Since I moved to Curaçao 27 years ago, I have been an involved citizen, not just by professional responsibilities as a former journalist and business consultant, but also as a volunteer in the board of various foundations and member of a local chapter of Rotary International. Curaçao is a community that is very much in development. This creates an inviting environment for involvement. Through my involvement especially in youth foundations, I noticed a big gap between the everyday challenges of many families and organizations and the focus of government and politicians in their policies and practices, and experienced also how hard it is to close that gap. As a citizen I was concerned about the discussions in preparation of the constitutional changes in 2010, because all eyes, minds, and negotiations were focused on the legal and financial aspects of becoming an autonomous country within the Dutch kingdom, and not at what kind of country Curaçao could become, and what it would take to achieve that. The case of Curaçao is fascinating in this respect, since this small country in the Dutch Kingdom had the unique opportunity to fully reshape its government and governance structure and processes in light of the constitutional changes in 2010. These changes made the island into a small city-state with one level of government for the island. Despite high ambitions with regard to accountability, citizen participation, and co-creation of sustainable policies, the reshaping of the government structure in Curaçao resulted in a traditional bureaucratic government structure of nine ministries, with little attention for governance aspects that provide room for the expressed ambitions.

Politics is an active part of everyday life in Curaçao, discussed by all on many occasions and in all media. Still, access to actual involvement or influence in politics is limited to voting, being an active member of a political party, or by the financing of parties. From the experience as a citizen in board functions of various foundations I have seen how difficult it is—even in such a small community—to bring issues into the political arena and obtain support for solutions, even when presenting them ready to implement to those with formal responsibilities in government. From a citizen perspective it is abundantly clear that, even though in the small Curaçao community connections are easily made, the real circle of influence towards government is actually quite limited. Civil society is as of yet underdeveloped, but does hold a vast amount of knowledge and insight based on experience in various fields of community interest. But, government in relation to civil society takes only its role as provider of subsidies into
account and hardly taps into the knowledge basis that is available in the community. These circumstances brought about a personal fascination to see if and how, by the implementation of dialogic and participative processes, governments could facilitate a more participative approach within the bureaucratic structure and within the context of the representative democracy.

But, there was more than fascination from a citizen perspective. In 2010 my professional life took a huge turn when I started working in public service. It started in October 2010 when, right after the constitutional changes, I was approached to guide the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations on an interim basis as secretary-general for a period of six months. Interim management was one of my professional activities as a business consultant in that period. The task was to make the ministry operational by implementing the business plan that was part of the legal structure for the new governmental apparatus. In 2011, however, I decided to apply for a permanent position as secretary-general, which was not an easy choice. Life as a business consultant was highly satisfactory and I was proceeding with my thesis, but my citizen experience as described above, and the research I had performed in the area of governance thus far, convinced me that some changes in the functioning of government were highly desirable, and I considered that I could contribute to such enhancements from the position as secretary-general. Based on a selection process I was selected as the preferred candidate by the recruitment bureau and appointed by the government as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations in June 2011. I had specifically applied for the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, because in that function I also preside over the Council of Secretary-generals, and thus have space to stimulate enhancements beyond the ministry where I was appointed. Until mid-2014 I consciously separated my professional work from my research activities, although the topics were related and sometimes overlapped. I applied knowledge and insights gained from my research in my work, but I consciously chose initially not to perform action research from my position as secretary-general. The political situation was and is volatile; by April 2017, I served the seventh prime minister since 2010. Also, political developments as such are so dynamic that the research could be heavily affected by it in terms of its continuation. I felt quite uncomfortable by the perspective of mixing up the roles. This meant that in the course of the first few sub-studies for this thesis, I chose the path of external observer in analyzing developments to write papers on the emerging topic of public governance in the knowledge era. The sub-studies that I did in the course of the research that were published in 2007, 2009/2010, and also 2013 were in general terms related to, but not as such influenced by, my professional position in any given time; I was an outsider, looking at developments and analyzing them. I tried to fully separate my professional and academic role. This all changed in the start of 2015, when the National Action Program for Youth
Development process became a reality. I had been responsible for this program as secretary-general since the start of the initiative in July 2014, when such a program was announced by the prime minister after a tragic and violent event at the airport, in which young gang members were involved. In the first few months I acted fully from my professional role and involved the other secretary-generals in the approach that youth development would be a pilot for a capacity development program within the government about collaborative leadership, integral policy development, and more cooperation between ministries and with the community for which we work. We took various preparatory steps in the summer and fall of 2014, including sessions with stakeholders, between ministries and in the Council of Secretary-generals. In December 2014 the proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development, which would work on an action program, was approved by the government. Then, in January 2015, while planning the process towards an action program, it dawned on me that this process would be a fascinating topic for action research in the context of my thesis about participative governance. In fact, I suddenly realized that all along I had unconsciously applied my academic knowledge and insights into participative governance to the design of this program. I was fascinated by the thought, but at the same time terrified about the mingling of roles. Due to the volatile political situation, the position of secretary-generals is constantly under fire. Within this context many questions and doubts flashed through my head, alarm bells were ringing at a high note. In spite of this, I could not let go of the thought. Especially since, as a secretary-general, I am in the unique position to do insider action research at the top level of a government organization, which provides unique perspectives to work with. The position right in the middle of the triangle formed by the bureaucratic government, the political leadership, and the community provides unique inside views into the tension filled processes that occur while working towards participation. So, I decided to try to work it out as an action research project and discuss it, to test the waters. This thesis is the result of the decision to go ahead and do insider action research in the organization that I work for, the Curaçao Government.

I owe thanks and appreciation to many people, but to one person in particular. I first met René Tissen when he was one of the professors in the MBA program that I followed in Curaçao. We maintained contact, and I followed his rich stream of publications. When I approached René with the then still vague desire to do PhD research, he immediately was supportive and stimulating. He saw opportunities and capacities that I did not yet recognize myself. He has proven to be a highly demanding and knowledgeable, but also a very generous and pleasurable, travel companion along the sometimes bumpy road. We share a love for the fascinating island Curaçao. I thank him profoundly for his persistence and continued belief in my research, and the stimulating and wise guidance that he provided. This thesis would not have become a reality without him.
Danielle Zandee was another decisive influence, especially by making me become comfortable with the “muddy waters” of action research. She stimulated me to remain open to wonder and follow the path of discovery and inquiry. She provided support and insights that gave me the confidence to follow the rather complex research path I have chosen.

The action research process was a scientific adventure I shared with a group of highly diverse, but at the same time very open and committed co-researchers. Elly Hellings, Ralph Schreinemacher, Iwan Zunder, and Daniel Corsen, all in their own ways, played a crucial role in the development of the Action Program for Youth Development that is part of this research. The many creative and reflective moments we have spent together have led to shared insights that are very rich and also pragmatic. We overcame challenges by providing space for everyone to build on his or her strength. My colleagues in government, especially the secretary-generals, have shown the courage and energy to try out new ways. It has been a beautiful road of discovery to travel with these colleagues.

On the personal level, my husband Edward has been the one who specifically stimulated me to push my limits and reach high when it comes to goal setting. His patience and loving support have been of crucial influence on this journey. I thank and appreciate him for being my true companion in life and love.

There are two co-researchers that deserve special credits. My father Jan van Rijn and his wife, my “bonus-mother,” Mia. They have been from the very start, highly supportive and stimulating, and provided a welcoming study home away from home, when I was visiting the Netherlands for my research. My father provided many ideas and critical questions along the way that kept me sharp and focused. I am thankful for having inherited my father’s inquisitive genes and never-ending curiosity.

A support base at home also consists of dear friends that respect the times that you cannot join them or invite them because of research activities. They never doubted that I would succeed. I owe Louise and Robby Tjong-a-Tjoe, and Yvonne and Andre Maduro a special thanks for their warm friendship and support. This also goes for family members that showed support and patience, especially my sisters-in-law Ivonne and Renee Heerenveen. Many thanks for the warm and loving words, dear sisters.

My mother Jeanne knew of my desire and application to do PhD research, but she suddenly passed away in June 2005. I was in the Netherlands for her funeral when in that same week Nyenrode Business University notified me that I was accepted in the PhD program. This was a bittersweet moment. Although my mother never knew I made it into the program, she would have been beside herself with pride if she knew that I finished it successfully.

I dedicate this thesis to her loving memory.
PART ONE

THEORETICAL EXPLORATION AND ANALYSIS
SYSTEMIC TRANSFORMATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Fast-paced and multi-dimensional transformative developments on the global scale have put governance systems under severe pressure. Systems and structures that were once considered reliable beacons of assurance have tumbled or have come under severe scrutiny, not only in the financial world, but also in the democratic context. Perceived certainty has been replaced by open-ended questions at this point in time of dynamic developments in nations and communities across the globe. Democratic representatives and their increasingly less democratically rooted representative political organizations seek new direction, but they look towards a yet fuzzy horizon of constantly rearranging realities.

This introductory chapter provides a glossary of the global developments across scientific fields that inspired this study into the renewal of democratic governance. The expressed views provide the global context for the local research, and they have led to the approach and specific topic of democratic governance for the knowledge democracy, projected on the case of Curaçao. The condensed social, historical, and economical perspective presented in this introduction is based on my professional and scientific insights, and it aims to contribute to an understanding of the complex view I have of the context of the research topic in this dissertation. This chapter also provides an introduction to the goal of the research and an overview of the research outline.
1.1 TRANSITIONAL TENSIONS

1.1.1 Introduction

In the aftermath of devastating financial-economic shocks and highly impacting social shifts, scholars across a variety of disciplines agree that the current period is one of major historical transition, although the post-transitional destination is yet to be unequivocally defined. From a sociological perspective, Castells (2005, 2011) describes that the world is definitely leaving the post-Industrial era behind and entering into the Information Age dominated by a new kind of society (i.e., the global, borderless network society). Barber (2013) and Taleb (2012), from a political science view, provide fuel, as Ohmae (1996) did earlier from an economic perspective, to the ongoing discussions about the end, or increasing irrelevance, of the nation state due to worldwide interdependence and transnational global challenges. Management theorist Peter Drucker (2001) simply refers to The Next Society, which he identifies as knowledge driven and highly competitive, and in which “new institutions and new theories, and ideologies and problems” (Drucker, 2001, p. 30) emerge. In’t Veld (2010) describes from a public administration perspective the fatal erosion of the representative democracy that—although from a Western perspective is considered to be the most desirable political system in modern times—is at the end of its lifespan. He identifies the urgent need for new governance that fits the new knowledge democracy. Rotmans and Loorbach (2008) call for transition management, in which content and process are combined in a cyclical, iterative, interactive, and participatory stakeholder discourse process. These are only a few of the scholars that identify—each within their own typology and field—the fact that the world is experiencing a transitional period.

Although historical transitions in the economic, social, and political realm will ultimately be defined and explained in hindsight from a historical perspective, the impacting and sometimes catastrophic economic, political, and social events marking the decades right before and after the new millennium certainly are indicative of major shifts. The world has been witness to a severe and prolonged financial-economic crisis in Europe and the US, with major banks, large cities, and even nations going (technically) bankrupt, combined with a boom of economic power (some say a shift) to Latin American and Asian countries. Although societies tend to quickly accept new circumstances as they develop into daily realities, it is important to realize that within a mere 25 years there have been major changes in the global political landscape, including the end of the Cold War, the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, and the end of apartheid in South Africa with the country’s first multi-racial democratic elections in 1994. The world was also confronted with an ethnic war on the European continent, the end of military dictatorships in Latin America, and with policy reforms in China that brought immense economic growth and developed China into the second largest economy in
the world. More recently our generation witnessed the revolutions in the Middle East that have toppled governments that were considered to be indestructible political (and military) pillars. New religion-based powers are literally fighting their way into recognition without regard for national borders. Also, a steady and important urban shift has become a statistical reality: half of the world’s population now lives in cities. Furthermore, those in the social sphere have become witnesses to—as well as participants in—unprecedented social changes due to online connectivity, causing an impacting shift of power from institutions to individuals. Also, there has arisen an involuntary transparency in top secret government information, exposing governments and national institutions as perpetrators through correspondences and conversations for the sake of identifying and combating terrorism, which has now become a worldwide phenomenon and threat.

1.1.2 New Governance

Only history will show if these and other fast-paced developments in a short time span indeed mark the transition into a whole new historical era. These events, however, have made painfully clear that in many cases the governance systems from the last century have not been effective in addressing the challenges of the 21st century (Ocampo, 2016); rather they have outstretched their options and reached the end of their life cycle. The oversight for the financial system has failed, as the subprime mortgage crisis has revealed, which has led to in-depth discussions in the G20 about the need for a new regulatory system on all aspects of the financial markets and the banking system. Also, policies of major international organizations are counterproductive, according to renowned economist and Nobel laureate Joseph Stiglitz (2008, 2012). He bombarded the fundamental paradigms applied worldwide that are embedded in the global economic policies of international institutions such as IMF, World Bank (which he governed from 1997 to 2000), and the WTO. According to Stiglitz the Washington Consensus doctrines, work counterproductive to their aims of poverty reduction and economic growth, and they stimulate inequality instead of eradicating it (2008, p. 144). The EU governance, with respect to monitoring its members’ budgetary and financial-economic indicators, did not prevent the partners in the southern region to overstretch their budgets into bankruptcy. The unsavory result was avoided only by costly and intensely debated salvage operations from other EU members, contributing to the erosion of European cohesion and the exit of one or more member countries. Other governmental systems are also in dire straits. In’t Veld (2010, p. 3–4) describes the need for new governance in connection to the rise of the knowledge democracy, because the current democratic models are under severe pressure. He argues that although representation has become “gradually the predominant mechanism by which the population at large, through elections, provides a body with a
general authorization to take decisions in all public domains for a certain period of
time” (In’t Veld, 2010, p. 3), it is apparent that such representational political frame-
works appear deficient in the knowledge era. According to In’t Veld, this is influenced
by factors that are intertwined and take place simultaneously on the micro-, meso-, and
macro-levels. On the micro-level, individual value patterns are no longer connected
through broad ideological principles; this leads to individualization and the impossi-
bility of being represented in a general way by a single representative in a political
setting. On the meso-level, political parties are no longer dedicated to developing
consistent, broad political strategies, but apply marketing techniques by leveraging
standpoints on issues, depending on the supposed voters’ preferences. And, on the
macro-level, politics has turned into media-politics by trying to maximize the numbers
of voters through the “selling” of personalities via mass media. This creates a structural
and reciprocal dependence between media and politics, leaving room for only short-
term agendas and with a focus on personalities instead of programs, thus destroying
the original meaning of representation (In’t Veld, 2010, p. 3–4).
Representative democracy on a national scale in essence may be a valid proposition,
but, according to Taleb (2012), it is dysfunctional for it to function in a complex environ-
ment that is dominated by non-linear challenges. The gap between the abstract prob-
lems that governments focus on and the day-to-day problems of citizens is becoming
too wide (Taleb, 2012; In’t Veld, 2010; Florida, 2002). Further indication for the
need for new governance is the fact that major international financial-economic institu-
tions (UN, World Economic Forum, and the World Bank) are investing extensively
in programs in both developed and less developed countries to reinvent governance
systems and procedures that fit the “glocal” challenges of the 21st century. This ensures
that the effects of global developments can be sufficiently addressed at the local level.
When reflecting on governance for the 21st century, one can consider not only struc-
ture and paradigm, but also scale. When Taleb (2012) argues that things that have
been around for some centuries are likely to survive for a few more, he puts the smaller
scale city-state in a far more favorable position than the nation state as a sustainable
political governance structure. Nation states with centralized bureaucracies are—from
a historical perspective—in the infancy phase of their existence compared to city-states
that go back many centuries (Taleb, 2012). Through his approach originating in risk
management, Taleb presents a unique paradigm in which he relates developments
and many aspects of society to nature’s evolutionary development practice. From his
anti-fragility paradigm, Taleb considers that change is a constant natural element, and
all things sooner or later will be affected by shocks and changes of some sort and of
some intensity and once in a while by major cataclysmic events. Currently, the para-
digm is to build big organizations, systems, and procedures that are optimally resistant
to large changes and shocks. But, according to Taleb, nature and history show that
eventually something will come to pass that harms even the strongest element in a detrimental way, a so called Black Swan event of devastating proportions. According to Taleb’s antifragility approach, it is better to be volatile to some degree, operate at a smaller scale, and create the ability to adapt to small shocks and adjust to new circumstances step-by-step to become increasingly better and stronger, which is comparable to the way nature deals with changes through an evolutionary approach. He calls for mechanisms of antifragility and the creation of layers of redundancy as a way of becoming increasingly stronger in many aspects of existence.

The role and decreasing significance of nation states, as previously mentioned, is one of the most fascinating discussions taking place in the context of transitional changes and governance. In an ongoing discussion, several scholars and institutions have taken the position that the nation state of today is quickly becoming rather irrelevant. National bureaucracies are considered to be an ineffective entity that seem unable to provide service and solutions for global challenges with respect to climate change, health care, and peoples’ everyday problems (Barber, 2013, p. 6). They are also seemingly unable to provide for the necessary economic facilitation and stimulus because they are fragile instead of robust or anti-fragile, and thus they are vulnerable to cataclysmic shocks (Taleb, 2012). The nation state is an “unnatural and even dysfunctional unit for organizing human activity and managing economic endeavor in a borderless world,” says Ohmae (1993, p. 78), because it is unable to develop connections to its highly diverse constituency. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is outspoken to this respect and already focuses many of its governance and public administration programs on the sub-national level, because governance on the national level cannot fulfill the development needs on its own (UNDP, 2010). Further confirmation of a worthwhile development is seen by the important role of cities perpetrating the consultancy world, with major players such as IBM creating the ‘Smarter Cities’ concept in cooperation with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Kanter and Litow, 2009), and PriceWaterhouseCoopers establishing a ‘City and Local Government Network’ (PWC, 2005, 2009).

1.1.3 The Citizen’s role in modern society

Within these cities one can see an important change that affects the development of cities and its governance: the focus of urban development is on people as a source of creativity and successful knowledge driven economic development on a sustainable basis (Carillo, 2006; Florida, 2002; Landry, 2000). But, creative citizens come with minds of their own and their expectations and requirements from city government are different; citizens in the knowledge era have dispersed interests (Barber, 2013; Florida, 2002; In’t Veld, 2010) and prefer a more bottom-up over a top-down approach (Taleb, 2012). Florida (2002, 2005) summarizes it as the creative capital
theory to economic growth and urban management, referring to the creative class as the key to economic growth and the need for city governments to create specific place-based factors that attracts it. The creativity concept thus has consequences for structure, content, and scale of governance.

When projecting the transitional development in the context of the three aspects of sustainable development (economic, ecological, and social), it is possible to discover some interesting clues that are of influence on a possible new governance approach. From the economic aspect one can group the economic and urban power of cities and regions as identified since the 1960s and 1970s into megalopolitan systems (Gottman, 1976), clusters (Porter, 1998) and megaregions (Florida, 2008; Florida, Gulden & Mellander, 2007). Cities have recognized their transnational powers (Barber, 2013; Hospers, 2003; Sassen, 2002) and feel compelled to deal with the effects of globalization on a local level, generally referred to as “glocalism”. From the ecological aspect it is clear that on the level of nation-states and in supranational bodies, the “blame-game” towards climate change dominates the post-Rio agenda and paralyzes an effective solutions-oriented approach between countries on the various continents, although the agreement reached during the Paris Climate Conference in 2015 breathes hope. Cities, however, have already been playing their part in building cooperative networks to deal with global environmental problems (Bouteligier, 2009, p. 18) and are much more effective and influential than national governments (Barber, 2013, p. 6). From the social aspect, it can be noted that although people’s interests in Western developed nations are highly individualized and dispersed and affiliations are spread across platforms and organizations (Barber, 2013; Florida, 2002; In’t Veld, 2010), there is a revival taking shape of “old values” in new communities, often through online connectivity (Leadbeater, 2009, p. 48). Also, ancient forms of connecting and communicating between people on complex issues are increasing in the form of constructive dialogue in various shapes and forms (Schein, 1993; UNDP, 2010).

1.1.4 The Human Scale

When connecting the dots referred to in this introductory section, one can detect a red line marking a return to the human scale of things. Within the triad of sustainability (with a balance between economic, ecological, and social aspects) this means that however global, large scale, and transnational specifically the financial-economic and ecological developments have evolved in the last half century, in the social context people are still very much seeking face-to-face interactions and a sense of belonging and community recognition, even though such communities no longer needed to be place bound. Societies seem to be on a path of seeking “glocal” direction and connection amidst global developments.
This is an approach that is not really being reflected in current political governance structures, and it can be considered the inability of the governance systems to travel downward on an upward moving escalator. This can be explained using the following perspective. On an individual level people may experience everyday problems in the economic (e.g., employment), ecological (e.g., pollution), and social spheres (e.g., school drop outs), some of which may be shared with others in the same city or the same country. Many day-to-day problems on the individual level end up in the political arena requiring a solution. In the current system, governments quantify such problems on an abstract level and produce statistical figures reflecting percentages of unemployment, school dropout rates, obesity, and so on. This results in prioritized solutions on the abstract level in the form of plans, projects, policies, or laws. In other words, the everyday problems have been pushed up the escalator, but the challenges arise of how to—from an abstract level—move the solutions down that upward moving escalator for implementation and how to reach the people and solve their actual problems on the local level and increase the quality of their day-to-day lives. UNESCO (2010) refers to this paradox in the context of the common use of indexes.

For example, the use of a simple index to measure poverty, such as defining the poor as those who live on less than $1 per day, fails to question what poverty means for those who actually experience it and may therefore lead to solutions believed to be valid everywhere but which are effective nowhere. The actions of the poor sometimes contradict the assumptions behind the proposed solutions. (UNESCO, 2010, p. 3)

The common practice to quantify and prioritize citizens’ problems on an abstract, national, and aggregated level leads to a major disconnect in two ways. In the first place plans, projects, policies, and laws on the abstract level do not necessarily provide a solution on an individual level. The origins may be more place-bound or person-bound than the abstract solution provides for. Secondly, and maybe even more importantly, the prioritization of solutions on the abstract level does not necessarily correlate with the perception of the priorities of solutions on the individual level, creating a mismatch between people’s needs and government’s priorities in solutions. This may contribute to the growing popularity of the happiness and quality of life surveys, in which standard indicators in the social-economic arena are exchanged for subjective place and person-bound indicators regarding general well-being, as seen in the OECD How’s Life research (2013).

Put simply, everyday problems of citizens can be added up and aggregated at an abstract level, but many solutions do not work top down with abstract and generalized approaches. They need to be at the level where they originate. Einstein said that
one cannot solve problems at the same level of thinking as when they were created. But, one cannot implement the solutions only at the higher level and expect them to work either. One needs to have connections and consultations in place on the human scale—at the bottom of the escalator—in order to connect top-down knowledge to local knowledge and necessity.

In this context local governments are in a far better position to solve problems on the human scale because they work at the bottom of the escalator. It is in city neighborhoods, where half of the world’s population lives, that problems arise in people’s everyday lives that call for a solution. It is at this level where local governments have more solution power than national or federal government in many issues that matter in people’s everyday lives. Andrew (2013, p. 13) refers to this as “contextual” power. Considerations with regard to the location and execution of power in knowledge driven governance systems is not only valid, it is highly necessary. Scholars such as Florida (2002, p. 321) express concern to this respect in the knowledge driven creative communities era, and they identify the need for due attention to a fair distribution of power, a balanced use of knowledge, and especially a fair access to knowledge to overcome the knowledge divide and, thus, mitigate the highly divisive risk of excluding groups in communities.

1.1.5 The public perspective

These transitional developments in relation to democratic governance are fascinating to me, both as a social scientist and global citizen, but I am also intrigued because I am a civil servant of one of the newest and smallest countries in the world, Curaçao, an autonomous country within the Dutch Kingdom with a unique governance, combining levels of nation and municipality into a single layer of government, as a city state. Since the constitutional reforms of the Dutch Kingdom in 2010, Curaçao has only one level of government combining the budgetary, legal, and executive authorities in one layer within a political framework of a representative parliamentary democracy. In other words, Curaçao can design policies and laws and connect them to budgets and executive power as long as there is support from parliament. There are no regional or city governments to depend on for implementation or that can oppose a plan. This brings both development possibilities and practical implications; the Curaçao Government is responsible at the same time for developing long term sustainable development for its 150,000 citizens through integral financial-economic and social policies, and is also directly addressed for each pothole in the street and every uncollected garbage can. Curaçao is extremely “glocal,” so to speak. To complicate matters in this unique governance setting, the government functions in a still young and immature political setting with dynamic democratic developments and all the liabilities and instabilities
that this brings about. Since 2010, Curaçao has been in the middle of a dynamic change process in which the country seeks direction for its development, and in this quest, it must align many initiatives and overcome deep internal divisions amidst politically turbulent times.

1.1.6 Governance challenges
Curaçao poses an interesting case in the context of governance. The unique fact that Curaçao was a “country to be” and thus the island-level government of Curaçao and federal-level government of the Netherlands Antilles had to merge, led to a series of deliberations before 2010 about the type of governance the small young country needed. It resulted in a design of the new government that was based on fundamental principles concerning transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency. It was formalized by law and implemented through a set of business plans per ministry defining the policy areas, tasks, and products of each ministry and also providing the organizational structure. The way this has worked out until now brings about tensions between the original design principles and the chosen structure of the nine ministries based on the business plans. Issues and possible adjustments in the business plans are being discussed in the Council of Secretary-generals, but there is also a dire need for research and evaluation around the central question: Are the governance mechanisms facilitating sufficiently towards applying the fundamental principles that were the basis for its design, such as transparency and participation? The choice for these fundamental principles is not being debated and is still considered valid. In more specific terms, the question arises of whether Curaçao as a small country is equipped with the right governance to face its development challenges; to comply with the fundamental principles concerning transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency that were discussed before 2010; and face the “glocal” issues of the 21st century, especially when considering that Curaçao is a small island development state (SIDS, as defined by the UN) with specific sustainability challenges and a city state with respect to its government structure.

Deliberations in the Council of Secretary-generals—based on an extensive analysis of issues with the core tasks of the ministries—has made clear that the structure and processes of the governmental organization since 2010 are not particularly conducive to an integral, participatory, and interactive approach. The secretary-generals have been discussing ways of working with a more integral approach within the current system. The focus is on the development and implementation of an Action Program for Youth Development, which is characterized by an integral and participatory approach between ministries and with stakeholders. The focus is not only on youth development as an important theme for development, but also on a participative and collaborative
approach as a new way for working for the government. The fact that the youth development process is considered a prototype for a new approach to governance within the existing structure provides a fitting case study in relation to transformative governance for the knowledge democracy.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

This section describes the purpose of the research in various aspects, such as the goal of the research, explaining the background to the research topic. Also, the horizon and scope of the research is discussed to sharpen the focus. The theoretical and practical implications that this brings about are also discussed.

1.2.1 Goal of the research

Curaçao, like many other communities, is facing a governance paradox. There is an inability to adjust the formal structure of the bureaucratic system and government in the short term to the requirements of the knowledge democracy, but there is also an eminent need and desire for at least more integral, participatory, and interactive governance mechanisms in order to deal with the challenges concerning development planning and compliance with fundamental principles of transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency, as well as to face the “glocal” issues of the 21st century. The question arises of how to combine a bureaucratic structure with the desire for a more participative and transparent governance.

An important aspect to consider in this context is how to deal with decision making related to participatory initiatives within a representative system, where the actual decision making power is in the hands of the chosen representatives in parliament and the government that these representatives create and support. Is there room for participative influence amid political considerations? Tensions may occur when decisions and policies are prepared on a participative basis with the involvement of citizens, stakeholders, and civil society once they are put before political executives and parliament to approve. In representative systems democratic rights of citizens are mainly exercised by electing representatives on a cyclical basis. The electoral votes provide a mandate to decide over all aspects of public interest for the duration of the political cycle. But participative processes, which are on the rise worldwide (Bingham et al, 2005; Bryson and Quick, 2013; Klinke, 2016), stretch and expand the democratic influence to the preparation of policies and decision making, which traditionally is the exclusive terrain of bureaucrats and executive power in government. In what way can the influence of participative processes become sustainable, what contributes to this, and what undermines it?

Therefore the problem statement for this research is:
In the context of the knowledge-based democracy, the question arises how governance and government can be adjusted effectively to allow for the sustainable participation of citizens and stakeholders, specifically within bureaucratic structures, while honoring the foundations and mechanisms of the political democracy, common in the modern world.

1.2.2 Horizon and scope
This study takes place amid a field of relatively new scientific concepts that can be considered elastic and even fluid. The current transitional period produces concepts that emerge and develop, but it will take time to see which concepts dissipate and which ones evolve and take a permanent shape. For now an exploratory and interdisciplinary approach is chosen to analyze governance challenges in relation to the complex developments regarding knowledge democracy. It is thereby recognized that governance in itself is interdisciplinary and has “roots in political science, public administration, sociology, economics and law, and with branches that extend into many applied fields” (Ansell and Torfing, 2016, p. 1). The concept of knowledge democracy is also new and discussed in an interdisciplinary fashion.

Therefore, the first part of the research is oriented towards open discovery and analysis of the various theoretic concepts related to governance in the knowledge democracy. This results in an initial design of a governance framework based on theoretical synthesis. The research is followed by action research in Curaçao as a case study to see what insights emerge from practice with respect to governance options. These results are analyzed to see what needs to be adapted in the initial governance framework that resulted from the theoretical synthesis. The combination of the theoretical synthesis and the Curaçao case study is then developed in a dynamic governance model that relates to the challenges as proposed in the problem statement.

As for the scope of the research, the analysis with respect to governance for the Curaçao case is addressed specifically in relation to Curaçao. The development of the framework and the dynamic model of governance, however, provides a broader scope related to identifying the right governance for 21st century communities on the most effective scale and context in these challenging transitional times. This dissertation should, therefore, contribute to the general body of knowledge on this issue, as well as contribute specifically to enhancing participative governance in the Curaçao case.

With respect to contributing to the general body of knowledge, this research entails an interdisciplinary and exploratory approach due to the fact that the field of governance in the knowledge democracy is new and as of yet relatively unexplored and undefined. The case study research is aimed at the city state of Curaçao, but is also analyzed within a wider theoretical context. This research aims to contribute to the theoretical basis by analyzing related theories across interdisciplinary scientific fields.
and, through a combination of empirical research and theoretical synthesis, design a governance framework in a dynamic model for the knowledge democracy. With respect to the Curaçao case, the goal of the research is to investigate whether elements of a new and more effective governance framework can be applied and to contribute to the goal of a more participatory governance, reflecting the needs and desires of a broad democratic basis of stakeholders and citizens of Curaçao. Specifically, the element of participation through a dialogic approach is analyzed as a way in which complex issues such as multi-stakeholder policy preparation and formulation of integral development plans can be addressed.

This results in a multi-layered and iterative research process: 1) the overall thesis level related to the problem statement with various intermediary deliverables, 2) the level of action learning in the government organization with respect to participative governance, and 3) a case study level directed at the project to develop an Action Program for Youth Development.

The timeline in Figure 1.1 reflects this multi-layered approach and the interrelatedness at various moments during the research process. The level of the overall research process shows the various theoretical explorations leading up to the initial governance framework. The organizational level shows the action learning process in the Curaçao Government concerning the development of integral and participatory governance, with the project of developing an Action Program for Youth Development as a specific case study. The action learning on the organization level is fed with the experiences from the case study and contributes on the overall research level to a review of the theoretical framework based on the practical experiences and to the development of a dynamic model for transformative governance.

1.2.3 Theoretical implications
This study relates to scientific concepts that are not yet fully developed. Therefore, several concepts are discussed in relation to this research, to clarify the theoretical context. The concept of knowledge is well known in the epistemological context, but the concept has recently been applied in various other settings and, as such, is still very much under development. Research into the recent approaches to knowledge has not yet led to a defined scientific field with clear boundaries. Chapter 2 elaborates on the various areas in which the knowledge concept is applied to create an understanding of the elasticity of the modern knowledge concept and to frame it in the context of this research. The role of cities is discussed in this research against the background of their role in sustainable development (economic, social, and ecological) and in a comparative
Figure 1.1 Timeline of the multi-layered and iterative research process

- **Track of PhD Research process (Chapter 1,2,7 & 8)**
  - 2016: Adjusted Framework for Governance for Knowledge Democracy based on Curaçao Case Study
  - 2015: Initial Framework for Governance for the Knowledge Democracy based on theoretical synthesis
  - 2014: Analysis of vision oriented ‘top down’ participative mechanisms and ‘bottom up’ approach from the knowledge / participation perspective.
  - 2009: Comparative analysis of business literature on knowledge management, and projected on vision development processes in cities, resulting in a dilemma model.

- **Track of Action Learning on Organizational Level (Chapter 3 & 4)**
  - 2016: Template Analysis Case Study
  - 2015: Evaluation concept Template Analysis
  - 2014: Youth Development as pilot for Integral Management in SG Council
  - 2013: Initiative for Integral Management in SG Council

- **Track of the case study Action Plan Youth Development Curaçao (Chapter 5 & 6)**
  - 2016: Evaluation and reflection cycles
  - 2015: Case Study Design Phase
  - 2014: Case Study Exploratory Phase
  - 2009: Evaluation and reflection cycles
  - 2008: Comparative analysis of business literature on knowledge management, and projected on vision development processes in cities, resulting in a dilemma model.

- **Final Thesis; Transformative Governance for the Knowledge Democracy**
approach of the governance of cities versus national governments. The attention to cities has changed dramatically over the years. A few decades ago, cities were seen as concentrations of economic and social problems, especially inner cities. But, against the reality of the unstoppable global urbanization trend, nowadays cities are rediscovered for their economic and social possibilities, especially in relation to their governance potential and the rising influence of (networks of) city governments on a global scale.

1.3 DISSERTATION OUTLINE

The dissertation consists of three main parts.

Figure 1.2 Graphical representation of thesis structure
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<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Reflections/recommendations</td>
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PART ONE
THEORETICAL EXPLORATION AND ANALYSIS

Part 1 (Chapters 1 and 2) consists of this introductory chapter, followed by a theoretical exploration of concepts in Chapter 2. The theoretical chapter analyzes various concepts discussed in this study to provide a view of the interdisciplinary scientific areas used for this study. This approach is chosen because the research topic of this thesis cannot be placed within the borders of a specific and well-defined scientific domain. The synthesis of theories from several scientific fields provides the contextual borders for this research. Chapter 2 concludes with an initial framework for effective governance in the knowledge democracy, based on the theoretical explorations and analysis. This framework is further refined in Chapter 7 based on the findings from the case study.

Chapter 3 describes and analyzes from a historical perspective the developments in Curaçao with regard to government and governance, influenced by the constitutional developments that led Curaçao to become an autonomous country within the Dutch Kingdom in October 2010. This has had huge ramifications for the government structure that is dominated by a merger between the former island territory apparatus and the
federal government body of the Netherlands Antilles into one complete new structure. Chapter 4 analyzes the specific governance challenges in the context of developments since 2010 in both government and governance in Curaçao. These challenges are used to create a model that provides insight into the relationship between government, governance, and national identity in the context of the creation of development plans for the future of Curaçao.

PART TWO
THE CURAÇAO CASE STUDY

Chapter 5 discusses the action research approach in the case study in Curaçao and the methodological choices that have been made. It also provides a description of the case itself, the project of producing in a participative way an Action Program for Youth Development. Chapter 6 discusses the data and findings of the case study. Chapter 7 discusses the conclusions and relates these back to the research questions and the framework for governance that was developed in Chapter 2. Based on this the framework for effective governance in the knowledge democracy is further refined. Also, a dynamic model is presented, presenting a relational model of the governance aspects and tensions.

PART 3 THREE
REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 8 presents the limitations of the research, as well as reflections on literature, from the three perspectives of action research, as well as from the quality perspective. It also provides recommendations for further research.
TOWARDS KNOWLEDGE-BASED DEMOCRACIES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a discussion of theories from several scientific fields as the contextual border for this research. As discussed in chapter 1, this research has taken place from an exploratory and interdisciplinary approach, because of the complexity of the concept of knowledge democracy. The first part of this chapter is oriented towards open discovery of existing and new theoretic concepts and approaches that are related to governance in the knowledge democracy. The open search has led to an exploration of various approaches of the concept of knowledge in organizations and in the public sector, as well as developments in democratic mechanisms in the context of knowledge democracy. The knowledge era is also accompanied by challenges of inequality in the form of a knowledge divide. Also discussed is the speed of the transformational changes that are reshaping our communities. Further exploration showed the increasing importance and changing role of cities in our world. Where cities were seen until recently for their concentration of problems, nowadays they are considered for their economic and social potential, and even - through their worldwide cooperation in networks and coalitions - as global powerhouses. The role of cities is relevant to discuss above all because it is mostly in cities that democratic renewal takes place in a variety of new processes and mechanisms that are shaping the knowledge democracy. The section about research developments illustrates the directions and adaptations in the research approach that took place in the course of the research, based on the open and interdisciplinary exploration.

These explorations have resulted through theoretical synthesis to the construction of an initial framework for governance of the knowledge democracy.
2.1 THE ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE

The influence and importance of knowledge has been broadly discussed over the years in an increasing number of scientific fields, without actually resulting in an established trend to replace industrial-based economic models by knowledge-based ones, other than in theory. Its origins as a practical concept—in addition to the centuries’ old epistemological discussion—go back to the second half of the last century when the knowledge-based development of organizations gained a prominent position in business management. More recently the role of knowledge gained a prominent role in the discussions about knowledge cities or creative cities, where creative citizens play a significant role in the economic potential of cities. This is accompanied by the need for another approach since these citizens—just like knowledge workers in organizations—have specific demands towards place-based qualities of their chosen location.

This chapter discusses the role of knowledge in organizations, the economy, the public sector, and public sector governance, and analyzes the transformation to the knowledge era and its potential impact on future governance.

2.1.1 Knowledge developments in organizations

Although the term knowledge worker was introduced by Peter Drucker in 1967, and Polanyi in the same decade (1962) already discussed and described the importance of tacit knowledge, the increasingly important role of knowledge in organizations did not come to the forefront until the early 1990s, driven by the statistical reality of the immense shift of workers from agricultural and industrial sectors to the service sector that had taken place (Florida, 2002; Florida, 2005; Leamer, 2007). In this emergent field of social science, the focus of scholars was on knowledge as an asset, as a resource for production, and thus as a competitive factor (Davenport and Prusak, 1998/2000; Florida, 2002; Tissen, Lekanne Deprez & Andriessen, 2000; Weggeman, 1997). The asset approach led to a body of research about how to assess the

10 approaches to knowledge management
(Boersema, 2002)
Human resources – focuses on human knowledge, motivation for cooperation, and sharing of knowledge;
Intellectual capital – focuses on representation of knowledge in financial reporting;
Organizational science – focuses on organizational structure and culture and self-directing teams;
Learning organization – focuses on stimulating people in organizations to learn, to adjust, and to change;
Network approach – focuses on exchanging knowledge by creating collaborative structures;
Innovation approach – focuses on knowledge creation for new products and services and research and development;
Strategic approach – focuses on managing and expanding the “core competence” and stresses crucial knowledge and competitive advantage;
Quality management approach – focuses on enhancing quality with an emphasis on procedures;
ICT approach – focuses on the use of ICT to support communication and exchange of knowledge;
Knowledge technology – focuses on capturing and documenting explicit knowledge in knowledge and expert systems.
value of knowledge as intellectual capital; the resource approach focused on what was required from a human resources and management perspective in order to satisfy the knowledge worker and its specific requirements. Japanese scholars Nonaka and Takeuchi (1997) focused on the aspect of knowledge creation by assessing the environment in which employees feel comfortable and are stimulated to share both tacit and implicit knowledge to create added value, introducing a more holistic approach. A main role in the knowledge management developments in organizations was reserved for information and communication technology (ICT) that focused on capturing, organizing, evaluating, sharing, and storing knowledge in organizations, working with a range of tools and technologies.

The role of knowledge in organizations is generally referred to as knowledge management, but a wide variety of interpretations exists, and—common to an emerging concept—is not always made explicit in writings and research. This motivated Boersma (2002) to state that the choice for one of the many descriptions depends on the context in which the concept is being applied. In his analysis Boersma categorized no fewer than 10 different approaches to knowledge management from a variety of contexts, each with its own goals.

Peter Senge (1990) referred to this phenomenon in his famous work on the learning organization as the compartmentalisation of knowledge. He dismissed such rational subdivisions, and considered this merely an analytical lens through which one can look, but not always see. Narrowed views make people believe that problems can be labelled, isolated, and thus solved, but according to Senge, the boundaries that separate the compartments are fundamentally arbitrary, which makes any solution inherently flawed (Senge, 1990, p. 283).

A further analysis of the labeling of topics that Senge referred to is provided by Andriessen (2008) in his research on knowledge metaphors, introducing the effects of linguistic aspects in relation to the connotation of words. He explains the variety of interpretations of the knowledge concept by looking at the influential role of metaphors when discussing knowledge. He referred to the use of metaphors as inescapable because it is the way the human mind works when reasoning about abstract concepts such as knowledge, but according to Andriessen humans use the metaphor without being aware

---

**Metaphors commonly used for knowledge**

(Andriessen, 2008)

- **Knowledge as a resource** – knowledge becomes part of a logistical discourse about organizations where knowledge is used in production, it adds to the production process, and it can be stored and shared.

- **Knowledge as an asset** – knowledge becomes part of an accounting discourse about organization where it can be controlled, it generates future economic benefits, it is identifiable, and the costs can be measured and deserve a place in the reporting system of an enterprise.

- **Knowledge as property** – knowledge is used in the legal discourse of an organization when one reasons about ownership, value, and exclusiveness of knowledge.
of the consequences for reasoning. His research of knowledge management literature showed no fewer than 22 metaphors that are commonly used, varying from knowledge as a resource, as an asset, as property, or as capital that dominates in Western science to knowledge as thoughts and feelings in Japanese literature. The choice for a metaphor highlights or hides certain attributes of knowledge. Andriessen states:

So while the knowledge as a resource metaphor highlights that knowledge is important to organizations, at the same time it hides that knowledge is about people that need to be empowered and treated with respect. The language of knowledge as a resource is mechanistic, dehumanized, cold. It talks about ‘gathering’ knowledge, ‘storing’ knowledge, ‘distributing’ knowledge as if it has nothing to do with people. (2008, p. 9)

In a test with two groups in which the metaphor for knowledge was consciously changed to the metaphor that “knowledge is love,” Andriessen noted that—although the participants discussed a comparable situation in an organization—the descriptions of problems and of the solutions were totally different, focusing on relationships within the organization, trust, passion in work, the gap between tasks, and personal aspirations. In other words, the diagnostics changed completely. Andriessen concludes that:

The unconscious choice of metaphor has enormous impact on how we reason about knowledge, what is highlighted and what is hidden, what is seen in the organizations as problems and what is understood as solutions. (2008, p.6)

The notion that the knowledge concept is being used—and not always by a conscious and explicit choice—in different contexts and with the use of varying metaphors should help to critically and consciously assess the reasoning of knowledge-driven developments. Considering the variety of approaches, the knowledge concept can be viewed as a work in progress that is multifaceted, as well as dynamic and fluid.

The dynamic and fluent developments with regard to knowledge are also visible in the broader economic context in debates, reports, and policies concerning the “knowledge economy” as a competitive race between cities, countries, and continents. In this race the focus was eventually mainly on developing the knowledge economy by stimulating research and development, innovation, education, and ICT infrastructure, thus focusing primarily on implicit knowledge. Also, intellectual property rights played a dominant role as a measure of the development of new knowledge, reflected in the creation of innovative products and services for which patents are registered. Driven by the reality of the knowledge economy, countries and continents developed policy frameworks in these areas to enhance their competitiveness.
For the European Union the knowledge economy has been a high priority on the policy agenda since the late 1990s. In March 2000 the European Commission set forth a clear goal with respect to the knowledge economy for the European Union. Europe would have to be in 2010, as the EC president stated in the conclusions of the Lisbon Conference, “the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and respect for the environment” (European Council, 2000). This goal has become known as the Lisbon Strategy. In its evaluation the High Level Group in 2004 was highly critical about the lack of implementation of the strategies. However, the aim of the Lisbon Strategy was at that moment reinforced:

The Lisbon Strategy is even more urgent today as the growth gap with North America and Asia has widened, while Europe must meet the combined challenges of low population growth and ageing. Time is running out and there can be no room for complacency. Better implementation is needed now to make up for lost time. (European Communities, 2004)

While the EU nations kept struggling with the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy agenda, many European cities embarked on interactive knowledge-based projects for future economic development, creating a vision of the future community, its specific goals, and the strategies needed to accomplish these goals. In the Netherlands for example, many municipalities entered into vision development processes such as Den Haag, Delft, and Dordrecht. Around Europe, and in fact all over the world, such processes—although with different methodologies and approaches—evolved as an important instrument for concrete knowledge-based policy development in which citizens, NGOs, and social partners are involved.

Despite the efforts of European cities and some EU-wide projects, the Lisbon Strategy did not materialize and did not provide the competitive edge that the EU was seeking. In addition to the dire financial economic crisis that struck in 2008, it also appeared impossible to “force” nations into the implementation of a Europe-wide policy agenda on an abstract level with
respect to what were considered the main drivers of the knowledge economy: education, research and development, and ICT infrastructure. According to Castells (2005, p. 17) the Lisbon Strategy failed to reach the set goals because much of the emphasis was placed on technological upgrading and enhancement of research capabilities. The European technological infrastructure improved considerably, but effects on productivity, on learning, on creativity, and on entrepreneurialism, were very limited. This is because acting on the developmental potential specific to the network society requires a combination of initiatives in technology, business, education, culture, spatial restructuring, infrastructure development, organizational change, and institutional reform. It is the synergy between these processes that acts as a lever of change on the mechanisms of the network society. (Castells, 2005, p. 17)

The European policy agenda that followed the Lisbon Strategy is referred to as Europe 2020 and consists of five, this time specifically formulated, “smart” targets that reach beyond the knowledge economy approach:

   **Employment** - 75% of the 20–64 year olds to be employed
   **R&D** - 3% of the EU’s GDP to be invested in R&D

**Climate change and energy sustainability**
- Green house gas emissions 20% (or even 30%, if the conditions are right) lower than 1990
- 20% of energy from renewables
- 20% increase in energy efficiency

**Education** - Reducing the rates of early school leaving to below 10%, and at least 40% of 30–34 year olds completing third-level education

**Fighting poverty and social exclusion** - at least 20 million fewer people in, or at risk of, poverty and social exclusion

This time not only EU-wide targets, but also targets on the national level of member states have been specified and indicators have been identified in detail, backed by a Eurostat tool for measuring progress on the national level. In the implementation of these policy priorities, contributions have been identified not only for the EU and its member states, but also for local and regional authorities, as well as NGOs and civil society. Looking at the targets and indicators, it is clear that the knowledge economy targets are now merged into a broader and more holistically designed agenda for sustainable development.
This “smart” measurable approach is necessary because of the competitive approach to the knowledge economy, which calls for new indicators. At the start of the new millennium, these indicators were not clearly defined. The Central Bureau of Planning in the Netherlands concluded in 2002 (CPB, 2002) that it was difficult to rate the performance of the knowledge economy in the Netherlands because of the variations in indicators that were applied internationally. They were not always measurable and clearly defined. A decade later, a variety of indicators are still used, among others by the World Economic Forum, OECD, and the World Bank, but they have in common a more expanded approach to sustainability, stimulating a policy agenda around inclusive development and environmental aspects, in addition to hard indicators of economic performance.

Even if the integral development and the implementation of policies for the knowledge economy lagged behind, there were clear economic shifts taking place in the knowledge-driven economy, especially because of new logistic opportunities facilitated by internet connectivity. Economic activity in several sectors—in service, as well as in production-oriented sectors—shifted from the US and Europe to Asia, and lower entry barriers through digital connectivity changed the level playing field, especially in service sectors. Stimulated by among others the bestselling book The World is Flat, by journalist Thomas Friedman (2005), debates concerning outsourcing to other countries and other economic shifts, such as the creation of transnational logistic networks, took center stage. Although not supported by statistics from the field of economics, Friedman’s book describes developments in the interconnected world, which is driven by information and communication technology and knowledge, that had not yet been connected and analyzed based on traditional economic models and indicators. The metaphoric title—suggesting the emergence of a global-level playing field as a melting pot of opportunities—sparked sharp criticism from both outside and inside the scientific field, and also from Ghemawat (2007) and Leamer (2007). They concluded, based on statistically supported analysis, that The World is Flat is a powerful and bestselling metaphor, but it is without scientific accuracy, substance, or significance.

2.1.2 Knowledge developments in the public sector: towards knowledge societies

In the public sector the focus in recent years has broadened from the economic and competitive aspect of knowledge to the development of knowledge-driven societies as a whole, thus broadening the knowledge concept to an integral development tool for communities, cities, regions, and nations (UNESCO, 2005). This is not just for competitive motives, but because it is broadly recognized that expert knowledge has many faces and is not limited to government expertise in policy departments (In’t Veld, 2010,
More and more it has become a common approach that in policy preparation and decision making, participation and inclusion are desirable from all potential experts and stakeholders, each within their field of interest, expertise, and experience. Such interactive processes have in the recent decade been applied on a broad scale. In the United States consultant Henry Luke of Luke Planning Inc. has guided 56 collaborative vision development processes in 18 different states. Luke was also involved in the vision process on the Caribbean island of Curaçao, which initiated its vision process “Vishon Kòrsou” in 1999, although it was not successfully implemented. In these knowledge-driven processes different members of the community—individual citizens, businesses, and NGOs alike—are involved in discovering, describing, and implementing the vision and strategies for their city. Vision development processes have been applied in many cities across several continent using a variety of methods and approaches to create the vision and strategies and a path to implementation. While some communities organized representative bodies of the community (Curaçao), others created platforms for collaboration and planning (Delft), but they have one thing in common: all try to use the diverse knowledge base that is available within the community through consultation, deliberation, or participation in various degrees of intensity. They are collaborative processes in which government, businesses, NGOs, and individual citizens share and create knowledge to optimize the outcome of the process, aiming for a shared, realistic, and attainable vision that creates a basis for competitive and sustainable development for the community.

The United Kingdom, for instance, has seen an extensive set of initiatives since the 1990s towards governance that enables the local authorities to work closely with citizens and stakeholders, and actually went so far as to aim for a shift of power and funding from central to local government, based on the Localism Act of 2011. The Department for Communities and Local Government formulated five policy priorities (DCLC, 2013):

- decentralize power as far as possible;
- reinvigorate accountability, democracy, participation, and transparency;
- support and incentivize local growth;
- meet people’s housing aspirations; and
- put communities in charge of planning.

Most initiatives aimed towards forms of collaborative vision development take place, however, without central guidance or stimulus on the state level. Many metropolitan cities have opted for such processes, of which Barcelona (Spain), Sydney (Australia), New York (USA), and Medellin (Colombia) are just four of many examples. The growing role of cities on a global scale will be further elaborated upon later in this chapter. Interestingly enough, even though such processes can be considered major social-economic developments, many take place without a scientific basis, without a scientific
approach, or without scientific guidance. There is an emerging research field towards knowledge cities (Landry, 2000; Ergazakis, Metaxiotis, Psarras, 2004; Carillo, 2006), creative cities (Florida, 2005, 2008), and smarter cities (Kanter and Litow, 2009), but no framework or methodology has yet been clearly defined. Florida focuses on the role of cities and regions as the “key economic and social organizing units of contemporary societies” (Florida, 2005, p. 2), with human creativity as the fuel that moves cities forward. The growing creative class and its implications will bring about “sweeping implications for the way we live and work, the way we organize our time, the nature of family and community structures en function of urban centers,” according to Florida (2005, p. 3). His approach is based on statistical analysis in the US and centers around the competitiveness of cities and the mechanisms that cities and regions need to create to attract and maintain creative citizens, but also “for harnessing the knowledge and ideas of all citizens at the neighborhood, local and regional levels for improving their quality of place” (Florida, 2005, p. 86). Florida also warns, however, for the negative impact of competitive developments that are likely to not benefit all in society. Besides the innovative and creative capacities, cities should therefore focus on their “absorptive capacity” to deal with effects that will emerge, such as income inequality, lack of affordable housing, uneven development, and underutilized human potential (Florida, 2005, p. 174). This requires specific efforts to create social cohesion and the mobilization of creativity from all segments in society in an inclusive approach to development. From his European urban perspective, Charles Landry describes methods and approaches to address urban planning in a creative way using a new mental toolkit (Landry, 2006). Part of the mental shift is to see cities not as machines that can be built, but as living organisms that can develop, with a focus on the living experience rather than on infrastructure, buildings, and place (Landry, 2006, p. 57). He describes a strategic mental toolkit approach with factors and indicators that cities and their leaders can apply to positively influence a city to become more creative and thus successful. The variation of the knowledge city concept is described, among others, by Carrillo (2006) from the resource and capital theory approach in a global context. From this perspective the knowledge city is seen as a productive system with activities that increase social value. The end value can be adjusted with combinations and re-combinations of values from different value categories. Above all, the city is considered a social knowledge-based system, a living system that can be crafted and adapted through deliberate and systematic developments of its capital system (Carillo, 2004).

Given the variety of approaches, the research field can be considered a diffuse and trans-disciplinary area with yet an absence of clear definitions, terminologies, and boundaries. The importance of the development of knowledge-based societies, however, is being discussed broadly. UNESCO dedicated its World Report 2005 to
the topic “Towards Knowledge Societies,” and connected it to the need for capacity building in communities in order to safeguard democratic principles of inclusion. “Knowledge societies in the twenty-first century will only be able to usher in a new era of sustainable human development if they ensure not only universal access to knowledge, but also the participation of all in knowledge societies” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 153). Renowned economist Joseph Stiglitz (2002) has put this approach as a prerequisite in the context of long term comprehensive and sustainable development, and has consistently pleaded for the application of broadly participatory processes, where also the vulnerable groups have a voice, and where there is transparency and openness. In 2014 Stiglitz presented this as Creating a Learning Society (Stiglitz and Greenwald, 2014), in which the aspect of constant learning and innovation is considered the key to increased standards of living. He dismisses the assumption that markets are efficient in the production and dissemination of knowledge and learning, so he describes possible interventions that stimulate constant learning and the broad creation of knowledge in a society.

2.1.3 Knowledge democracy

The question arises if current democratic and government structures fit the proposed knowledge society in which more forms of participation and knowledge creation and sharing should be applied for the sustainable development of communities. Scholars such as In’t Veld (2010, 2010a) and Castells (2005) mention increasing tensions between the current structures of representative democracies and the challenges of the knowledge era. In’t Veld argues that a new governance for the knowledge democracy is an inescapable requirement because “collective decision making, as a core business of democracy, has become intensely complex” (2010, p. 163) because of developments in society that cannot only be identified individually, but also interact and thus influence one another. He refers to:

- the fragmentation of values of individuals, a phenomenon in which people no longer collectively share values based on broader ideologies, but on personal and fragmented interests. While this makes every person unique, it also becomes inherently impossible for an individual to be represented in all areas of his dispersed interests by one person in an election in the context of a representative democracy;
- the fact that political agendas are filled with wicked problems, characterized by complexity, a variety of value propositions, and the absence of consensus regarding required scientific knowledge;
- the reflective process in social systems, through which these systems constantly change behavior through learning processes, making them unpredictable and the application of scientific knowledge more difficult;
- mediapolitics with a bilateral “marketing like” dependency of top-down commer-
cial media and modern populist politics. While on the other hand, bottom-up [social] media provides new power to individuals;

- ICT developments, which take place at an incredibly fast pace, creating an explosive growth of information and knowledge in both quantity and variety, but lead to education systems lagging behind in quality.

The consequence is, according to In’t Veld’s analysis, a decrease in the prestige of political representatives in the western world, accompanied by less participation in political parties in many nations. While the charismatic capacities and personalities of politicians dominate elections, the constituency expresses more dissatisfaction with politics as such. Populism is increasing in several places around the world. And, while more participatory processes emerge, these processes also create tensions because the results of participation do not always appear to be acceptable to existing political institutions.

Referring to shared values in a community as a result of argumentation and conviction, In’t Veld (2010, p. 32) considers the representative parliamentary democracy an organizational design in which the “majority rule” and the custom of electing representation through general elections have become core values, combined with the separation of powers based on trias politica and checks and balances in the form of certain institutions with controlling power. But, even though such governance has been immensely popular in recent centuries, it is—according to In’t Veld—nothing more and nothing less than an instilled reflection of values of a community. If the community changes, and the values change, then the institutional arrangements as reflected in governance must also adapt.

According to Himanen (2005, p. 345) the current era with its developments concerning the improbability of being able to continue the welfare state and the dynamic developments in the information society, carry a real risk for a further widening of the knowledge and inequality gap. A possible solution lies, according to Himanen, in value-based management by politicians who are driven by a set of values that facilitate the continued combination of the welfare state and the information society to counter the widening gaps. Values that should be pre-dominant in such a political approach are: caring, confidence, communality, encouragement, freedom, creativity, courage, visionary, balance, and meaningfulness.

Himanen projects these values in a pyramid (see Figure 2.1 on page 44) in which the holistic application of these values can direct a community in a psychological context, from a state of exhaustion in which people fight for survival, towards a community driven by hope, based on courageous and visionary political leadership.

Communities are changing continuously. As a result new value patterns arise, among others with respect to values related to the right governance in the knowledge society, based on movements towards more participation and sustainable development. But,
the values that form the basis for the belief system concerning representative democracy seem very much alive; there are no large movements for the abolition of representative democracy. However, tensions are clearly visible. Those tensions result in floor crossing, problems in coalition forming, and a general discontent with the performance of politicians when balancing general versus political interests.

If within the representative democracy the trend points in the direction of an inclusive and participatory approach with broad use of the knowledge base, the question arises of what comprises such an approach. What are the urban aspects of knowledge-based social-economic development? For this a framework of analysis was created by Van Winden, Van den Berg, and Pol (2007) for cities in the knowledge economy. Seven structural characteristics were identified that contribute to a city’s “ability to acquire, create, disseminate and use (codified and tacit) knowledge” (Van Winden, Van den Berg & Pol, 2007, p. 529) for greater economic and social development:

- the knowledge base of the population, consisting of universities, public and private R&D facilities, and the education level;
- the strength of the industrial structure and the degree of specialization;
- the urban amenities and quality of life as key factors to attract and retain knowledge workers;
- the accessibility of transportation on the international, national and regional level;
- the urban diversity of inhabitants to facilitate interactions between economic players, which generates new ideas;
- the geographic and numerical scale of a city, which influences the attractiveness for companies and knowledge workers; and
- the degree of social equity to avoid tensions between “haves” and “have nots” and between ethnic groups, to promote a feeling of safety.
Towards knowledge-based democracies

These characteristics indeed supersede the abilities and responsibilities of government, and call for a broader governance base and for more inclusive and participatory processes in the knowledge democracy. Whatever role local government chooses to play as initiator, coordinator, or facilitator, Ergazakis, Metaxiotis, and Psarras (2004, p. 7) argue that the process of developing a knowledge-based city “is neither quick nor simple.” They mention political will as the most important factor that should work like a spark that ignites action within an appropriate legislative framework. Governments, be it on the city, regional, or national level, that are not willing to show such igniting power, will have a dim future ahead of them as: “Resistant governments will be left to reign over traditional political territories as all meaningful participation in the global economy migrates beyond their well-preserved frontiers” (Ohmae, 1993, p. 85).

Castells (2005) identifies the public sector as “the decisive actor” to develop and shape the network society.

The public sector is the sphere of society where new communication technologies are the least diffused and where organizational obstacles to innovation and networking are the most pronounced. Thus, reform of the public sector commands everything else in the process of productive shaping of the network society. (Castells, 2005, p. 17)

The role of the public sector and the identified need for participative knowledge driven governance structures inherently raises the question about what to do or how to make participation work within the formal structures of representative democracy. How can mechanisms be built within the classic democratic system to increase forms of participation and deliberation? In’t Veld (2010, p. 170) has formulated four propositions to this respect:

• Fight the degeneracy of representation by reducing the role of elected representatives and to strengthen the position of directly elected officials;
• Replace representation in policy preparation by increasing the participation of citizens and organizations in interactive policy development;
• The government resigns as solitary decision maker and introduces auctions and similar arrangements to come to collective decision making;
• Introduce more forms of direct steering by citizens by making shares or vouchers available to come to collective decision making.

Still many issues and dilemmas remain, among others there are associated questions that arise with respect to the location of the power base and representation issues. Governance—as a participatory-driven expansion of government—can be considered
as participative democracy, but according to Van der Heijden “no one yet has the
definite answer to the question how participative democracy relates to the representa-
tional democracy as we know it” (2005, p. 65). The tension between the principles
of the current system of representative democracy and the participation of non-elected
and often not representative people and organizations in governance processes was
also recognized in the conclusions of the Demos project (2004). In the conclusions of
this project, it was suggested that where in participatory processes the participants
are not representative in a pure democratic sense—as often is the case in participa-
tory processes—it is “the legitimacy or credibility of community representatives which is
important rather than their strict representativeness.” (Demos, 2004, p. 29)

In’t Veld (2010a, p. 33) calls for a whole new governance approach, which he refers
to as knowledge democracy. He considers it a logical evolution of the knowledge
society, which brings forth that citizens nowadays prefer partial representation per value
domain, as they have come to understand the limitations of non-personal representation
and/or involvement in current decision-making processes, which affect their individual lives
and futures, both directly as well as indirectly. The combination of the two concepts of knowl-
edge and democracy into a new concept of the knowledge democracy is very recent, and like
the knowledge concept to which it is related, the conceptual boundaries are rather elastic.

In the ancient times of the Greek and Roman Empires, which consisted mostly of city-states,
the democratic institutions in many ways had representative structures and processes. But,
the ultimate institution for decision making on the highest level and on the most serious
of topics (such as warfare) was the primary assembly (Larsen, 1966, p. 15). This assembly
consisted of citizens that could exercise their voting right as a way of direct government.
Larsen attributes this consistent choice to an ingrained belief that reigned throughout ancient
times and in all discussions about the different forms of democracy, namely the theory that the
judgment of the masses was superior to that of

**Success factors in ancient democracies**
(Malville and Ober, 2003, p. 53)

**Participatory Structures** – flat organization with clearly defined and understood processes and institutions—including councils, courts, and executive offices—served to minimize hierarchy, inhibit the development of the ruling class, and engage citizens in governance and jurispru-
dence.

**Communal Values** – the interest of the citizen was indistinguishable from the interest of the govern-
ment, with a set of values centered on individuality, community, and moral reciprocity.

**Practices of Engagement** – the day-to-day prac-
tices that provided and stimulated active participa-
tion can be subdivided in practices of access, prac-
tices of process, and practices of conse-
quence. These three practices were overarched
by jurisdiction practices.

“The culture of citizenship created by the Athe-
nians – with its interplay of structures, values, and practices – encouraged every person to zeal-
ously pursue individual excellence and at the same time created, through processes of self-gov-
ernance, an emotional commitment to efforts for the common good.”
experts. Aristotle (trans. 1996) referred to this in his work The Politics. For each individual has a share of excellence and practical wisdom, and when they meet together, just as they become in a manner one man, who has many feet, and hands, and senses, so too with regard to their character and thought. (III.11, 1281b–4) Manville and Ober (2003, p. 50–52) contribute the success of Athens’ direct democracy to three factors: participatory structures, communal values, and practices of engagement. Although they insist it is not a ready-to-mix recipe for current day managers in knowledge intensive organizations or cities, Manville and Ober consider these factors to be a fitting context for how an organization can genuinely change its organizational and managerial culture to suit the needs of its knowledge workers and citizens.

In’t Veld (2009) relates the need for more direct or participatory forms of democracy to the complexity of challenges in current times and to the reflexivity that is needed of governance, in order to be able to adapt quickly to the ever-changing circumstances.

The political agenda is filled with so called wicked problems, characterized by the absence of consensus both on the relevant values and the necessary knowledge and information. […]. Knowledge democracy could become an emerging concept with political ideological and persuasive meaning. (In’t Veld, 2009, p. 5–6)

2.1.4 The knowledge divide
Most scholars agree that the new era of knowledge democracy should be an inclusive era in which marginalized groups and those with a weaker voice can play their part, not just for the sake of democracy and inclusiveness, but to create optimal development potential. Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz has already consistently argued that open, transparent, and participative processes are important for parallel economic and social development as a means to more rapid economic growth (2002, p. 175). He has developed his views into an holistic approach called The learning society (Stiglitz & Greenwald, 2014) in which he explains the connected learning mechanisms that reinforce and complement each other to reduce the knowledge gap and reach maximum development and growth potential. Learning and education are keys to stimulating continuous innovation in various aspects of society. Florida also refers to this crucial aspect, but uses the term “creativity” as the fundamental source for economic growth (2002, p. 317).

So far such an inclusive approach seems more fiction than fact. Not even Friedman (2005, p. 205) expects equality for all in his “flat world,” and he is not the only one who warns about the consequences of exclusion and inequality. But, where in the industrial era the discussions focused on an income and education gap, nowadays the discussion focuses on the “knowledge divide” as the gap not just between groups of
people with different levels of education, but also between those who can participate in the networked knowledge-based society and those who have no access to gaining knowledge, which is considered a required basic capacity, by lack of education and digital connectivity (UNESCO, 2005).

UNESCO describes the knowledge divide as a fault line between “those who have access to knowledge and participate in knowledge-sharing, and the others, those relegated to the sidelines of knowledge societies” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 160). This is a major pitfall to avoid, according to UNESCO, namely the risk that the world would be divided into two knowledge civilizations “one based on the production of knowledge and the other on its consumption or application” (UNESCO, 2005, p. 163). Florida describes the divide in the United States as a fault line between the regions that have citizens of the creative class, who stimulate and foster innovation, creativity, and economic growth, and regions dominated by people that are “becoming more anxious, less open and more resistant to change” (Florida, 2005, p. 174). Florida fears the latter regions make the US less able to deal with economic issues and increasingly weaker in the field of competitiveness. Without the ability to mobilize and attract global talent and creative minds, the US will lag behind in the economic race.

Besides the economic effects, the knowledge divide also influences governance and the use of democratic opportunities and instruments. UNESCO (2005) warns for a democratic inequality due to the knowledge gap:

If knowledge is the condition for the capacity of citizens in a democratic society, then care must be taken to ensure that knowledge gaps between citizens in the same democracy do not result in the most knowledgeable of them being vested with excessive authority in public debate, and that the overlap of knowledge societies with a democratic regime does not lead to tutelary authority being conferred on a limited number of experts specializing in public affairs. (UNESCO, 2005, p. 173)
Furthermore, a noticeable aspect is that a knowledge divide is not only identified in or between countries among citizens, but also in the global scientific community (UNESCO, 2010). This is considered highly relevant, because the question arises of whether or not social sciences are capable of accompanying the evolution of human societies. Social sciences have a double function, since “they are shaped by the transformations in societies, and at the same time invite societies to reflect and act upon themselves” (UNESCO, 2010, p. 349). At the beginning of the 21st century, social sciences do not seem to be in a favorable position. UNESCO dedicated its 2010 World Social Sciences report to this scientific knowledge divide, and identified several types of divides in the social sciences that undermine its capacity to effectively fulfill the double function:

- a geographical divide;
- a capacity divide;
- the unequal degree of internationalization of knowledge production;
- the divide between disciplines;
- the divide between mainstream research and alternative approaches;
- the competition resulting from new managerial practices; and
- the sometimes tense relations between academics and society and between academics and policy-makers.

UNESCO reached two main conclusions, with the first being that there are persistent disparities in research capacities, showing a further reinforcement of the traditional big institutional players Europe and the US with respect to journals, bibliographical databases, universities, and research centers (UNESCO, 2010, p. 350). The second conclusion concerns knowledge fragmentation, showing the same “North Atlantic hegemony” in both the internationalization of research, as well as in the use of primarily the English language for research collaboration and dissemination (UNESCO, 2010, p. 353).

While many scholars support the need for closing the knowledge gap, Castells (2005) holds a slightly different view and considers it inevitable that part of the world’s population is and will remain excluded, because this is a necessity for an efficient network society.

The global segmentation of the network society, precisely because of its dynamism and productivity, is placing a significant part of humankind under conditions of structural irrelevance. It is not just poverty, it is that the global economy and the network society work more efficiently without hundreds of millions of our co-inhabitants of this planet. Thus, a major contradiction: the more we develop a highly productive, innovative system of production and social organization, the less this core needs a substantial proportion of marginal population, and the more difficult it becomes for this population to catch up. The correction of this massive exclusionary process requires concerted international public policy acting on the roots
of the new model of development (technology, infrastructure, education, diffusion and management of knowledge) rather than just providing for the needs arising from social exclusion in the form of charity. (Castells, 2005, p. 19)

The knowledge gap could thus be considered—as Stiglitz, Florida, and Castells each in their own way propose—as a stimulus for knowledge and skills development and as a source of motivation for innovative development. Graham and Felton (2005), however, warn that this is a purely Western view. They propose that inequality does matter, but it does not automatically function as a catalyst for development. They studied the effects of relative income differences, as well as of inequality more broadly defined, to individual welfare in Latin America, using both standard and less conventional measures of inequality. In their exploratory research they found that in Europe and the US, inequality can be assumed to be a sign of the possibility for income mobility and opportunity as much as it is a signal of injustice. However,

in Latin America, a region where the gaps between the poor and the wealthy are much larger and more persistent, inequality seems to be a signal of persistent advantage for the very wealthy and persistent disadvantage for the poor, rather than a signal of future opportunities. (Graham & Felton, 2005, p. 26)

This implies that specific and coherent policies in the cultural and social context of a community is needed to close the divide and to create perceived opportunities out of situations of persistent inequality.

2.1.5 Transformation at high speed

However, as dispersed knowledge related topics are across various scientific fields, it becomes evident that the knowledge era, the technological developments, economic shifts, and societal changes accompanying and stimulating these developments eventually will have at least as much impact on daily life as did the Industrial Revolution (Drucker, 2001; Florida, 2002; Friedman, 2007; Leadbeater, 2009). But, besides considering the magnitude of the impact, it is also worthwhile to consider the increased speed with which transformative developments take shape. The industrial era evolved over a period of two centuries and impacted and changed all aspects of daily life, as it brought major changes in manufacturing, mining, agriculture, and transport, based on new technologies such as steam power, machine-based manufacturing, mechanization of industries, and also the internal combustion engine and electric power generation. This created immense societal and organizational changes that shaped the modern Western world. One of the societal changes is the significant urbanization, which took place worldwide on a grand scale. By 2009, half of the world’s population had
chosen to move away from rural areas into densely populated urbanized regions (UN, 2008), and the urbanization pace still increases. By the year 2050, two thirds of the world’s population is expected to live in urban surroundings (UN, 2011).

The transformative changes as a result of the Industrial Revolution occurred in a mere two centuries, which resembles a few generations in terms of a human life cycle. It represents only a fraction of time when related to the total time span of the central civilization of human societies, which—according to the systems analyst’s view of Wilkinson (2004)—dates back to 1500 BC. Never before in history did the human species in such a short period of time have such an altering and impacting effect on our planet’s surroundings and on the ways in which it exists, both physically and environmentally. The current pervasive attention to sustainability seems a correcting factor in this respect, by recognizing that resources and assets cannot be used endlessly, because they are finite. Thus, besides the fact that our societies seem to be experiencing an impact at least as big as the transition into the industrial era, the current transition is taking place at a much higher pace (Friedman, 2007, p. 49; Leamer, 2007, p. 119; Lehrer, 2010, p. 17). Geoffrey West (Lehrer, 2010), from his background as a theoretical physicist, argued in The New York Times that the current impacting changes and major innovations are taking place at an unprecedented speed, even within one’s individual lifecycle:

Until recently the period of time between major innovations far exceeded the productive life span of a human being. Beginning towards the end of the twentieth century this was no longer true; a typical human now lives significantly longer than the period between major innovations. The period between the most recent major shift from the ‘Computer Age’ to the ‘Information and Digital Age’ was only about 20 years, which is to be compared with the order of thousands of years between the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages. Furthermore, the time differential to the next significant innovation is destined to be even shorter. (Lehrer, 2010, p. 17)

The speed of transition towards knowledge societies also increases the perceived impact on the way people live and work. Leadbeater (2009) focuses on the phenomenon that, due to broadly available digital connectivity, people find new ways of organizing and constructing the actual building blocks of society, referring to human networks and relationships (Leadbeater, 2009, p. 242). Like Castells (2005) he considers the networks not as a new phenomenon, but as a confirmation of how humankind has lived since early urbanization. The “new” networks, however, are no longer place bound. The human networks and relationships in digital form facilitate mass innovation and collaboration across scientific fields, and—more importantly—also outside traditional organizing units.
and governmental entities, thus creating a shift of power and of innovation capacity away from institutions and organizations (including government) to individuals and groups of people with a common interest. The three main ingredients to create what Leadbeater (2009) refers to as the “We Think” approach are participation, recognition, and collaboration. According to Leadbeater, referring to collaborative examples such as Wikipedia, these ingredients need to be carefully balanced in order to create “We Think” in the sense of the wisdom of crowds, instead of the stupidity of the masses.

2.2 THE ROLE OF CITIES

Cities are a centerpiece in discussions in the knowledge era because they play a centrifugal role in an economic sense as drivers of the economy, as well as with respect to innovation, creativity, and governance. Many city networks arise and their contributions to solutions for modern day challenges are quickly gaining ground. Benjamin Barber recently dedicated a detailed analysis of the increasing role of cities in solving not only local, but also global problems in “If Mayors Ruled the World, Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities” (2013). The specific aspect of knowledge in relation to cities has surfaced in the last two decades as a focal point with respect to the development of knowledge cities and creative cities, and in a broader sense to the knowledge-based development of cities. The terminology is not clearly defined, but the common denominator is the effort to develop cities as economically viable and competitive entities in which creative citizens want to live. This section discusses the economic role of cities, their position in the knowledge era, and the implications with respect to governance for the knowledge democracy.

When considering policies aimed at stimulating the knowledge economy, such as those stemming from the Lisbon agenda, the main strategies are defined on a European level, with detailed planning and implementation delegated as a task to the national level. Several authors in recent decades have warned, however, that national policies, statistics, and analysis do not fit the realities of the knowledge economy (Florida, 2008; Ohmae, 1993; Porter, 1998; Van Winden, Van den Berg, & Pol, 2007). The measurement of performance and the policies and laws are traditionally focused on indicators and regulations on the national and multinational “space-bound” level. But, this national focus neglects, according to Ohmae (1993), the fact that

The nation state has become an unnatural, even dysfunctional, unit for organizing human activity and managing economic endeavour in a borderless world. It represents no genuine shared community of economic interest; it defines no meaningful flows of economic activity. In fact, it overlooks the true linkages and
synergies that exist among often disparate populations by combining important measures of human activity at the wrong level of analysis. (Ohmae, 1993, p. 78)

In other words, regional economic activity in the globalized world has little respect for national borders and tends to migrate across politically set boundaries of nation states. The newly formed region states, as Ohmae refers to these economic concentrations, develop along lines of real economic opportunity as reflected in “patterns manifest in countless individual decisions” (1993, p. 78) of people and businesses. These region states replace nations as an organizing economic unit, and each of these region states possesses, “in one or another combination, the key to ingredients for successful participation in the global economy” (Ohmae, 1993, p. 79). Florida (2008, 2008a) takes the regional effect one step further and describes that the world economy is organized around 40 mega regions, which produce most of the world’s economic activity (66%) and innovation (86%). He refers to these mega regions as spikes in a statistically rather flat landscape of economic activity. Florida argues that:

Writers like Thomas Friedman have overemphasized the centrifugal forces of globalization, arguing that the world is flat. In so doing they neglect the powerful centripetal forces that trigger economic concentration. (Florida, 2008a, p. 19)

The world is both flat and spiky; economic activity is both dispersed and concentrating at the same time, says Florida. While routine economic functions spread geographically, higher level economic activities tend to concentrate in a relatively small number of locations at the same time. The US economy, according to Florida, is powered by roughly a dozen mega regions, and “the real economies of Europe are contained not in individual countries, but rather in six or seven mega regions” (Florida, 2008a, p. 19). There is a natural overlap between the economic and the regional urban concentration trend. In UN population statistics, the trend towards the concentration of people in large urban areas is expected to continue. The UN concludes that the number of mega-cities, those with over 10 million people in their urban agglomerations, has risen from 3 in 1975, to 19 in 2007, and 23 in 2011. They were home to 9.9 % of the world’s urban population in 2011 and the figure is expected to grow to 13.6 % by 2025 (UN, 2012). Interestingly enough the UN concludes that medium sized and small cities (with less than 500,000 residents) are growing more rapidly, and this trend is expected to continue in both developed and developing countries. Between 2007 and 2025, small urban centers with fewer than half a million citizens are expected to absorb nearly half of the expected increase in the urban population (UN, 2008, p. 8). As noted by Laquian (UN, 2008a, p. 83), the UN’s figures regarding megacities represent only location of inhabitants and not economic contribution, thus this
may underestimate the true size and economic significance of such regions. Laquian proposes that planners should consider whole urban corridors and mega-city regions, which closely connects to Florida’s view on mega-regions. Porter’s (1998) analysis also focuses on regional economic significance. He discusses the concentrations of competitive power in cities and regions as clusters, which he defines as: “geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular field” (1998, p. 78). Porter calls it a paradox that local aspects such as knowledge, relationships, and motivation, which cannot be matched by rival clusters, increasingly determine the competitive advantages in a global economy:

The enduring competitive advantages in a global economy are often heavily local, arising from concentrations of highly specialized skills, and knowledge, institutions, rivals, related businesses, and sophisticated customers.[…] The more the world economy becomes complex, knowledge based, and dynamic, the more this is true. (Porter, 1998, p. 90)

The trend towards megaregions and clustering is illustrative for the rediscovery of cities for their favorable potential instead of for their problems. Some theorists in the urban field find it quite logical to concentrate on cities, since cities are much older economic entities than nations, and each city has unique development options. Jane Jacobs was one of the early urban thinkers who looked at cities for their potential, instead of for their problems (Jacobs, 1969), and considered cities as driving forces for economic development and as windows of opportunity for building vibrant, socially stable, and economically diverse communities. Currently, economically strong cities and regions are considered as important driving forces that can support and sustain successful national strategies towards international competitiveness, as acknowledged by the European Council on urban policies in “Cities Empower Europe” (2004).

The growth of cities due to the spatial distribution of people from rural to urban areas, as well as the natural increase of the city population, is regarded as largely unstoppable. The fact that currently over half of the world’s population lives in urbanized areas is no longer seen as a threat, but rather as an opportunity, especially in developed countries. Illustrating this point, the former director of the White House Department of Urban Development, Carriòn, stated that “we also need to stop seeing our cities as the problem and start seeing them as the solution …strong cities are the building blocks of strong regions, and strong regions are essential for a strong America” (White House, 2009). The US policy recognizes cities and metropolitan areas as dynamic engines for the economy, and this is also the trend on an international level. A United Nations expert meeting on population distribution, internal migration, and development concluded that “Cities can indeed be considered as the site in which the main economic, demo-
graphic, social and environmental issues of the future will play out” (UN, 2008, p. 49). These developments put cities and urban regions in the forefront of the international competitive challenge, and cities are actively seeking their unique competitive strong points. The important role of cities forces the focus on the people that inhabit these cities, since they can be considered to be the ultimate objects of policy concern. It seems a paradox that the globalized economy has lead to an increased importance of “place” and especially the softer aspects of place reflected in the perceived quality of life that a city offers its citizens. Florida stressed throughout his research that business follows creative citizens. This requires that cities must focus on attracting knowledge citizens—which he refers to as the creative class—and through them attract economic activity (2002, 2005, 2005a). Florida essentially turned the table and asked not what motivates the location of firms and industries —a common economic policy orientation in cities—but what motivates the location decisions of people and, thus, “how do peoples’ location decisions affect the ability of places to innovate and spur economic growth” (2005, p. 19). According to Florida, cities and regions that want to gain competitive advantage “need to create mechanisms for harnessing the knowledge and ideas of all citizens at the neighbourhood, local and regional levels for improving their quality of place” (Florida, 2005, p. 86).

The question arises as to how cities achieve this and, more specifically, which knowledge mechanisms or processes they need to create and maintain. Ergazakis, Metaxiotis, and Psarras (2004, p. 7) define knowledge cities as “place bound” communal structures, which develop and grow “by encouraging the continuous creation, sharing, evaluation, renewal and update of knowledge. This can be achieved through strategies, policies, processes and practices of continuous interaction between cities and citizens and between cities and other cities’ citizens” (Ergazakis, Metaxiotis, & Psarras, 2004, p. 7). Factors that are recognized as being important in this respect involve, among others, cities’ and citizens’ knowledge sharing cultures, as well as a city’s design, IT networks, and infrastructure, supporting both critical creative mass and interactions. The knowledge city concept reflects comparable aspects of the creative city concept of Florida (2005). This concept revolves around what Florida refers to as a simple formula of the “3 Ts” of economic growth: technology, talent, and tolerance. In order to achieve economic growth, cities must, according to Florida, optimize these three interconnected aspects. An important aspect related to tolerance involves the importance being attached to a culture of diversity in cities, in order for those cities to be able to attract and maintain talent. Florida (2005, 2008), in his research in the US on creative cities, used specific indices to measure levels of diversity in relation to the presence and growth of high tech industries. His theory states that “a connection exists between a metropolitan area’s level of tolerance for a range of people, its ethnic and social diversity, and its success
in attracting people, including high-technology workers” (2005, p. 130). Florida concluded that while diversity maintains the strongest connection to high tech industry and talent, the relationship between the Bohemian Index—reflected in the relative presence of people with an artistic profession—and concentrations of high human capital individuals and such industry are also significant (2005, p. 115). In the same context Leadbeater (2007) refers to the need for “combination” in cities that desire to operate creatively and expand economically. “Cities innovate when people mix and mingle, sharing and combining ideas from different vantage points and traditions. That mixing takes place on and in shared infrastructures and spaces that bring people together” (Leadbeater, 2007, p. 28).

The idea of involving citizens and stakeholders in public governance is not exactly new. As early as 1974 in The Netherlands, discussions and experiments were taking place concerning how to provide citizens more influence in decision-making processes in the public domain. De Jong (1974, p. 105) mentioned that theory and research did not keep pace with the experiments that were taking place at that moment. He mentioned a “bureaucratic paradox” as a complicating factor, referring to the tension that exists between the citizens who become more dependent upon government and the government, which at the same time moves in a retreating direction (De Jong, 1974, p. 122). And, although the research showed intentions of public organizations to be client oriented, the bureaucratic organization in its basic design appeared not to be conducive to such involvement and interaction. Now, 40 years later Leadbeater (2009) sees that not much has changed: “The truth is that often in the name of doing things for people, traditional and hierarchical organizations end up doing things to people” (Leadbeater, 2009, p. 240). The focus of public services should to be to become “platforms for participation and collaboration, mobilizing citizens as players-developers in creating public goods” (Leadbeater, 2009, p. 153).

The call for effective city governance based on co-creation and knowledge sharing finds broad resonance. Sassen (2010) calls for urgent innovation of urban governance.

The old bureaucratic ways will not do. Ours is a whole new urban era, with its share of positive potential as well as miseries. In cities, our governance challenges become concrete and urgent. National states can keep talking; urban leadership needs to act. Sassen (2010, p. 31).

And, cities are indeed stepping up to the plate, creating platforms and networks for cooperation to seek pragmatic solutions for the glocal challenges with which cities and their citizens are confronted. Barber (2013a) is perhaps the fiercest and most proclaimed bearer of the opinion that cities are much more effective and naturally
better suited for solving citizens’ issues and addressing glocal challenges, such as “weapons, trade, climate change, cultural exchange, crime, drugs, transportation, public health, immigration, and technology” (Barber, 2013, p. 7). Barber discusses the role of cities as the essential platform for democracy and for fulfilling the needs of this interdependent era, filled with cross-border challenges.

As it was our origin, the city now appears to be our destiny. It is where creativity is unleashed, community solidified, and citizenship realized. If we are to be rescued, the city rather than the nation-state must be the agent of change. (Barber, 2013, p. 4)

Notable is that Barber chooses a pragmatic stance and deems it possible that cities can help to solve problems “pragmatically rather than ideologically” (Barber, 2013, p. 24). But, at the same time, he presents a paradox when he describes that an ideological shift is needed to recognize the cities’ opportunities: “For all the contradictions and obstacles presented by cities, they remain a formidable alternative to the conventional nation-state paradigm in which our thinking has been imprisoned for the past three centuries” (Barber, 2013, p. 18). According to Barber, in earlier centuries and before the rise of the nation state in the 17th century, cities and networks of cities were the main unit of economic and democratic significance, referring to among others the Hanseatic League of about 40 cities, which protected their joint economic power around the North Sea and the Baltic Sea (2013, p. 108). The current era again is one of city networks that have been launched across continents and with a focus on several topics such as sustainable development, which is for cities a topic of vital concern. One of the bigger networks, which celebrated 100 years of existence during 2013 World Congress, is United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), with 3500 delegates from cities in more than 120 countries. Barber refers to this network as “the world’s largest and most influential organization nobody has ever heard of.” (Barber, 2013, p. 110).

Various other networks exist—either thematically or geographically connected—and produce tangible solutions for challenges such as climate change and infrastructure.

As nations fall prey to rivalry and dysfunction, cities are rising and find themselves in the ironic position of being empowered globally by their lack of sovereignty nationally. Their interdependence makes them likely building blocks for a viable global order. (Barber, 2013, p. 147)

Barber’s ideal, and in his belief inevitable, future situation is a world in which mayors form a global parliament and provide a global interdependent structure and style of governance.
Optimism about the future arises out of the nature of cities themselves. They are already networked and naturally disposed to creative interactivity and innovative cross-border experimentation and collaboration; they are relational, communal, and naturally interdependent. They embody local liberty and promote participatory engagement by citizens. Whether we call it global governance or simply cosmopolitanism as praxis and whether or not it is underwritten by a parliament of mayors or some other global association, cities will play an increasingly crucial role in taking decisions across borders on behalf of humanity. (Barber, 2013, p. 171)

2.3 THE BASIS OF IT ALL: MODERN DEMOCRACIES

When discussing the transition towards the knowledge era, one of the fundamental aspects remains largely in the shadow, and that is how communities are organized and governed in a democratic way during this highly dynamic period. Traditional electoral systems seem to not be entirely satisfactory anymore to deal with the dynamic involvement needs and aspirations of creative citizens. How can modern democracies be enabled to effectively deal with the dynamic challenges presented by citizens who are both knowledgeable and connected, as well as demanding of recognition of the way they see their society moving in the right or wrong direction? And, how do we involve the part of the citizenry that work in the non-knowledge-based sectors and are less digitally connected, and how do we address this knowledge divide? The key question arising from this is how governments can deal with citizen participation in a representative system, when many and often conflicting views exist with regard to the right solution, for the right problem at the right moment in time (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2013).

As described earlier, various scholars describe the failure of the representative mechanisms—both on national as well as local level—and in the daily news these weaknesses take shape in the form of public protests, many discussions about the ‘gap’ between representatives and their constituencies, and low voter turnout for elections. On top of that, the representative value of traditional parliamentary democracies can be subdued by political mechanisms, which offer individual representatives in parliament the freedom to change political party after they are elected, while holding on to their political seats. This effectively results in a disconnect with the people that elected them and provided them their mandate for representation. This phenomenon of “floor crossing” or “party switching” is visible in both Western democracies such as in the Netherlands, as well as in emergent democracies in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean. Also the US and Canada have a documented history of the occurrence of this phenom-
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Even in European countries there is a good deal of party switching, including in Italy, where almost one fourth of the members of the lower house, the Chamber of Deputies, switched parties at least once between 1996 and 2001 (Janda, 2009). Scholars hold different opinions about whether crossing the floor poses a threat to democratic systems, or whether it simply contributes to a process of increased democratic maturity over time. But, the fact is that the voter is left in uncertainty about the value of his vote for representation when the link between his elected representative and a party affiliation is cut short, since political parties are the structural link between voters and political representatives in parliamentary democracies.

Taking these developments in representative democratic systems into account, it is no surprise that a recent extensive study into citizen participation across Europe by the Central and Eastern European Citizens Network signals a “genuine concern among a growing number of citizens about the workings of democracy in their home countries and the continent as a whole” (Forbrig, 2011, p. 6). The study signals that the agitation of citizens is much more fundamental than the occasional protest vote in elections or mass demonstration in public places. These ordinary Europeans are seeking constructive ways of engaging in public discourse and influencing decision making as a means of addressing social problems outside of and alternative to the classical, and clearly limited, arenas of political parties, elections and parliaments. (Forbrig 2011, p. 6)

So, what needs to be adjusted in current structures and mechanisms, in which officials are elected in a representative body (e.g., parliament or city council) and thus provided with “a general authorization to take decisions in all public domains for a certain period of time” (In’t Veld 2010, p. 3). It seems obvious—considering the growing body of criticism on the erosion of our political systems—that there is no more support a general authorization in

Learning for Local Democracy
(Forbrig, 2011, p. 6)

A Study of Local Citizen Participation in Europe

“Of course, this extension of democratic politics beyond elections is to be welcomed. It reflects an acknowledgement that classical state institutions, political structures and representative democracy are limited in their capacity to accommodate the growing range of interests, beliefs, problems and solutions that come with ever more differentiated societies and global interdependencies of the post-modern age. It suggests a new centrality of citizens and their directly voiced concerns, and it highlights their continuous initiative and importance in public debate and decision-making. It expresses a hope that new forms of political participation and a stronger role for civil society can help to re-invigorate contemporary democracy in Europe: by re-connecting politics and societies where democratic institutions and citizens seem to have grown apart, by challenging political elites where these close in on power and office, and by enhancing the civic grass-roots and its potential for detecting and solving pressing social issues.”
all public domains for representatives as being satisfactory. If this is the case, what needs to be replaced, adjusted, or added in order to accommodate the needs of a modern democracy? It is obvious that the wickedness of issues in the knowledge era seems to surpass the manageability by—and knowledge ability of—a limited amount of representatives, and the dynamic speed of developments surpasses the common four year election cycles in our democratic systems. Serious reconsiderations are required about how to overhaul our democratic systems and mechanisms to fit our new way of living. The research into democratic systems and principles needs to be expanded and deepened from the representation aspect to the participation aspect of democracy, from government to governance, whereby governance in this context can be defined as the cooperation between governments, citizens, companies, and civil organizations, with the aim to solve problems within the public domain (Van der Heijden, 2005, p. 11). Democracy knows no single definition or theory (Dahl, 2013); it is a topic of lively debates that have in common the principle of the will of the people in the form of majority rule, but the theories vary in many other fundamental aspects such as power, justice, and equality. The discussion of democracy originates in ancient times, but still resonates very much in the contemporary, since it concerns the basic and very fundamental question of how societies want communities to be governed. It is largely unavoidable that when communities experience dynamic transitional changes over time, the same adheres to democratic institutions and mechanisms. Deliberation and participation—besides the traditional aspect of representation—have become the focus in contemporary democratic debates, as well as in democratic practice. Worldwide, several participative and deliberative forms of governance are taking shape, mostly in an exploratory approach and sometimes in the context of planning and decision making, in policy formulation, or in resolving conflicting interests or longstanding societal disputes. Practices such as community-based vision development projects, democratic dialogue processes, and consultative approaches are part of a broad variety of participative mechanisms that are being applied, mostly on municipal level, across the globe. The web is filled with discussion groups and platforms about participative projects and experiences. There is even a Wiki (Participedia) that functions as a participative project and knowledge-sharing platform.

One of the widely applied mechanisms is participatory budgeting, both in developing countries as well as in developed countries such as Great Britain and the US. The World Bank promotes participatory budgeting (PB) as part of their efforts in the area of social development and, more specifically, participation and civic engagement. The World Bank refers to PB as

a direct-democracy approach to budgeting. It offers citizens at large an opportunity to learn about government operations and to deliberate, debate, and influence
the allocation of public resources. It is a tool for educating, engaging, and empowering citizens and strengthening demand for good governance. The enhanced transparency and accountability that participatory budgeting creates can help reduce government inefficiency and curb clientelism, patronage, and corruption. Participatory budgeting also strengthens inclusive governance by giving marginalized and excluded groups the opportunity to have their voices heard and to influence public decision making vital to their interests. Done right, it has the potential to make governments more responsive to citizens’ needs and preferences and more accountable to them for performance in resource allocation and service delivery. In doing so, participatory budgeting can improve government performance and enhance the quality of democratic participation. (Shah, 2007, p. 1)

According to the non-profit organization Participatory Budget Project, the practices have spread widely since the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre started a participatory budgeting process in 1989. As a practice, PB has now spread to over 1,500 cities in Latin America, North America, Asia, Africa, and Europe. In the US and Canada, PB has been used in Toronto, Montreal, Guelph, Chicago, New York City, and the Californian city Vallejo (www.participatorybudgeting.org).

Although an increasing body of research, publications, projects, and networks is dedicated to participative and deliberative forms of government, according to Fung (2004), “…contemporary scholars have for the most part shied away from answering, or even asking, how state and society might be pragmatically reconnected” (Fung, 2004, p 16). Even though growing criticism and discontent towards the commonly isolated approach of government in the knowledge era can be detected, the prime question is wide open as to what it takes to organize and facilitate citizen participation in a sustainable way within a representative system. How can hierarchical bureaucracies interactively engage with citizens and stakeholders in a structural manner in solving the complex issues of our time, while adhering to democratic principles and respecting also the rights of minorities and vulnerable groups? It seems a tough question to answer, because the answer requires more than a quest for pragmatic methods, instruments, and mechanisms; it requires a critical look at behaviors, which been approved of for a long time, but that under the dynamic circumstances seem to no longer fit. A change in behavior, however, requires a change in mindset. According to Senge (1990, p. 175) referring to Argyris (1982), our mental models determine our attitudes, so if we want to change the interaction and cooperation between government and citizens, we need to dig a layer deeper than pragmatic mechanisms, projects, and instruments for participation, if we seek to build actual new meaningful relationships and interactions. Landry (2000), from an urban planning perspective, subscribes to the need for what
he calls a new and broader way of thinking (2000, p. 41). He actually refers to such radical new thinking, that he refers to the new mindset as a paradigm shift (2000, p. xiv). Based on his firm belief in the potential of cities, he designed a toolkit with the purpose “to reexamine how problems can be addressed, by reexamining the underlying philosophies, principles and assumptions behind decision making and to challenge the way urban problems and solutions are framed” (Landry, 2000, p. 165). In his analysis of creative cities, Landry designed a ranking for innovative solutions in seven phases (Landry, 2000, p. 198) varying from appalling bad practice upwards through bad practice, good practice, best practice, basic innovation, and paradigm shift, to the highest ranking of meta paradigm shift, thereby referring to the theories of Thomas Kuhn (1962). Landry applies these rankings to illustrate examples of creative projects in cities and research projects in areas such as economic regeneration, environment, governance, and evaluation.

The question of how impacting the level of innovation of our modern democracies and governance systems should be in the transition towards the knowledge era remains unanswered. It is clear from the various considerations and discussions in this context that there are various thoughts and experiences based on the many exploratory projects in citizen participation and deliberation, but the underlying principles and mechanisms in the knowledge era are not clearly analyzed and defined.

2.4 RESEARCH DEVELOPMENTS

The exploratory research for this dissertation has evolved over the course of 10 years through a series of sub-studies followed by action research in Curaçao into the Action Program for Youth Development. The sub-studies and their findings are explained in the following sections to provide an understanding of the developments and the chosen direction of action research and as follow up to the theoretical synthesis.

The research started with a fascination and curiosity about the various ways in which cities across the globe have developed participatory vision processes for their communities as a way to tap into the knowledge potential in their communities by interactively involving citizens in strategic policy setting, mostly without any scientific methodology or guidance. The course of this research has resulted in four sub-studies. The first is an analytical framework for comparing vision processes between cities based on KM literature in business (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2007). This was followed by an exploration of the concept of knowledge democracy and, more specifically, the way in which the democratic knowledge potential of cities is used through participatory processes based on analysis of concepts as applied in knowledge management practice in business
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(Tissen & Van Rijn, 2010). The research continued with an analytical comparison of the top-down “vision perspective” with the bottom-up “knowledge/participation perspective,” which shows fundamental differences in governance context in structure and in process approach (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2013). These publications and additional theoretical explorations have resulted in the design of an initial framework for governance in knowledge democracy (see section 2.5).

From a helicopter perspective these sub-studies are interlinked and can be regarded as a step-by-step deepening of the actual research issues at hand. With the first sub-study the aim was to make a comparison between city-based vision processes and business practice, from the point of view that vision and mission development processes are core elements of any business strategy. This first part of the research aimed at developing an analytical framework to compare cities that had applied a variety of vision processes, in the absence of any formal scientific methodological basis for such community visioning processes. The first paper was published in the proceedings of the European Conference on Knowledge Management (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2007). Both views on and interpretations of knowledge management were reviewed in relation to recent literature in urban research on vision development. The analysis indicated that a number of relevant concepts exist or can emerge, which can best be described as dilemmas. The dilemmas can be used to develop a comparative framework of analysis for vision development processes in cities.

The second part of the research touched on the subject of the governance tensions that such processes can bring about in a democratic context, because participatory vision development processes take place within the formal decision-making structures of a representative democracy, which puts the power in the hands of a limited amount of representatives that may or may not be in support of the outcome of vision development processes. In preparation of a paper for the 2009 conference about knowledge democracy and the book chapter published afterwards (Van Rijn & Tissen, 2010), it became clear, based on the literature analysis, that however interesting a comparison between vision processes in various cities may be, some fundamental questions seemed to surround these processes, such as what constitutes success, in the sense that how can the outcome of any participatory process be guaranteed or stimulated within the existing power structures of parliamentary representation? The concept of knowledge democracy challenges many government and governance aspects, structures, and practices that seem to no longer fit this current era. “Participation of creative citizens—both individuals as well as company citizens and civil organizations—in the governance of a city is imperative” (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2010, p. 187) for two reasons: to be able to tap into their knowledge potential for the further development of the city, and secondly
because a participative governance structure can offer a lasting competitive advent, as creative citizens who actually participate in the shaping of “place” also create a certain meaning in life that goes beyond individual meaning.

The concept of the knowledge democracy and, more specifically, the way in which the democratic knowledge potential of cities is used through participatory processes such as collaborative visioning, can be further developed by cross-disciplinary research into knowledge management policies and practices from business management. (Tissen & Van Rijn, 2010, p. 187)

Figure 2.2 Schematic representation of research developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Zadar (Makelearn): A critical look at citizen participation processes in knowledge-based societies within the framework of representative (parliamentary) democracies (Tissen &amp; Van Rijn, 2013)</td>
<td>A governance approach that is conducive to knowledge driven participatory processes in democratic systems based on representation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By diving deeper into these questions with a paper (Van Rijn & Tissen, 2013) for the 2013 Makelearn Conference in Zadar, Croatia, it became clear that we live in an almost paradoxical era in which our societies function as “knowledge democracies,” but without adequate mechanisms (structures and/or processes) to address complex and often far reaching challenges in the field of citizen participation. Based on a comparative model for organizational change, with incremental change impacts from traditional to transitional and transformational change, it becomes clear that the approach towards citizen participation in vision driven/decision making processes mostly reflects transitional change, but does not reflect the intention of fundamental transformation to a new form of governance for the knowledge democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma model as a comparative framework for analysis of vision development between cities.</td>
<td>Focus on vision development processes in cities (comparative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement &lt;-&gt; consultation</td>
<td>Focus on interests and governance tensions with regard to participative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation &lt;-&gt; top-down implementation</td>
<td>Focus on different governance contexts with regard to participative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance &lt;-&gt; conservatism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &lt;-&gt; Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of care &lt;-&gt; the language of war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue &lt;-&gt; talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation &lt;-&gt; consolidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action &lt;-&gt; words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common values &lt;-&gt; general values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness &lt;-&gt; copy cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall structure and guiding principles and processes of traditional representative democracies offer limited options for active citizen participation. Traditional electoral systems seem not to be entirely satisfactory anymore to deal with the dynamic involvement of creative citizens.

Transformation to the knowledge democracy requires new governance structures and processes that fit the transformational changes, requiring major shifts in the way communities and organizations work. The vision driven/decision making processes mostly reflect transitional change, but do not reflect the intention of fundamental transformation to a new form of governance for the knowledge democracy.
The focus in research thus has shifted from looking at vision processes to the governance context in which such processes take place and to the tensions that this may bring about. Based on the exploratory analyses, the focus was aimed at contributing to the body of knowledge with regard to participatory processes by identifying the governance principles that are required in the knowledge era to make such processes succeed.

2.5 INITIAL GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK FOR KNOWLEDGE DEMOCRACY

This concluding section of Part 1 of this study seeks to consolidate the aspects that have been discussed and play a role in a fitting governance approach for the era of knowledge democracy. The consolidation takes shape in the form of an initial framework for governance in the knowledge era. The framework takes into consideration the variety of that have been discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 on knowledge, participation, and the relationship between government and governance. It thus focuses on a holistic approach of governance, including underlying assumptions. This may help to clarify and create insight into the apparent paradox that has arisen in the knowledge era: the more the society collectively knows, the less we seem to be able to collectively deal with the broadened knowledge base in a satisfactory manner, especially with respect to the governance of our communities.

This chapter has presented the notion that the knowledge concept as such leaves room for many interpretations due to its fluent attributes that seems to adjust to the context in which it is used. This also resonates in the aspects discussed about co-creation and learning, which have been emphasized in the context of the knowledge economy. The economic lens, however, as originally applied in the European development planning based on the Lisbon Strategy, has widened to a broader view. The development of knowledge societies is now deeply embedded in a global sustainability agenda, balancing economic aspects with ecological and social aspects of development. It is also clear that there is an unanswered question about how to fit more knowledge-based and participative governance into the current democratic system of representation, which limits the democratic activities of citizens mostly to voluntary participation in cyclical voting processes. In such electoral processes representatives are chosen who are entrusted with full decision power to make choices to solve problems and create the necessary perspectives to further develop communities and nations. But, the limitations of this approach can be heard in a growing body of criticism, and they are also visible in the many projects and processes across the globe, which provide a more interactive and participative role for citizens within the structure of traditional representative democ-
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While voting in electoral cycles is the common mindset, the increasing amount of participative initiatives and projects around the world mostly on municipal level seem to indicate that there is a growing and explicit desire to apply more direct democratic influence than just casting a vote every four years. So the question arises: what are the options and mechanisms somewhere between the two democratic “extremes” of pure representation and direct democracy? How does one facilitate and stimulate more influence and co-creation from citizens and stakeholders in society dealing with wicked problems, while the formal decision power is still in the hands of a small group of chosen representatives? Where in the creative chain from policy development towards formal decision making the broader knowledge potential be used, while balancing the various interests along the way and likely having to choose from more than one “right” solution, considering the wickedness of our problems.

To further add to the complexity, these democratic challenges take place in a dynamic community context, with a clear movement towards more holistic approaches and indicators for development (Tommasoli, 2007; OECD, 2013a; Meuleman, 2013; OECD, 2016) besides the traditional macro-economic ratios and figures. GDP, and even HDI (Human Development Index), do no longer satisfy the need to measure the actual well-being of people and progress of a society. Besides the obvious need for statistical averages as a necessity for comparison, they do not provide insight into the actual situation on a human scale in a society or nation. Inequalities, be it in income or in knowledge, and the actual well-being as experienced by citizens, remain largely invisible in many of such aggregated figures. This contributes to the apparent fact that the desired development of communities and nations is increasingly projected as a holistic image of development, using different indicators, beyond strictly the common macro-economic indicators. General well-being is becoming a standardized approach, as reflected in the concept of inclusive growth, which is aimed at fighting poverty and inequality and improving quality of life (OECD, 2012). This has lead to the development of new concepts and indicators for developing general well-being of citizens and creating collaborative governance through citizen engagement (Worldbank, 2013). There is, however, a very diverse and emerging practice with as of yet little scientific insight into “why,” “how,” and “what” with respect to participative governance and citizen engagement to promote the well-being of citizens and the progress of communities.

Consolidating the dynamic global context in Chapter 1, the highly diverse conceptual views on knowledge in Chapter 2, as well as combining various theoretical concepts discussed in literature, leads to the possibility to design a governance framework for the knowledge democracy. The framework provides an analytical as well as a design view based on an approach on how to effectively fit knowledge developments and
participative processes in the current representational structures of democratic systems. In considering such a framework for knowledge-based societies, several aspects can be considered to obtain a holistic approach as a contribution to answering the “why,” “how,” and “what” questions.

WHY
In answering the “why” question (i.e., why should the leadership of a community choose this path of participative governance?) considerations can be made towards two specific aspects.

Purpose - what is the actual purpose of participative governance, and why should leadership of a community opt for participative governance? Participation is not the goal in itself. Citizen participation in policy development and knowledge-based decision making aims towards community or city competitive development, conflict resolution, and sustainable development, resulting in higher quality of life for citizens.

Outcome - what should be the result of the governance approach? The participative process should lead to transformation of paradigms and related attitudes, towards a more collectively shared responsibility and action for sustainable development of the community and its citizens.

HOW
In answering the “how” question, it should become clear which instruments and mechanisms play a role in creating an effective participative governance. Six aspects can be considered.

Knowledge - what can be considered as knowledge in the context of governance? Knowledge relates to place based collective wisdom, including implicit knowledge, with attention to data driven analysis and co-creation and with a high degree of transparency and accountability.

Time path - what is the appropriate time path for a transformative governance approach? The governance approach should not be project but process oriented, constantly adapting to emerging realities, thus a continuous time path, and with a start, but no date for a desired end state.

Structure - what is the desired structure for participative processes? With the orientation on a developing process, the structure must remain emergent, fluent, flexible, and tailored to the local social and cultural context.

Participation - who should be involved in participative processes? The key word is inclusiveness based on low entry barriers, with special attention to the “voiceless” groups, and preferably direct participation by target groups
and stakeholders, not only representatives of representative organizations (such as unions and associations).

**Approach** - what should be the underlying assumptions/mindset when designing and working with participative mechanisms?

An effective approach is centered on learning in a holistic way, through reflexivity, and aimed at co-creation from a generative perspective.

**Focus** - what is the appropriate starting point; and from what perspective?

In order to make co-creation happen, the focus must be on the ability and willingness of sharing, thus from the inside out.

**WHAT**

The “what” question is related to what should actually be taking place in participative processes. Three aspects can be considered.

**Instruments/mechanisms** - what instruments or mechanisms can be considered as appropriate and effective?

The applicable instruments and mechanisms are place based and context dependent, they must be variable and interactive, with a dialogic approach, and future oriented aimed at shared vision and identity development.

**Impact** - who will/should be impacted by participative governance?

The impact should be felt by both policymakers and decision makers, as well as citizens and civil society, requiring a well-balanced orientation on a variety of interests.

**Location of power** - where is the location of power in participative processes?

Although the formal decision-making power can remain with elected representatives, proposed decisions should result from a participative process. This implies a shift of focus from the moment of decision making to the collective preparation of such decisions, thus resulting in the empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy and an actual shift of power.
Table 2.1  Initial Framework for Governance for the Knowledge Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Citizen participation in policy development and knowledge-based decision making leading to (community/city) competitive development and conflict resolution, resulting in higher quality of life, with transparency and accountability</td>
<td>Transformation of paradigms and attitudes towards collective/shared responsibility and action, in the context of sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Time path</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Place-based collective wisdom, including implicit knowledge, data driven, co-creation, transparency and accountability</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Emergent, fluent, flexible, process orientation (not a project), tailored to social and cultural context</td>
<td>Inclusive, broad (also the “voiceless”), direct by target groups (not only representatives of representative organizations)</td>
<td>Learning approach, holistic, reflexivity, generative</td>
<td>Inside out (sharing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>Instruments / mechanisms</th>
<th>Impact on who</th>
<th>Location of power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Place based, variable and interactive, dialogic approach, shared vision/identity</td>
<td>Policymakers, decision makers, citizens and civil society (balancing interests)</td>
<td>Empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy, actual shift of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 CHALLENGING THEORY WITH PRACTICE

The question arises if this theoretical framework represents a set of aspects and concepts that are comparable to what can be learned from participative processes in practice. What would emerge from participative governance in practice that supports, changes, or adds to the initial theoretical framework? To challenge the theoretical framework, an action research process in Curaçao provides for a case study where one can discover what comes to the forefront when designing and practicing participative governance. Chapters 3 and 4 describe the developments in Curaçao with respect to government and governance, followed in Chapters 5 and 6 with a description and findings of the action research process. These findings are related back to the initial governance framework and translated into a dynamic model in the conclusions in Chapter 7.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and analyzes the governmental and organizational developments in Curaçao on the way to become an autonomous country in 2010. The aim is to discover and analyze the governance challenges that the autonomous constitutional status and the merger of two layers of government brought about. These developments have as of yet not yet been extensively documented.

The story of Curaçao is a fascinating one. Curaçao is a new country, which formalized its renewed constitutional position in 2010 more as a “city-state” than as a “nation-state” by the lack of certain responsibilities that are arranged at the kingdom level. As such, Curaçao had the unique opportunity to redesign not just its constitutional arrangements, but also its full governmental structure by merging the former central Government of the Netherlands Antilles with the island territory-level Government of Curaçao. Two totally different organizational practices and cultures were merged with the intent to make it “better than it ever was before” and fully in line with international standards towards governance, integrity, transparency, and accountability.

This chapter describes, analyses, and positions the development of Curaçao towards a knowledge society, in the historical and actual context of the constitutional changes that came into effect in 2010 with regard to the formal relationship within the Dutch Caribbean countries and islands and the Dutch Kingdom. This chapter specifically examines the dynamic political context in which Curaçao aims to fulfill and preserve the conditions of a modern democratic society, while also providing the local context to the global governance challenges that have been discussed in earlier chapters, in terms of challenges between governance structures in a democratic representational system and the requirements of the knowledge society.
3.1 PERSPECTIVES

Curaçao’s history and recent country status can be observed from many different viewpoints and analyzed along various criteria and from different positions. Being a former Dutch colony in the southern part of the very diverse and multicultural chain of islands referred to as the West Indies, and with a past as a logistical hub for the transcontinental slave trade and international merchandise trade, the history of Curaçao provides a rich palette of options to choose from historically, as well as politically and ideologically.

To this day, some traces of Curaçao’s history as a former Dutch colony remain physically while other are visible in the governance of the country. Its historic role in the transcontinental slave trade provides both grim tales of human abuse as a trade off for the wealth of the Netherlands during the “Golden Era,” as well as colorful assets that still remain in the form of a historic inner city with Amsterdam style canal houses (recognized by Unesco as World Heritage) and beautiful country mansions on former plantations. As for governance, Curaçao had been reigned over by the Dutch for centuries since its colonization in 1634, but the island—together with the five other Dutch islands in the Caribbean—gained an autonomous status as a country within the Dutch Kingdom with the signing of the Charter (Statuut) of the Dutch Kingdom in 1954. The newly formed country was named the Netherlands Antilles and consisted of Aruba, Curaçao, and Bonaire in the Southern Caribbean, located just off the coast of Venezuela, and Sint Maarten, Sint Eustatius, and Saba, located 900 kilometers to the north in the outermost northeastern part of the Caribbean rim.

The integration of six very diverse islands into one country in 1954 led to internal tensions from the onset. With the seat of national government and the national parliament on the biggest island, Curaçao, the reality of diversity between the islands in economic potential, size, and inhabitants (Saba had a mere 1,000 inhabitants, while Curaçao had a population of 150,000), and the very different social-cultural contexts on the islands, the role of Curaçao was always considered by the other islands as to be overly dominant. Although each island had a local parliament and executive council, and both electoral and constitutional arrangements prohibited Curaçao from effective majority rule in the national parliament, the feeling of covert and even overt inequality and dominance by Curaçao lingered on the other islands, leading to ongoing discussions about the need for new constitutional arrangements within the kingdom (Hirsch Ballin, 2009).

Aruba was the first to leave the Antillean constellation and became an autonomous country in 1985. A few years later in Curaçao, political parties announced their desire to move in that same direction, but were surprised by a mass rejection of the people when the first constitutional referendum, which was held in Curaçao in November
1993, turned out negative. The people rejected the favored option of almost all political parties for autonomy, and over 73% of the people voted to maintain the constellation of the Netherlands Antilles, with Curacao remaining co-responsible for the smaller islands. It was specifically acknowledged in this option, however, that the governance structure of the Netherlands Antilles needed a restructuring, aiming for more autonomous responsibilities for the islands and a less dominant position for the national government (located on Curacao). However, this process of a desired new governance of the five remaining islands failed to reach consensus after many rounds of discussions (Oostindie, 1997).

3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS 2005–2010

In April 2005 the tide had turned drastically, when a clear majority of 68% of the Curacao voters in a second constitutional referendum supported the option to cut constitutional ties with the other islands. The majority of the people wanted Curacao to follow Aruba’s example of obtaining a “Status Aparte” as an autonomous country within the Dutch Kingdom (Electoral Board, 2005). The results of this second referendum marked the start of difficult negotiations between Curacao and the Dutch governments and also intense debates between groups in civil society and political parties in Curacao, who to this day hold very different opinions about the actual contents of the “Status Aparte” option that had won the majority. In the negotiations, the Dutch Government aimed for a lighter version of Aruba’s autonomous status, with no full autonomy for Curacao, specifically towards the portfolios of finance and justice. But, the opposing civil society groups and political parties aimed for “at least” the Aruban constitutional arrangements, preferably with even more autonomy for Curacao in relation to the Kingdom.

The coalition, led by the political party PAR (Partido Antia Restrukturá), started negotiations with the Dutch Government. These negotiations soon moved in the direction of the lighter version, leaving Curacao with fewer autonomous tasks than it did in the Antillean constitutional constellation in exchange for a one time, substantial debt relief by the Dutch Government of 1.5 billion euros, with the aim to create a healthy starting position for Curacao as a country. This was reflected in the signing of the Final Declaration (Slotverklaring, 2006) of the constitutional deliberations in the kingdom on November 2, 2006.

The full picture of the constitutional negotiations within the kingdom was highly complex, because Sint Maarten had also expressed its desire for an autonomous status, and Bonaire and Saba in their respective referenda had opted for integration within the Netherlands, leaving only the tiny island of Sint Eustatius as a proclaimed supporter of
the Antillean constellation. The Dutch Government was negotiating within the difficult context of its two biggest islands, although very different in size and economic potential, wanting to become autonomous countries, like Aruba, with a “Status Aparte,” despite being considered by the Dutch Government as too small and vulnerable for full autonomy. And, for the three remaining small islands (Bonaire, Saba, and Sint Eustatius) no other option was on the table than to fully integrate into the Dutch governance system, although with a special status (openbaar lichaam), which provided for a different legal basis and standards for development of the communities than the Dutch municipalities on the European continent (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Kingdom Relations, 2010).

The initial result of the negotiations of the Dutch Government with Curaçao and the other islands was on the table in November 2006 (Slotverklaring, 2006), and although it was approved by the Dutch Parliament and the parliaments of the other islands, the Curaçao Government lost its political support in parliament, and the process subsequently was put on hold. It took almost two years, and a coalition change in Curaçao, before the next formal result of negotiations was on the table, coming from a Round Table Conference on December 15, 2008, which was set up to confirm the agreements reached in 2006. The signed declaration of that conference (Ronde Tafel Conferentie, 2008) confirmed that Curaçao and Sint Maarten would become autonomous countries within the Dutch Kingdom, and it marked the start of the implementation phase towards the new constitutional status.

The acceptance of the provisions of the new status had not been finalized, however, as the people of Curaçao had the rightful option to ratify or reject the results of the negotiations through a further referendum. The period leading up towards the referendum on May 15, 2009 was marked by fierce debates and campaigns for either a Yes or a No to the constitutional proposals. By a very narrow margin of 52 versus 48 percent, the initial provisions were ratified by voters, showing a clear divide in the Curaçao community (Electoral Board, 2009). The scheduled national (Antillean) parliamentary elections of January 10, 2010 were also dominated by this divide and showed the same narrow results with still a slight majority of the voters preferring the political parties that were in favor of the new constitutional arrangements and the debt relief package deal.

The delicate balance of 48/52 percent, however, turned into 52/48 percent, when voters went to the ballot box on August 27, 2010 to vote for the last local parliament, which would automatically become the first national Parliament of Curaçao after it had become a country at the set date of October 10, 2010 (10-10-10). The seemingly insignificant percentage change resulted in an almost detrimental shift in the constitutional process. The political parties that had negotiated the constitutional arrange-
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ment of debt relief in exchange for partial autonomy and supported the “Yes” option did not succeed to obtain a majority, and the constitutional restructuring process was hanging by a thread. Further pressure was added to the process because the time schedule for the final and formal steps towards an autonomous status was extremely tight. The Government of Curaçao, which had to be formed after the August 27th elections, needed to be in an airplane to the Netherlands on September 4th, only 8 days after the election, for the final rounds of talks with the Dutch Government and the other islands. The signing of a formal and final declaration to change the Charter of the Kingdom was scheduled only a few days after that, on September 9, 2010. The schedule was so tight because the political parties that supported the “Yes” option in favor of the constitutional reform had fully expected to win a majority in the August elections, but they had now been taken out of the game by the same narrow margin that had held them in power just years before.

The newly erected political party, MFK (Movementu Futuro Kòrsou), played a key role towards a solution. This party was launched only seven weeks before the elections and was the cause of the sudden shift in balance by astonishingly winning five out of a total of 21 seats in the Curaçao Parliament, representing 21% of the votes. MFK expressed criticism of the constitutional package deal, but was not fully against it, as the other former opposition parties had been. MFK formed a coalition with the political parties of the “No” option that rejected the results of the constitutional negotiations under the strict political deal that the autonomous status for Curaçao would continue, and the final steps would be taken so Curaçao would be an autonomous country within the kingdom by October 10, 2010. A political consensus was reached about this compromise with both the local coalition parties from the “No” camp, as well as with the Dutch Government based on an extra provision in the joint declaration of September 7, 2010, which stated that discussions with the Dutch Government about the functioning of the kingdom (in its new constitutional arrangements) would from now on take place on a yearly basis. This provided the parties that were against the negotiated constitutional results the hope that they had a platform to discuss their objections against the debt relief for partial autonomy package deal.

Now, seven years into the autonomous status, it is clear that the debates over the “package deal” of debt relief in exchange for less autonomy for Curaçao as a country have caused an enormous divide, which to this day cuts deep trenches into the Curaçao community, with groups strongly proclaiming their positions. The debates even stimulated the strong growth of a political party, Pueblo Soberano, which aims at full independence of Curaçao. This is somewhat surprising, given the fact that in the referendum of 2005 the option for full independence did not even receive 5% of the votes. The debate over autonomy, as a step towards independence, versus a sustained
relation and cooperation within the Dutch kingdom, to this day effectively splits the Curaçao community, with one side in favor of more (or at least sustained) involvement from the Dutch Government, and the other side in favor of as little involvement as possible as a way to finalize the process of decolonization (Marijnissen, 2017).

3.3 ISSUES AND CHALLENGES IN GOVERNANCE

The political turmoil surrounding the constitutional reform severely influenced the development process of a new government apparatus for Curaçao, bringing delays in deadlines and shifts in focus of political executives several times (Kristensen, 2012, p. 85). This section first provides a description of issues and challenges surrounding the process that was designed to lead to a new governmental organization for Curaçao. This is followed by an expert analysis of several people who acted as civil servants or consultants during the transition period. Also provided is my personal analysis and viewpoint as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, followed by views from four people with a variety of backgrounds in the Curaçao community.

During the era of the Antillean constellation, Curaçao effectively had two layers of government: one operating on the national Antillean level providing public services to all Antillean islands and one functioning on the island territory level. As of 2005 discussions started on whether the island level should merge into the national level, or vice versa. As Mollen (2012, p. 18) explains, the choice was made for a third option, namely to create a whole new governance system for the new country, which would be better than both levels were before, with specific attention for client services, policy development, modern human resources management, and accountability, all referring to modern state management principles and practices. Mollen (2012, p. 20) rhetorically poses the question of whether this desire was too ambitious from the beginning, thus hampering instead of enabling its realization.

The basis for the new and better governance for Curaçao was documented in a so-called foundation document (Fundamentennota “Design to Change”), which was approved by the island territory in February 2008 (Curaçao, 2008). It was formulated based on a series of internal discussion sessions with civil servants, experts, and consultants, and it reflected the ambitious goal of creating a government better than it ever was before. The “Design to Change” document was the first in a three-step process to develop the new governance for Curaçao, which needed to be ready and implemented by October 10, 2010, the set “birth date” of the new nation.

The first step, “Design to Change” (Curaçao, 2008), documented the goal of a whole new design for the government apparatus for the “country-to-be” based on interna-
tional criteria. The document discussed international trends in public governance and the quality of governance with which Curaçao aimed to comply. The foundation document mentioned criteria such as “democracy (responsiveness and participation), legality (lawfulness and good governance), effectiveness and efficiency (attainment of goals and management of resources), and integrity (being incorruptible and ethically responsible)” (Curaçao, 2008, p. 12).

The challenge, however, was to translate such abstract criteria into a specific organizational design in the short term, and also to create a plan to implement the new design and actually bring it into practice in time for the transition date of 10-10-10. An approach was chosen to work with a model for the measurement of administrative effectiveness in which the new government would have six roles to fulfill. These roles are defined in the foundation document as follows (“Design to Change,” 2008, p.5):

- **The Curaçao Government as a service provider:** The government as a service provider serves individuals and businesses consistently in an effective and efficient manner and without preference.

- **The Curaçao Government as regulator and enforcer:** The Curaçao government will be based on clear, consistent, programmatic and integrated policy frameworks and will consistently take care of monitoring and imply penalties for violations, so that the laws and regulations are complied with, a healthy environment for the population is established and the integrity of the public administration is not compromised.

- **The Curaçao Government as an employer:** The government of Curaçao strives to offer work packages and benefit levels at every level of efficacy that can compete with similar work in similar sectors of society. In addition, government will excel especially in an attractive package of development opportunities for employees to enhance their knowledge and skills to implement the core tasks of the government of Curaçao.
The Curaçao Government as administrative partner: Government of Curaçao chooses to use and create private initiatives and sustainable partnerships (within the kingdom) and make optimal use of such partnerships in achieving the objectives in the field of social, economic and community development.

The Curaçao Government as democracy: The government of Curaçao chooses to use a variety of instruments to approach individuals and groups on an equal footing and to have them participate in creating public opinion and thus influence the public decision-making processes.

The Curaçao Government as a developer and creator of policy: The government of Curaçao chooses to formulate its policy in a sustainable, integrated and coherent manner.

The definition of these roles made the goals of the new public administration more tangible, but still did not provide a sufficient context for a specific organizational design. In order to create a basis for the specific and detailed organizational design, 21 fundamental principles were derived from the six roles, dealing with organizational aspects such as the desired structure, control, leadership and management, human

Figure 3.2 Twenty-one fundamental principles for the design of the Government of Curaçao.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP &amp; MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>HUMAN POTENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>separation between policy and implementation</td>
<td>Ministers control by policy</td>
<td>Clear roles, responsibilities and authorities for managers at all levels</td>
<td>Progressive HR policies with associated tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated policy areas</td>
<td>1 principal accountable civil servant in each ministry</td>
<td>Required leadership characteristics and competencies defined in leadership and competence profiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat organization</td>
<td>General managers in positions of final responsibility</td>
<td>Completion of all, especially key positions, based on objective and transparent recruitment and performance management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform structure</td>
<td>Top management accountable for results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-level managers have delegated power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

potential, continuous improvement, long term vision, resources, and processes. These principles are reflected in Figure 3.2.

Some of the six identified roles for government that were introduced in the “Design to Change” document suggest the need for a network organization that interacts and creates partnerships with the public and private community and stakeholders, thus focusing on “governance.” But, during the creative distillation process from six roles to 21 fundamental principles (as described in Figure 3.2), some of the roles have not been transferred into these principles. The 21 principles are fully focused on the internal organization of the new governmental body—thus focused on “government”—but do not specifically deal with the interaction and participation aspects with the community that are described in three of the six roles, specifically the roles for government as administrative partner, as democracy, and as a developer and creator of policies, which roles cover a broader governance spectrum.

Other aspects of the governance structure for the new country were dealt with in the constitution for the new country. These structures were partly copied from the Antillean constellation. The trias política was provided for through the Curaçao Parliament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>LONG TERM VISION</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continuous evaluation of the planning and control cycle</td>
<td>• Guiding framework with long-term needs present and continuous review of the implementation</td>
<td>• Adequate mechanism in place for determining present administrative priorities</td>
<td>• The structure of the organization and processes is simple and transparent for customers and employees in various divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement structurally embedded in the organization through periodic measurements and embedded in performance management</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic support tasks centralized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative support tasks bundled into shared service organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective administrative housing policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(21 representatives) as the legislative branch, the Government (consisting of the Council of Ministers and the Governor) as the executive branch, and the Court of Justice as the judiciary branch. The existing formal advisory councils remained intact through a Social-Economic Council (SER), an Advisory Council (Raad van Advies), a General Auditing Office (Algemene Rekenkamer), and an Ombudsman. No other new structure, council, or instrument was designed in the periphery of the government that might have provided for the execution of the participative and interactive roles as described in “Design to Change.”

The second milestone in the process was the NBO Nota (New Governmental Organization Document), which translated the 21 principles into policy areas and criteria for a partition into nine ministries. This document also describes uniform structures, functions, and procedures for the ministries, and includes the delegation of administrative powers from the executive to the administrative top level. The NBO Nota thus provided the framework for not only the official administrative organization in which the design of the basic ministries, but also for inspection services and policy implementation organizations mapped all the way down to department level. It was planned to finalize this detailed mapping exercise within a few months, but due to internal discussions it took until July 2009 (Mollen, 2012, p. 22).

This left little time for step 3, the last step (the preparation of business plans for each of the ministries), in which the core tasks, products, and services for each of the ministries, and the re-allocation of about 4000 government employees from the central and island territory level into functions in the new ministries, needed to be worked out in great detail. The scarce time was not used efficiently. After a consuming and complex process of public offerings, it was not until January 2010, with only nine months to go before the start of operations of the new ministries, that the actual process of developing the business plans began (Mollen, 2012, p. 23). Several consultancy firms were involved, operating under the guidance of an administrative committee, to ensure a uniform design of the structure of the ministries with key tasks, products and services, work procedures, and allocation of personnel. The business plans were finished in April 2010 but were not approved until July 2010. Only then did the implementation receive a push forward (Mollen, 2012, p. 28), leaving effectively three months for most aspects of the implementation. The implementation included formal placement of the approximately 4000 civil servants in their new functions and the recruitment of the 37 top managers of the nine ministries. It also included a mass re-housing and moving plan to physically locate the ministries in a coherent manner in the available government offices, which were spread out over dozens of buildings around the island. The implementation also included administrative and legal transition and integration processes.
The implementation was not finished, and not even duly prepared in all aspects, when the elections of August 27, 2010 brought a sudden change in political power. The former opposition parties, which had newly come into power, had not been included in the transition and implementation plans by the former government; they were hardly informed about the complex processes it entailed and thus distrusted what was on the table (Kristensen, 2012, p. 89). After the final declarations had been signed on September 9, 2010 in the Netherlands (Slot-Ronde Tafel Conferentie, 2010), the transition was very cautiously continued under new and uninformed political leadership, which slowed the process while the “birth date” of October 10, 2010 was clearly in sight. The newly elected government had to deal with a very steep learning curve and operate amid waves of uncertainty, such as the 25% of civil servants who had filed formal complaints about their re-allocation into a new function. The recruitment of the new top managers of the ministries was not yet finished either, so there was no administrative leadership in place for the implementation of the business plans and to lead the ministries after 10-10-10. The new government decided to appoint three implementation managers per ministry to fill the temporary voids in administrative leadership and create space to finish the recruitment process. The implementation managers were appointed for a period of six months. They had not been involved in the transition and implementation process that had started several years before, and had very diverse backgrounds. The implementation managers were confronted with business plans, which reflected the desired future situation of the administrative organization, but there was no implementation plan for how to transition from the old situation into the new one. Several aspects further contributed to the uncertain situation, such as the re-allocation process for the civil servants, which was far from over and was hampered by complaints; the unfinished plan for regrouping the government buildings to create coherent office space for the nine ministries; and various other yet unready process steps towards giving the new government apparatus its shape and form.

Thus, it happened that after the historical and very festive day of the 10th of October, 2010 had passed, and the first working day of the new country started, most civil servants found themselves at the same workplace they had been previously, mostly doing the same work, and asking themselves ‘what is going to change and when?’ It was clear that more time was needed to actually re-create the ministries and bring them into full operational status. To facilitate this transition, the government decided that a six-month implementation period was needed to make the business plans operational, and it also instituted a transition team to guide the implementation managers in a uniform way towards the creation of the new ministries. In July 2011, the government closed the transition period and the ministries were formally operational and put under administrative leadership of management teams, which in the meantime had been recruited, although in practice not all transition processes were finalized, and some
legal and administrative integration processes have to this day not been finalized. The full process of the preparation, transition, and implementation is shown in Figure 3.3 (in Dutch).

The Fundamenten nota “Design to Change” in 2008 discussed the desire to create a government apparatus that would be compliant with the highest international criteria and modern governance standards. But, along the way from six roles and 21 principles towards the organizational design as reflected in the nine business plans, some “governance” aspects seem to have gotten lost. The design process ultimately resulted in a fairly traditional bureaucratic government body consisting of nine ministries, of which three with more or less general or supporting functions, and six with specific policy areas:

- Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations
- Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Service
- Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports
- Ministry of Health, Environment and Nature
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Social Development, Labor, and Well-being
- Ministry of Economic Development
- Ministry of Traffic, Transport and Urban Planning

Each ministry is under the administrative leadership of a management team consisting of the secretary-general, the sector-directors, and the policy-director. They report to their minister who is responsible in the Council of Ministers and held accountable in parliament for the functioning of his or her ministry and the formulation and execution of policies in the specific policy fields of the ministry. Very few cross-ministerial connections and interactive processes or structures with the community had been incorporated in the business plans. The only four structural inter-ministerial processes that can be identified are:

- On the top level the secretary-generals meet each other in the Council of Secretary-generals—a platform, which, as formulated by law, meets at least every two months—to discuss inter-ministerial operational issues and policies at a high level.
- The policy departments can propose government to create inter-ministerial task forces for overlapping or interdependent policy areas.
- In the Ministry of General Affairs a policy coordination unit is created to support the prime minister—in his position as president of the Council of Ministers—in monitoring a coherent execution of the government program, but with no formal authority over the policy directors of the various ministries.
Figure 3.3 The full process of the preparation, transition, and implementation (in Dutch)

**Voortraject 2005-2009: mijlpalen**

- ‘Slotverklaring’ ondertekend
- Coalitie opnieuw gewijzigd; ‘Slotverklaring’ geratificeerd
- ‘NBO proces’ opgestart; globaal organisatie ontwerp voor nieuwe overheid
- ‘Fundamenten nota’ Einddatum NBO nota
- ‘Iedereen een baan’ NBO nota klaar
- Verkiezing Eilandsraad en eerste Parlement Pais Korsou
- Nieuw Bestuurscollege
- Wijzigingen Statuut PAIS KORSOU

2010: voorbereidingen; mijlpalen

- Traject business plannen gestart
- Werving & selectie top kader gestart
- Ministerieel transitie teams samengesteld; Sociaal Statuut getekend
- Eerste plaatsings brieven verstuurd
- Nieuw Bestuurscollege
- Wijzigingen Statuut PAIS KORSOU

2010-2011: transitietraject: mijlpalen

- Aanstelling implementatie managers in 9 ministeries
- Eerste regering PAIS KORSOU
- Ondersteunings Bureau Transitie
- Benoeming Topkaderleden
- MT in 9 ministeries geïnstalleerd
- Transitie periode afgerond

Source: “Een nieuw land Curaçao ... En alles wat daarbij komt kijken” (Kristensen & Huisden, Eds., 2012)
• The Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Service has a department called Masterplanning, whose purpose has been unclear and under discussion from the very start.

The design is not conducive to stimulate cooperation between ministries, and does not reflect the integrative and holistic approach that was discussed in “Design to Change” (Curaçao, 2009). The final design seems to have narrowed down the organizational approach to “government” instead of focusing on “governance.”

3.4 MULTIPLE VIEWPOINTS

The following sections provide multiple viewpoints about the development of the Curaçao Government since 2010. The viewpoints include an expert analysis of individuals involved in the transition, a civil servant view from my experience as a senior civil servant in public office since 2010, and also a views of four individuals with different professional backgrounds from within the Curaçao community. This allows for a variety of viewpoints to work towards the conclusions about the Curaçao governance since 2010 in the closing section of the chapter.

3.4.1 Expert analysis

Hardly any analyses of the Curaçao transition case in governance have been put in writing since October 10, 2010. One of the very few, which was actually published in 2012, is “Een nieuw land Curaçao ...... En alles wat daarbij komt kijken” (Kristensen and Huisden, Eds., 2012), in which several civil servants and consultants who were involved in the process give their views on and personal analyses of “the making of” the new country Curaçao.

In the general conclusions summarizing the various personal observations in the book, it is mentioned that the rush towards the transition date 10-10-10 was one of the key factors that had a negative impact on the process, even to a great extent. The process to put the basic governance structure on paper in the “Design for Change” (Curaçao, 2008) and NBO Nota (Curaçao, 2009) was quite extensive, while the production time for the business plans (January–April 2010) and the implementation phase that followed of just a few months, were way too short. The attention of all involved, including the politicians who had to approve steps along the way, also deviated several times due to the strong focus on the complex and highly dynamic political process, instead of on the organizational and administrative implications of becoming an autonomous nation (Kristensen en Huisden, Eds., 2012, p. 99).
An important conclusion is also that “the team of civil servants and consultants that designed the new governmental organization was not the same team of civil servants and consultants that designed the business plans” (Kristensen en Huisden, Eds., 2012, p. 101). In his observations, Eustatius (2012, p. 46) notes that along the way, different interpretations were given of the new governmental organization in several aspects. Jussen (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 58) also mentions different viewpoints and difficult cooperation between the consultants and the civil servants involved in the business plans. This might explain the obvious mismatch between the holistic governance approach as reflected in the six roles and 21 principles with a networked “outside-in” view in the “Design to Change” document (Curaçao, 2008), and the final result of the organizational design in the business plans, which reflects a more inward looking and bureaucratically segmented government design approach. This aspect of different teams (and thus varying “intellectual ownership” during the process) combined with the increasing rush in 2009 and 2010, and the focus on the political process (which deviated attention from the organizational process) contribute to a possible explanation for the mismatch between the ambitious intentions in the design and the eventual results. A significant lack of communication on the new governmental organization is also mentioned by several experts as an important critical aspect that was insufficiently taken into account.

Two different authors of the book “Een nieuw land Curaçao ... en alles wat daarbij komt kijken” (Kristensen and Huisden, Eds., 2012) refer to the race against the clock, but in very different contexts and perceptions. While Jansen (Jansen, 2012, p. 12) concludes that the race against the clock was eventually won because the business plans were ready by the set deadline, Kristensen and Huisden (2012, p. 99) discuss the difference between “clock time”—referring to the set deadlines—and “experienced time”—referring to the period of time that people need for reflection in order to accept and be willing to adjust to new circumstances or situations. Kristensen and Huisden conclude that there was “too little feeling for the perceived time, to consider what was, or was not, possible at several moments” (Kristensen and Huisden, Eds., 2012, p.100).

Palm (Jussen and Palm, 2012) observes confusion, especially towards the policy approach in the business plans. He feels dissatisfied because of the loss of opportunity to introduce real breakthroughs in the traditional political patronage in policymaking and the lack of fundamentally new approaches based on collaborative governance. He mentions the need for Curaçao to become more democratic and “this requires from civil experts that they start positioning themselves in the field of tension of interactive policy making, where on the one hand politics need to be served, and on the other hand stakeholders” (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 56). He poses the question of
how in the case of Curaçao the organizational and policy procedures will support civil servants in their “in-between” position when aiming for interactive policy development in the context of the knowledge democracy (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 56). Participation of stakeholders and civil society is essential for Curaçao’s democracy, and a clear desire in that direction has been identified, according to Palm. He notes that although the new governmental organization does offer space for the desired dialogue and interaction with the community, until now the orientation in policy processes has been focused internally and not from the “outside in” (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 59).

Kristensen (2012) presents his analysis in an international context of critical success factors for government change processes, and concludes that in the case of Curaçao, many critical success factors have been met. However, Kristensen also makes critical remarks about the possible friction between the fundamental ideas behind the new governmental organization and some of the cultural aspects of Curaçao and its governance, referring among others to the culture of fear and aspects of little trust in the community. This may prevent Curaçao from using the opportunities that have been created for internal cooperation in teams, inter-ministerial policy development, operational responsibilities at the top administrative level instead of on the political level, and the separation between policy and execution. In the case of these four opportunities, the existing culture is not aligned with the options that the new organization offers, which may prove to be a major pitfall if not adequately recognized and addressed (Kristensen, 2012, p. 95-98).

3.4.2 Public servant analysis

This section is written from the civil servant perspective with a participative inside view, as my personal involvement in public service started in late August 2010, when I assisted the prospective new prime minister in the formation of the first cabinet for Curaçao. The results of the elections had provided a sudden shift in the tight balance between pro and contra forces in the package deal of less autonomy in exchange for debt relief; and sent a shockwave through the community; 52% experienced a positive shock, and 48% of the voter population was in utter disbelief. After the election on August 27, 2010, there were eight days to form a cabinet under very polarizing political circumstances, before a decisive trip to the Netherlands was planned to sign the new constitutional arrangements into effect. Assisting the prospective prime minister consisted of participating and providing support during talks and negotiations with potential coalition parties and also broad discussions with civil society, advisory organizations, and other formal institutions about the policy directions for the new country after October 10, 2010.
After the new country was officially established, I accepted a temporary position as interim secretary-general in the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations to implement the business plan and make the new ministry operational within six months. It was supposed to be an interim job, much like other temporary managerial positions I had previously occupied as a business consultant, but within short I felt highly motivated professionally by the enormous tasks at hand for the new government organization. I decided to apply for the function of secretary-general at the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations when recruitment for permanent positions started in February 2011, and I was selected as the best suitable candidate after the assessments by the recruitment bureau. I was formally appointed in June 2011 as secretary-general at the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, a position I hold to this day.

The weeks between the election results on August 27, 2010, and the formalization of the new status on October 10, 2010 were extremely hectic and dominated by many decisions made on short notice and with little information to rely on. The surprising electoral results meant that the former government had not prepared any transition of power and was not willing to provide information either, given the politically polarized situation. The situation was so polarized that the political leadership of the new government mostly distrusted information that was available on the administrative level. To a great extent, Curaçao’s political and societal culture reflects a lack of trust (Transparency International, 2013, p. 237). So, since the former opposition parties had not been informed nor been involved in the transition plans, they considered most plans as politically oriented or motivated. There was not much to start with; in some cases not even desks were available in the government offices that had been left behind.

In the first weeks when I was interim secretary-general at the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, committees were formed with members of the coalition parties, some of whom were also implementation managers in one of the ministries, to draw up a concept government agreement to outline the policy priorities for the new government. Another focal point was on operationalizing the ministry according to the business plan. It soon became apparent that each ministry was heading its own way with its own implementation team, and the new governmental organization threatened to become incoherent and inconsistent with the business plans. To align the implementation, the government decided in November 2010 to appoint a program manager for the transition period, assisted by a transition support team, to finalize the implementation period in a coherent way and make the ministries operational and with the critical aspects in place (Da Costa Gomez and Kristensen, 2012, p. 72).
The implementation phase ended with most organizational elements in place and most of the new administrative management appointed. Although not all leadership positions on the top administrative level were permanently filled, some were appointed on an interim basis, and some simply remained open. Many challenges in the operations of the ministries still persisted, and the appointed top-level administrative leaders had to finalize what remained for the ministries to become fully operational, and also to start policy development and execution. To date, not all aspects of the new governmental organization operate the way they are supposed to, and some adaptations to the business plans have already taken place. The challenges remain on aspects such as qualitative and quantitative human resources, administrative procedures that are still not congruent, and many inefficiencies that continue to influence the bottom line of the government budget. Policy development has not yet picked up speed in many areas.

Several factors have great influenced the stagnant development of the governmental organization in the period since 2010. Political instability is one of the main influences. A chronological view of the dynamics of politics in Curaçao shows that between October 2010 and September 2012 some ministries saw changes in political leadership several times. Especially the Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Service (which functions as the backbone for the whole governmental organization with many support functions for other ministries), as well as the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports, changed ministers every few months because of conflicts between the minister and the political leadership of the party to which the minister belonged. With organizational structures and policies not yet fully in place, each new minister pointed the ministry and the policies in a new direction, and they often replaced the administrative leadership, causing huge uncertainties and lack of direction and consistency. In August 2012 the coalition lost its majority support in Parliament due to internal quarrels in several political parties of the coalition, and the government called for new elections to take place on October 19, 2012. Three weeks before the elections, the Governor of Curaçao decided, based on a motion adopted by a majority of the members of parliament, to replace the outgoing cabinet—which already operated under a “caretaker status”—with an interim cabinet that served three months until at the end of December 2012 a new coalition was formalized, based on the results of the October 19, 2012, elections. The new coalition opted to install a so-called “task cabinet” consisting of non-political ministers for a period of six months to take care of a specific set of austerity measures needed to balance the budget. After three months, however, the “task cabinet” resigned to make room for a new political cabinet. Due to necessary procedural arrangements, it took until June 7, 2013 before the political cabinet was formally installed, being the fourth cabinet since Curaçao became a country in October 2010. The prime minister of that cabinet resigned at the end of
August 2015, due to conflicting views with his political party. The party then appointed a new prime minister, the fifth since 2010.

In November 2015 the coalition lost its majority after a member of parliament crossed the floor and became independent. The political crisis was solved without calling elections, because an opposition party with two seats in parliament declared its willingness to join the coalition.

A matter that has greatly influenced the political and administrative dynamics since 2013 is the brutal killing of one of the leading political figures on Curaçao, the leader of Pueblo Soberano, Helmin Wiels, who was also the leader of the coalition that was formed in December 2012. His assassination on May 5, 2013 left his party in disarray and the country in shock, because never before in its history had the island been confronted with the violent death of a leading political figure. The motivation for his murder is still unknown and under investigation. Pueblo Soberano—a party with a socialist signature that aims for full independence for Curaçao—still leads the coalition, but has been confronted with internal quarrels ever since the elections of October 2012, mainly because of the sudden change in political direction its leader made by forming a coalition with the current coalition partners, who are more centralist and capitalist oriented, and who support ongoing cooperation within the Dutch Kingdom. Many prominent Pueblo Soberano members publicly denounced this move and withdrew their support. On top of that, since the death of Helmin Wiels, the party has been confronted with an internal power struggle and discussions concerning the essence of his legacy, leading to even more internal divisiveness and frequent changes in minister positions, including, as mentioned, the position of prime minister in the cabinet under the leadership of Pueblo Soberano.

Besides the challenges that these influences brought on the organizational level of making the structures and people actually work according to design and ambition, challenges were also visible on the policy level. Each cabinet since 2010 has chosen different approaches and directions. The first cabinet worked based on a government program (Government Program 2010–2014) with detailed policy plans for each of the ministries centered around four strategic goals. In the second cabinet, the focus was mainly on the priorities regarding austerity measures and not on a variety of other policy areas. The third and fourth cabinets started out with a broadly formulated coalition agreement as a policy guideline for the year 2013. This political agreement was worked out in more detail into a government program, which was published in December 2013 and links the policy activities to five strategic goals. Palm (Jussen and Palm, 2012) expressed his hope that the new governmental organization will lead towards more democratic policies, and he holds the opinion that the new
governmental organization provides space for this (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 59). He is right, but only to a certain extent. Although the organizational design provides space for—or better yet, does not actually prohibit—interministerial cooperation and participative policy development, there are no specific structures, instruments, or processes in place to provide for or stimulate it. With respect to these aspects, the actual organization differs from the intentions in its design. The “space” provided consists of the application of the policy development cycle with one of the steps involving research into the policy context. In theory this provides the option for interactive policy development or policy dialogues with stakeholders, but only if this is consciously sought after, because it is not prescribed or specifically facilitated, nor is it customary according to current policy practices in Curaçao. Palm (Jussen and Palm, 2012, p. 56) also fears that especially the overwhelming pressure and influence of ministers on their ministries on the operational level will remain. The mingling of ministers in operational aspects, especially towards personnel matters, is something that was specifically addressed in the design plans for the new organization, and was meant to be eliminated by delegating operational responsibilities to the top administrative level, leaving the responsibility for policy to the political leadership. Although by law there is a clear separation in responsibilities, and the top administrative management is by that same law accountable for all operational aspects, there is nothing that really prohibits a minister from mingling in operational affairs. Depending on the personal view and the executive experience of each minister, they may decide to keep their distance from operations, but most ministers in the various cabinets since 2010 have not been able to resist being intimately involved with daily operations instead of focusing on policy and political matters.

In the final design of the new governmental organization, the chosen path was to work towards integrated policy development in phases. Taking a big step towards creating one central policy development department for all policy fields was deemed “too radical” (Mollen, 2012, p. 24). Instead, the option was chosen for policy departments per ministry, each headed by a policy director. Also introduced were two small departments that would focus on integral aspects: the Department of Policy Coordination in the Ministry of General Affairs—with the task of coordinating the coherent and timely execution of the government program—and the Department of Masterplanning in the Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Service. In my opinion the choice for separated policy departments has reinforced the existing habit of working isolated within ministries, while most challenges in the Curaçao community require an integral approach, such as addressing the 37.2% youth unemployment (CBS, 2013), the stagnant economy (CBCS, 2013), and the continued budgetary challenges (CFT, 2013). The Department of Policy Coordination has no formal authority over the policy depart-
ments of other ministries, and thus can only advise and guide, or—if needed as an last resort—use the power of the prime minister under whose direct guidance it operates. The Department of Masterplanning has not really been effective since 2010. This new department was seeking its direction, but had to do so under changing administrative and political leadership every few months. Also, the Department of Masterplanning was not considered a top priority among the many crucial support functions the Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Services has to offer to other ministries and the community, such as human resources, shared services organization, public services, and IT.

In addition to the Departments of Policy Coordination and Masterplanning, another option was created, but has been hardly used, in the new governmental organization: task forces for inter-ministerial policy areas. To this date no task force has actively worked on inter-ministerial policies. The last option is the Council of Secretary-Generals, which I elaborate on hereafter.

In the six years as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, I have experienced mixed feelings about the new governmental organization. These feelings vary from appreciation of what has been coherently put in place in the business plans by various consultants in a relatively short time, to professional disgust—and sometimes even anger—about how easily some mistakes seem to have been made and opportunities lost, based on assumptions or rigid ambitions, by obviously neglecting well-known cultural aspects of the governmental organization, as well as turning a blind eye to the dynamics of an immense transition project such as this. In my position as head of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, I preside over the Council of Secretary-generals, a platform to discuss high-level inter-ministerial operational and policy affairs. According to the law concerning the new governmental organization, this platform is supposed to meet at least every two months. In practice the council meets much more often—scheduled meetings take place every two weeks or more often as needed—which reflects the desire in the top administrative level to work through an integral approach and cooperate between ministries. That desire, however, manifests itself in a field of tension on two sides; from the top, the political leadership focuses on his or her ministerial responsibility, and from within the ministries, the secretary-generals deal with traditionally inward looking departments that cling to protecting their turf whenever they feel outsiders approach. Even for the secretary-generals it took time to become accustomed to the high-level inter-ministerial platform that the council represents and where experiences and insights can be shared. Since 2011, when the administrative top was appointed, there have been so many operational challenges and aspects requiring the attention of all ministries that the council slowly developed into a logical platform to address the overall operations of government.
When the council concluded that although the business plans had been made operational, much more efficiency was needed on many cost aspects as well as personnel aspects, the decision was made to organize a first high-level workshop in September 2012. In this workshop involving the management teams of all ministries, the administrative top took its legal responsibility to proactively produce proposals to increase operational effectiveness and decrease costs. This effort was halted because the cabinet fell. The efforts were resumed and intensified under the following two interim cabinets, expanding to all operational and policy aspects in the context of the dire need to reach a balanced budget.

Despite these efforts, it bothers me that to this day very few people involved in government have recognized one of the greatest assets resulting from Curaçao’s acquired position as an autonomous country: there is only one layer of government, one organization that can plan and execute policies on all areas of interest. There is one organization that—of course respecting the *trias politica*—in essence can plan, budget, legalize, and execute every policy topic it can think of. The Government does not have to depend on any other regional or municipal entity. Curaçao with its 444 square kilometers is so small that it is a nation and a city-state at the same time—a unique position it shares with Singapore and some other small islands, such as its sister islands, Aruba and Sint Maarten. The Curaçao Government runs all local, national, and international aspects of its community of 160,000 men, women, and children. Especially in the area of policy development, this provides powerful opportunities to give Curaçao a competitive edge in the region and deal with many of the “glocal” challenges in its community.

There have been efforts over the last three years to use the “space” for such an integral and participative approach, thus aiming for “governance” instead of just “government”. It is clear, however, that in practice the actual “space” fully depends on the policy priorities of the coalition in power and the room that is given for execution on the administrative level.

The first cabinet (from October 10, 2010 to September 18, 2012) used the provided space in several ways. The government designed an integral plan to deal with the many problematic situations in Curaçao’s neighborhoods. Over half of the neighborhoods have social-economic indicators below the acceptable standard. The “Plan Nashonal pa Desaroyá Bario” (National Neighborhood Development Plan) was an interactive policy approach in which inhabitants were empowered to define and prioritize problems in their neighborhood and design solutions, together with government, civil society, and other stakeholders. After the first 20 neighborhood plans were finished and the design and implementation of the solutions was in preparation, the cabinet fell and “Plan Nashonal” was halted by the next governments. Extensive studies were also initiated to prepare long-term strategies for sustainable economic development,
including the future of the Curaçao oil refinery. The main report—presented in 2012—provided a coherent set of short, mid, and long-term policies for an integral approach to sustainable development of various economic sectors on the island and the requirements to make the implementation viable. Interactive processes on specific policy subjects took place mostly after conflicts with stakeholders, such as the revision of the health care system and the introduction of new reward systems for medical practitioners. Such processes were discussed extensively with the stakeholders involved, and in some cases this created space for solutions that would avoid further conflict and solutions that could count on support of those involved.

The second cabinet (from September 19, 2012 to December 31, 2012) tried a specific interactive approach to gain short-term support for the impacting austerity measures at hand, but did not succeed. The government supported the initiative from social partners for the National Dialogue with representatives of labor unions and private sector organizations, aimed specifically at the planned austerity measures. This process was not completed due to, among other reasons, the short time span of this first interim cabinet. Also, because the labor unions and private sector organizations had put up specific demands that would prohibit an actual dialogue from taking place, it reflected more of an negotiation approach.

The third cabinet (from January 1, 2013 to June 6, 2013) was a “task cabinet” with no initiatives for participation or integral policy development. The cabinet resigned after two and a half months, but had to remain in office while the formalization of the appointment of the next cabinet took a few months to complete.

The fourth cabinet (from June 7, 2013 to August 30, 2015) had several initiatives, but they were not aligned and sometimes even contradicted or seemed to compete with one another. The government announced a new National Dialogue to begin in January 2014, although only involving social partners (representatives of labor unions and representatives of private sector organizations) and not the broader civil society. The direction and approach to this dialogue was based on ILO principles for social dialogue. The protocol mentions a broad range of topics that those involved wanted to see addressed: industrial policy, mobility on the labor market, labor laws and laws for social security, labor related topics concerning labor security, inspection services, promoting awareness among workers of mobility, National Development Plan, effective government, and enhancing security in the community.

Another program that is being implemented in this cabinet is a UNDP project for capacity building in Curaçao, which actually was signed under the first cabinet after 2010, but was confronted with a number of operational delays. One of the deliver-
ables is capacity building for a National Development Plan by applying the methodology of democratic dialogue. The prime minister has requested the Council of Secretary-generals to work towards integrated operational affairs and also integrated policy development. The council has taken this as an opportunity to align many effectiveness and efficiency projects that were taking place, and combine these with the project for renewal of the ICT infrastructure, and with the functional design of a new central government building which is planned for construction. These projects were not aligned or connected, but when these projects are combined with the dynamic HR developments of a new influx of more than 500 employees in a period of five years, and these processes are looked at through an organizational development lens, the picture of a full transformation becomes clear. The Council of Secretary-generals recognizes this as a unique opportunity to fix what went wrong right before and after 2010, and construct the new governmental organization for the future that can deal with the dynamic challenges the community faces. The pilot process for an integral way of working is focused on the area of youth development: a process for a participative and integral approach that functions as a prototype for a new way of working for the government.

3.4.3 Different strokes for different folks
This section provides an additional mosaic of views and perspectives from various stakeholders in the Curaçao society regarding the process of nation building of Curaçao since 2010 and its overall effectiveness. Clearly, no single opinion on what the country needed to achieve and how and by when existed or was intended in the planning towards 2010. All energy and political dynamics between 2005 and 2010 were exclusively centered on the divide in the community over the constitutional status within the kingdom and the negotiations with the Dutch Government over debt relief. There was hardly any attention for what kind of country Curaçao could or should become after the highly anticipated date of 10-10-10.

To provide broader views in addition to the expert analysis and my personal view from the civil servant perspective, four qualitative interviews have been conducted with leading representatives of the Curaçao society (Mr. Ron Gomes Casseres, Dr. George Curiel, Mr. Henry van der Kwast, Mr. Ronald Ignacio). They have been selected based on their diverse backgrounds in the private sector, labor unions, advisory organizations, and consultancy. Each person responded to the same five questions. Three respondents were interviewed and their interviews have been recorded and transcribed. The fourth respondent (Mr. Gomes Casseres) contributed in writing to the five questions. The interviews have been summarized as reflected in the following sections. Table 3.1 provides a schematic overview of the responses to the questions.
Interview questions from qualitative interviews on Curaçao governance since 2010

- The aim in the design of the new Curaçao Government in 2008 (Fundamenten Nota “Design to Change”) was to recreate the new government apparatus in 2010 as a networked organization that had six roles to fulfill and was meant to work in interactive cooperation with the community and stakeholders. Do you consider such a network approach to government important for Curaçao, and if so, why?

- Do you think that the government succeeded in recreating a new government structure that is modernized and functions as an interactive partner with the community and stakeholders and is ready to address the challenges of our community? If possible, please compare with before 2010 in the Antillean constellation.

- Is it your opinion that since 2010 the government has operated optimally, among others with respect to integral and interactive policy development and in public services?

- What are the aspects that in your opinion have most influenced the performance of the new governmental body since 2010 (either positively or negatively)?

- Do you see added value in creating structures and space for community members and stakeholders in the formulation of policies and decision making, or is it enough to rely on the representativeness of our national parliament to address the full spectrum of global and local challenges of the Curaçao community?

Table 3.1 Stakeholder views about governance since 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY NEEDED</th>
<th>REALIZATION SINCE 2010</th>
<th>INFLUENCES SINCE 2010</th>
<th>ROLE OF REPRESENTATIVE PARLIAMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• holistic approach to governance</td>
<td>• decreased effectiveness</td>
<td>• executive management functions</td>
<td>• need to refocus on role in trias politica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• challenges are wicked problems</td>
<td>• no modernization</td>
<td>• understaffed, or on interim basis</td>
<td>• weak and under-developed political organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• focus on development</td>
<td>• not tuned to society’s needs</td>
<td>• inconsistent political leadership with micro focus</td>
<td>• increased political division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shared vision for the country</td>
<td>• lack of coordination and overall direction</td>
<td>• structure not designed for development</td>
<td>• representatives should join multi-organizational platforms for dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• human and cultural aspects: governance as a living structure</td>
<td>• role of culture neglected</td>
<td>• overnight changes are impossible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• instability in organizational and political leadership</td>
<td>• no connection between level of ambition and human capacity</td>
<td>• lack of attention or culture aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• executive management functions</td>
<td>• Utopian ambition level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3.1 Interview with Mr. Ron Gomes Casseres

Mr. Ron Gomes Casseres is a former managing director and current board member of Maduro & Curiel's Bank, and former President of the Advisory Council, a formal council that advises the government on all laws in concept before they are sent to parliament. Mr. Gomes Casseres considers a fully networked approach to modern government important for Curaçao. “For the same reasons as described well in this chapter, Curaçao’s society is small and benefits from a holistic approach to development. That implies that also policymakers and regulators must operate in a holistic, interconnected manner. It is probably fair to say that none of the principal objectives of government, whether it be employment, education, health care, environmental, crime, social, housing, and poverty can be dealt with in an isolated ‘silo’-fashion.”

Mr. Gomes Casseres has seen no real state building progress in Curaçao in recent years. “There has been little, if any, progress in the effectiveness of governance in the past 10 to 15 years, and there has been decreased effectiveness of government in the past five years. Even if the pre-2010 plans had seemed to be effective on paper, which they clearly were not, their implementation starting in October 2010 has been poor. Except in the margin of some areas, there has been no modernization of government’s functioning in the past five years. The structure that has been created lacks interconnections (as stated before) but is especially not tuned to the needs of society—or at the very least is not able to respond to the needs of society. Just a few examples of this can be found in education, health care, rising unemployment, and a stagnant economy, combating crime and moving poverty to a back burner—all of which have gotten worse since 10-10-10 due to ineffective governance from the very top to down. Instead of two layers of government, we probably now have several more as there appears to be complete lack of coordination and lack of overall direction since 2010. For better or for worse, when political structure was the main objective of government policy leading up to 2010, at least there was an overall direction, even if many other areas ended up being neglected; now, and since 2010, there has been no such overall direction and ‘the noses point in all directions’ simultaneously. We are worse, not better off, in governance making many to wonder whether this autonomy was a good idea after all.”

There are many reasons for this as described in this chapter, but two that he finds are not sufficiently emphasized. “The first is the fact that many senior and important positions in the new government structure remain unstaffed or are filled only on an interim basis. That has two negative consequences. One is that there is insufficient capable and professional direction to the ministries, and the other is that this does not allow the minister to dedicate himself or herself to policy, rather than to policy preparation and policy execution, but also opens the door for politically motivated involvement in the preparation and execution of policy for lack of good management and guidance within the ministry. There is yet another consequence. The harsh and politicized way in which some
senior officials were dealt with, particularly between 2010 and 2012, also in government-owned companies, has led to caution with local professionals a number of which have become extremely hesitant of working in this new, most heavily politicized, style of government. The second aspect that I find insufficiently emphasized is that the prime minister, starting in 2010 with Schotte, but continuing also with Asjes (though to a lesser extent), does not see himself as a ‘primus inter pares’ to provide general policy directives, and to ensure that at all times there is coherence of policies of the various ministers and ‘all noses are pointed in the same direction.’ Instead the prime minister considers himself a glorified commissioner who needs to be dealing himself with mini-issues and putting out micro-fires, while delegating little to other ministers, and carrying specific portfolios best left to other (portfolio-)ministers. This has contributed to the lack of direction and poor execution of the plans to structure new governance for the new country.”

Mr. Gomes Casseres sees strong added value in participatory structures and mechanism, but not yet for Curaçao. “I do not believe our society and its community members are ready for that. Our educational methods do not prepare our citizens for such a role, nor do we even teach the structure of our government, or how our government operates, or should operate, any longer in our schools. Radio call-ins testify to the fact that minuscule issues, and lack of information, often bring emotional reactions and conclusions. The media in general also do not prepare society for such a role. Neither do our politicians: the in-transparency of ‘Reforma’¹ and the 100 guilders worth of food coupons² in the last election are examples that our own political leaders do not consider our society ripe to participate in decision making based on objective information. I support greater involvement of stakeholders in ‘dialogue’ for the preparation of policy objectives and policies, but I agree with the statement in your paper that the definition of dialogue is not the same with all stakeholders. That leaves, perhaps by default, our national parliaments, but also there much work needs to be done before parliament can truly do justice to its role as one of the three legs of the trias politica.”

3.4.3.2 Interview Dr. George Curiel

Dr. George Curiel is a former Director of the Department of Development Cooperation, consultant in organizational development, and co-author of “The Three Levels of Sustainability” (Cavagnaro and Curiel, 2012). Dr. Curiel was also the first facilitator selected to guide the National Dialogue of the prime minister.

Dr. Curiel refers to a fundamental mistake that was made in the design of the gover-

---

¹ “Reforma” is a movement initiated that aims to restructure the representative parliamentary democracy, with among others a directly chosen prime minister who forms a cabinet with ministers of his choice.

² The political party MFK during the election campaign of September 2012 made electoral promises about the introduction of coupons of one hundred guilders, which people could be entitled to receive after the election.
nance for Curaçao. “The design was made to be implemented from one day to the other. Mention to me one organization, or one government, that has changed structure overnight? Not done!”

Another fundamental flaw is that the structure is not based on the main goal of government, which should be the development of the country in a certain direction. But, Curaçao lacks a vision on the direction of its development. “If development is the main goal of a government, then somewhere in the design, the structure must serve that goal. If not, your goal ends up second place, and the focus is more operational. And I think that is what happened.”

Another design flaw is the lack of attention for the differences in culture between the former Antillean national government and the island territory government. Where the ministers and the public servants in the ministries in the national government operated on quite a distance from their constituency, the island territory politicians worked in close proximity of their voters, and the public servants took that into account. “In the process of the design they should have taken the different cultures into account. But at 10-10-10 we drew a line, and we mainly thought about where we place all employees. As per definition, then you create chaos.”

The political culture also influences the functioning of government. “The way in which our political organizations work brings about that that there is no strong government when a party enters with a mandate to do something. They are not prepared to do what they said they would do. They said they would do something to win an election. But to say something to win an election is not the same as having the capacity to continue with it, and execute it in government. If you don’t have the organizational capacity in a party to keep monitoring if your line of thinking is implemented in the ministries, than you are fully dependent on the internal advices from inside of government, you depend on the bureaucrats.”

Dr. Curiel supports the idea of a more interactive approach to government, but participation should be based on a clear (and shared) direction for the country. “If government is serious about creating a clear and consistent framework of thinking about in which direction we develop, and what kind of instruments we will apply to go where we are heading with our development, then you need the instruments for that, such as dialogue, so the direction is supported by as many people as possible. A framework of thinking cannot come out of a dialogue. You have to start preparing it, and you can use dialogue for validation, if you want a rational process that runs in a structured way.”

3.4.3.3 Interview Mr. Henry van der Kwast

Mr. Henry van der Kwast is President of the Board of Maduro Holding, a logistics and shipping company, and President of the Board of Insel Air International BV, a regional airline.
Mr. Van der Kwast, from a business management perspective, considers the 2010 plans for the new government apparatus to be very ambitious. “I never looked at government thinking that for a more effective government you would need such impacting design structures. They went very far; it is almost a Utopian model. When you first read this, you already know that it has not succeeded. If you look at it independently, it is enormously ambitious, considering our experiences.” Van der Kwast refers specifically to the lack of human capacity in Curaçao for such processes and to fulfill positions in such structures. Also the fact that many people enter politics without having obtained sufficient education. “I have always been worried about a lot of people entering politics who are not well prepared as for their education level. The staffing of positions will then be very difficult.” A more gradual process of change might have had a greater chance. He does not sense another “modus operandi” as was before 2010. “When I look at it from the private sector, I still see no openness, and I don’t see a better service provider.” On the contrary, what has intensified is the internal and political division all the way down to parliament. “You always have divisions in parliament, but we don’t practice an opposition role for democratic motivations. You are against something, just because of who came with the idea, that is the political motivation of political parties in parliament.” He relates this mentality to a form of envy or jealousy. “It comes back to ‘who’s gonna score?’ When you design a structure, you need to take culture, feelings and practices of people into consideration. You cannot force a square peg into a round hole.” Mr. van der Kwast considers it “highly necessary” to create a more interactive and participative form of governance for Curaçao. “Especially in order to absorb the human and cultural elements, you cannot change people, but you must adjust structures to the current times. The pace of adaptation has changed dramatically in the last 10–15 years. Whether you refer to more efficient computers, internet, communication, and perhaps it is all connected. But if you don’t adjust, you’ll lose the race.” In Van der Kwast’s view the government might need to develop “more into a living structure, that you can adjust and develop over time as peoples’ capacities also develop. It must be flexible and self adjusting; it has to be a living model.”

3.4.3.4 Interview Mr. Roland Ignacio

Mr. Ronald Ignacio is secretary-general of the labor union SGTK (Sindikato General di Trahadonan di Kòrsou) and the former president of the labor union of public servants ABVO (Antilliaanse Bond voor Overheidspersoneel).

Mr. Ignacio refers to earlier efforts for government optimization that have taken place, especially in the late 1990s when one third of government employees were laid off. “All such efforts took place, but up to this day I see the same things coming back over and over again in the role of government as executive body: they should have invested in the culture of the organization, and the training of employees. There were forms of training,
but on separate paths. If we talk about knowledge government, knowledge democracy and knowledge economy, in earlier times at least there was an anchor, there was a program for the professional education of public servants, in which you could invest in the knowledge of the public servants. That was changed; it became a more conventional program in modular form. But they were all isolated, and not connected to the programs of organizational change to adjust the structure of the organization.” In this respect government as an employer failed, says Ignacio. “The way the government acted as an employer failed completely; they always put emphasis only on political interests. The ‘Design to Change’ plan also had a change management process planned to connect with it, in the form of a ‘Governance Academy’ in 2010, but this also did not materialize. They never connected the tools to the processes; to create the necessary requirements to seriously work towards a holistic and sustainable change.”

Mr. Ignacio has not yet noted significantly better performance since 2010. “The driving power in all this is the Ministry of Governance, Planning and Public Services. They were confronted with the majority of the problems with allocation of personnel, housing, and internally they could not synchronize, let alone direct the rest of the organization and see how to make the cross networking work out. Besides this, in this ministry the political management changed many times, so there was a lack in consistency in political leadership, as well as a lack of executive management, which is still not in place.” He also mentions a fundamental flaw in the government’s approach, namely focusing strictly on cost instead of organizational development. Processes until now were “not aimed at efficiency, but on economization, which caused that from that moment already, you created that your goal was minimizing costs, instead of investing in it to make the government function well in its roles. This is counterproductive to what you want to accomplish.”

Mr. Ignacio is a strong believer of an interactive approach based on a shared vision. “Besides the tri-partite dialogue that currently takes place based on the ILO convention 144 as a basis, this must result in interactive contact with other stakeholders also, and must result in a multi-organizational dialogue platform for various areas. Based on this, also our parliament, as the one that actually represents the community, must start to join in defining roles. They are the organization that controls government in its functioning in the common interest.”
3.5 CONCLUSIONS

This section provides a concluding summary to the governance developments in Curaçao since 2010 as seen through the eyes of experts, civil servants, and stakeholders. Curaçao as a country—in its quest for an autonomous status in the Dutch Kingdom—has ended up being a single island nation with fewer autonomous powers as compared to before 2010, when it was still part of the five-island nation called the Netherlands Antilles. The lack of governmental responsibility for the former Antillean islands, however, has led towards a general perception in Curaçao that the island—now freed from the “burden” of the smaller islands—enjoys increased autonomy. Contrary to apparent logic, this perception about increased autonomy has not been followed by an identified need, or indeed a process, of nation building for Curaçao in the sense of creating a path to the future development of the country. Since 2010, the integration of the former national- and island-level organizations into one new level of government, which was based on high ambitions, did not materialize. On the contrary, the government organization since 2010 has not been perceived as being more effective or efficient. The government does not live up to expectations and lacks a long-term vision, internal coordination, and stability. The political and executive management of the country has been organized in a political structure of a representative parliamentary democracy, reflecting the classic “trias politica,” and in a rather bureaucratic organizational structure of nine ministries. However, the actual “nationwide agenda” to layout the future direction of development of the Curaçao society together with stakeholders and citizens is left afloat. This is highly influenced by the dynamics in the political arena, which is not conducive to nation building based on shared vision. Subsequently, hardly any processes, structures, or mechanisms are in place to fill the vacuum of the lack of participative governance, nor is there anything in place in the context of a process towards nation building or integral policy development.
BUILDING BLOCKS FOR THE CITY-STATE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the developments that have taken place in Curaçao since 2010 that are aimed at shaping the new country, both with respect to the governmental organization, as well as the nation. The various building blocks for constructing the nation are discussed and analyzed, among others in relation to the role of identity and the importance of creating internal cohesion in the community.

The pre and post constitutional negotiations in the Kingdom, as well as the political and societal debates before and after the 2010 “status aparte” in Curaçao, have predominantly focused on the degree of legal autonomy of the new nation. Much less focus has been put on what the nation should constitute and stand for as a society that its inhabitants can identify with and contribute to through participative mechanisms based on an integral development approach. In order for citizens to be willing to or desire to contribute and participate, a sense of belonging and shared destiny for the community is required. Commonly, this part of the process of nation building is related to a country’s national identity, both existing and desired, as well as the explicit versus implicit. National identity is a multi-dimensional concept that can be defined in various ways. Guiberneau (2004) argues that national identity is a modern phenomenon of a fluid and dynamic nature, one by means of which a community sharing a particular set of characteristics is led to the subjective belief that its members are ancestrally related. Belief in a shared culture, history, traditions, symbols, kinship, language, religion, territory, founding moment, and destiny have been invoked, with varying intensity at different times and places, by peoples claiming to share a particular national identity. (Guiberneau, 2004, p. 134)
She also argues that national identity is usually applied to citizens of a nation-state. There are exceptions, however, such as Scotland, Flanders and Catalonia, “where national identity is shared among individuals belonging to a nation without a state of their own” (Guiberneau, 2004, p. 134).

This is an important aspect in relation to the Curacao case since the island can be considered a nation, but not a state, since it forms part of the Dutch Kingdom. Differentiation between nation-states and nations without states is important according to Guiberneau because having or not having a state makes a great difference in terms of the access to power and resources enjoyed by a nation and, even more crucially, in its international status. Effectively, nations without states are excluded from direct representation in the major international and transnational organizations and institutions such as the EU, NAFTA, NATO, the IMF, the UN, etc. (2004, p. 133)

Guiberneau (2004, p. 135) adapted Anthony Smith’s (1996) commonly used definition of national identity and notes five dimensions, adding the political dimension to the psychological, cultural, territorial, and historical dimensions. While these multi-dimensional aspects already indicate that building a national identity is a complex challenge in itself, this is especially true for Curacao, being an ethnic, cultural, and religious melting pot on a stove fueled by decolonization. When considering the five dimensions on Curacao the following challenges for the island can be foreseen:

**Psychological dimension** - With respect to the psychological dimension, Guiberneau refers to sentient or felt history, not the chronological or factual history which is of importance (2004, p. 135). In Curacao the colonial past puts groups of inhabitants on either side of a fierce debate about decolonization instead of uniting them in a shared feeling of unity over its past.

**Cultural dimension** - Referring to Smith (1996), Guiberneau mentions cultural components of national identity such as values, beliefs, customs, conventions, habits, languages, and practices (2014, p. 136). The language component is most crucial since this facilitates communication between groups. But, while the local language Papiamentsu is increasing in application and importance, Curacao has officially recognized not only Papiamentsu, but also Dutch and English. Language, therefore, can be expected to be less of a binding component in Curacao than in other nations with a single language.

**Historical dimension** - Curacao as a nation was born in 2010, so there is not yet a shared history to differentiate the Curacao people from others and increase self-esteem through national pride, which forges the character of a nation. The formal history goes back just five years and is tainted by politically divisive developments in the autonomy debate.
Territorial dimension - Curaçao is naturally limited in its territory due to its geographic reality of being an island surrounded by the ocean. But, territorial issues do pose a challenge, because until the turn of the century it was commonplace to identify the people of Curaçao first as “Antillean” and then as “Yu di Kòrsou” (child of Curaçao). Curaçao anthropologist Rose Mary Allen (2010, p. 118) mentions the Antillean identity as being “paradoxal,” because in their hearts most locally born inhabitants experience their identity as “Yu di Kòrsou” first. But, the commonly used identity—as reflected in the names of many national and state companies on the island—is “Antillean.”

Political dimension - This fifth dimension, added by Guiberneau (2004), refers to the state’s strategies to forge a national identity through nation building with aspects such as the conscious creation of an image of the nation by symbols and rituals, the advancement of citizenship, the creation of common enemies, national education, and media systems. The challenge is that Curaçao is at the beginning of becoming a nation with a shared identity, but still without a common vision that can inspire and connect the very diverse groups on the island.

To this day there is hardly a visible approach towards the creation of a national identity in Curaçao. Anthropologist Allen (2010) describes leading up to the constitutional changes in 2010 “discussions about national identity [were] centered on the concept of Yu di Kòrsou. Translated from the local Creole language Papiamentu, this literally means: Child of Curaçao” (Allen, 2010, p. 117). Thus, the focus in the identity debate was aimed more at aspects of citizenship and much less on one or more of the other dimensions.

While most scholars tend to put emphasis on historic and cultural roots which provide a connection to shared identity based on the past, Hall (1996) has a constructive forward looking approach. He argues that:

> identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not ‘who we are’ or ‘where we came from’, so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation. (Hall, 1996, p. 4)

This is a future-oriented approach that is applicable to Curaçao as a new nation still needing to forge a national identity among a very diverse population without a past to physically unite them on the island, but that psychologically actually divides them. The viewpoint from the national identity theories is highly relevant, because it shows that constitutional autonomy on paper—as recently acquired by Curaçao—does not in itself (and without specific effort) lead to the creation of a nation in which citizens want to
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participate and actively join forces towards the realization of a shared vision. There is no clear roadmap for the constructive journey that Curaçao as a young country has started, and it is unclear which specific efforts are required at this point. The Curaçao case reflects a distinct need for model development towards the relationship between interdependent aspects such as government, governance, and national identity. The basic ingredients are clear, but the specific recipe for preparation has not yet been defined. The aspect of the governmental structure has been described in Chapter 3, as well as its lack of mechanisms for broader participative governance. Some steps have been taken towards nation building but not coherently, nor specifically directed at creating a cohesive national identity.

The following sections describe the developments since 2010 and the various building blocks for Curaçao as a city-state, which can shape the new nation in a participative way. The building blocks can be found along two main routes: building the government and building the nation. Both routes are elaborated upon in the following sections. Based on these experiences, a model is discussed for the coherence and interplay between government, governance, and national identity.

4.1 BUILDING THE GOVERNMENT

Paving the route for “building the government” began in 2010 by imposing business-like efficiency on an archaic, culturally diverse, and recently merged organization, in the form of business plans for the nine ministries. Ever since the basic implementation phase of the new apparatus based on those plans formally ended in June 2011, efforts have been underway to further optimize the civil infrastructure with the aim to build an effective and efficient government for the country. The lack of an effective and efficient governmental infrastructure contributed to a buildup of frustrations both inside and outside of government; the new infrastructure did not meet the expectations of a better government or governance after the status aparte. The first steps on the route towards better government were taken on executive management level. These consisted of individual initiatives undertaken with respect to various ministries in 2011 to eliminate the most pressing issues concerning organizational structure. This was followed in 2012 by a second step in the form of a joint initiative of the Council of Secretary-generals to more coherently analyze several aspects in a top meeting between the management teams of all nine ministries. This congress focused on personnel, overhead, and operational effectiveness and efficiency, but the implementation of decisions was put on hold after the cabinet fell and new elections were called in the autumn of 2012.

By the beginning of 2013, it was clear that the government could not maintain its operational expenditure level due to increasing budget deficits. The initiative of September
2012 was intensified and expanded into a full operational optimization track under the name Optimizing the Functioning of Government, in Dutch referred to as Optimalisering Functioneren Overheidsorganisatie (OFO).

All of the steps mentioned thus far were mainly driven by efficiency goals, and not so much by identified goals towards better effectiveness (results oriented) and integrated policy goals on a national level, with no identifiable efforts towards a more "outside-in" approach with an aim for more participative governance. The first building block in that direction was provided by the Ministry of Economic Development in December 2011, with the signing of a protocol with the UNDP’s “Capacity Development for Nation Building of Curaçao” (UNDP, 2011). Curaçao, with its relatively high GDP, is not eligible for programs funded by the UNDP, but the country can implement programs under the UNDP’s umbrella if the budget is provided by the government. For the capacity building protocol a program budget of 914,850.00 USD was assigned to the UNDP. The expected outcome was identified in the protocol as “Enhanced Capacity of New Country Curaçao Towards Effective Management of Transition Process and Sustainable Development” (UNDP, 2011) This was to be achieved through the following four outputs:

1. Participatory dialogue process to improve and finalize a National Development Plan;
2. Creation of a national socio-economic Database;
3. Implementation of pilot project targeting Millennium Development Goals 1 & 7 (poverty reduction and sustainable environment);
4. Preparation of an aid coordination and resource mobilization Plan.

As a building block the UNDP program has seen interesting developments which have brought it close to being not just a building block towards the government track, but also with the potential of contributing to the track of Building the Nation, and thus better governance. The project started out slowly and encountered managerial challenges in its first year. In May 2013 a new program manager was appointed who had to work out specific strategies and plans towards the four outputs, with the desired outcome in mind. International UNDP experts visited the island in the fall of 2013 for a scoping mission on the project, and their findings (UNDP, 2013) provide an in depth look into the challenges for Curaçao in building democratic governance. In October 2013 the scoping mission report (UNDP, 2013) concluded that

Rather than the need to identify (once again) key development priorities and “what” the country needs to do, it has been the “how,” or more specifically the “inability to implement” that is the most widely recognized obstacle to development. In concrete terms, it is the difficulty among stakeholders to align around
shared priorities and to coordinate actions required to implement many of the strategies and initiatives required by existing plans that were established over the past couple of years. (UNDP, 2013, p. 1)

The more detailed findings reported, among others, on a consensus for change, but at the same time a lack of real commitment to cooperate in actual change other than through verbal expressions (referred to as a “wall of willingness”). The findings also mention a culture of fear, distrust, and divided relationships as an important factor. “Strengthening democratic governance and increasing capacities within Curaçao for navigating complex development challenges will require developing and prioritizing processes for building trust, improving relationships, and achieving greater political stability” (UNDP, 2013, p. 5).

Other findings include a lack of the required long-term oriented leadership styles and concentrated power that resides within the small circuit of political leaders without a culture of real public accountability. The findings also identified a need for both individual and institutional (systemic) capacity building to strengthen the effectiveness of government on all levels. An important finding concerns “dialogue fatigue” in Curaçao; most stakeholders expressed a clear wish for less talk and more action. However, while there is recognition that nobody needs more talk, most agreed on the need for higher quality of open and transparent conversations that:

1) enable more critical thinking and common understanding; 2) promote shared ownership; and 3) begin to shift patterns of interaction and transform relationships. Moving forward with plans and actions without this quality of conversation that can enable greater coordination and ownership is likely to deliver limited results. (UNDP, 2013, p. 7)

The recommendations of the scoping mission report recognized that for the output of a National Development Plan (NDP), as mentioned in the protocol between government and UNDP, an extra effort would be needed beyond the current program and budget. The UNDP program management organized several activities to determine the relevance of the NDP as an output, such as round tables, stakeholder assessment, high-level government workshops, the scoping mission and trainings by a demo-
ocratic dialogue specialist, and a national conference. The conclusion about the option to start an NDP process through democratic dialogue was that

The pre-conditions for an NDP-process are marginally present: level of dialogue is not present to come up with constructive solutions over a broad nation-wide front. Also the basic relations to cooperate are not always in place because of high turn-over, incompetence, distrust & fear. We perceived dysfunctional relations on different levels: political, public sector and between government and other stakeholders. (UNDP, 2014a, p. 1)

The UNDP concluded that in the implementation phase, pre-conditions needed to be built to refocus attention to the “how” (by developing collaborative capacity through democratic dialogue) instead of the “what” (producing a National Development Plan as such), in order to create clear ownership and pave the way for a nationwide NDP process. The process was popularly labeled “Kòrsou Kapasítá” and consisted of a three-level approach.

Working from the bottom up, the process recognized on the tertiary level the need for capacity development in order to move government and stakeholders from planning to action. The secondary level focused on the development of dialogue capacity and implementation of the dialogic approach in government and in the community to create a basis for acceptance of a National Dialogue process towards an NDP. This dialogic process was popularly labeled “Curaçao Speaks!” The first level focused on explaining and creating support for the NDP itself, once the NDP process was leading to specific proposals. The path towards creating the actual plan was prepared by the Ministry of Economic Development through extra funding for hiring an NDP expert, since there was no formal concept of an NDP yet available.

It is important to notice that the UNDP program is under the responsibility and execution of the Ministry of Economic Development. It had been approved in the Council of Ministers in 2011, which was the first cabinet after the constitutional changes in 2010. But, in 2014 the fourth cabinet was in power and not yet broadly involved in the implementation of the UNDP program. The prime minister of this fourth cabinet had expressed his strong support though for a National Development Plan during the scoping mission in 2013 (UNDP, 2013, p. 8). The process itself, however, did not expand far outside the Ministry of Economic Development until the early spring of 2014. The expanded attention for the NDP process was jump started by a meeting between the prime minister of Curaçao and the Council of Secretary-generals, in which the prime minister requested an integral approach of the nine ministries in both policy development and operational management. The prime minister essentially requested a focus on increasing efficiency, as well as effectiveness throughout the government. This
can be considered an important initiative, and thus building block, for moving beyond restructuring the government as an organization, and actually work towards a process of seeking what the new nation actually desires from its governmental organization in the context of nation building. The NDP process received strong support from the secretaries-generals for both the aspect of capacity building for better cooperation through a dialogic approach, as well as for the development of an NDP as an overarching “master plan” for developing the governmental policies in an interactive and cooper-
ative manner, and based on the nation’s priorities. The UNDP approach tapped into the identified need in the Council of Secretary-generals to build a governmental organization that would work dramatically differently in a few years time. The Council was working, since the meeting with the prime minister in January 2014, towards an integral plan for a government that could do “more with less” in 2018. The budgetary goal of the Council of Ministers to reduce the government to 3350 employees by the end of 2017 as a way to structurally save 50 million Antillean guilders on personnel costs was adopted by the secretary-generals as an opportunity for a transformational process.

The transformation process as visualised in Figure 4.3 entails four change drivers that had already started as separate projects within government, but without coherence until that moment. The Council of Secretary-generals opted to align them towards the goal of doing “more with less.” The four change drivers for the transformational process were identified as

1. A strategic human resources approach to address a variety of personnel issues since 2010, combined with organizational development to solve issues with the bureaucratic structure and processes;

2. The creation of one central housing facility to eliminate the current use of dozens of buildings for governmental offices and to stimulate and support integral work processes;

3. Investments in ICT, including hardware structure, data registers, and applications, to increase efficiency and quality of public services as intermediate steps towards realizing e-government;

4. The development of integral policies based on priorities, and work procedures to eliminate bureaucracy and enhance effectiveness.

There was broad support in the Council of Secretary-generals for the possibilities provided by the UNDP capacity development program, given the realistic opportunities for the transformation of government that came together in a holistic way. A road map towards the government of 2018 was to be presented to the Council of Ministers in September 2014, with the UNDP playing a role in one of the four change drivers (see Figure 4.3) by planning action learning sessions in the fall of 2014 and preparing the creation of an NDP as a “nationwide agenda” for integral and long-term priorities. The execution of the NDP process “Kòrsou Avansá” under the umbrella of the UNDP took place through attracting and training dialogue facilitators and persons in other functions mostly on a voluntary basis, and by making civil servants available on a part-time basis. By May 2014 a team—totaling some 60 people—of dialogue facilitators, secretariat staff, communication and event specialists, and a research team was recruited, trained, in place, and ready to start the dialogue sessions of “Curaçao Speaks!” in the commu-
The implementation plan for the process, lasting until September 2014, consisted of six dialogue sessions in various neighborhoods, to test and adapt the dialogic approach as needed before larger scale sessions and events on a national level would take place focusing on the actual NDP. The first dialogue session “Curaçao Speaks!” took place in the neighborhood of Otrobanda in Curaçao on May 31, 2014, where some 30 participants discussed the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of reducing poverty. Parallel to the implementation process for the dialogue, an NDP expert was hired by the Ministry of Economic Development to work on the preparation of the actual plan. The expert was asked to give recommendations for structure of both the plan and an NDP office, and a monitoring regime in the form of a road map (UNDP, 2014). The mission report confirmed findings of earlier reports and shared the opinion of the secretaries-generals, stating that:

An effective National Development Plan requires an agreed vision and set of objectives, based on an iterative process of broad consultation and clear leadership, with enough time and resources to enact. It also presumes an understanding of the nature of the plan and the planning process. In spite of the many plans which have been created there is reason to believe that such an understanding is lacking across the broad spectrum of stakeholders. (UNDP, 2014, p. 4)
There was an important difference, however, between this report in June 2014 and the report eight months earlier in October 2013. Following the request of the prime minister in January 2014, the secretary-generals had extensively discussed the need for an integral approach to policy development and inter-ministerial cooperation. The presentation by the UNDP to the Council of Secretary-generals about the option for an NDP process was embraced, as stated in the mission report. Finally, though over-burdened with plans and projects, senior managers could see the potential for an NDP to provide a framework which would allow for priorities and phasing, for collapsing ongoing initiatives into an overall process which could ease capacity constraints and accelerate execution. (UNDP, 2014, p. 5)

The mission report also stressed the need for capacity building in the area of leadership, dialogic process, collaboration, and institutional capacity building, since this is considered vital for the success of an NDP, not only within government, but especially to involve multi-stakeholder consultations to build support and generate input for an NDP. The mission report strongly recommended involving stakeholders and other opinion leaders in the creation of an NDP, specifically with regard to strategic vision and the priority development sectors. The implemented dialogic process, “Curaçao Speaks!”, was considered to be highly valuable in order to provide feedback from citizens and stakeholders on their concerns towards the future development of the country. Referring to this new approach for Curaçao of opting for a dialogic process the mission mentions that

This is the key piece to build momentum and put in place the framework for the plan and subsequent choices. And it is the current stumbling block for progress. Given the reported state of mistrust and the observed political instability an option for national development outside of the “normal” route must be explored. (UNDP, 2014, p. 9)

The concept mission report concluded with two main options to move forward with initiative, support, and input starting at the political level, and from the top executive level in government if at the political level the maturity lacks strategic long-term planning and cooperation with an open and constructive mind based on a dialogic approach. By September 2014, due to unforeseen developments at the executive level concerning the UNDP program “Kòrsou Kapasitá,” the choice between these options had not yet been made. These developments occurred suddenly and right after the first dialogue sessions on the neighborhood level had taken place on May 31, 2014, and when the NDP mission was finalizing its mission report. Although the UNDP program had gained broad support from top government officials of all ministries—and had also gained momentum in the community with the first dialogue session, the training of the team of volunteers, and a range of other community activities—the executive responsi-
bility for the UNDP program was still located solely in the Ministry of Economic Development. The executive management of that ministry made a sudden and unexpected decision in June 2014 to re-strategize the UNDP program, which brought a screeching halt to the execution of the dialogue sessions and all other related activities that were gaining momentum and support within government and in the community. Communication about the decision to stop the activities was minimal, and the argumentation for it unknown, so the information about the change in direction was slowly permeating towards the secretary-generals. The Council of Secretary-generals in August 2014 again expressed its desire to continue with the implementation plan of UNDP, focusing on capacity building and a dialogic approach towards the creation of an NDP. All activities were on hold until the fall of 2014, when the prime minister restarted the initiative. The approach this time, however, was not on capacity development and a dialogic approach, but on writing an NDP as a the plan of all earlier plans. Bilateral consultations were set up between the UNDP consultant and various stakeholders and ministries to provide input for the NDP.

4.2 BUILDING THE NATION

The route towards building the nation was paved in the beginning of 2014, more than three years after the inception of the nation. During a national speech after the New Year in 2014, the prime minister announced that he would start a National Dialogue process with representatives from labor unions and from private sector organizations. The announcement came unexpectedly, since the labor unions had already tried for some time in vain to pressure the government into a tri-partite approach based on articles 144 and 152 of the International Labor Organization (ILO) regarding “social dialogue.” Subsequently, in February 2014 a protocol was signed to start a National Dialogue, “Kòrsou ta Avansá” (Curaçao will move forward), with a focus on seven topics:

1. Institutionalization of industrial policy
2. Mobility of labor
3. Modernization of labor and social security laws
4. Labor security and inspection, and creating a process to increase consciousness among workers to increase their chances on the labor market
5. Multi annual National Development Plan
6. Increase effectiveness and efficiency of government to lower cost and provide service
7. Safety and security
Neither the secretary-generals, nor other top-level administrators from the ministries, were consulted or involved at that point—except for the secretariat of the Council of Ministers and a member of the prime minister’s policy coordination unit. The prime minister was appointed as the representative of government in the dialogue; no other ministers were structurally involved in this process at the start. The UNDP was not consulted beforehand about the NDP mentioned in the National Dialogue of the prime minister, nor was there a relationship at that moment with the dialogue process planned under the UNDP program. The UNDP was invited in a session of the National Dialogue on March 19, 2014 to explain the approach and planning.

The prime minister presided over the National Dialogue in the first few months. The dialogue took place under the strict agreement of confidentiality of both the minutes of the meeting as well as all data and documents used and produced. At the end of July 2014, the government approved the hiring of a consultant to provide facilitation and a secretariat for the National Dialogue process.

Questions can be raised around the expected effectiveness of the prime minister’s initiative, given its isolated approach, the limited variety of topics, and the not so national representativeness of the participants. The participants are representatives from two organizations for labor unions and two organizations from the private sector. No broader consultations have been foreseen. Although this kind of representation is tri-partite according to the ILO convention, it is not representative in a broader sense for the Curaçao community and its variety of sectors and stakeholders.

However, when taking the findings into account of the UNDP scoping mission in 2013 and the NDP expert in 2014 about the lack of trust on all levels and the need for involvement of stakeholders, the prime minister’s initiative can also be seen as a process with very high potential. The National Dialogue could be the seed from which high-level alignment, building trust, and setting joint priorities around a shared vision might eventually spring. Potentially, the National Dialogue is a promising start towards complying with the Top-2 best practices for an NDP: 1) high-level political commitment and 2) national ownership (UNDP, 2014: 16). The latter of course on the pre-condition that other stakeholders would eventually be broadly involved.

The setting of the National Dialogue could especially be considered as highly promising towards broad support for an eventual NDP if the National Dialogue and the UNDP Dialogic Process in the community could be aligned to complement top-down and bottom-up input for the direction of the future development of the young nation.
4.3 CURRENT STATUS

The route towards building a better government with the four change drivers is ongoing with slow but certain progress on various change drivers, although until now it is not perceived by many outside the Council of Secretary-generals as an aligned and integral transformation process. The National Dialogue initiated by the prime minister has continued under facilitated guidance. Its meetings take place behind closed doors and the documentation is confidential. Therefore, it is difficult to factually determine whether or not the high potential of the National Dialogue can be transformed into realistic opportunities. The high-level input and commitment to an NDP, and the possible combination with a bottom-up dialogic approach in the community, looks highly promising. But, due to the confidentiality of the National Dialogue process, the level of realistic potential based on actual results of the National Dialogue process is as of yet hard to determine, based on what is publicly known about it. It is possible, however, to analyze its potential based on theoretical synthesis and modeling.

4.4 MODEL IMPLICATIONS

The challenges confronted in the fragile country of Curaçao illustrate the distinct need for model development to analyze the interdependency between government, governance, and national identity. The Curaçao case shows that building an effective and efficient government apparatus in itself is not enough to create participative sustainable development. The steps towards a more participative governance and nation building through the National Dialogue of the prime minister are restricted by the nature of its limited and representative participation and the confidentiality of its proceedings. The analysis of UNDP experts in 2013 and 2014 showed that the lack of an NDP as such is not the main challenge for Curaçao, but rather it is the inability to initiate an NDP as a nationwide participative process, due to distrust and fear as well as incompetence with regards to dialogue capacity. “This prohibits constructive solutions over a broad nationwide front” (UNDP, 2014a, p. 1).

The connective link may be found in a model that brings both social coherence and provides national direction in the form of a vision. Such a vision is usually the main starting point for an NDP. Wilson, in her description of a roadmap towards an NDP for Curaçao (UNDP, 2014: 8), illustrated the basic structure of a NDP with a shared vision as a starting point (see Figure 4.5).
National identity theory shows that “People are not only citizens by law, they also participate in forming the idea of the nation as it is represented in their national culture. A nation is a symbolic community constructed discursively” (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, p. 155).

This implies that dialogic processes can be used to create a discourse on the vision of the future of the country as a binding focal point in the process of creating a national identity. De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak (1999), in their study of how the Austrian national identity can be analyzed, note that

Through discourse social actors constitute knowledge, situations, social roles as well as identities and interpersonal relations between various interacting social groups. In addition, discursive acts are socially constitutive in a number of ways. First, they play a decisive role in the genesis, production and construction of certain social conditions. Thus, discourses may serve to construct national identities. (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, p. 157)

The instrumental role of language in combination with “codes” in discourse is described by Hall (2006), who states that “reality exists outside of language, but is constantly mediated by and through language” (Hall, 2006, p. 167). In his analysis of how television media play a role in the communication process of encoding/decoding, he refers
to the role of “code” as a recognizable context needed in order to create connection between the sender and receiver with as little distortion as possible. A shared vision can provide such context or “code” to help the various social actors recognize themselves and feel represented and connected.

The national identity theories as discussed in this chapter show that the fact that a country has formal constitutional autonomy does not in itself and without effort lead to the creation of a nation in which citizens want to participate and actively join forces towards the realization of a shared vision for the future. This is also the case, as discussed in this chapter about developments in Curaçao, for investing in the governmental organization on aspects of efficiency and effectiveness. However important these aspects are, an effective and efficient government does not automatically generate a drive and willingness among citizens to actively become co-creators of the future of the community. The missing aspect may be found in a model that combines social coherence and national direction. The social coherence can be stimulated by dialogic processes that can be used to give national direction to the community through the creation of future-oriented discourse in the form of a shared vision.

Figure 4.6  Relational model of government–governance–national identity
Thus a model can be drawn consisting of the following concepts:

**Government** - formal structure, policies, and processes

**Governance** - participative processes/mechanisms

**National identity through vision development** - create uniqueness and separation from “others”; provides emotional and rational connection/direction on the national level based on future-oriented discourse, which is perceived to be shared between stakeholders/participants from various social contexts

**Dialogue** - instrument to create the shared constructive discourse between participants from various social contexts and positions of power.

National identity is described as being internally binding in a community and, at the same time, as externally separating the community from others. The fundamental internal homogeneity exists within a “constructed form of closure” (Hall, 1996: 4) as a way to create uniqueness by distinction from what it is not. A future-oriented approach of national identity based on a shared future vision can thus be expected to represent the variety of actors in a nation, even if it is quite divided by its past like the Curaçao community is.

This approach is supported by the study of the construction of the Austrian identity of De Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak (1999). This study identified five semantic macro areas related to the discursive construction of the Austrian identity and nation:

- the idea of a “homo austriacus” and a “homo externus”
- the narrative of a collective political history
- the discursive construction of a common culture
- the discursive construction of a collective present and future
- the discursive construction of a “national body.”

(De Cillia, Reisigl & Wodak, 1999, p. 158)

In relation to the model in Figure 4.6, the last two macro areas are most relevant with a collective political present and future connected to the “topics of ‘citizenship’, ‘political achievements’, ‘present and future political problems’, ‘crises and threats’, ‘prospective political aims’ and ‘political virtues/values’” (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak, 1999, p. 159). The area of the national body focuses on

the local, geographic and physical dimension, i.e. on the national territory with its boundaries, its natural resources and its landscapes, but also with the materialized results of ‘development planning’, the artificial structuration and arrangement as well as the architectural artefacts of national importance. In a certain sense, even the bodies of prominent top sportspersons who compete in international
championships as living partes pro toto for a specific nation are conceivable as parts of a ‘national body’. (De Cillia, Reisigl, and Wodak, 1999, p. 160)

Projecting the model of Figure 4.6 onto the case of Curaçao shows that although several elements for building the city-state are in place on both the tracks of “building the government” and “building the nation,” there is little chance of succeeding coherent nation building for the city-state without the creation of a constructed form of closure in the form of a shared vision of Curaçao’s future society. The government as a structure is being optimized. A more participative governance is being tested in the National Dialogue process. Explicitly lacking, however, is the element of creating a future-oriented national identity through vision development as a constructed form of closure. Because of the lack of alignment and clear operational connection between the various initiatives, there is no identified need for vision development towards a future national identity as an instrument for internal coherence and closure.
ACTION RESEARCH PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the case study of Curaçao on the project level, focusing on the development of an Action Program for Youth Development in an interactive and participative way. Specifically, this touches upon the third level of this research process. After introducing the specific research questions for this action research project, the methodology, applied methods, and considerations towards quality are discussed. This is followed by a description of the case study with its three phases.

5.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Considering the problem statement presented in Chapter 1, and the research developments as reflected in the sub-studies, more detailed questions surface related to the lingering aspects with respect to creating a fitting governance for a knowledge driven democracy. What governance mechanisms can bring about a knowledge driven transformational shift, especially with regard to power and influence, within existing democratic structures and processes? Most nations and cities have a representative parliamentary structure in which, through periodical election cycles, representatives are elected to govern our societies. There is a growing desire and willingness among citizens to become more participative, considering the many projects and methods being tried and tested worldwide, mostly on a project basis. But, what about the fundamental questions surrounding the tensions that this creates between participation and representation, since the elected representatives ultimately have the power to decide? How can one ensure that participative input is honored in a representative system? How can participation and representation be combined, what aspects bring about tensions, and how can these be addressed? The formal decision making power is in the hands
of a small group of elected representatives with a broad multi-year mandate based on the election cycles. They create and support an executive government. Can it be ensured that participative contributions in whatever shape or form are honored when the moment of decision making is there? What promotes or undermines this? The government structure as such also needs to be taken into consideration, especially if the aim is to make participation a structural element in a knowledge driven community, and not just an experimental project. What is possible, with regard to developing a more participative governance approach within a traditional bureaucratic structure, that in itself hardly has participative mechanisms and structures? As critics of bureaucratic systems say, most governments do things to people, not with them. Without turning bureaucratic organizations completely upside down, can one create room for participation within current structures? What works and what does not?

The problem statement in this research is to explore, in the context of the knowledge-based democracy, how governance and government can be adjusted effectively to allow for the sustainable participation of citizens and stakeholders, specifically within bureaucratic structures, while honoring the foundations and mechanisms of the political democracy common in the modern world.

The research questions are formulated as follows:

- What participative structures or processes can be applied within a traditional bureaucratic government structure, where policy development is a non-participatory process? What are the success factors and risks?
- How can participation of citizens be organized/shaped in a parliamentary democracy, where the formal power is in the hands of an elected body of representatives, who create an executive government?
- What tensions with respect to power in policy development and decision making does this bring forward, and how can this be addressed?

These research questions are addressed through an action research project in Curaçao, which is elaborated upon in this chapter. The research focuses on the design of an Action Program for Youth Development that is meant to become a multi-year participatory process, based on co-creation and co-execution between government, social partners, stakeholders, and NGOs. This takes place within a traditional bureaucratic structure of government and in the context of a representative democracy. The aim of the action research is the development of the Action Program for Youth Development as such, but it is also considered a pilot for a new way of working for the Curaçao Government. This implies that it is a twofold approach: as a project in itself aiming at the development of the Action Program and also on the organizational level as an action-learning process on how to work more participatively and interactively in a bureaucratic structure. The findings on project and organizational level are reflected upon in the closing
chapters of this dissertation to compare the experiences from practice with the theoretical development of the governance framework for the knowledge democracy.

5.2 ACTION PROGRAM FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AS A CASE STUDY

The process around youth development in Curaçao started out as an acute desire to address the structural issues behind the negative phenomenon of youth being involved in violent crimes, as experienced in various incidents. A particularly unfortunate event at the airport raised an urgent call for action, and it was felt and expressed throughout the community of Curaçao. The government responded to it with the announcement of a national action program directed at the youth to turn the tide. This announcement was the starting point of open discussions with ministries and organizations in the community involved with youth, to seek out what an effective approach in such an action program would entail. It resulted in the proposal to launch the National Platform for Youth Development, which would be in charge of developing an Action Program for Youth Development. The focus in this first exploratory phase was on action towards creating a structure (a national platform) to address the design of an integral and action-oriented approach, and not just another policy paper. It was clearly a call for action, not a call for a new plan. It was in the course of the first phase that the realization kicked in that in order for the action program to be effective, the government needed to not just develop and implement an action program, but that it would actually require a whole new way of alignment and collaborative working. It became clear during deliberations between ministries and with stakeholders that the modus operandi of the government had had a decisive influence on the results with youth development in the past, and that a new governance approach was crucial in obtaining better results. During the explorations it became clear that a major policy challenge such as this required an approach in which ministries work together and align their efforts, and that the government needs to involve stakeholders and organizations in the community with the aim of using a broad knowledge base, and create support and active involvement. As such, the goal of the process became twofold: 1) to develop an approach to youth development that encompasses and uses all available knowledge, creates a collaborative path of action that will contribute to healthy development opportunities for all youth in Curaçao, and which has the approval of government, and 2) develop the approach as a prototype for a new way of working for government in an integral and participative way with involvement and participation of various ministries, as well as stakeholders and civil society. These goals provide a close connection to the research questions and make it suitable as a case study for participative governance from a practical approach.
5.3 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The case study consists of designing, monitoring, and evaluating the Action Program for Youth Development with regard to content, structure, and processes as a participative process, as well as the preparation of the structures and processes for the implementation phase. I am professionally responsible for this project as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs of the Government of Curaçao. This role provides the opportunity to do insider action research into my own organization. I can do this from the unique perspective of a top-level public servant, operating between the political level, the bureaucracy, and the community and its stakeholders. I consider insider action research to be highly challenging, since up until now I have tried to consciously separate my professional and my scientific work. But, this process provides an excellent opportunity for hands-on experience with the challenges as formulated in the problem statement and research questions, with respect to organizing a participative approach within a bureaucratic system and in the context of a representative democracy. The project was actually a few months underway when I discovered this and became aware that in my professional capacity I had unconsciously been applying my scientific knowledge and insights; they had become part of the toolkit that I work with, so to speak. When that realization dawned on me, I decided to test the waters and design the AR process with regard to the development of the Action Program for Youth Development.

In this case the research approach I chose to utilize is insider action research, as described by Coghlan and Brannick (2014), into the organization that I work in, the Government of Curaçao. As secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations, I am responsible for the content and process of the action program. This creates a setting in which I can create and help guide a participatory process and structures based on action research. My position as secretary-general doing insider action research also implies, however, that I am not able to do all action research activities personally or directly. The action research involves working with a team of people who are active in guiding the process, in writing the action program, in doing research into youth development, and in facilitating participative sessions and dialogues. Although I am formally responsible for the end result, I consider myself a co-researcher together with this team, as well as with the Council of Secretary-generals and the stakeholders and youth with whom we worked. My core role is to make co-creation happen, not to be personally involved in all activities and sessions. During the process, data collection provides the challenge of using various sources and documents produced by co-researchers in the course of the process of producing the action program. Not all data is recorded or obtainable through my personal involvement. I am, however, in the unique position to guide, experience, and work firsthand, especially with the power related aspects of the “politics” that are involved, both in the
organizational context, as well as in the political context. The focus on the tensions between participation and representation is uniquely close, due to my insider perspective as secretary-general. This position also provides a highly involved perspective in the bureaucratic surroundings in relation to the research questions. The choice for action research is based on the desire to expand and deepen the knowledge and insights on participation in the context of the Action Program for Youth Development in Curacao. An objective and scientifically neutral approach as applied in research in the positivist scientific philosophy would not fit the need for close-up exploration and experimentation with the actual challenges and experiences of trying to incorporate participation in a bureaucratic environment within a representative democracy. Since the Action Program for Youth Development is an exploratory prototype for a new cooperative and participative way of working for the Curacao Government, the desire is to document the experiences hands on as a learning process. The action research orientation of change with others (Reason and Bradbury, 2008, p. 1), the desire to act creatively in the face of a pressing issue in the community, to do so based on “engagement with people in collaborative relationships” in which “dialogue and development” flourish, and especially the “emergent process that changes and develops as those engaged deepen their understanding of the issues to be addressed” (Reason and Bradbury, 2008, p. 3) are descriptive aspects of action research, and fit like a glove into the context of this research project.

Action research is defined in various ways. Reason and Bradbury (2008) use the following.

A participatory process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their community. (Reason and Bradbury, 2008, p. 4)

This definition reflects both the broad scope, as well the origin of action research, in which the active participation of, and collaboration with, the persons (“subjects”) being researched broke with the positivist epistemology of objective “outsider” research. It is attributed to Kurt Lewin, who, as a social psychologist at the end of World War II, brought the objective researchers and the subjects of the research together and developed theory concerning AR. But, AR has developed from, and in, multiple directions. Bradbury (2015) speaks of two origins of AR that are intertwined. One is, as mentioned, Lewin. The other is to be found in Colombia (Fals Borda) and Bangladesh (Rahman), with the liberation and emancipation movements. The various branches of this family of
practices and approaches (Bradbury, 2015) have evolved over recent decades and developed along the variety of needs for positive change, and the creation of new knowledge in communities, in organizations, and in social science theory. In the following, I review various aspects of the AR groundings (sometimes in relation to my personal drive and social and scientific paradigm) to provide insight into why I feel specifically attracted to AR and use it to research the Curacao case of participative governance.

The core characteristic of AR is to contribute to human well-being and the flourishing of communities, besides building scientific theory. The goal of contributing to better social circumstances is reflected in AR definitions of various scholars (Reason and Bradbury, 2008; Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988; McNiff and Whitehead, 2011). The drive for positive change, combined with a critical world view, relates to the critical foundation of AR as initiated through the Frankfurt School and later scholars with emancipatory (Freire) and liberational (Fals Borda) motivations, who were driven by “deep concern to overcome social injustice and the establishment of more just social conditions for all people” (Kemmis, 2008, p. 125). Beyond analysis and description, AR aims to find the reason behind injustice and seeks solutions in the practical realm. The orientation is on actual issues that need a solution, often referred to as the pragmatic stance of AR, which aims to solve problems in the real life and not aim solely for building theory. During this research my curiosity into comparing vision processes evolved into a fascination with governance and how government and the community can co-create for a better future. The involvement in earlier community visioning processes unlocked a curiosity in cultural and societal aspects in the context of change processes. It opened my eyes to a systemic view of such processes, in which various powers influence a process at a given time. This relates to AR as a systemic approach (Midgley, 2015), the view that we operate in, and also as a living (social) system with boundaries, interrelated connections, and context related influences that are not always apparent. A systems view, thus, relates to the fact that phenomena can be explained by the interrelatedness of various aspects that form a whole, whereby the whole is more just the sum of its parts (Vermaak, 2009, p. 86).

This contextual view is also in line with the social constructionist position of many, but not all, ARs. The social constructionist view “traces the origin of knowledge, meaning or understanding to human relationships” (Gergen and Gergen, 2015, p. 402). According to Gergen and Gergen (2015), three movements influence and stimulate the social constructionist approach: the critical movement that provides criticism on the positivist ideology concerning “authoritative accounts of the world;” the literary/rhetorical movement, which considers that traditions of language provide society with what it views as the world; and the third social element, objecting to a factual approach to knowledge and instead proposing that social processes form the basis for knowledge. Indeed
all three, and especially the language aspect, in the social constructionist approach appeal to me, as I have actively worked as a reporter and writer, always making conscious choices of language to evaluate the effect it has in providing meaning to an article or a specific aspect in an article. In my work as senior-level civil servant, I often have to connect various professional or ideological worlds and viewpoints, and I experience that the choice of words and language are often decisive for bridging such apparent divides. As such, “fragmentations and dualisms are mere social constructions” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 3) and perceptions of truth exist within such constructs. A dialogic approach, as described by Schein (1993), is used often to bridge divides that would otherwise remain gaping depths, such as in international conflict resolution.

Scholars and analysts are interested in this context, including David van Reybrouck (2013), who holds a highly critical stand on elections as the only (and overly glorified) way for citizens to exercise their democratic rights in Western societies. He, with many others in recent times, encourages deliberative and participative forms of democracy. Although elections are most often used as a way to exercise democratic rights, In’t Veld (2010) describes the highly eroding influence of the media in the forming of personalities in such elections. Elections that have become a media spectacle, dominated by daily polling instead of a competition on ideologies and ideas for the further development of a country, state, or city. The US elections 2016 provide a case in point in this context. Most populist movements in Western Europe also reflect this “media-cracy” (In’t Veld, 2010), which steers people further and further away from the essence of democracy and democratic citizenship. This relates to the liberation aspects and activist origin of AR, as reflected in the AR movements in areas of social change, such as feminism and gender policies, social inequality, race, economic exclusion, and oppression.

Engagement is another important aspect of AR. “We are called to engage with, rather than merely understand, the unprecedented and compounding challenges that surround us” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 3). This goes hand in hand, though, with a healthy degree of realism, into what one can and would want to influence. In AR terms this is coined as “reflexivity,” or a “critical stance on what limits and enables our own and others’ participation” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 3). Reflexivity also refers to a broader—or deeper—discovery of one’s philosophical position, in which metaphysical, epistemic, and moral commitments are often unconsciously reflected in mental biases (Gonnerman, O’Rourke, Crowley, & Hall, 2015, p. 674). Given the collaborative nature of AR, it is important that philosophical assumptions are made explicit.

Action researchers are described as “constituting a movement that is committed to alternative models for the creation of transformational knowledge” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 4). This provides a coherent frame around sometimes seemingly unrelated views. The more I become acquainted with AR literature and practices, the more things seem to fall into
place with respect to my own logic and reasoning that have evolved over the years. I encounter many authors whose works I have been reading over the last 15 years (e.g., Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, Davenport, and Prusak; Nonaka and Takeuchi; Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder), but I was unable to connect them in a philosophical framework, while I recognized a binding logic in their approach and schools of thought. They can be connected through the AR family of approaches.

Action Research as a qualitative method is applied broadly in business management, among others for organizational innovation and design. In this context Shani and Pasmore (as cited in Coghlan and Brannick, 2014, p. 5) use a narrowed definition of AR, focusing on organizational development.

Action research may be defined as an emergent inquiry process in which applied behavioral science knowledge is integrated with existing organizational knowledge and applied to solve real organizational problems. It is simultaneously concerned with bringing about change in organizations, in developing self-help competencies in organizational members and adding to scientific knowledge. Finally, it is an evolving process that is undertaken in a spirit of collaboration and co-inquiry. (Shani and Pasmore, as cited in Coghlan and Brannick, 2014, p. 5)

They present a theory of the AR process with four factors: context, the quality of relationships, the quality of the action research process itself, and outcomes.

A specific AR approach in organizational development is insider AR (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014; Coghland and Shani, 2015), which refers to members of an organization doing AR in their own organization. In doing so, they enhance organizational change capabilities and impact change (Coghlan and Shani, 2015, p. 47). This kind of AR brings about three perspectives for the action researcher (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014, p. 7), which correlate with the three audiences as described by Reason and Marshall (1987, p. 112–113, as cited in Coghlan and Brannick, 2014): me, the first-person perspective with explorations on a personal level; us, the second-person perspective with explorations on the organizational level; and them, the third-person perspective with explorations on the level of the scientific community.

According to Coghlan and Brannick (2014, p. 7), the first-person perspective “addresses the individual’s ability to foster an inquiring approach to their own life, to act out of awareness and purposefully.” The second-person perspective addresses the ability “to inquire into and work with others in issues of mutual concern, through face-to-face dialogue, conversation and joint action.” The third-person perspective “aims at creating communities of inquiry, involving people beyond the direct second-person action.” This
happens through reporting and publishing “and extrapolating from the concrete to the 
general” (Coghlan & Brannick, 2014, p. 7).
In the following sections I describe the use of insider AR in this research and the appli-
cation of specific methods and instruments such as action learning and template anal-
ysis. I also argue how quality aspects have been taken into consideration.

5.4 THE AR PROCESS

The following sections describe how the AR process actually took place with respect to 
roles and perspectives, creating learning cycles, collecting data, the choice of analyt-
ical methods, and the attention to aspects of quality. First presented is an impression 
of the AR process in time.
As discussed in Chapter 1, this research has an iterative and exploratory approach at 
three levels, which interact with one another. See Figure 5.1.

On the organization level, the AR process focuses on an action learning approach, 
which focuses on how to make participation and cooperation work within a bureau-
ocratic environment in the Curaçao Government. At the case study level, the project of 
the development of the Action program for Youth Development focuses on the produc-
tion of the action program itself as a case study. The research takes the shape of insider 
AR from the position of secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign 
Relations in Curaçao.

The idea of a national Action Program for Youth Development was initiated in July 
2014, after a fatal shooting incident at the airport, which involved young people who 
were affiliated with competing local gangs. The shooting, which involved automatic 
weapons in the parking lot right outside of the airport’s arrival hall, left two gang 
members dead and six bystanders injured. This was the direct motive for a critical look 
at what makes young people end up making such choices. There were many more 
worrisome indicators in recent years, but the shooting was the proverbial drop that 
made the bucket overflow, and launched an urgent call for action.

The development of the action program took place in three phases (see also Figure 5.1):
an exploratory phase (July 2015–December 2014) in which various stakeholders 
were consulted to identify challenges with regard to youth development, and 
also possible solutions. It resulted in the proposal for the National Platform 
for Youth Development, and the proposal to design an Action Program for 
Youth Development under the guidance of the platform. These proposals were 
approved in December 2014 by the Government of Curaçao.
Figure 5.1 Multilayered and iterative research process

- **Track of PhD Research process (Chapter 1, 2, 7 & 8)**
  - Final Thesis; Transformative Governance for the Knowledge Democracy
  - Dynamic Model Transformative Governance for Knowledge Democracy
  - Adjusted Framework for Governance for Knowledge Democracy based on Curacao Case Study
  - Initial Framework for Governance for the Knowledge Democracy based on theoretical synthesis
  - Analysis of vision oriented ‘top down’ participative mechanisms and ‘bottom up’ approach from the knowledge / participation perspective.
  - Comparison of knowledge developments in business and in communities, focusing on the strategic and economic significance of a knowledge based approach.
  - Comparison of business literature on knowledge management, and projected on vision development processes in cities, resulting in a dilemma model.

- **Track of Action Learning on Organizational Level (Chapter 3 & 4)**
  - Template Analysis
  - Evaluation concept Template Analysis
  - Case Study Validation Phase
  - Case Study Design Phase
  - Case Study Exploratory Phase

- **Track of the case study Action Plan Youth Development Curacao (Chapter 5 & 6)**
  - Youth Development as pilot for Integral Management in SG Council
  - Initiative for Integral Management in SG Council
  - Evaluation and reflection cycles
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A design phase (January–April 2015) in which the national platform was formed and became operational, and a draft was prepared of the Action Program for Youth Development, based on multi-stakeholder consultations, including ministries and youth dialogues. Research was performed to develop a vision and comprehensive approach to youth development and to ensure an evidence-based action program.

A validation phase (April–August 2015) in which the draft of the action program was validated through sessions and dialogues, and an overview was produced of all youth development related activities and projects of both public and private sector. Based on the consultations, priorities were selected and validated for implementation in 2015 and 2016. Also, a new financing approach was developed and introduced, involving public and private sector funding. A structure and process were developed for the implementation phase of the action program.

The case study research mainly covers the phases of design and validation. Some aspects and developments that took place during the first phase of exploration are also taken into account based on available data.

**Figure 5.2 The three project phases towards the Action Program for Youth Development**

- **Exploration** July-Dec 2014
  - Consulting stakeholders
  - Identifying challenges with regard to Youth Development
  - Identifying possible solutions: a National Platform and an Action Program for Youth Development
  - Preparing proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development and initiative for an Action Program
  - Approval of proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development and an Action Program

- **Design** Jan-April 2015
  - Designing a vision and comprehensive approach to youth development
  - Compile and analyze research, facts and figures
  - Consulting ministries, stakeholders and youth
  - Produce first draft of the Action Program for Youth Development
  - Implement National Platform for Youth Development

- **Validation** April-Aug 2015
  - Validate draft action program through consultations and dialogues
  - Develop overview of activities and projects related to Youth Development
  - Prioritize activities and projects for 2015 and 2016
  - Develop implementation process and structure
  - Develop alternative financing approach and involvement of private sector funds
  - Approval of the action program by the Council of Ministers
The process of the Action Program for Youth Development is of great importance to the government in two ways: 1) on the project/case study level, to address the development of all youth in Curaçao in a structural way within a clear policy framework and to not just address problems that manifest themselves as symptoms of the underlying developmental issues; and 2) on the organizational level, to develop a new way of working for the Government of Curaçao, through an integral collaborative approach between ministries, and also based on cooperation with, and participation of, stakeholders, such as the youth. This last aim correlates directly with the supplementary approach in the form of the development of “an internal action research change capability to guide and lead change” (Coghlan and Shani, 2015).

5.5 ACTION RESEARCH ROLES IN THE RESEARCH

This paragraph elaborates on the three AR perspectives of “me” (personal), “we” (organization/co-researchers), and “us” (scientific/community). They can be recognized in the structure, the process, as well as the various activities in the research process. The second-person perspective (“we”) was applied in the process by working closely with a team of writers, researchers, facilitators, and the president of the National Platform for Youth Development, who together formed the core team for guiding the process. We met mostly on a weekly basis. Also, the Council of Secretary-generals was directly involved through the regular bi-weekly meetings in which they were updated and asked for feedback, and many times were also asked for direct involvement of colleagues from the various ministries in working groups (“tiger teams”) of the secretariat. This aspect mostly reflects the second-person or organizational perspective, in which the development of change capabilities to become a more cooperative and participative organization was the focal point. The bigger picture of the process shows that—besides the ministries—a great variety of stakeholders and experts participated through sessions, and the youth who were involved through rounds of consultations and dialogues.

The first-person perspective (“me”) took shape during the process by working with a research journal and being active with personal reflections on the developments during the process. Operating in this highly varied field of co-researchers, while being professionally responsible for the process and its results, reflected mostly the first-person perspective in dealing with the various roles and the regular switching of perspectives, and the challenge of doing practical research in my organization on a scientifically sound basis.

The third-person perspective (“us”) is reflected in the production of this dissertation. The wider dissemination into the scientific world reflects the third-person perspective,
where knowledge development on scientific level is central, by evaluating the specific outcomes of this case on a conceptual level.

5.6 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

During the process a large amount of documents, reports, emails, and other publications have been produced. This stream, consisting of a variety of documentation, forms the source for the data for this research. They have only partially been written directly by me and mostly by co-researchers in either the core team or the secretariat of the National Platform for Youth Development. In order to methodologically analyze this data, various methods have been considered, such as the grounded theory approach and discourse analysis. Grounded theory as described by Charmaz (2014) consists of a systematic, yet flexible way of collecting data and analyzing it for theory construction. The grounded theory approach facilitates an approach to simultaneously collect and work through the raw qualitative data in an iterative manner, coding the data by attaching labels to segments as a basis for further analysis at various levels of abstraction. Although grounded theory greatly appeals to me, especially in the approach of Charmaz who considers it aligned with a social constructionist view, the process itself and the type of data did not fit the application of grounded theory in this research project. This is mainly caused by the type of data and documents as well as my senior-level role, which creates a distance between the actual hands on generation of data. The process of developing the Action Program for Youth Development was a constant flow of quickly evolving learning cycles, which lessons learned needed practical application right away in each next step of the process (i.e., the next AR cycle). The choice for data collection and analysis was a challenge, because the data are embedded in a great variety of documents. The aim with the data collection is to be as complete as possible, in the sense that the data represent the various kinds of sessions that took place and the different populations that were involved, and also ensures that the three phases of the project are covered. The types of used data include descriptive reports from facilitated expert sessions, minutes of meetings with stakeholders, reports from the youth dialogues, conclusions of reflective sessions, my personal research journal, the Action Program for Youth Development itself, emails, legal documents with respect to the National Platform for Youth Development, power point presentations, and progress reports. The total amount of documents used for the data collection is 29, varying in length from 1 page to 200+ pages. I was not personally involved in the production of all documents. This played a role when I considered discourse analysis as a possible method for analysis. The type of documents reflect a variety of data, but many of the documents do not mention actual
or direct discourse, since they are accounts of meetings and sessions, reports, and other kinds of documents. These accounts not necessarily reflect the actual discourse of, for instance, the youth dialogues; they are a compilation of and—to a certain extent—an interpretation of the discourse during the sessions. This brings about the notion that, in relation to the research questions, neither grounded theory nor discourse analysis seemed to lead to useful knowledge in the form of answers to the mostly process-oriented research questions.

The choice was made to use template analysis (King, 2012) for the analysis of data as a way to deal with the extensive amount and level of complexity of the data. As described by King (2012, p. 426), template analysis (TA) is a style of thematic analysis, which brings a balance between structure in the analytical process and flexibility towards the specific research project. Even though it is used mostly for analyzing data from interviews, it can also be used on other forms of data, such as in this research. Template analysis works with a coding template that is based on a subset of the data. This is the starting point for further development and refinement of the codes into a template with thematic levels, based on the analysis of all available data. Template analysis offers a quite flexible method that, according to ongoing literature research by King, has been used in over 200 articles and studies in the area of organizational research, health, education, clinical psychology, and sports science (King 2010, p. 427). The largest study using TA consisted of 81 interviews and the smallest consisted of only one, with the common average between 15 and 30. As discussed, this particular research used a total of 29 documents in a variety of forms and lengths as data sources in the application of TA. A digital tool (Qualitative Data Analysis Miner) was used for data input and analysis, resulting in a template analysis in the form of a codebook. The digital tool and TA were really helpful also in dealing with the challenge of multi-lingual data sources, as was the case in this research with data in Dutch, English, and the native language of Curacao, Papiamentu.

The digital tool provides the option to upload all documents as “cases” and analyze them one-by-one and connect either a new or an already used code to the sentences and paragraphs. The applied code appears in the overview of codes, to which one can apply categories and sub-categories for the codes. The totality of the codes produces a full overview in the form of a codebook that reflects the template analysis. The digital tool allows for multiple forms of analysis and retrieval of codes.

Three features can be considered in the choice for TA instead of related methods, such as grounded theory or interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). These three features are the flexibility of the coding, the use of a priori themes, and the use of an initial template. All three are later discussed in relation to this research process. With
respect to the first feature—the flexibility of coding—TA is not prescriptive in how to incrementally move from descriptive coding to interpretative coding on a more abstract thematic level. The technique, as King prefers to call TA, places no restriction on the amount of levels that can be used, and as such it can be tailor made to the topic of the research. In the case of this research, it turned out that the maximum amount of levels was four in some themes, depending on the richness of the data in relation to one or more of the research questions.

For the second feature, King distinguishes the use of a priori themes as a middle ground option, moving between bottom-up and inductively developed themes such as in grounded theory and IPA, and top-down approaches to themes, such as in matrix analysis (Nadin and Cassell, 2004) and framework analysis (Pope et al., 2000). Some themes can be defined beforehand, but also adapted or discarded during the further data analysis. In the case of this research, the thematic subdivision of the Action Program for Youth Development itself was used as a very broad a priori approach, distinguishing between three main themes of “why,” “how,” and “what,” providing space to analyze motivations, as well the process and activities in relation to the research questions.

The third feature is related to step-by-step analysis and coding. Template analysis allows the researcher to work with an initial template, which is developed based on a subset of data. The researcher can then adapt and adjust the template for each new
dataset, instead of starting coding from scratch with each dataset. In this case the personal research journal was used as a subset for the initial template, since it covered the main phases (design and validation), and also it is the only document (besides the voluminous action program itself) that covers a broad set of aspects and can form a useful basis for the rest of the datasets. Most other documents provide a narrow data set related to specific events in the process. The research journal provided the opportunity to look at themes related to the organization, the project, my managerial position, and scientific aspects to produce a useful subset of the data with which to start.

The research journal was analyzed as a subset of the data to produce an initial template. This was followed by analysis and coding of all other documents. Each adaptation to the initial template has been recorded in a file distinguishing between four different adaptations:

1. Insertion - adding a new code;
2. Deletion - deleting a code because there is no use for it related to the research questions or in case of strong overlap;
3. Changing scope - redefining code to a lower of higher level when it seems to narrow or to broadly defined; and
4. Changing higher order classification - changing a sub-category code from one higher order classification to fit beneath another higher order code.

In this research, adaptations of all four types have been made, though the majority consisted of either insertions or a change in the higher order classification.

In an epistemological context, TA can fit both a positivist approach to qualitative research as well as a constructionist view. The emphasis, according to King, is not on coding reliability, but in the reflexive capabilities of the researcher to work from various perspectives and the richness of the analytic descriptions. In the case of this research, reflectivity was built into the core process of the development of the Action Program for Youth Development. The core research team, consisting of the president and the secretary of the National Platform for Youth Development, two facilitators, and myself, met on a weekly basis and structurally reserved time to reflect on what had taken place, what had been achieved and how, and what this meant for the next steps. This meant that the AR cycles were not always sequential, because more than one aspect needed to be taken into account at any given moment, as many activities and aspects ran parallel during the process. Specific moments of evaluation were also built in beyond the direct process activities of the development of the action program. We used such moments, for instance, to reflect as a group on the template analysis to see where my reflections and analysis matched or mismatched those of the other core team members. This was used to further refine the template.
Constant learning was imperative to the process, not only for scientific reasons, but because the development of the Action Program for Youth Development and the National Platform for Youth Development is a prototype for a new way of working for the Curaçao Government. The processes towards the design of the action process and making the National Platform for Youth Development and secretariat with its “tiger teams” operational are just as important as the content of the actual Action Program for Youth Development. In fact, the action program itself dedicates attention not just to “what” needs to be done on activity level, but also specifically to “why” an integral and participative approach is necessary and “how” we can learn to work this way. In order to build participation and support for this process—which essentially is an organizational and even a societal change process towards participation—a lot of attention has been given to involve and inform both ministries, as well as stakeholders in the community. Special attention has been given to involving the youth directly, as their future is the topic of the Action Program for Youth Development. To involve the ministries, the secretary-generals were involved in using the platform of the bi-weekly Council of Secretary-generals. The secretary-generals were at the basis for the initial design of an integral approach and collaboration not only between ministries, but also with stakeholders in the National Platform for Youth Development. Further sessions have taken place in the key ministries involving the management team, and also the policy and financial departments, especially to listen to their concerns and discuss how the action program can be of help in addressing their challenges. Stakeholders were invited to facilitated thematic sessions, as stakeholders and/or as experts. This was meant to bring people and organizations together who otherwise hardly knew of each other’s existence and certainly had never met, or collaborated, although often working in the same area of youth development. The invitees were chosen carefully, so as to complement each other, to provide for a variety of views and perspectives during dialogues, and especially to share practical knowledge and insights. Therefore, the invitations were sent out not to the board or director level, but personally to field workers. The youth were involved in various ways and throughout the process. During the exploratory phase, young people were invited to consultation rounds combined with training in dialogue. These sessions were used to test the waters of how to organize later dialogue sessions with youth, to discover what could be achieved in such dialogues and with which techniques, and also to train young people to be dialogue facilitators during the planned sessions on a larger and more public scale in the next phases. Certain surveys among participants, adjustments to recruitment and invitations, as well as a variety of locations for the dialogues across the island were used to reach a large and diverse group of young people to become involved and provide input and feedback for the action program. More about considerations that have been made about representativeness versus diversity with regard to
youth participation is discussed in Chapter 6. In total more than 350 young people have been directly involved in the dialogue sessions.

The full analytical process of the data is captured in Figure 5.4, which describes how the analytical process took place from working with and analyzing the raw data based on broad a priori themes to making an initial template design and template analysis in the form of a codebook, then using the TA (codebook) as a starting point for interpretative analysis, and relating the findings and analysis literature and the research questions.

**Figure 5.4 Schematic representation of the analytical process**

1. **Analysis of operational phases**
   - Analyze findings in the three phases of the Action Program, working with broad a priori themes

2. **Template design**
   - Design initial template based on research journal as subset of data
   - Code all data (29 documents)
   - Organize and reorganize categories/codes in relation to logic of the template and research questions (RQ)
   - Adjust template (record adaptations)

3. **Template analysis**
   - Summarize the findings per category and per code
   - Analyze the findings, note discussion points for analysis
   - Find connections and overlaps between categories, consider changes
   - Adjust template in final form (record adaptations)

4. **Interpretative analysis**
   - Interpret and discuss findings in final template on abstract/thematic level
   - Interpret and discuss findings in relation to literature
STEP 1 - A priori themes
Template analysis starts out with a priori themes that form the basis to build an initial template. In this research four broad a priori themes were selected based on two elements from the structure of the Action Program for Youth Development: “the what” and “the how,” and also two themes in relation to the research questions: “designing appropriate governance” and “politics and power.”

STEP 2 - Initial Template
The second step in the TA involves the development of an initial template. The initial template was designed based on categories and codes that emerged from analyzing my personal research journal, which covered the design and validation phase as well as major aspects of the process. This resulted in an initial template with categories and codes. The four main themes were defined in more detail to build upon in the further analysis:

- **The What** - This theme addresses aspects related to the content and structure of the Action Program for Youth Development, as well as aspects regarding the participative sessions that have been organized and aspects related to inclusiveness in participation.

- **The How** - This theme addresses various aspects of how the participative process has worked and how it has functioned as a learning process, with specific attention to the learning cycles, creative aspects, risk factors, and various elements related to teamwork.

- **Designing appropriate governance** - This theme addresses aspects related to governance requirements and mechanisms that have played a role in the process of developing the action program and that will be applied in the implementation phase, as well as the leadership aspects that have influenced the process.

- **Politics and power** - This theme addresses the tensions that arise concerning the role of politics, both on a formal political level, as well as organizational politics, such as understanding and aligning various interests. The theme also describes what aspects play a role in stimulating support and working amid dynamic political circumstances.

STEP 3 - Refining the initial template
The initial template, which emerged based on analysis of the research journal as a first subset of the data, was then used as a basis to further add, change, and refine themes, categories, and codes through analysis of the full volume of documents. Each adaptation to the initial template has been recorded in a file distinguishing between four different adaptations:
Insertion - adding a new code
Deletion - deleting a code because there is no use for it related to the research questions or in case of strong overlap
Changing scope - redefining code to a lower of higher level when it seems to narrow or to broadly defined
Changing higher order classification - changing a sub-category code from one higher order classification to fit beneath another higher order code.

In this research, adaptations of all four types have been made, though the majority consisted of either insertions or changes in the higher order classification. The refinement based on data from all documents resulted in a codebook in which the four main themes in the TA are subdivided in 14 first-level categories, of which four have second-level categories. A total of 82 codes have been identified.

STEP 4 - Interpretative analysis

The TA as reflected in the codebook is the basis for interpretative analysis of the data by examining the themes in depth. King (2012) suggests that in order to choose which themes are worth discussing, it is necessary to consider aspects such as listing codes, selectivity, openness, and relationships between themes. Listing codes refers to the frequency of themes and their distribution within and across documents, which may (or may not) reveal why it is relevant to discuss. Selectivity is related to the need to be selective in which themes (or cluster of themes) to discuss, based on whether they provide certain insight into the research topic. Openness relates to the need to remain open discussing themes, even if they are not directly related to the research questions. If such themes contribute to a deeper understanding of the themes that are directly related to the research questions, then they can be considered for discussion. Relationship between themes is the consideration of whether certain themes are interconnected, since this may provide for relevant discussion in the interpretative analysis. The central focus of the interpretative analysis is the relation to the research questions:

1. What participative structures or processes can be applied within a traditional bureaucratic government structure, where policy development is a non-participatory process? What are success factors and risks?
2. How can participation of citizens be organized/shaped in a parliamentary democracy where the formal power is in the hands of an elected body of representatives who create an executive government?
3. What tensions with respect to power in policy development and decision making does this bring forward, and how can this be addressed?

Besides the direct relevance to the research questions, the following questions have also been considered in making a selection of relevant topics to discuss, following King’s (2012) suggestions concerning listing codes, selectivity, openness, and relationships
between themes:

- What themes and codes appear most frequently, and do they appear across various documents, or in specific documents?
- What themes and codes have been persistently present from the start?
- Which themes have come to the forefront based on the sessions/dialogues and were added along the way? (In other words, what was not foreseen beforehand?)
- What was a specific focus of the youth, as expressed during the youth dialogues?
- What themes are strongly related?
- Which themes have received fewer codes, but are still important?

### 5.7 CONSIDERATIONS TOWARDS QUALITY

Quality in AR has been discussed by various scholars (Levin, 2003; Reason, 2006; Reason and Bradbury, 2008; Bradbury, 2015). Discussions concerning quality aspects are evolving along the lines of AR’s incremental development into a widely used scientific practice. The search is for criteria and requirements that are rigorous, but that make a clear distinction from validity and objective truth claims as applied in the positivist epistemology. Various quality approaches specifically aimed at AR have been brought forward. Levin (2003) developed a four-point framework:

- **Participation** - how well does the AR reflect cooperation between the members of the system and me?
- **Real-life problems** - is the AR project guided by a concern for real-life, practical outcomes, and is it governed by constant and iterative reflection as part of the process?
- **Joint meaning construction** - is the process of interpreting events, articulating meaning, and generating understanding a collaborative process between the members of the system and me?
- **Workable solutions** - does the AR project result in significant work and sustainable outcomes?

Reason (2006) discussed in a comparable fashion various choice points that need to be considered and made transparent to enable judgment about AR:

1. Being explicitly aimed at, and grounded in, the world of practice;
2. Being explicitly and actively participative (research with, for, and by people rather than on people);
3. Drawing on a wide range of ways of knowing including intuitive, experiential,
presentational, as well as conceptual, and linking appropriately to form theory; and

4. Results are aimed to be significant in their context and can be emergent.

Coghlan (2014) discussed such choice points and explains that a researcher cannot rate all choice points evenly. The key is to show the understanding of events, how insights were tested and weighed up the evidence, and how value judgments and decisions were made. In each research it is important to select against which choice points the research can be judged, and the dealings with those choice points should be made transparent.

In the most recent version of the SAGE Handbook of Action Research, Bradbury (2015, p. 8) compiles what constitutes “quality in action research” as a “colleague” among editors of the Action Research Journal in seven criteria.

1. **Quality requires articulation of objectives** - the extent to which the AR actually addresses its objectives.

2. **Quality requires partnerships and participation** - the extent to and means by which the AR reflects or enacts participative values and concern for the relational component of the research. By the extent of participation, I am referring to a continuum from consultation with stakeholders to stakeholders as full co-researchers.

3. **Quality requires contribution to AR theory-practice** - the extent to which the AR builds on (creates explicit links with) or contributes to a wider body of practice knowledge and/or theory, which it contributes to the AR literature.

4. **Quality requires appropriate methods and process** - the extent to which the AR process and related methods are clearly articulated and illustrated. By illustrated, I mean that empirical papers “show” and do not just “tell” about process and outcomes by including analysis of data that includes the voices of participants in the research.

5. **Quality requires actionability** - the extent to which the AR provides new ideas that guide action in response to a need.

6. **Quality requires reflexivity** - the extent to which self-location as a change agent is acknowledged. By self-location I mean that authors take a personal, involved, and self-critical stance as reflected in clarity about their role in the AR process, clarity about the context in which the AR process takes place, and clarity about which led to their involvement in this research.

7. **Quality requires significance** - the extent to which the insights of the AR are significant in content and process. By significant I mean having meaning and relevance beyond their immediate context in support of the flourishing of persons, communities, and the wider ecology (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8).
For the use of template analysis, King (2012) developed some specific quality criteria regarding the coding and analysis. He mentions three aspects to consider in the qualitative judgment of the use of template analysis: critical comparison among researchers of the coding, provision of audit trails such as record of changes made to the template, and respondent feedback.

5.8 CASE DESCRIPTION

The case study involves the development of an Action Program for Youth Development by the Government of Curaçao in a participative and interactive way with involvement of ministries, youth, NGOs, and other stakeholders. The goal was twofold: develop an action plan, but also an action learning process towards a new way of working for the government. As described briefly in section 5.1 these goals provide a close connection to the research questions and make it suitable as a case study for participative governance. The case study in the government of Curaçao provides a bureaucratic structure as the organizational context for the introduction of a participative and knowledge driven process. As described in chapters 3 and 4, the design of the new government structure was intended to become more participative in its original approach, but this did not materialize in the structures and processes that were designed thereafter and implemented in 2010. This bureaucratic context relates particularly to research question 1. Curaçao is a small country, in fact a city-state, with a parliamentary democracy. This aspect relates directly to research question 2. The choice for action research from my position as Secretary-general of the ministry of general affairs and foreign relations, provides the unique opportunity to address power aspects on both organizational, as well as the political level that are related to research question 3.

The development of the action program took place in three phases (see also Figure 5.1): an exploratory phase (July 2014–December 2014), a design phase (January 2015–April 2015), and a validation phase (April 2015–August 2015). The following sections describe the three phases and the developments therein.

5.8.1 The exploratory phase

The exploratory phase started in July and ended in December 2014, with the approval of the government to launch a National Platform for Youth Development and produce an Action Program for Youth Development. This section describes the developments in this phase.

In the exploratory phase the following steps in the process were taken: 1) consulting stakeholders, 2) identifying challenges with regard to youth development, 3) identifying possible solutions in the form of a National Platform for Youth Development and
an Action Program for Youth Development, 4) preparing the proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development and initiative for an action program, and 5) approval by the government of the proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development and an action program.

During this exploratory phase several activities took place in order to seek possible solutions. Two meetings were organized to consult various ministries and stakeholders on the backgrounds of what had happened, and to discuss what a comprehensive approach towards structural solutions would entail. Several challenges with respect to youth development in Curaçao were reported from these first sessions. The stakeholders noted a fragmentation of attention, energy, and budgets resulting in very minimal overall results. They also saw a lack of profound insight based on research (e.g., causes and effects); in practice most insight was based on experiences on individual organizational level. Stakeholders also concluded a lack of evaluation of existing interventions and actions, and the absence of comprehensive policies. They also noted that there is little trust and cooperation between ministries and also within and between NGOs, so there is a need for capacity development in order to learn to collaborate. In this phase it was concluded that there is no coherent evidence-based approach, but rather a collection of partial solutions on various specific areas, based on a variety of insights and different priorities. This is further enhanced because of the lack of comprehensive data and analysis of the data. The meetings with ministries and stakeholders were followed by further exchanges in writing, which led to the final formulation of the proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development to the government, as reflected in the formal decree.

In the exploratory phase, internal discussions and brainstorming sessions were also organized in the Council of Secretary-generals about the topic of youth development and how to address this more effectively as government. These discussions first focused on the current approach and on an analysis of this way of working, followed by discussions about how to accomplish an integral approach based on shared focus and collaboration. It became clear that each ministry had its own context through which they identified topics and issues with regard to youth development. The Justice Department, for instance, mainly looks at youth from a crime perspective, while the Department of Social Affairs and Labor looks at circumstances in neighborhoods and families, and considers topics related to the labor market. Each ministry has its own lens through which it looks at youth development, and identifies policy issues and topics accordingly. In the exploratory discussions the SG’s discovered, however, that all the ministries seek solutions in exactly the same set of aspects: the family situation, labor (paid and voluntary), schooling, training and education, the social environment, and research. Through these discussions the secretary-generals identified that cooperation is desir-
Figure 5.5  Analysis of possible cooperation in bureaucratic structure with relation to youth in Curaçao

Strategic level - community involvement

National Platform Youth
Government with variety of stakeholders, Strategic choices and direction

Project secretariat
Coordination, reporting, research, writing and editing Action Program Youth Development

Mixed working groups
(as part of change process of government - focus on integral collaboration)

Government level - approaches of ministries w.r.t. challenges and solutions

JUSTICE
Repeat offenders
Resocialization

EDUCATION
pre-schoolers
troubled students in schools
Drop outs

SOCIAL AND LABOR
Prevention, neighborhoods
Clients multiple challenges

HEALTH
Life long prevention approaches

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
vacancies in sectors
Investors labor needs

Operational level - types of solutions that ministries seek

Home and family situation
Chain of care by government, NGO’s, private sector

Labor (paid/unpaid)
Vocational training and training on the job, guided labor, voluntary work

Education and training
Training, schooling, courses, vocational coaching

Social environment
Investments in social projects and neighborhoods

Research
Target groups, cause/effect, longitudinal research

Table: able and possible on the operational level, while the variety of approaches between ministries on strategic level can be honored and remain intact. This way each ministry recognizes its own perspective, while room is being created for collaboration on the operational level.

Figure 5.5 reflects the analysis made in the Council of Secretary-generals and discussed with stakeholders in the community.

The discussions and consultations in the exploratory phase resulted in a proposal to the government to launch a National Platform for Youth Development (see Appendix A). The proposal had the support of the stakeholders and Council of Secretary-generals and was approved by the government on December 3, 2014. The government decree also included approval to work with a project secretariat and working groups that would focus on various development themes.
5.8.2 The design phase
The design phase from January until April 2015 had the government decree for the launch of a National Platform for Youth Development and the initiative for an action program as its starting point. This section describes the developments and findings in this phase, and it is concluded with reflections on the activities and developments of this phase from a first-person (personal) and second-person (organizational) perspective. In the exploratory phase the following steps in the process were taken: 1) design a vision and comprehensive approach to youth development; 2) compile and analyze research, facts, and figures; 3) consult ministries, stakeholders, and youth; 4) produce a first draft of the Action Program for Youth Development; and 5) implement National Platform for Youth Development.

This phase entailed a strong interplay and connectedness between three parallel trails with respect to the various activities that took place:

- the participative trail in which ministries, stakeholders, and youth were involved in a variety of meetings, sessions, and dialogues;
- the evidence-based trail in which an inventory of all available research since the year 2000 was made with respect to youth development, and cross-checked with findings and ideas from the participative trail; and
- a process guidance trail in which the steps in the process were planned and reflected upon, and in which decision making was prepared.
The participative trail
The design phase started with various sessions with stakeholders who could be possible partners in the National Platform for Youth Development to inform and involve them. Broad support and even outright enthusiasm for the initiative was expressed during these meetings. Also, consultants were hired for the project secretariat to start preparing a draft action program and perform the research needed to make it comprehensive and evidence-based. Thus, in guiding the process as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs, I was closely cooperating with a youth development specialist who is the author of the Action Program for Youth Development, two researchers, the president of the platform, and two professional facilitators, who were specifically preparing dialogue sessions with the youth and with stakeholders. The Council of Secretary-generals was closely involved by means of presentations and feedback. A series of 28 bilateral meetings took place by the youth development specialist to generate input for the first version of the action program and the initial design of the vision on youth development.

The evidence-based trail
The researchers consulted a great variety of organizations and institutions to generate over 90 research documents and reports that had been produced since the year 2000. Of each document or report, a synopsis was made to create an overview of the available research on youth development. The available research was cross-checked with the findings in the bilateral meetings and dialogues with stakeholders, and used as input for the first version to ensure the action program was evidence-based. It was used specifically to determine the possible development themes and the priorities for each theme. All available data were categorized and analyzed per theme and cross-checked with existing government policies, and with the findings of the discussions and dialogues with various stakeholders in the field and with ministries.

Process guidance trail
The initial focus in this phase was on the structure, with the aim to launch the national platform as soon as possible. Invitations were sent out after the meetings with the prime minister for participation in the National Platform for Youth Development to a variety of stakeholders, youth organizations, and ministries. The decree stipulated that the president of the national platform would invite other stake-

Meetings and sessions in design phase:
- Bilateral talks with ministries, stakeholders, and NGO’s
- Youth Consultations (December 13, 2014 and March 22, 2015)
- Presentation and consultation SG-council (December 2014, January 27, February 20 and April 14, 2015)
- Stakeholder Session – School drop outs (March 12, 2015)
- Follow up session - School drop outs (April 24, 2015)
- Expert session – Youth & Sports (March 26, 2015)
holders to become a member, so the first focus was on finding a president. The aim was to have a young person as president, and through informal consultations the idea was brought forward to appeal to the association of scouting organizations to propose a president. This had the support of various stakeholders, and a formal request was sent to the scouting association on January 16, 2015. Based on the profile the scouting organization proposed a candidate, a 27-year-old entrepreneur, with a passion for youth participation. His appointment was formalized in February 2015. It took quite some time, however, to receive candidates from the other organizations and ministries to become member of the platform. The first meeting to make the platform operational took place on May 15, 2015.

Developments along the three trails
Although the first intentions and steps were in the direction of creating the structure (the platform), most progress was made on the process of preparing a first draft action program through rounds of consultations and cross-checking with available research. To generate input for the draft, facilitated sessions were organized with various groups: two youth consultations, expert sessions about dropouts, and sports. Also, various meetings took place with the Council of Secretary-generals, as well as bilateral meetings with ministries, NGOs, and other organizations in the field.

The first draft of the action program, based on these rounds of meetings, consultations, and research, was ready and presented to the Council of Ministers at the end of April 2015. The draft action program had several main elements:

• A vision in the form of five pillars as the national context for youth development: the UN universal rights of children, positive youth policy (appreciative and with focus on development, not problem oriented), the pedagogical civil society, protective and risk factors for youth development (based on the Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) of the Search Institute), and the 21st century skills.
• Five comprehensive themes for youth development with a description, and facts and figures on these topics: education and after school activities, health and well-being, work and entrepreneurship, housing and social environment, and security.
• A description of the proposed validation and implementation process based on the principles of participation, working evidence-based, capacity development.
• A description of the implementation structure, financial planning, and critical success factors.
• Appendixes:
  1. statistics and information about youth development in Curaçao;
  2. the governmental decree about the National Platform for Youth Development;
  3. an overview of the criteria used in the proposed Development Assets Profile as a structural evaluation method for youth development in Curaçao;
4. a summary of the available research since the year 2000;
5. an overview of the meetings held in the design phase;
6. reports of the dialogue sessions.

Since March 2015 regular meetings have been held with the core team working on the action program, consisting of the secretary/author of the action program, the president of the platform, the two dialogue facilitators and trainers who guided the sessions, and myself as secretary-general of the Ministry of General Affairs. The meetings were aimed at process guidance and paid specific attention to reflexivity on the process, aligning the trails, and the preparation of decision making with respect to the action program by the government.

The first version of the Action Program for Youth Development was discussed by the government on April 22, 2015, and received a go-ahead to proceed to the validation phase.

5.8.3 The validation phase

The validation phase covered the period from the end of April 2015 to the end of August 2015, when the action program was discussed and accepted by government as the context for youth development in the coming five years, and also an operational budget for implementation of the program was approved. This section describes the developments and findings in this phase. It is concluded with reflections on the activities and developments this phase from first-person and second-person perspectives.

The aim of the validation phase was to validate the action program on the vision, five themes, and priorities, and to design and plan the implementation. This entailed a shift in the parallel trails of activities. The trail of participation and process guidance remained intact, although with the focus now on the validation and thus intensified participation. The process guidance remained largely intact, although with the activities intensified, also the reflexivity became much more intense. This was needed to ensure alignment of the trails, to ensure authentic validation by broad-based participation, and to prepare the political decision making of the validated action program.

A new aspect of activities was present in this phase: ensuring the sustainability of the action program. The sustainability had a direct connection to the second main goal of the action program: to develop the approach as a prototype for a new way of working for government in an integral and participative manner with involvement and participation of various ministries, as well as stakeholders and civil society. This required training and capacity development of civil servants, and also to apply action learning and create learning cycles with lessons learned about what works and what fails, with respect to collaboration and participation.
An inventory was included of all projects and activities taking place either initiated by government, in the NGO field, or in the private sector related to youth development, categorized under the five development themes. The idea was to present a visual confrontation of the fragmentation taking place in the range of activities across ministries, NGOs and the private sector. Related to this, during the validation phase a proposal was also worked out for a new way of inter-ministerial budgeting, so as to promote effectiveness and efficiency in the financing of youth-related activities. The approach of program financing was new in Curaçao and requires more than one yearly budgetary cycle to fully develop and align it with our formal regulations and laws. The first step consisted of presenting all projects (GO,
NGO, and private sector) and their sources of financing in the formal budgetary format, and add them as an appendix to the formal government budget for 2016, as approved by parliament. This was completed within the required time limits of the formal budget preparations, and was as such included in the government budget for 2016 that was sent to parliament.

The validation took place through a range of sessions and dialogues with a variety of stakeholders, as well as two specific sessions with private sector companies and funds to discuss financing options, priorities, and overlaps. Also, bilateral meetings with ministries and NGOs and other youth-related organizations were organized. The youth was directly involved in three youth dialogues, dispersed over different regions in Curaçao (Banda Abou, Banda Ariba, and a central down town location). This resulted in over 250 young people directly participating in the dialogues. During these dialogues, they not only discussed youth development themes among themselves, but—especially in the third dialogue—also with experts in the field, policy makers, and ministers.

The core team of the secretary, the president of the National Platform for Youth Development, the two facilitators, and myself as secretary-general continued meeting in the validation phase on a weekly basis to reflect on developments and plan ahead step-by-step, thus creating learning cycles.

The researchers in the secretariat in this phase focused on identifying options for structural monitoring and the evaluation of youth development during the implementation. They worked out two main aspects: 1) the development of a digital knowledge base connected to the website in which all available research can be shared, and a social map that shows who does what in the area of youth development; and 2) preparation of the implementation of a structural tool to assess youth development using the DAP from the US-based Search Institute. This entails translation and validation of questionnaires for a representative group of the youth to be used each year to monitor the development along the 40 risk and protective factors.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses and analyzes the findings of the insider AR into the participative process of developing an Action Program for Youth Development in Curaçao. The first paragraph discusses the analytical process of the TA. Paragraph 6.1 presents the findings of the TA as recorded in the codebook and discusses the findings, and the patterns and interrelated aspects in the findings. This is followed in paragraph 6.2 by an interpretive analysis on a more abstract level about themes that have emerged during the participative process based on the use of template analysis. Paragraph 6.3 discusses the findings in relation to literature concerning various aspects that have emerged. This chapter closes with a discussion of the findings in relation to the research questions.

6.1 ANALYSIS TOWARDS CODEBOOK

This section discusses the analytical process and presents the findings of the AR process working with TA (King, 2012). The aim is to make the analysis transparent, since the method is used in a slightly alternative way. Template analysis is often used to analyze comparable documents, such as interviews. As discussed in the previous chapter, the data used for this analysis are compiled from 29 documents, varying in form, length, function, and content. The variety includes the final version of the action program and its voluminous appendixes, as well as reports and summaries of meetings, sessions, and dialogues, the research journal, the formal government decree, presentations, reflections, evaluations, and emails. The data have been analyzed using TA (King, 2012) to design and refine a codebook with categories and subcategories that represent the findings of the AR project. The analysis, the outcome, and relations that have been discovered are discussed in this chapter.
The codebook provides an analytical framework and the opportunity to discuss both main findings, as well as important details that stood out. Figure 6.2 (on page 161) shows the codebook visualized on the level of the main categories. The main categories are “The What,” “The How,” “Designing Appropriate Governance,” and “Politics and Power.” The main categories have sub-categories, and some of them also have a third-level category to distinguish the codes. Figure 6.3 on page 162 shows the codebook with all codes in detail to provide an impression of the type and the amount of codes.
Figure 6.2 Codebook visualized on category level

THE WHAT
- Content aspects
- Sessions
- Inclusiveness in participation
- Learning process
- Doing things differently

THE HOW
- Teamwork
- Risk factors
- Attracting opportunities
- Working mechanisms

DESIGNING APPROPRIATE GOVERNANCE
- Implementation governance
- Leadership

POLITICS AND POWER
- Political dynamics
- Understanding interests
- Promote (political) support

Organizing sessions
Preparing aspects
Who participates
Creative expressions
Figure 6.3  Detailed codebook reflecting the TA

1. The WHAT
1.1. Content aspects
  1.1.1. Context and direction
  1.1.2. Build on what is already there
  1.1.3. Connect separated worlds
  1.1.4. Working evidence based
  1.1.5. Work results oriented
  1.1.6. Combine short and long term focus

1.2. Sessions
  1.2.1. Organizing sessions
    1.2.1.1. Challenges in multilingual setting
    1.2.1.2. Aiming for high quality
    1.2.1.3. Unleash positive energy
    1.2.1.4. When to organize sessions
    1.2.1.5. Safe, pleasant, and informal environment
    1.2.1.6. Stimulate interaction
    1.2.1.7. Preparing sessions (content)
    1.2.1.8. Pre-determined goals
    1.2.1.9. Complexity in relation to capacity
    1.2.1.10. Goal-oriented facilitation
    1.2.1.11. Creative/constructive collisions
    1.2.1.12. Group dynamics
    1.2.1.13. Managing expectations
  1.2.2. Who participates
    1.2.2.1. Challenges with representatives
    1.2.2.2. The need for “skin in the game”
    1.2.2.3. Cooperation must grow
    1.2.2.4. Representation versus diversity
    1.2.2.5. Expert knowledge
    1.2.2.6. Ownership in ministries
    1.2.2.7. Group size

1.3. Inclusiveness in participation
  1.3.1. Targeting special groups
  1.3.2. Outreach to voiceless groups
  1.3.3. Multi-stakeholder setting
  1.3.4. Target all youth, not just problem groups
  1.3.5. Talk with youth, not about them

2. The HOW
2.1. Learning process
  2.1.1. Capacity development
  2.1.2. Evaluations
  2.1.3. Conscious reflections
  2.1.4. Action learning
  2.1.5. Process guidance
  2.1.6. Facilitated sessions

2.2. Doing things differently
  2.2.1. Choice of words and language
  2.2.2. Break through bureaucratic financing
  2.2.3. Appreciative approach
  2.2.4. Dialogic approach
  2.2.5. Aim for sustainability

2.2.6. Creative expressions
  2.2.6.1. Graphics
  2.2.6.2. Video
  2.2.6.3. Theatre/Arts
  2.2.6.4. Media and technology

3. Designing appropriate governance
3.1. Working mechanisms
  3.1.1. Organize around capacities
  3.1.2. Process versus structure

3.2. Implementation governance
  3.2.1. Nobody owns it
  3.2.2. Location for team meetings
  3.2.3. Interaction between teams
  3.2.4. Formal responsibilities
  3.2.5. Coordination and networking
  3.2.6. Combine internal and external capacities
  3.2.7. Interaction
  3.2.8. Action oriented
  3.2.9. Accountability

3.3. Leadership in insider AR
  3.3.1. Conflicting roles
  3.3.2. Reinforcing roles
  3.3.3. Switching and combining roles
  3.3.4. Facilitative leadership
  3.3.5. Dare to trust—the art of letting go

4. Politics and power
4.1. Political dynamics
  4.1.1. Continuity in dynamic political setting
  4.1.2. Dealing with doubts in community
  4.1.3. Balancing political ownership and labeling

4.2. Understanding interests
  4.2.1. Respecting territories
  4.2.2. Relationship management
  4.2.3. Active communication

4.3. Promote political support
  4.3.1. Choice of language and words
  4.3.2. Flexibility
  4.3.3. Role of politicians in sessions
  4.3.4. Let them experience it
  4.3.5. Managing of expectations
  4.3.6. Bottom-up approach
### Table 6.1 Sample of the recording of adaptations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSERTION</th>
<th>DELETION</th>
<th>CHANGING SCOPE</th>
<th>CHANGING HIGHER ORDER CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>REMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adding a new code</td>
<td>deleting a code because there is no use for it related to the RQs, or in case of strong overlap</td>
<td>redefining code at a higher or lower level when it seems too narrow or too broadly defined</td>
<td>changing a sub-category code from one higher order code to fit below another higher order code</td>
<td>Explain reason for adaptation and origin (e.g., during data analysis or quality review with team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Group size” under “Who participates”

“Power of creative expressions” under “Preparing sessions”

“Action research” under “The HOW of the process”

CONSIDER: merging “choice of words and language” under “doing things differently,” with “choice of language and words” under “building political support.”

Moved “Program governance-implementation phase” as stand-alone code to “formal responsibilities” under the category Program governance-implementation phase

During analysis of Rapportage Voortgang maart 2015 - Size of the group participants in sessions matters, depending on the type of session and the preset goal.

During code analysis - Overlap with creative expressions under “Doing things differently,” no part of text was coded under this.

During Code analysis - Used only once as a description in the action program. No relation to analysis of RQs.

During Code analysis - Can this be combined under same meaning and purpose in relation to analysis? Decided not to combine > it highlights different aspects with different purposes. See comment under “doing things differently > choice of words and language.”

During Code analysis - has no meaning as stand-alone code. The category it was moved to was created later to support creating more diverse insights in the program governance aspects.
The data that form the basis for the codebook have been coded and analyzed using a digital tool called Qualitative Data Analysis Miner (QDA Miner). Using this tool, each document was coded one-by-one, adding to the initial template/codebook with either new code or existing code, and adapting the categories based on the data. The analysis towards the final TA codebook was a step-by-step process. When all documents had been coded, the template was again analyzed, looking for overlaps, connections, and relevance of code towards the research questions. Each adaptation during the analysis was documented. A sample of the recording of such adaptations can be seen in see Table 6.1 on page 163. The adaptations could be insertion of a new code, deletion of a code, redefining a code at a higher or lower level in the categories, or changing a code to another sub-category. A total of 67 adaptations have been recorded.

The initial template was further analyzed by reviewing the codebook and formulating possible discussion points. These discussion points were formulated in relation to what stood out, but also specifically on which codes were derived from the documents early on in the process and had come back in later documents. This might reveal early insights that remained valid throughout the process. Also, relationships between codes were identified and reconsidered for revision and discussion.

Other aspects that were taken into consideration were the identification of certain pivotal or crucial moments in the action research process, as well as the relation of the data to the research questions. The possible adjustments and discussion points have been recorded in a separate 30 page analysis in which every category, subcategory and its codes and texts have been reviewed and analyzed in detail using color coding to highlight various aspects. See the sample in Figure 6.4

The step-by-step analysis and adjustments resulted in the final codebook as a reflection of the template analysis.

The next step was the analysis of the final codebook and what could be derived and interpreted from it. With the QDA Miner, all codes and the texts it relates to could be retrieved and grouped for analysis. Below, with the aim to provide an impression of the grouping of data through the QDA Miner, an example is presented of the code and texts for the category “Working Mechanisms” as part of the top-level category “Designing appropriate governance.”

Table 6.2 shows how data can be retrieved and exported to show data per category, code from which document (or case) it originates, and the detailed text. The comment column is added for analysis purposes.
### Figure 6.4 Sample of analysis with adjustments and discussion points

#### Table 6.2 Sample data retrieval on detail level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE TEXT</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Organize around capacities</td>
<td>What is the profile of the stakeholders that would have to participate in the Tigerteam?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Organize around capacities</td>
<td>“Just get started,” does mean working with “the right people,” we need quality on all levels and we are working on a growth model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Organize around capacities</td>
<td>The tiger teams need to be appropriately filled with the right people (see also the other group, not just selection based on thematic involvement, but also on the capacity for renewal).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Organize around capacities</td>
<td>Be alert to sufficient capacities in project staff&gt; identify what all of the activities include and then allocate the right capacities to the various tasks. This is also important if we are going to work with internal project team members from the government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Organize around capacities</td>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Knowledge regarding the framework, knowledge and an overview of the roles and players in the field, organizational skills, thoroughness, knowledge and experience with participatory techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates?</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Dual focus on content and process needed Observation: The focus of this action research project must be dual: both on content of the action program, and on the process of this new way of working together and planning collaboratively. <strong>Reaction:</strong> How do I share these insights and make people act on it as co-researchers, so we pick up as many process signals as possible? <strong>Judgment:</strong> The project secretariat confirms the importance of attention to process and even calls it &quot;crucial.&quot; How do we overcome the usual &quot;silo&quot; approach, especially in government and between ministries? Many plans have been written, but none has succeeded, mostly because of egos or fights over responsibilities. Policy makers in one department of government claim the exclusive right to a certain policy area, and do not include other departments. <strong>Intervention:</strong> I have discussed the need to not only make reports on the meetings on content, but also on process aspects. Attention to process will be specifically evaluated, besides delivering the content of the action program. This point reflects the fact that we started out in December by formalizing a structure (The National Platform for Youth Development), but along the way the process was more important for the participative mechanism than the structure. The platform only became operational far into the validation phase of the action program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates?</td>
<td>Gmail - platform2</td>
<td>We have discussed the organizational structure in which the platform members are of the opinion that the secretariat should be in the middle between the tiger teams, and position the platform in the center. The importance of the operationalization of the secretariat is strongly emphasized by all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.2  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates ²</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Dual focus on content and process needed. Observation: The focus of this action research project must be dual: both on content of the action program, and on the process of this new way of working together and planning collaboratively. Reaction: How do I share these insights and make people act on it as co-researchers, so we pick up as many process signals as possible. Judgment: Project secretariat confirms the importance of attention to process and even calls it “crucial.” How do we overcome the usual “silo” approach, especially in government and between ministries? Many plans have been written, but none has succeeded, mostly because of egos or fights over responsibilities. Policy makers in one department of government claim the exclusive right to a certain policy area, and do not include other departments. Intervention: I have discussed to make reports not only on the meetings on content, but also on process aspects. Attention to process will be specifically evaluated, besides delivering the content of the action program.</td>
<td>Process, structure, AND content must be balanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Working mechanisms     | Process versus structure - what dominates ² | Report exploratory meeting July 21, 2014 | The purpose of this meeting is to reach agreement with a limited group of experts to achieve sufficient alignment so that a clear national decree can be made to appoint the task force or secretariat. The minister takes the decree to the National Dialogue to create support and ask for the cooperation in appointing representatives of employers and labor unions organizations. Then, the content and approach towards a National Program should be discussed more broadly. |                                                                                           |
### Table 6.2  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates?</td>
<td>Action Program</td>
<td>Weekly alignment of the core team to jointly develop content, structure, and process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates?</td>
<td>Report Exploratory Meeting</td>
<td>Going the extra mile is reflected in “how” you do things, not in “what” you do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 21, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working mechanisms</td>
<td>Process versus structure - what dominates?</td>
<td>Report Exploratory Meeting</td>
<td>We need to keep separating action (what) from process (how).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 21, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 6.5  Sample of comparison of frequency of codes

![Sample of comparison of frequency of codes](image-url)
Another tool that the QDA Miner provides is the analysis of comparative overviews based on the frequency of the codes. This was analyzed in relation to the possible discussion points to see if the comparative occurrence of certain codes could further add to the review and selection of possible discussion points.

Figure 6.5 illustrates a comparison of the frequency of some of the main codes under the main category “What” in the codebook.

In the analysis the frequency itself was not considered as a main indicator of importance for discussion, but rather it was used to cross-analyze the data. The frequency has no direct relation to the importance of the code, because for the template analysis a great variety of document types was used. This means, that even if a code might not have occurred in many documents, it might still be considered an important finding in relation to pivotal moments in the process or in relation to the research questions.

6.2. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The research produced a rich and voluminous set of data. This is related to the two-sided approach of researching both the development of the Action Program for Youth Development and the goal of documenting it as a new way of cooperative and participative working for government. The data, therefore, was viewed from various angles. From the perspective of the action program, the focus was mainly on the main categories “How” and “What,” while the categories “Designing appropriate governance” and “Politics and power” are more, but not exclusively, related to the new way of working for government and the research questions.

One of the findings that stands out from the analysis is that the initial focus was on attention for building structures, such as the National Platform for Youth Development. But, in practice most attention was given and most results were realized by designing, guiding, and monitoring the participative processes. The design phase of the action program was concluded in December 2014, with a formal decree to launch a National Platform for Youth Development. But, it was not until May 2015 that the platform had members appointed and started meeting. Meanwhile, the process of developing the action program in a cooperative and participative way moved ahead.

When the platform became operational, it, in fact, had some catching up to do. This focus on process developed along the way, even though there were some data documents early on in the process that already pointed to this. It took experiencing this aspect during the project’s phases to let that point sink in.

The attention for process over structure is reflected in the many categories that are related to how people have been brought together to cooperate and participate. Catego-
ries like “Sessions” (with three subcategories), “Inclusiveness in participation,” and “the How” (with five subcategories) discuss aspects of having people work together in new settings and under different circumstances based on a dialogic approach. Most categories and data, thus, are focused on aspects related to bringing people together, developing capacities, and creating a positive approach towards youth development, instead of discussing specific problems that the youth encounter. Because the process had an action learning approach, we gathered data through continuous reflection. The lessons learned found their way into the main category “Designing appropriate governance.”

Table 6.3 shows samples of data from the category “Learning process,” which illustrate the attention to process and teaching people to interact in new ways. Regarding the columns, “category” indicates the category in the codebook, “code” refers to the specific code, “case” is the document that is selected, and “text” is the detailed text from that document that has been coded.

Table 6.3. Sample of data from codebook category “Learning process”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Action learning</td>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Working with an integral approach is not easy; people need to be supported in this. In the process of the Action Program for Youth Development, the method of “action learning” has been chosen. “Action learning” does not work with common training and courses, but the learning is embedded in the implementation process. People learn in practice by doing. “Action learning” is a way to achieve sustainable knowledge and expertise. In the process of preparation and implementation of the Action Program for Youth Development, the focus is on the development and realization of two specific competencies: cooperation and making joint choices. These skills are very important to be able to understand the importance of working with an integral and eventually be able to work in a collaborative fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Consideration towards content and process. Observation: We need to ensure that capacity building is an integral part of the participative process. Currently funding is as of yet unsure, because it is linked to the OFO process of 2015, which is not yet approved. Need to seek alternative funding. Reaction: I am anxious that the content of the Action Program alone will not deliver a convincing point and does not raise the need for doing things really different this time. Judgment: We need to have some training in collaboration/dialogue in place, also to provide the dialogue facilitators more experience. Intervention: Based on the formal decision, two other ministries are supposed to have provided funds in 2014. I contact the ministries and take the necessary steps to ensure we can use those funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a need to develop capacities in the area of collaboration.

Collaborating with an integrated approach is not commonplace in Curaçao. To get all noses in the same direction, and to get relevant stakeholders act from the same concept and directed at the same goal, is not easy. At the same time it is imperative to achieve greater cooperation and coordination in both policy development and implementation; it is indispensable in order for the Action Program for Youth Development to be successful.

We need to pay attention to building trust and collaboration.

Because we are working in small groups to get more input, a large pool is formed of about 20 facilitators. The facilitators are HBO/university educated people who like working for youth development and are able to lead a session in a constructive manner based on the principles. The facilitators are well prepared in the form of facilitator training.

Work on collaboration and capacity development.

UNDP: we can contribute to stimulating the aspect of collaboration.

The type of sessions and the facilitation and support for collaborative processes are innovative; the reactions are enthusiastic (stakeholders, youth, government, and parliament).

During the validation and implementation phase, dialogue and the dialogic approach are key. Dialogues can be used for different purposes. Within this program it will primarily be used as a tool to create a generative and reflective space, or as a means to achieve a strategic discussion on a shared vision. Dialogue is aptly described as participatory and democratic; “Dialogue is based on mutual respect and on building trust. It enables participants to listen to and to learn from each other beyond the issues that divide them. This offers the possibility of improving and positively transforming relations between the actors. Dialogue is important because it consolidates the participation of social, economic, political, cultural, and institutional actors. It strengthens the values of democracy and fosters actions that are more inclusive and sustainable” (Democratic Dialogue – Handbook for Practitioners).
There was a relatively high turnout (more than the first youth consultation and on a Tuesday night) whereby participants indicated that they would like to devote more time to dialogue and giving their input.

To meet these learning needs, the training program Collaboration & Choices has been developed with key elements focused on collaboration, prioritization, and dialogue. This program offers the opportunity to provide tailor-made training.

To determine which capacities need to be developed.

During implementation sharing and learning is important, reflected in process management and capacity development, regular consultations, structured process experiences (reflection), active and conscious communication to all stakeholders.

Lack of mutual trust and cooperation, between ministries as well as with and between NGOs; need for capacity development in order to collaborate better.

Table 6.3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>There was a relatively high turnout (more than the first youth consultation and on a Tuesday night) whereby participants indicated that they would like to devote more time to dialogue and giving their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Progress report March 15, 2015</td>
<td>To meet these learning needs, the training program Collaboration &amp; Choices has been developed with key elements focused on collaboration, prioritization, and dialogue. This program offers the opportunity to provide tailor-made training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Donorsession 2</td>
<td>Determine which capacities need to be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Brainstorm Aug 26, 2015</td>
<td>During implementation sharing and learning is important, reflected in process management and capacity development, regular consultations, structured process experiences (reflection), active and conscious communication to all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>PPT slides meeting NGOs Jan. 16, 2015</td>
<td>Lack of mutual trust and cooperation, between ministries as well as with and between NGOs; need for capacity development in order to collaborate better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An unexpected amount of data is related to the category “Sessions,” the category even has three third-level categories connected to it: “Organizing sessions,” “Preparing sessions,” and “Who participates.” This reflects the dynamics between people that played a role specifically during the last two phases of the Action Program for Youth Development. The data shows that attention to a variety of aspects in dialogue sessions requires careful preparation and execution. The data reflect a constant balancing act between an open dialogue and aiming for useful input through the sessions for the Action Program for Youth Development. During the second phase, aimed at the design of the action program, the aim was to have broad input from the youth and from stakeholders and ministries. The third phase was aimed at validating the input that had been generated in the earlier phase to come to a final proposal for the action program. The data reflect that while on the one hand the process was aimed at specific results with regard to the sessions, a true dialogic approach also requires openness to whatever would take place and come out of the sessions. Below are some samples of data that reflect tensions brought about by the sometimes paradoxical approach of both goal-oriented sessions and the aim for open dialogue.

The samples of data in Table 6.4 are from the category “Preparing sessions.” The column “category” indicates the category in the codebook, “code” refers to the specific code, “case” is the document that is selected, and “text” is the detailed text from that document that has been coded.
### Table 6.4  Sample of data from codebook category Sessions and its sub-categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing sessions</td>
<td>Creative/constructive collisions</td>
<td>Action Program Youth Development</td>
<td>Also, resistance and frustrations may come out, but it is important to channel this and to put it into context, and aim for a proactive turn towards a change in thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing sessions</td>
<td>Stimulate interaction</td>
<td>Donor-session 1</td>
<td>During the interactive part the attendees were divided into five groups. Each group discussed the question of what specific actions are needed to promote cooperation between businesses, government, and funds in the implementation of the Action Program for Youth Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing sessions</td>
<td>Group dynamics</td>
<td>Gmail expert session</td>
<td>I continued thinking for quite a while about the experiences during the expert session. All kind of things happened that we had not seen happen in other sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing sessions</td>
<td>Stimulate interaction</td>
<td>Youth dialogue 2</td>
<td>During the youth dialogue attendees were divided into ten different groups, whereby each group discussed sub-themes. Per theme, possible benchmarks in the future (so-called “red dots”) were discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing sessions</td>
<td>Creative/constructive collisions</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>She writes a long mail in which she reflects about the session in the morning that apparently ran into some unexpected dynamics. It was an expert meeting. There were some frustrations expressed that tended to dominate the sessions, but the facilitators steered it towards constructive criticism in the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing sessions</td>
<td>Stimulate interaction</td>
<td>Expert session</td>
<td>During the brainstorming session, the participants were divided into three different groups. Each group was given a subject to be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing sessions</td>
<td>Creative/constructive collisions</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>This was the first session with less “hurray!” and more criticism. We had an extensive discussion and judge this as highly important to reflect back on, to see what caused these dynamics and not to avoid them next time to identify what created them and where they exist, and find a way to use these feelings and frustrations in a constructive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing sessions</td>
<td>Creative/constructive collisions</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We reflect on the difficult session. We will try to evaluate in more depth what caused the dynamics so we can be prepared the next time if we have the same ingredients or participants. We conclude that it is absolutely desirable to have these more difficult sessions. We do not aim to avoid them, but we want to use the dynamics constructively. There is a lot of skepticism, especially among civil servants and other long time serving persons, on certain topics and we need to provide room for that skepticism, but then bend it into constructive action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data coded under “Group dynamics” and “Constructive collisions” had strong relations with codes in other categories such as “Action oriented,” “Results driven,” and “Connect separated worlds” in the category “Content,” and also with “Understanding interests” under the category “Power and politics.” There is also a strong relation in the category “Learning process” with the codes “Process guidance” and “Facilitating sessions.”

Most important in the data is the richness in the findings, due to the action learning approach with ample time for reflection. The data provide information that is highly useful for both the goal of creating the Action Program for Youth Development in a collaborative and participative way, as well as for the second goal, the new way of working for government, which was explicitly made a goal from the start.

From the initial exploratory phase and during the whole process, the data indicate that participants in the action program want to work with what is already there, and not reinvent the wheel or put aside valuable work that has already been done. This contributes to the recognition of all the work that already takes place with regard to youth development, which stimulates the acceptance of the action program as a joint framework for youth development. This aspect is closely linked to the data concerning the aspect of “Connect separated worlds.” This aspect indicates that, although a lot of projects and activities are in place, there is no connection or alignment between them. Each organization focuses on his piece of the puzzle, without a view of where its exact place is in the full jigsaw picture, and to which other parts it connects. Aiming
for “Constructive and creative collisions” during sessions contributes to connecting the separated worlds, and is also related to data about the aspects of “understanding interests” in the category Politics and Power.

An interesting amount of data from various documents refers to the difficulty of getting from talk to collaborative action and co-creation, labeled as “the need for skin in the game.” In collaborative processes the aim is not to just provide space for conversations, but to stimulate joint action and co-responsibility. The data indicates that participation in dialogues does not automatically lead to collaborative action. It requires special attention and follow up to stimulate those involved to collaborative and aligned action beyond talk. During the dialogues this was given attention in the form of consciously having participants formulate their own specific actions as a follow up to the session. Although NGOs and other stakeholders expressed willingness for collaborative action from the start, it appeared difficult to make the actual shift from willingness to action.

Table 6.5 shows samples of data referring to the aspect of “need for skin in the game.” The column “category” indicates the category in the codebook, “code” refers to the specific code, “case” is the document that is selected, and “text” is the detailed text from that document that has been coded.

### Table 6.5  Sample of data from codebook category “Who participates”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Action Program Youth Development</td>
<td>Stakeholders were also stimulated to remain involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Action Program Youth Development</td>
<td>Getting and retaining commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Action Program Youth Development</td>
<td>Creating shared ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Action Program Youth Development</td>
<td>Create a sense of urgency to stimulate ownership among others by bringing stakeholders and youth in direct contact with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Brainstorm Aug. 26, 2015</td>
<td>The ownership of what is being done and achieved must remain in the field, where the results have been achieved. Special attention is needed for the ministries, how to get them on board, see also into other groups the theme “sustainability.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for “skin in the game”</td>
<td>Reflections August 1</td>
<td>Participation versus deliberation: Participation is also co-responsibility, not just actions by the government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.5  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Youth dialogue 1</td>
<td>Employers are aware of their role and contribution and offer the youth realistic opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>PPT slides meeting NGOs Jan. 16, 2015</td>
<td>There is a role and responsibilities for the government, but also for other stakeholders, such as employers. Their cooperation (in connecting education and the labor market needs) is crucial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Progress report March 15, 2015</td>
<td>Mobilization &amp; Commitment: Active participation of relevant actors and stakeholders in youth development is essential. Strategic choices concerning the mobilization for expert sessions and the selection of members of Joint Working Groups and task forces are important in this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Progress report March 15, 2015</td>
<td>This also stimulates the joint ownership of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Progress report March 15, 2015</td>
<td>Urgency: the continued awareness of immediate urgency around the theme at hand enhances the sense of responsibility of different actors. This is done by providing a stage in Expert Sessions to share experiences, through dialogue between stakeholders and target groups (Youth Dialogues), and by the presence of the target group (youth) in the Joint Working Groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Reflection point: In relation to the National Dialogue, do the private sector and labor unions really seek participation which is linked to personal commitment and co-responsibility, or do they just seek influence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Engagement is willing to make real effort, from influencing to co-responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>The representatives of employers and labor unions mostly bring up their own issues. Nonetheless, we have a constructive discussion and both social partners express support for the program. We again ask for representatives from both partners to be appointed in the National Platform for Youth Development. Only one of the labor unions has a candidate. We immediately hand out the invitation for the first meeting later in the week. Question remains: how do we get these social partners from involvement through talking, to “skin-in-the-game” as Nassim Taleb puts it (2013), by taking co-responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We still need representation from the Chamber of Commerce, the Council of Churches, labor unions, and the other ministries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.5  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Meeting report with NGOs</td>
<td>Glad to discuss WE, because the government cannot do it alone. Parents, teachers, and government have a general responsibility, but with a lot of fragmentation and less control on what effects it brings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participates</td>
<td>The need for &quot;skin in the game&quot;</td>
<td>Meeting report with NGOs</td>
<td>Must develop our vision and decide what each and everyone contributes to it. With your cooperation this will be in place; we are ready for dialogue and start with action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following subchapter discusses the findings on a thematic level with more illustrations from the data.

6.2.1 Structure provides a context, but attention to the underlying processes delivers results

As discussed, one of the most important findings is that in the exploratory phase and the start of the design phase, the focus was mostly on building a structure. This aspect is worthwhile to look at in more depth. The meetings and discussions in the exploratory phase resulted in a decree to launch a national platform with specific tasks, among them to produce an Action Program for Youth Development. The platform is supported by a secretariat with tasks and responsibilities. But, along the way it became clear from the meetings and sessions, that in order to accomplish a collaborative and participative way of working, whatever structure is in place, at least as much emphasis needs to be on the process of how to align mindsets and interests of various people and organizations involved towards an integral approach. Creating a structure in itself does not automatically or necessarily produce the results one aims for. And, also, the structure must provide for flexibility that is needed to adjust to ever changing circumstances and developments.

The most obvious thing that people working together expect from a structure is a form of hierarchy, which reflects who is responsible at what level, and who reports to whom, especially in bureaucratic organizations. The focus in this process, however, was not on hierarchy, but on a network structure with connected nodes, as a sort of overlay on top of the bureaucratic structure. This choice positively influenced the commonly held hierarchic views, and steered discussions more easily towards collaboration and interaction. The National Platform for Youth Development, for example, supported the proposal for the networked structure with connected nodes, and during the discussions about it proposed an important adjustment. It is not the National Platform, which—
according to the structure approach—is the highest point, that needs to be in the center, but rather the secretariat. The secretariat was considered the driving force and should be the centrally placed connecting node that can sense and coordinate best what goes on the working groups (“tiger teams”), and then advise the National Platform for Youth Development on the strategic level about required decisions.

The “Process versus structure” aspect is also dominant in the various roles and responsibilities that I combine in the process: I am hierarchically responsible for the project as secretary-general, I am the principal that hires the external consultants, I am one of the members of the National Platform for Youth Development, and I am co-researcher in the insider action research process. In order to combine the roles and the various hierarchic positions in the structures, I needed to focus on the process and the steps to be taken, and constantly balance that with aspects of my position in the various roles. This aspect is, therefore, strongly related to the type of leadership required in these processes. I refer to it as “Facilitative leadership,” which ensures in a supportive and stimulating way that co-creation can happen at the moment required during the process. This sometimes requires a huge detachment from the formal role or leadership position and responsibilities. It also requires the ability to let go and provide space to others to do not just what needs to be done, but also how they want to do it. It requires providing ample operational space, even though from a hierarchical position the manager is directly responsible for the end result.

Table 6.6 shows some samples of the data on the aspects of process versus structure and facilitative leadership.
### Table 6.6  Sample of data on the aspect of process versus structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>The facilitation of the sessions is a constant balance between ‘task’ and ‘process’. First, the content is important, but equally important is the process, how to include all participants, to create support for the change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email correspondence</td>
<td>We have discussed the organizational structure, whereby the platform members believe that the Secretariat should be in the middle between the tiger teams and not the platform. The importance of the operationalization of the Secretariat is strongly emphasized by all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program</td>
<td>Weekly coordination in the core team to develop content, structure and process simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>The extra mile is in ‘how’ we will do things, not just ‘what’ we will be doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Journal entry</td>
<td>We go through each of the paragraphs of the YAP and discuss what needs to be adjusted to the final version. It is quite a lot. I worry if there is enough time to finish the writing. Whenever a deadline approaches my roles as co-researcher and project manager overlap with a certain degree of discomfort on my behalf. We are in a co-creation process, but I am also responsible for what is delivered as an end result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Journal entry</td>
<td>May 16 - first Dialogue with Youth. I am nervous, because I am not physically involved in the logistics of the process, many ‘what if ..’ questions move through my head in the early morning hours. My role as SG and member of research team again clash in the sense that if things go wrong I will blame myself for not being more controlling beforehand. I have left it in the capable hands of the facilitation team, and I know their skills, but at the way to the event I do many mental exercises in ‘what if’. The control side of me needs to calm down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Journal entry</td>
<td>Surprised to see some of the faces together, which is good. I advise but don’t interfere with the list of invitees. That seems to work well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Journal entry</td>
<td>When asked a few weeks ago, if I could ask the port authority for permission to use the quay, I had no idea what they had in mind. My imagination was not strong enough to see the quay as a suitable location for the dialogue at tables, but thankfully they did, and it looked astonishingly beautiful, especially at sunset when the historic background of the Emmabrug and Handelskade all lit up colorfully. They even managed to have giant letters CURAÇAO in place as a make shift separation from the waterline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 A variety of interactions based on dialogic approach

In relation to the focus on “how” to make co-creation and collaboration happen, many data entries across categories refer to aspects of facilitating interaction based on a dialogic approach. Throughout the process many and various types of sessions have taken place using dialogue facilitators, who were also members of the core team of co-researchers. In the core research team we discussed the specific aims for each session, the group dynamics, and what kind of interaction would bring the desired results, whether it was, for instance, knowledge sharing, providing input for the action program, or validating the priorities and actions proposed in the action program. The dialogic interaction was not reserved just for meetings with stakeholders and the dialogues with the youth, it was also, as a conscious choice, applied in meetings of the National Platform for Youth Development and the Council of Secretary-Generals. A variety of challenges with regards to the sessions presented itself and were sorted out along the way, learning step-by-step. Challenges included finding the right timing and duration of the sessions, creating a comfortable and psychologically safe atmosphere, and determining how to get the right people at the table, how to guide group dynamics and create constructive collisions, and how to match the complexity of the Action Program for Youth Development to the capacities of the participants. A challenge was also how to connect during these sessions the separated worlds that participants live and work in, even though they share the focus on working with youth. The dialogic approach was very effective, especially in the instances where empathy and listening are important, in order to create shared meaning. The approach often was explained and introduced by a simple physical exercise between pairs of participants, in which one exercise reflects debate, and another dialogue. Small physical exercises and interactions in general were very effective in creating an open atmosphere and a quick and non-intrusive way of getting to know the other participants in the room.

Table 6.7 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to interaction with a dialogic approach.
## Table 6.7 Sample of data on the aspect of interaction with a dialogic approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>What was obvious is that the information that was presented, was not understandable for all youth. This had a relation with a language barrier, but more so with the level of the information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>It is important for the next youth dialogues to present the information in a way that it is comprehensible for all participating youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth dialogue #2</td>
<td>During the Youth Dialogue attendees were divided into ten different groups, where each group discussed sub-themes. Each theme was discussed on what might be possible benchmarks in the future (so-called ‘Red Dots’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept action plan</td>
<td>There is a lack of coherent policies. Too little mutual trust and cooperation, both between ministries and with, and between, NGOs. There is need for capacity building for effective cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Active participation of relevant actors and stakeholders in youth development is essential. Strategic choices concerning the mobilization for Expert sessions and selection of members of Joint Working Groups and Task Forces are important therein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>During the validation and implementation phase, dialogue and the dialogic approach are key. Dialogue can be used for different purposes. Within this program it will primarily be used as a tool to create a generative and reflective space as a means to achieve a strategic discussion towards a shared vision. Dialogue is aptly described as participatory and democratic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Participants in the Expert session were invited based on their experience and perception of the theme. They were explicitly not invited based on their function or role in youth development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Dialogue #2</td>
<td>The high attendance (70 young people) is illustrative for the interest among youth to have their voice heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>In expert sessions it is important to maintain a small group size with a maximum of 20 participants. This facilitates active participation by all and it makes the selection for the tiger teams is easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Quality is more important than quantity is the lesson we learned tonight. With a low turnout we had GREAT participation of major leaders of the neighborhood organizations. They chose pro-actively to not push many neighborhood leaders to attend in the prep meeting because otherwise they might be less tempted to come next week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>I learn from this that we can be fully open ended in such sessions and not to plan or direct too much w.r.t. outcome, because with the right atmosphere whatever comes out and is agreed upon is fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>The dialogic approach refers to a specific code of conduct for players and the quality of interaction that can bring about a positive change. It is this code that is implicitly or explicitly promoted during the various meetings, consultations, workshops and training courses. The language of dialogue is for everyone the common thread in the way of interacting. The concept of a dialogic change process is at the center; an inclusive and action-oriented process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.3 Language and communication choices are instrumental in keeping people on board

The role of language and communication runs as a red line through various categories in the analysis. Some aspects are practical; some are more profoundly connected to giving meaning. From a practical standpoint the process in Curaçao is difficult because the country is multilingual. Dutch, English, and the local Papiamentu are official languages, and Spanish is widely spoken. The two main facilitators understand Papiamentu, but do not fully speak it actively. This was sometimes a challenge in the more heated parts of sessions. Also, in a practical sense most materials and discussions must at least be in Dutch and in Papiamentu, which is labor and cost intensive. Not being bilingual, however, is not an option in relation to the aim of being inclusive. Active communication and being fully transparent about goals and next steps during a process such as this is also crucial to the managing of expectations. This, though, also created dilemmas. The volume of the core of the action program consists of only about 50 pages, but with appendices—including the reports of all sessions—the program exceeds 200 pages. This was so daunting a challenge to many people that a small booklet in two languages was made, to point out the key concepts and highlights of the action program, so that it was more easily digestible.

In the area of meaning, the choice of words and language proved of high influence, both in acceptance of the action program, and in perception. The conscious choice for an “action program” (and avoiding the word “policy”) contributed to the creation of a sense of urgency and a hands-on mentality of less talk, more action. The choice to not work with “committees” or “task forces” but to name the working groups “tiger teams” and explain that the goal of the tiger teams was to “sink their teeth” into the topics was also consciously made and greeted with understanding about the perceptions we were trying to create, namely that the action program process is different from usual practice, which stimulated participation. Sometimes specific words hindered acceptance. In a certain setting the word “research” was used to explain the need to work evidence based, but it raised resistance. It created the impression of not focusing on action, but on talk and doing more research before actual steps would be taken. When “research” was changed to “measuring results,” it was perceived as perfectly acceptable. The connotation of words can easily lead to misperceptions; this requires alert sensing and listening during sessions and presentations, and being highly flexible in the wordings that are used. For politicians it is especially important that they can recognize and identify their goals in the choice of words and inclusiveness of the activities of their ministry.

Table 6.8 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to language and communication challenges.
Table 6.8  Sample of data on the aspect of language and communication challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We also discuss the possible names of the groups working on the themes. ‘Task force’ and ‘working group’ are very un-inspirational, so we consider more inspiring names such as ‘tiger teams’ that will put their teeth in each of the five themes. Tiger teams will be the 5 structural groups of people dedicated to planning and organizing the priority activities per theme. If a smaller group of people need to dive deeper into a specific sub-topic for a theme, they could form small project teams (expedition team?) that delves deeper and reports back to the tiger team. Our aim is to create expectations of things being different, and that the choice for names reflects the fact that this is unlike other projects and processes that people may have been involved in, and that it stresses the fact that this is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>In this the secretariat has a central role, as the coordinating center of the tiger teams for the five themes. Each tiger team monitors and supervises the activities of a theme. From a tiger team can be set up one or more smaller expedition teams who immerse themselves temporarily in a specific subject. The results are fed back to the tiger team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>The Action Program Youth Development Curaçao consciously refrains from a problem-oriented approach, focusing on a select audience, but rather a positive approach, oriented at general development for all children and young people in Curaçao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>When we discuss the formal decision (Landsbesluit) that describes the role and responsibilities of the Platform and its president, I encounter quite some “problem oriented” language instead of a positive approach. This to me reflects the change in mindset that we have already gone through in a short period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>The experiences of the earlier session, and the expectations of this session have been discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Expectation Management: transparent information about the upcoming process creates calmness and clarity with actors. This also promotes shared ownership of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation session</td>
<td>It is remarkable that there are so many linguistic elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We discuss the preparation for the CoM meeting, a.o. how to take the remarks of PM into account. We have a lengthy discussion about the decision points: what are the necessary decisions we need from the CoM? We adjust the decision to four points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Momentum and communication: the sessions will create a momentum around youth development. Communication is a prerequisite for maintenance of the momentum; This can be done by, for instance, digital newsletters and audiovisual materials of the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>The last session will then become a combination of various other sessions and dialogues with ‘what’s next?’ as the central aspect, heading towards the implementation phase. The central message could be: we are only getting started now, it is not a closing session, but a starting session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.4 Getting from just talk to co-ownership and a “movement from within”

People need to become intrinsically motivated to stay on board during the process. In this case the process has the dual goal of producing an Action Program for Youth Development and developing it as a new way of working for the government. It takes a certain amount of time to have people become intrinsically motivated. There is no quick fix; participants need to feel and experience the benefit, otherwise a new perspective on youth development and an alternative way of working will not last. The willingness very often is present (and expressed), but until some interest and especially a benefit of the ministry is at stake, there will be no true ownership and intrinsic motivation. Participants may attend sessions, but not make actual changes in their perceptions and actions. This makes stakeholder analysis, or variations thereof, a very powerful and necessary tool to work with, as well as active relationship management. It also requires a high level of flexibility in the steps taken. It proved to be beneficial that as many people as possible, but specifically important stakeholders, actually experience dialogic sessions for themselves, because the positive energy that they experience is contagious.

Participation in a process as this is worthwhile, and even fun, when it adds value for the participant compared to doing things on his or her own. This was experienced in the clear need for context and direction. The framework for youth development based on five pillars was clear and recognizable to all involved. Every participant at the sessions was presented a clear view of where we are going, and they liked the destination. They also saw a role for themselves and how they could contribute, and realized that on their own the goals of youth development would be hard to reach. It was stressed also by participants that there are stepping stones already in place in some areas that would benefit us in the form of projects, work of NGOs, and private initiatives. We did not have to pave every step of the way from scratch, because some tracks on the path to integral youth development had been laid out before. They are just not aligned, and not known to all involved.

Table 6.9 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to getting from just talk to co-ownership and a “Movement from within.”
### Table 6.9 Sample of data on the aspect of from talk to co-ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We also ask the SG Council to involve people from their ministries directly in the project secretariat. But not just to have people present, we explain that we are looking for people that are working on aspects of the action program and in that line of work they also become active in the platform. This is the SG’s do not have the perception that they will be outsourcing their people for another goal, but for their own goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>Good representation of the MT team and policy department. They fully understand the meaning of the meeting: an in depth look at what the ministry actually does with respect activities concerning youth development and what is on their budget either as core tasks, projects or as subsidy to an external organization. We have planned such meetings with the major ministries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Need for inclusion towards the ministries. Actions: link with the communication project, and create awareness about the secretariat and the platform, we are possibly perceived as being ‘exclusive’, and therefore we need to bring the theme of inclusion in trainings and work sessions. Through newsletters, videos etc, we can keep many officials informed and help them realize the importance of the action program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Maybe we should organize an inter-ministerial session with executives and policy makers? Maybe this also helps to get the SG’s and/or their replacements more enthusiastic for real participation in the Platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>I explained that the working group (that has hardly been able to meet, nor plan or execute specific projects so far) will become part of the action program. This made me realize that we need to remain focused on creating a common language and understanding about what the participatory approach of the action program means, especially in the ministries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The ownership for what is achieved and accomplished, must remain in the field, where the results have been established. Special action is needed for the specialized ministries on “How to get them on board”, see also the considerations in the other group about &quot;sustainability&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>We must develop our vision, and decide what each and everyone contributes to it. With your cooperation this will be in place, we are ready for dialogue and to start with action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerpoint presenta-</td>
<td>There is a role and responsibility for government, but also for other stakeholders, like f.e. employers. Their cooperation (in the connection between education and the labor market) is crucial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Attention to the urgency and creating a sense of responsibility, f.e. by having stakeholders and the youth as target group, interact directly with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA SOURCE</td>
<td>DATA SAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Creating momentum ensures that people want to remain participant in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>They liked the high speed and pressure, and the fact that the topic is ‘youth’, which was very appealing to these young professionals. So the combination of an interesting topic and the very positive atmosphere, and the chance to work optimally made it attractive for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>A common perception about the underlying aims - a positive and participative approach that fits the way of working of government - creates responsibility and enthusiasm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We also take into account that we need to make a big effort into getting the right people there, especially those that we need for the rest of the process, since it seems to make a difference when you have been there. The people that have participated give feedback about the positive energy that they experienced and the open atmosphere in which discussions take place. So we need crucial people to also experience that. We go through the list and decide on who does what w.r.t. invitations and extra efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>At this moment the acceptance in ministries may still be superficial, it's not yet deeply ingrained. On which layer in government do we step in to create involvement: policy directors or policy officers? Or both? What would work is to let people in the ministries be “infected with the virus”, we need to create ambassadors for the participatory approach. But when do we have a ‘critical mass’ and what does it look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We do have an animated meeting thanks to the facilitation, and also thanks to the experiences the members had with the first dialogue session. They express that “the enthusiasm was highly tangible” and that they “left that session filled with energy”. They really liked all the viewpoints that were presented. Great to hear!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>It is necessary to be flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>But so far we have succeeded and reached goals with a step-by-step approach, because you are highly attuned to circumstances of the moment and less focused on a prepared plan that may no longer fit the current moment. Flexibility and adaptability have proven to be valuable assets in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>I ensure to specifically mention some aspects that I know are important aspects for the ministers that are present, and how these aspects are addressed in the Action Program. Aim is to promote a feeling of ownership with the individual ministers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.9  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>For the participants it is important that they recognize their issues in the implementation: their own interests must be recognized and experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The action program is confronted with a double dilemma: on the one hand we need to ensure an integral approach, on the other hand we need to be open to the variety and maybe conflicting interests of ministries and stakeholders. This means there is a tension between the ‘single issue focus’ of ministries and the integral approach of the action program. How do we deal with this tension? The project managers must have highly sensitive antennas and obtain good information and insights in interests and sensitivities. The Platform on a higher level can apply a helicopter view. This requires cross-pollination between project managers and the platform/SG’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>It is a pity that in the very busy weeks we have not actually been able to do a profound stakeholder mapping yet. It is still on the table for the platform and the SG Council, but besides discussing the need we have not yet been able to do the actual exercise together. This would make it easier to see who we really need and why in the dialogue tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We put extensive time in relationship management with important stakeholders, to ensure they feel included and respected instead of threatened. The stakeholder mapping should further contribute to developing all the necessary antenna’s and sub-agenda’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>A personal relationship in mobilizing stakeholders is crucial, especially for the mobilization of the tiger teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerpoint presentation</td>
<td>There are many existing initiatives (i.e. a protocol between 4 ministries) but we need focus (choices), coherence and consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Develop</td>
<td>The need to show that there is a bigger picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Develop</td>
<td>Also in the field, among the broad group of workers in youth related activities, they feel a lack of an overall vision on youth development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Develop</td>
<td>Because of the lack of a clear framework and a transparent financing structure, until now everybody follow his own route, there is a lot of fragmentation, and there are few linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>There is need for a broad strategy and more synchronization and alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>All participants have been asked to mention the projects that they support. The categorization in themes of the action program was used as a framework. During the sessions a total of 131 projects have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.5 Breaking through financial, mental, and organizational systems

Various codes across categories relate to the need to break through existing systems, whether they are financial, mental, or organizational. From early on mention was made by stakeholders that the fragmented way in which subsidies are provided by government to NGOs contributes to the lack of coherence in youth development. Individual ministries, and even sectors within ministries, design what to support, while a policy framework to make choices is not always present. Some financial relationships are also traditional and repetitive, without actual evaluation towards desired results. As a result, NGOs sometimes depend on and report to more than one ministry to receive subsidies for their activities. A comprehensive policy framework across ministries to make choices and create alignment in priorities was lacking until now. This led to the decision to include a new financial approach in the final version of the Action Program for Youth Development, and work on the development of program financing as a new way of working and budgeting within government.

The mindsets of many civil servants, which relates to nine individual ministries instead of one body of government as the community perceives it, and also the hierarchically organized responsibilities and culture within ministries, are not conducive to a comprehensive and ministry overlapping way of working. The focus is on segmented tasks and responsibilities, and this coincides with the organizational structure, which hardly provides for cooperative groups or teams. But, it does not prohibit it, either. In this lies the opportunity, as reflected in the choice to create for each of the five themes in the action program a tiger team. Such teams consist of not only a mix of civil servants from various ministries, but also representatives of stakeholders and NGOs.

The non-comprehensive mindset also stretches out beyond government and into the work field where NGOs operate, often with an isolated approach towards their specific activities or target group. It was notable as a result of the many sessions, that in the area of youth development various separated worlds exist without being aware of each other’s existence and without cooperation or alignment in the field. These systems are hard to break through and replace with new mental frames and structures. This requires time, persistence, and dedicated attention in the form of showing benefits to the various actors of another way of working, organizing, or looking at things, that bring more or better results, and is perceived as non-threatening and maybe even enjoyable. The positive energy during many sessions where many met for the first time and learned of each other’s activities and ideas was experienced as pleasant and participants often left with a taste for more.

Table 6.10 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to breaking through systems.
Table 6.10  Sample of data on the aspect of breaking through systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>This should, in practice, lead to more effective spending and subsidies, less fragmentation, more comprehensive cooperation, and more balance in activities and expenditures in relation to the specific desired results for the healthy development of our youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We specifically explain the fact that we want to find a new way of budgeting and financing, by developing program financing as an extra chapter to the current government budget. Parliament will be the one to approve it, so it is imperative that they understand this from the start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>Go to a demand-driven approach, working from priorities (based on what is needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>The cooperation between the various donors is very limited, so there is fragmentation among initiatives that are being supported, and there is a lot of overlap, in addition, it is currently unclear who is responsible for what.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>The lack of an overall vision and policy framework for youth from the government causes that there is fragmentation, and arbitrary initiatives, which the government may or may not finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>Matching the total supply of financial resources (government and donors) with the demand for funds by the institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We discuss that in the coming year actual allocation remains in the separate ministries, but an extra chapter will be included in the national budget to show the joint efforts of all ministries and also private sector and funds related to youth development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>What comes to mind is that in having such talks you can immediately connect things from one ministry to another that the individual ministries are not aware of. F.e. GMN has several activities that can make curriculum in schools more fun and varied or could be used in after school activities to contribute to 21st century skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>It is a challenge to break through isolated thinking. The overarching themes as they are formulated will help in this, because they are specifically formulated to be overarching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>Due to the lack of a comprehensive youth vision, inter-sectoral collaboration is the exception rather than the rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>Stimulate participatory policy development: involving government, enterprises, institutions, donors and the audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA SOURCE | DATA SAMPLE
--- | ---
Meeting report | Everyone works on his own, and everyone pretends to know everything, including NGO’s. NGO’s know and think they know everything, and then demand (and get) grants.
Action Program for Youth Development | Preconditions for the development of working with an integrated approach: the ability to think comprehensively, to transcend predefined frameworks, strong connective force to effectively break through the old sectorial way of working.
Action Program for Youth Development | The choice of these five themes is also made with a strategic aim in the sense that they can hardly be linked to a single public sector or ministry, and as such cooperation and coordination between organizations can be facilitated more effectively.
Research journal | We can aim for cooperation, but we cannot force it. Cooperation and alignment where so desired, but it should grow organically from their own desires.
Evaluation | Key point: different way of working is important and therefore the training of lead facilitators, but how many people in government can and will ultimately pay much attention to process management? Reality is that the focus in government departments is mostly on “issues of the day”.
Research journal | Within government there is a fear for cooperation with other ministers, because they may be held accountable for surpassing ministerial lines/priorities. There is political support needed in order to empower civil servants to cooperate across ministerial boundaries.

6.2.6 Political dynamics as risk and opportunity

During the three phases, dealing with political dynamics provided huge opportunities, as well as great risks to the process. The political dynamics in Curaçao show a high rate of change in individual ministers, cabinets, and also high-level civil servants. Organizational politics also play a role in ministries, as well as in the field. The fact that this process was initiated by the government, however, also provided great and unique potential.

One of the risks concerns credibility. In Curaçao, a cabinet usually does not remain in power for a full electoral cycle, and a new coalition is usually not inclined to accept and continue processes or projects that have been initiated by a former government consisting of other parties. This brought about challenges in creating credibility concerning the Action Program for Youth Development as being viable beyond the current cabinet. In many sessions the question was raised, and concerns were expressed, about the sustainability of this multi-annual action program after elections.

Changes in ministers also required getting each new minister “on board” for the process
and ensuring that his or her priorities towards the youth were being included. That also is the case in the regular changes of high-level civil servants. The natural first focus at the start of a term of a high-level civil servant is his or her own ministry. It is usually later on that many experience that the amount of serious policy issues that can be addressed by ministries on an individual level is limited. Most of the increasing amount of complex challenges that the government faces requires cooperation with other ministries and the involvement of stakeholders or other organizations.

Organizational politics include the risk that with a comprehensive and collaborative approach, ministries may feel that others are interfering in their area of policy. Also, colleagues, as well as other organizations, may feel threatened or overrun, if credit is not given where it belongs when results or initiatives are presented. In this context, it is noted as important that all existing initiatives should be praised and incorporated if they fit the priorities of the action program, and to underscore that the program is launched with the sole purpose of providing common vision, alignment, and coordination of activities. The aim is not for the platform or the secretariat to start new projects as such, to avoid a feeling of competition.

On the opportunity end of this dilemma, the fact that this process is initiated on the highest level of government, and that this political initiative reflects sentiments that were broadly felt in the community, creates a unique opportunity. Being initiated at the top, high-level acceptation and support is easier to accomplish. Bottom-up initiatives face an uphill struggle in decision making and acceptance of propositions. This initiative had the need for bottom-up input set out as a requirement from the political leadership. This facilitated acceptance of the action program, and contributed to the willingness to cooperate, even though, as mentioned, there was skepticism about the sustainability of the Action Program for Youth Development after elections. This created a dilemma in itself, because clear political support from the ministers representing the current coalition parties may form a risk to support in a new coalition. For this reason attention was given to introducing the action program in parliament in settings in which all political parties (coalition and opposition) were represented. Also, the choice from the start to launch a national platform with government representatives, as well as labor unions, private sector organizations, and NGOs, creates a body that is not politically connected to a certain coalition. The platform and its broad representative base, may contribute to the broad political support across elections cycles. The discussions about durability beyond electoral cycles also referred to the fact that a broad participation in the community would create support for the action program, which is hard to suppress for political reasons.

Table 6.11 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to political dynamics.
Table 6.1  Sample of data on the aspect of political dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We discuss that we need to invest in both coalition and opposition and in politicians as well as the parties. As for timing we discuss that they ideally should be informed before the public presentation of the program. This may contribute to avoiding a political label to the program and create broad support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>After the presentation one of the opposition parties makes an important statement: He refers to the lack of confidence in politics because after elections everything changes. Comprehensive programs such as this should survive elections and not be swept off the table after elections! He is the first to react after the presentation so that seems a good start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>The meeting is a preparatory meeting for a trip to the Netherlands where the parliaments of the kingdom discuss matters of common concern. Children’s rights is one of them. During such meetings they operate not as coalition versus opposition, but as one voice representing Curaçao. Another lucky ‘add on’. I happily share this news with the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>The Platform must surpass ‘politics of the day’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>There is some tension between the political support needed and the fact that too fierce a political identification might lead to rejection when a new government steps in. Need for stakeholder analysis / force field analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>What about after this government? It is tri-partite and will involve parliament, that way it must be possible to continue this beyond a coalition. It will be part of the National Development plan, the future vision for development of the country. These two are main projects for this year. They should be continuous beyond one cabinet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>There is concern about political continuity. What happens in a next cabinet, after elections? Some propose a protocol between political parties, we conclude however that it is in no way a guarantee. We believe in building ownership, in the community with NGO’s, in ministries, as well as with politicians. That is the only possible ‘guarantee’ that might work. They must want it and see added value for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>How do we ensure continuity and commitment to the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>The need to create support in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>It requires political independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>Government must commit to targets and not constantly changing targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.11  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>The Platform will not become an new institution or foundation, it is a forum in which all private and public sector organizations work together, and also work directly with the youth, and deliberate about how to implement a national action program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>The special feature of the Youth Development Action Program is that it is an overarching initiative. The aim is to seek and, by supporting the cooperation and reconciliation process, ultimately achieve better results by connecting all individual policies. This requires a holistic approach that can be used by all concerned as the framework for youth development in Curaçao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Decree</td>
<td>It is desirable that, on the basis of a jointly developed and defined vision, a comprehensive, results-oriented and effective policy and a proposed implementation structure for the short and long term should be developed in close cooperation between the government, NGOs and stakeholders (including target group itself), while using existing and new knowledge, experience and initiatives within and outside of Curaçao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>I specifically mentioned some aspects that I know are important aspects for the ministers that are present, and how these aspects are addressed in the Action Program. Aim is to promote a feeling of ownership with the individual ministers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>For ministers the Action Program must be instrumental to realize their wishes and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>To be recognizable is important, in the implementation it is important for the various players that their own interests must be experienced and recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>This means we need to tap in clearly in the needs of the various ministers during the presentation. Otherwise they will think it is not in their interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.7  Reflection and learning to build sustainability

In the design phase, the second of the three phases, a conscious choice was made to include action learning and reflection as important elements in the process. This was closely related to the dual aim of the Action Program for Youth Development: develop an integral approach to youth development and develop collaboration and participation as a new way of working in government. Both were considered to be paths of discovery, not meticulously prepared routes to a destination. In the core research team this meant that continuous evaluations and regular reflections took place to create learning cycles.
Table 6.12 Sample of data from on the aspect of reflection and learning for sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>We learned in the first two phases (design of the development framework, and the validation of the Action Program), and also experienced, what does and does not work. These lessons are reflected in the Action Program (see Section B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td><strong>WHAT WORKS IN GENERAL?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Working within a specific content framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Having a strong core team ‘in place’ with specific qualities: knowledge regarding the framework, knowledge and overview of the roles and players in the field, organizational skills, thoroughness, knowledge and experience with participatory techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organic approach: practical and flexible approach is needed, regardless of structures and hierarchies. A precondition is good cooperation and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weekly coordination in the core team to develop content, structure and process at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High quality and motivated back-office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint consciousness for the higher and broader purpose: a positive and participatory approach that fits the way of working in the government, creates responsibility and enthusiasm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>In operationalising sharing and learning is important, therefore, process management and capacity development, regular consultations, structured process experiences (reflection), active and conscious communication to all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>With this way of working in the Action Program the issues can be determined in a clear way, the next actions are planned that will lead to an expected result, the action is implemented, there is an evaluation of whether there is a result, and based on that new actions are being planned, and so on. This cyclic learning process is practical, it rapidly delivers insights, and leads to a permanent focus on effectiveness / results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>Capacity development in the area for collaboration is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting report</td>
<td>Pay attention to building trust and cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Program for Youth Development</td>
<td>To prepare the ministries for this new way of working, it is proposed to start the Secretariat with external expertise, combined with internal capacity. [...] It is the aim to let the external experts train and guide internal people, so that eventually they will be able themselves to run the secretariat, and implement it as a new way of working.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.12  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>To comply with the identified development need, training program Collaboration and Choices has been developed, with the main focus on collaboration, making choices and dialogue. The program facilitates custom made training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session report</td>
<td>We need to identify which capacities need to be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research journal</td>
<td>We discuss the need to build in reflection time in our meetings to make sure we are not overwhelmed by the activities and events, but remain focused on learning with an open mind. Experience what is happening and try to capture what happens and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The teamwork aspects that emerged in the evaluation, how do we apply this consciously in the Secretariat? Not by teaching or preaching it, we need to respect the organic development of the team, and provide space to take ownership of their work. It should be 'their own thing', as was the case in the core team. The core team and lead facilitators should not aim to duplicate how they did it. Providing room for personal interpretation is precisely the powerful aspect that was identified, to be combined with conscious reflection and exchanges. So we need to work on a structure for consistent reflection, and include moments for that in annual planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue report</td>
<td>We also included the improvements that were put forward in the organization of the Second National Youth Dialogue, which took place on June 9 in Sentro di Bario Tera Kora.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of how to collaboratively design and validate the action program, and to try out and learn what works in collaboration and participation was part of intensive process management. From the start it also involved a lot of attention to capacity development to stimulate the required competencies, but also to ensure that internal capacities are created to make the process sustainable. External expertise was mixed with internal capacity development as much as possible.

The learning approach included formal evaluations, for instance of participants to sessions, but more informal reflection in the weekly meetings of the core research team. The learning approach was included and explained in the action program.

Table 6.12 shows some samples of the data on aspects related to reflection and learning to build sustainability.
6.3 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS IN RELATION TO LITERATURE

In this thesis, several scientific themes related to the research have been discussed; from the current transformational era, with the collapse of systems and structures, to the still rather elastic and fluid concept of knowledge, the increasing role of cities in the knowledge era, and the democratic processes that are under stress in representative electoral systems have been discussed. The focus in the action research is on Curaçao that, as a young country, has had the unique opportunity to redesign its government structure and governance mechanisms. The goal of the research focused on the apparent paradox: there is an inability to adjust the formal structure of the bureaucratic system and government on the short term to the requirements of citizens in the knowledge democracy, but there is also an eminent need and desire for at least more integral, participatory, and interactive governance mechanisms in order to deal with the challenges concerning development planning and compliance with fundamental principles of transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency, as well as to face the “glocal” issues of the 21st century.

The findings focus attention to a diverse set of aspects related to knowledge democracy and governance. The first chapters of this thesis discussed literature which has been considered and selected for the design of the initial framework for governance. The following sections discuss relevant theoretical aspects that have come to the forefront based on the findings of the research, to analyze how the findings are related to specific and recent scientific themes in literature.

6.3.1 Values

At the core of discussions about governance for the knowledge democracy, is the aspect of values, more specifically the values that a community and its leadership uphold in designing and practicing a governance approach. As discussed in Chapter 2, various scholars relate current systemic tensions to changes in values of creative citizens in a knowledge democracy. A question that surfaces in this respect concerns causal relationships between values and governance; the views on what drives what differ somewhat. The organizational design of institutions within a society is—according to In’t Veld (2010, p. 32)—an instilled reflection of values of a community. If the community changes, and the values change, then also the institutional arrangements as reflected in governance must adapt. From the perspective of comparative development models, Hiimanen (2005) also suggests a value-driven and proactive approach of politicians as managers of development. Fung and Wright (2001, p. 6), however, focus on traditional democratic values in an abstract sense, and do not suggest or note a change in democratic values, but instead suggest that the traditional values need
to be advanced by new democratic strategies, such as deliberative and participative practices. The expansion of deliberative and participative mechanisms in communities across the globe certainly shows a surfacing of new, or renewed, perceptions of politics, democracy, and government. Whether they represent new or different values than in earlier decades is hard to unequivocally determine. The findings of this research, as well as the current dynamics in our democratic processes, show an apparent disconnect between the value systems of creative citizens and those that are reflected in our current governmental and democratic institutions and systems. The realization and acceptance of the existence of such new belief systems, especially by politicians and public sector managers, is a requirement for governance to be able to change in a transformative way. Beyond the Curacao case, dynamic discussions take place in democracies, highlighting the non-sustainability of hierarchic top-down management in both public and private organizations (Tissen, Lekanne Deprez, Burgers, & Halmans, 2008; Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013), the growing resistance against increased income inequality (Stiglitz, 2012; Gaventa, 2016), the lack of trust in traditional politics as reflected in representative structures (Barber 2003; In’t Veld, 2010; Van Reybrouck, 2013), the increased importance of “place” (Florida, 2008; Landry, 2006), and the broad attention to factors of well-being, instead of financial indicators for development by national governments, as well as international institutions. Such discussions, and the societal dynamics by which they are accompanied, clearly suggest that a value-based transformation towards adaptations in democratic governance is required and desired in the knowledge era.

6.3.2 Participation and deliberation

The democratic strategies that are developed and practiced towards the value-driven transformation of governance focus on participative and deliberative practices. They are often intertwined or used interchangeably, but there are differences between the concepts of deliberation and participation; as of yet, they have not been univocally defined according to their attributes.

Some scholars consider participative democracy as the umbrella, with deliberative processes as one of its forms (Nabatchi and Leighniger, 2015). Others juxtapose deliberative and participative democracy as being incompatible (Mutz, 2006). There is a distinction also between deliberation and participation as interaction with formal government and governmental institutions, or among citizens and NGOs or other players in civil society without direct governmental involvement. This subchapter discusses the variety of views on the concepts of deliberation and participation and their interrelatedness and differences to conclude on what is relevant to the initial governance framework for knowledge democracy developed earlier in this thesis. Van Reybrouck (2013) is a strong public vocalist promoting deliberative democracy
based on ancient Athenian practices, whereby through a lottery citizens take turns in carrying out public responsibilities and preparing decisions. Van Reybrouck discusses the necessary balance between efficiency and legitimacy in any political system, and he states that both aspects are in a state of crisis in many western democracies. Representative democracy is no longer efficient due to dwindling electoral voter participation, and legitimacy is undermined by the lack of trust in politics and in elections that have become dominated by personalities over issues and marketing through media over ideological debates. This strongly relates to In’t Veld’s (2010) analysis of modern day mediapolitics. Van Reybrouck refers illustratively to political protest groups such as the Occupy movement in the USA, Los Indignados in Spain, and comparable movements elsewhere. He also notes a rise in alternative political parties that want to break with political traditions and establishments. Many European countries have seen such parties gain seats in parliament. Also illustrative is the rise of senator Bernie Sanders in the 2016 US presidential elections, who represents a progressive and even revolutionary political sub stream in the Democratic party. And, also Donald Trump, who—with a rebellious message of being an outsider fighting the establishment—won the electoral vote and became the new President of the USA. While the protest movements focus on vocal messages against what they consider to be systematically wrong in current day societies, and alternative political parties seek representation in the traditional democratic electoral system, the hundreds of projects for deliberative and participative processes in cities around the world reflect the actual practices for more direct democratic involvement of the public.

Deliberative processes come in various shapes and forms and carry a variety of names, but the fundamental shared aspect is that citizens come to informed decision making about proposals, based on an extensive exchange of information, and through dialogues in which experts, politicians, and stakeholders are consulted. This is for instance how, with some variations in the technical process, the Irish and Icelandic constitutions have been reviewed and amended. However, the proposals that result from such deliberative processes still have to be accepted by the formal political representatives in executive government and/or parliament, depending on the topic and on legal provisions. Deliberation, thus, poses propositions to the traditional representatives and lacks formal decision-making power for participants that reaches beyond decision making on the proposal. Deliberative processes do not necessarily lead to an actual shift in decision-making power towards citizens, since the success is dependent on the acceptance of the propositions that have been formulated based on deliberation. Many deliberative processes seek political legitimacy and support by closely involving politicians in the deliberative process.

Participative projects also come in a variety of approaches and mechanisms, of which some are characterized by an actual shift in the power of decision making from author-
ities to citizens. This is true for instance for many participatory budgeting processes, where part of a public budget can be allocated to the preferred expenses by the community or neighborhood.

So, what types of influence in participative processes can be distinguished? In the context of international development cooperation, White (2000) analyzed the variety of interests for participation in international development programs and projects financed by international organizations. She warns that even though “the language of democracy dominates development circles,” there is reason for caution, since “sharing through participation does not necessarily means sharing in power” (White, 2000, p. 142–143). White distinguishes four types of interest in participation, ranging from nominal participation to instrumental participation, representative participation and transformative participation. Only the last type of participation has empowerment in mind as a means and also as the end goal (White, 2000, p. 147). Varieties in participation had also been analyzed some decades earlier by Arnstein (1969), who developed a ladder of citizen participation. Arnstein also puts the aspect of power as a focal point in presenting a simplified view on the various levels of participation, and the extent to which citizens obtain actual power or influence towards the end result. The ladder starts in its less impacting form with manipulation and therapy as forms of nonparticipation through informing, consultation, and placation as degrees of tokenism, to partnership, delegated power, and citizen control as forms of citizen power (Arnstein, 1969, p. 217). The simplified frameworks for analysis of both White and Arnstein are inherently more diversified than the generalist definition of Creighton (2005) in the public participation handbook, written from the urban planning perspective. The handbook is meant as a pragmatic guide to the legal requirements for participation that have come in place in Western societies, for citizens to be involved in most topics regarding planning of neighborhood, environmental, and infrastructural projects. Creighton (2005) states that

Public participation is the process by which public concerns, needs, and values are incorporated into governmental and corporate decision making. It is twoway communication and interaction, with the overall goal of better decisions that are supported by the public. (Creighton, 2005, p. 7)

The power aspect, or empowerment of citizens, is in this approach limited to creating levels of impact or influence for citizens on the decision making process by representative bodies.

Barber (2003, p. xii), on the other hand, has for over 30 years taken a strong stand against representation as a form of “alienating” citizens from its government. Barber makes the case for citizens to take themselves seriously
not merely as voters, certainly not solely as clients or wards of government. Citizens are governors: self-governors, communal governors, masters of their own faith. They need not participate all of the time in all public affairs, but they should participate at least some of the time in at least some of the public affairs. (Barber, 2003, p. xxix)

With this view, also supported by Manville and Ober (2003) and Klinke (2016), Barber puts large responsibility for participation in the hand of citizens themselves, whereby he considers politics not as a way of life, but as a way of living, with the aim of citizens to be of advantage to their mutuality (Barber, 2003, p. 118). This strongly relates to the systems view approach of Scharmer and Kaufer (2013), who plead for a shift from “ego-systems” to “eco-systems” to overcome the “Age of Disruption”, referring to the dying old civilization characterized by a mindset of the maximum in everything for “me.” The sum of all individual “me” interests is a result that, according to Scharmer and Kaufer, nobody wants, referring to current developments in all major global challenges (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 1). The ecosystem approach calls for institutional transformation into a 4.0 mode, which for governments means that they become “a distributed direct dialogic system that operates by connecting to and empowering its citizens to co-shape the whole” (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 197). This closely connected to their concept of “Democracy 4.0”, which is characterized by “participatory direct, distributed, digital, and dialogic democracy” (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 197).

It is clear that the concepts of deliberation and participation relate to a variety of perceptions concerning power, empowerment, the legitimacy of representation, and the role of citizens in their government and governance mechanisms. In the most subtle and less impacting form, it refers to giving citizens a voice to influence topics and issues that touch their lives. In the most transforming approach, the actual power for shaping the future is shifted to citizens who consider themselves co-responsible for their community, who give practical meaning to the democratic principle of self-rule and self-determination (Klinke, 2016), and who are actively willing to bridge the current divide between government and being governed. The international association for public participation (IAPP, 2016) has developed a spectrum with an increasing level of impact starting at informing as the least impacting form, through consulting, involving, and collaborating, with empowerment as the most impacting form of public participation. Contrary to Arnstein (1969), who takes power as the increasing factor on the ladder, the IAPP looks at the increasing impact of the participative process, related to the purpose of the specific public participation process.

The research findings in Curacao reflect a form of participation somewhere in between the subtle and transformative effects. The process created a form of participative gover-
nance that provided far-reaching influence for citizens on the content of the action program, but without formal decision-making opportunities. The transformative options of participation within the context of bureaucracy and representative democracy are limited by the decision-making structures and processes at play. The structures and processes as such do not inhibit transformational forms of participation. But, unless those with the formal decision-making authority act proactively upon a highly progressive belief system as discussed in subparagraph 6.3.1, and provide optimal space for participative decision making, transformational results with respect to a knowledge-driven governance cannot be expected.

The Curaçao case provides limited insight into the actual willingness of citizens to be co-creators and take responsibility for decision making with respect to communal development. The empirical research focused on the design and planning of an Action Program for Youth Development, in which participants indeed showed high willingness to participate, and valuable conclusions were drawn about the mechanisms at work in a dialogic approach. But, in the actual implementation it remains to be seen if the participative influence in the planning and design phase translates into active participation in the implementation phase driven by a sense of shared responsibility, as described by Barber (2013) and Manville and Ober (2003).

6.3.3 The discourse of power

The concept of power in relation to participative governance is fascinating. It is consistently present in discourse about participation and deliberation, but it is not always clear, however, if the use of the seemingly simple word “power” in each case reflects the same conceptions about this multi-faceted concept. The variety of interpretations of power is connected to the context in which it is used. To add to the complexity, power is often related and interlinked with concepts such as empowerment, inclusion, and exclusion, and from the emancipation perspective, also with oppression and liberation. In their analysis of power and knowledge, Gaventa and Cornwall (2015) review the developments from the early understandings about power, towards a more profound and nuanced understanding, based on the diverse practices of participatory action research. While in the early understanding power was considered an attribute or resource in a situation of conflict where some have power and others do not, it developed into a three-dimensional view, where the “knowledge is power” concept was seen as a resource, as an instrument for agenda setting, and, in the third dimension, as a way to shape consciousness about the agenda. But, in all three dimensions the concept is considered in a negative way as a situation of conflict between the powerful and powerless. Others have sought more positive, or even generative views on power. Gaventa and Cornwall quote Foucault’s view of power as a “multiplicity of force relations” (Foucault, 1979, p. 92) and thus as a factor within all social relation-
Hayward (1998) takes this approach a step further and considers even a generative aspect of power, describing it as “a network of boundaries, that delimit, for all, the field of what is socially possible” (Hayward, 1998, The study of power, para. 7). In her view, all actors interact within power mechanisms such as “institutional laws, norms, and procedures”, and personal and social group identities influence “what they want to do {...}, what they believe they need to do, and should do” (1998, social action, social boundaries, para. 4). In connecting to Habermas’s (1984) theory of communicative action, she considers the boundaries not necessarily as just a limiting, but also as an enabling factor. Power relations can be contested and changed, depending on the mechanisms at work within such relations. Gaventa and Cornwall (2015, p. 70) conclude that the effect of these more generative views on the practice of participatory action research is that a change in power relations is indispensable in participation, to avoid the illusion of inclusion and the reinforcement of the status quo.

Gergen (1995) presents a social constructionist theory on power, which, although there may be variations throughout constructionist approaches, in general relates to the presumption of human relatedness through processes of human interchange (Gergen, 1995, p. 35), as well as a discursive structuring of the social world (Gergen, 1995, p. 45). As such, Gergen considers power not as an absolute, but as a comparative concept that is dynamic and adaptable to context and circumstances. This implies that power is created within social contexts and relations, and that perceptions and reflections of power can be influenced. Power is in a sense, a perceived social reality based on human connections and context.

During the research various aspects and perceptions of power have been experienced. The political and organizational power tensions that were identified indicate that there is no status quo in such tensions; there is a certain elasticity in the concept of power, influenced by the actions of players involved. The research thus finds connection to the views of Hayward with respect to power mechanisms that can be used to act on the power boundaries. It also confirms Gergen’s constructionist view of human connections and interrelatedness with respect to power. At several moments during the research there were successful actions to influence power relations and expand influence to create support for the Action Program for Youth Development. This was done by paying close and constant attention to relationships and discursive aspects, and tapping into identified needs in social groups and sometimes specific players. Based on the research findings in Curaçao, power is not an absolute resource statically located at a fixed point between the outer ends of a conflictive situation. It is a dynamic element in socially constructed relationships. The implication of this is that in participative processes power mechanisms need to be analyzed carefully in the specific setting of the social context, in order to determine what mechanisms are at work that can be used to expand or shift the boundaries of power between social actors, where this is desired. This relates
to the power theory of Haugaard (2016) on the fourth dimension of power, where adaptability and flexibility are required to work within a complex society of interacting networks that make conflicting demands (2016, p. 194).

6.3.4 Dialogic approach

The concept of a dialogic approach is present in several areas, among others in the international context for community development and democratic renewal, and as an approach for conflict resolution in deeply entrenched conflicts. There are also major developments with respect to dialogue in social science, specifically in the area of dialogic organizational development (OD).

Several scholars can be considered when looking at the foundations for the dialogic approach and its role in organizations, from Edgar Schein on group methods (1964) and Kurt Lewin’s psychological reflections on group dynamics and organizational development, to Chris Argyris (1964) and Peter Senge (1990) on learning organizations, and David Bohm (1989) and William Isaacs (1999), with emphasis on dialogue as a listening and learning process. Dialogue is a process with methodological as well as a psychological aspects that can best be experienced to capture its profoundly generative workings. As I have experienced in recent years in variety of settings, including this research, dialogue is as much about listening as it is about talking, it is more about discovering than about knowing, and it relies on the ability and willingness of participants to reflect on personal inner feelings, motivations, and reasoning, with the aim to learn from others, respect diverse points of view, and discover common ground for future-oriented action. It contradicts debate and discussion with a win–win objective, instead of a win–lose proposition. As such, it helps build qualitatively better relationships.

This implies that dialogue is almost always facilitated, because it is a process involving group dynamics in which certain conditions must be met in order to achieve the setting in which participants feel mentally comfortable for a dialogue to take place. The important role of facilitators is confirmed in the research of Bryson and Quick (2013) into guidelines for the design of public participation. One of the fascinating aspects that requires a new mindset of both participants and facilitators is that dialogic processes have open outcomes. Dialogue is about discovering what the participants jointly conceive as attainable propositions for action, and that cannot be predetermined. Dialogue, as a process thus, is focused on “how’ and ‘why,” with the outcome (“what”) as an open-ended question.

The research in Curaçao showed that the contextual and procedural constraints to dialogue require extensive preparation and guidance. Careful consideration is required for questions such as who do we want to participate, what group dynamics can we expect, what constitutes a safe place, and what level of complexity can be used for
the framing of the topics and given the available time span? Such questions need to be carefully considered for each unique setting. The importance of such choices in the preparatory phase are confirmed in the guidelines for the design of public participation (Bryson and Quick, 2013). The dialogues in Curaçao had a specific purpose: to obtain input for the design, content, and priorities for the Action Program for Youth Development. The main topic and five development themes were predetermined, but those themes were validated through dialogues, and the outcomes as for priorities and possible actions were open ended at the start of each dialogue session. The dialogues in small groups and larger settings are inherently different and require different facilitation challenges.

The dialogic approach has been instrumental and even crucial to obtain the amount and high level of the input that has been obtained during this research process. This supports the view on the generative possibilities of dialogue. Participants needed to get used to the dialogic approach as another way of interacting, and also to interact with new people that they do not easily encounter in meetings that follow the ministerial and hierarchical structures. In this sense the dialogic approach reinforced the chosen network approach for the action program, with its inter-ministerial and hierarchically cross-cutting “tiger teams.” We have also experienced that dialogues can contribute to new mindsets and open hearts. Yet, it also creates a thirst for more, for which it is sometimes not easy to provide direct follow up.

Based on the research, I propose that transformational change cannot be achieved with traditional meeting methods. The dialogic approach contributes to the necessary opening up of the hearts and minds towards future developments, and creates support for change processes, due to its orientation on joint action for future development. For a transformative effect, it does require, however, that the leadership of the organization is part of the dialogic process and respects its outcomes.

The key reason for using the dialogic approach in the Curaçao case was the learning and generative effect and its participative nature, since the aim of the research is to analyze what participative and knowledge-driven processes are possible within bureaucratic organizations. A question that comes to mind in relation to the dialogic approach is whether the aspects of participation and being knowledge driven in governance are essentially different. Does a participative process automatically imply that it is knowledge driven, since it implies the use of a potential broad knowledge base? And, vice versa, is a knowledge-driven process always participative? In relation to the process in Curaçao, both the aspect of participation and knowledge driven have played an important and even overlapping role. This is mainly due to the dialogic approach. Through dialogues, the use of a broad knowledge base has been stimulated, and generated a variety of viewpoints on youth development. The interactive
setting of the dialogues, and the choice to validate the input through the dialogues and use it in a transparent way in the action program, made the Curacao process inherently participative, as well as knowledge driven. This implies that if a process is really participative and based on a dialogic approach, participation and knowledge driven actually form interwoven and even overlapping concepts. Knowledge-driven processes without actual participation represent all talk, no action. Participation without actual knowledge being shared and used represents symbolism and the illusion of inclusion, as referred to by Gaventa and Cornwall (2015, p. 470). A dialogic approach, therefore, is essential for actual co-creation in participative processes.

6.3.5 The concept of governance

Across scientific disciplines the word governance is used in a variety of contexts to describe ways of interacting between actors, be it in an organization, a community, or a specific sector. The governance theories about such interactions between actors mostly relates to aspects such as decision-making authority and power, processes, and accountability. In the public sphere, the term governance has developed from a synonym for government into a more diverse and interrelated concept of interactive governing styles with “blurred boundaries” between public and private sector (Stoker, 1998, p. 17). Ansell and Gash refer to this as “collaborative governance” (2007), where multiple stakeholders and public agencies aim for “consensus-oriented decision making” (2007, p. 543). Such collaboration is based on fundamental elements such as the origin as a public initiative, working with non-state actors, actual involvement in decision making, and some structural form of deliberation where the aim is to reach consensus on topics in the public sphere. Boyte (2005, p. 518) refers to this as a participative approach, which shows a shift of attention from government as a sole actor towards interaction with members of the community, including civil society and business, adding aspects such as representation, transparency, and human rights. Boyte also discusses a paradigm shift from “seeing citizens as voters, volunteers, clients, or consumers, to viewing citizens as problem solvers and cocreators of public good” (Boyte, 2005, p. 519). Such governance with aspects of networks and markets (Bevir, 2012) requires much more than a right to vote in electoral cycles. It points towards closing the gap between government and being governed, enabling for non-public actors an active role in development of the community, by introducing new forms of engagement and interaction.

Multiple views exist on how to organize and frame governance as a theoretical concept. Ansell and Torfing describe a variety of “analytical lenses” (2016, p. 1) to look at the theories of governance from viewpoints such as interactions, role-play, the design of governance, and measurement of outcomes. They place the increased atten-
tion for the “fashionable” concept of governance in a wider context, related to the question “how can we govern effectively and democratically in a world in which political authority, capacity and power are fragmented, distributed or constrained?” (Ansell and Torfing, 2016, p. 5). This question has been asked in a variety of fields such as public administration, development studies, international relations, economics and environmental studies, as well as democratic theory and organization theory. The research in each of these domains produced the plethora of governance terms with various qualifying prefixes, including corporate governance, good governance, democratic governance, multi-level governance, knowledge governance, global governance, and quite some more. Ansell and Torfing consider that the development of governance theory across “multiple intellectual disciplines” (2016, p. 13) is one of the strengths of the overarching governance theory, combined with other strengths such as the contribution to the classical social concepts of power, legitimacy and accountability, and the stimulus of interdisciplinary research with governance as a boundary object.

Pyper (2015), has a competing theoretical approach and organizes the various viewpoints and developments differently. He positions public administration as an overarching paradigm, and locates governance and public management as subsequent developments within that paradigm, as a response to the challenge of increasingly complex governmental and societal interactions.

From the same perspective of public administration Bouckaert (2015, p. 37) looks at governance from yet a different angle; he looks at the span of governance, arranging the term in 5 types of governance. The narrowest type is corporate governance, which is about the management of public sector organizations. The second and somewhat broader type of governance is holding governance, focusing on managing a range of organizations. This is followed by public service governance, suprastructure governance, and systemic governance as the broadest governance approach. The link of this approach with the concept of democracy is that - according to Bouckaert - democracy supersedes electoral voting processes. It is about participation, transparency, open society, due process in decision making, responsibility and accountability, legitimacy and trusting systems.

In this research about a governance framework for the knowledge democracy the framing and placement can be looked at from either of the theoretical angles mentioned. The conscious choice has been made from the start of this research process to work inter-disciplinary and not feel limited to any specific discipline, and thus trying to give way to a creative discovery of aspects.

The question posed by Bouckaert (2015) about the relationship between governance and democracy is a fundamental one; it relates to
“forces and dynamics such as the de-centralization of political power, the de-hierarchization of decision making authority, the growth of horizontal forms of cooperation and coordination, and the increase of direct involvement of experts, stakeholders, public interest groups and individuals in the processes that shape collective objectives”. (Klinke, 2015, p. 86).

Klinke also discusses the influence of governance developments on democratic theory. He distinguishes a normative strand of theory which focuses on “how and why democracy is morally desirable and which principles shape democratic institutions” (Klinke, 2015, p. 87), and an empirical-analytical strand which focuses on democratic societies and tries to understand “why and how real-world democratic institutions and processes operate” (Klinke, 2015, p. 88). It discusses aspects such pluralism, interest intermediation, concordance, negotiation and direct democracy. The research for this thesis relates to both strands, with a theoretical analysis and contribution concerning the how and why questions, and a relation to the empirical-analytical strand, with a focus on how participation can be organized within representative democracy and the structure and processes of bureaucratic organizations.

Governance developments are clearly accompanied by new theoretic and practical challenges and dilemmas. Meuleman (2013) mentions plurality as such a dilemma in the context of sustainable development. Global diversity calls for “situationally effective combinations of ideas from hierarchical, network and market governance” (Meuleman, 2013, p. 37) fitted to the local circumstances. Respecting the cultural and value-driven aspects, Meuleman presents the definition of governance as “the totality of interactions of governments, other public bodies, the private sector and civil society, aiming at solving societal problems or creating societal opportunities” (Meuleman, 2013, p. 51). In this research the term governance leans towards Meuleman’s definition, with an all encompassing approach and focus on both societal problems, but also in development opportunities. Governance for the knowledge democracy relies on co-creation in various settings and within a variety of contributors, from the government, NGOs, the private sector, as well as citizens.

Klinke (2015) poses the question on whether new forms of governance in the future will replace or just add to the current representative system, and will it perhaps undermine traditional institutions? Klinke notes that there is both uneasiness and excitement about participative prospects. In the case of this research the question has been provided a partial answer; the participative process was undertaken within current institutional arrangements, and as such added to it; it did not disrupt or replace any institutions or institutional processes. This research specifically provides a view on the dynamics at play when adding participative processes to current institutionalized processes, as described in Chapter 7.
6.4 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This subchapter discusses the findings of the research in relation to the three research questions. The findings in relation to the questions are discussed chronologically.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1 - What participative structures or processes can be applied within a traditional bureaucratic government structure, where policy development is a non-participatory process? What are success factors and risks?

This research question relates to the fact that if a government organization is not specifically structured and organized for participation, the question arises what can be done to create participative mechanisms without changing much of the original bureaucratic design. The starting point here is that the Curaçao Government organization is a bureaucratically shaped organization, built around separated policy domains and the specification of tasks, divided into sectors with formal procedures, and with hierarchically organized responsibilities. In addition, it was newly designed in 2010. The options for changing its structure, and to a certain extent also its core processes, are slim, because of its very recent origin. This is also due to the fact that the design structure with nine ministries and their respective tasks and responsibilities is anchored in a formal law. Adaptations require a full preparatory and advisory process before the proposed changes reach parliament for the discussions and decision making. Still, the aim is to become more participative and collaborative within the public sphere and beyond, working with stakeholders in the community. Therefore, it is relevant to explore what can be done within the current structure.

Based on the findings of the research, it can be concluded that it is possible to apply participative structures and processes within a bureaucratic government structure, and that some specific aspects play a role in contributing to either success or failure. This is discussed in the context of various aspects related to bureaucracies: organizational structure, tasks, processes/procedures, and capacities. Also, the risk and success factors are discussed. Table 6.13 summarizes the identified structures and processes and the aspects that characterize them.

Organizational structure - In this action research process the choice has been made to work within the existing structures and hierarchies, and to add to that a new inter-ministerial cross-cutting structure (the secretariat with tiger teams), and also an overarching participative/collaborative structure (the National Platform for Youth Development), with a mixed involvement from ministries and stakeholders (youth organizations, labor unions, representatives of private sector organizations). These additional structures are organized fundamentally differ-
ently than the ministries, based on a network approach, but without changing individual responsibilities in the hierarchical reality. The network approach is organized with the hierarchical responsibilities intact and even underscored. A crucial element in the hierarchical context is also that the additions in structure have been supported from the top. The fact that the ideas for a national platform on the strategic level and the cooperation between ministries on the operational level have been designed and validated in the Council of Secretary-generals, and approved in the Council of Ministers, provided a sound basis of support with which to start. And, it formed no threat to existing roles and responsibilities, but instead provided a possible chance for better results.

**Tasks** - The alignment and cooperation within the bureaucratic structure worked in the Curaçao case, because the original tasks per ministry remained intact, and the action program was not used to add to those tasks, but as an instrument to align and prioritize the existing tasks, especially on the operational level. The rough trail of getting ownership in the ministries for the action program was paved by ensuring that the action program as a participative and collaborative process does not add to the already impressive amount of tasks in ministries, 

---

Table 6.13  Identified structures and processes, and aspects that characterize them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES</th>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organizational structure | New inter-ministerial cross-cutting/horizontal structure  
Overarching participative/collaborative structure based on network approach  
Hierarchical responsibilities intact  
Support from the top |
| Tasks | No addition of new tasks  
Align and prioritize existing tasks  
Include existing plans and processes for recognition  
Inclusive with respect to invitations for participation |
| Processes/procedures | Start participation in policy design and development phase  
Adhere to hierarchic lines in decision-making phase  
Create learning cycles with ministries and stakeholders |
| Capacities | Invest in developing new capacities, with civil servants and with stakeholders  
Based on dialogic approach  
New types of interactions with facilitated sessions |
but rather will facilitate in executing the current tasks with better results. This is not an easy pledge to make, however. Anything that seems like an addition to existing work is initially greeted with skepticism. It also became clear that ministries can be defensive about their work territory, and consider the collaboration between ministries and with stakeholders as a potential threat. To address this, specific attention has been given to include all existing plans and processes in the Action Program for Youth Development so that ministries recognize their work in the program, and apply a very inclusive approach in sending out invitations for meetings and sessions. The aim is to ensure the ministries feel that the action program serves their purposes, and does not add new goals that they do not consider preferential to their portfolios.

**Processes/procedures** - Within a bureaucratic government structure, participatory processes can be introduced at various points between policy design and decision making. In this case the choice was made to work participatively in the area of policy design and development, while in the decision-making phase the regular hierarchical structure was followed. In the Curaçao case, participation as well as collaboration were introduced in the exploratory phase of the Action Program for Youth Development, and continued throughout the design and validation phase. Also, the structure for implementation had been designed on the basis of participation and collaboration between ministries and with stakeholders. This was related to the choice of creating learning cycles, which was central in the Action Program for Youth Development. The cyclic approach to learning also relates very well to the circle of the policy process. Policy development as such is not considered a linear process, but a circular process—a continuous cycle, starting with a specific situation or challenge, identifying possible solutions, defining and presenting alternative solutions, determining and planning a course of action, implementing the proposed actions, and then evaluating them, before a next policy cycle starts with the evaluation of the previous cycle and its effects.

**Capacities** - In order to be able to work participatively and collaboratively in a bureaucratic organization, investments must be made in developing new capacities, not only with civil servants but also with stakeholders. The action program mentions various times that collaboration does not happen by itself; it needs to be developed and stimulated. The dialogic approach is key to this, because it provides safe space to learn from others and interchange ideas from various perspectives, so as to promote a common understanding, and to possibly discover new routes to results.
Another key element with respect to capacities is that all involved discovered new ways of interacting with each other, because almost all sessions were professionally facilitated. They were not regular meetings with an agenda and someone presiding over the meeting to keep course. Such meetings often have a hierarchical structure and context. In the case of the Action Program for Youth Development, almost all sessions were interactive, and facilitated with specific goals for each session in mind, but with the freedom to let things happen as they happen along the group dynamics that develop. In such sessions all participants are equally important, selected based on their potentially experiential and/or intellectual contributions, not based on hierarchical position. This creates space for learning and new ways to interact with each other to stimulate collaboration. In order to make this approach sustainable, investments have been made in training internal facilitators to guide dialogic sessions, so it can become a regular way of interacting where this is needed or desired.

**Success and risk factors**

Table 6.14 summarizes the success and risk factors in creating participative processes within a bureaucratic organization.

**Success factors**

Based on the findings, the following success factors that contribute to working participative in a bureaucratic organization can be identified.

- **Top-down support with bottom-up input** - The initiative for the Action Program for Youth Development and the National Platform for Youth Development was taken at the highest level of government and included as a specific requirement that bottom-up input was desired. This provided both credibility for the action program and support for participation in the development process of the action program.

- **Creating intrinsic motivation** - In order to get and maintain people of various organizations on board in such a comprehensive process, it proved effective to tap into the specific interests of all involved, so as to create intrinsic motivation among participants. They need to recognize what is in it for them, and how it helps them realize their own goals. This requires an intensive communication effort. Stakeholder mapping or analysis supports a sharp focus on agendas and sub-agendas. The fact that in the Curaçao case such an analysis during the design and validation of the action program was not formally completed, and only discussed informally, has been felt as an omission. Stakeholder analysis can make certain choices in process guidance, relationship management, and communication much easier along the way.
Conscious and flexible process management based on action learning principles - A success factor has been that through intensive process guidance, the process could be adapted quickly to changing circumstances and developments. The destination was always clear, but not the route towards the destination. Through learning cycles and regular reflections, the team was able to change course or pace where needed.

Capacity development focusing on desired competencies and new mindsets - The dual goal to not only produce an action program through a participative process, but also to develop it as a new way of working for government, contributed to working with a strong focus on capacity development. A new way of working requires that participation and collaboration become the norm, not an exception just for the action program. Specific efforts to invest in capacity development, and to create new mindsets, instead of being satisfied with a onetime positively deviant performance, can be considered a success factor. This contributes to sustainability.

Doing things differently - A success factor can also be considered the fact that many aspects in this process were experienced as being "different," whether it was the choice of words such as the titles for the working groups (tiger teams), the facilitation of sessions, the space for constructive collisions during sessions, the use of expressive arts in various ways, or the network structure supporting the process. This "Doing things differently" created a positive energy among most participants. An important different factor was also the action orientation of the process, and not just focusing on writing a new plan or policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS FACTORS</th>
<th>RISK FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-down support with bottom-up input</td>
<td>Lack of active relationship management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Political dynamics in the political and organizational arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious and flexible process management based on action learning principles</td>
<td>Lack of &quot;skin-in-the-game&quot; for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development focusing on desired competencies and new mindsets</td>
<td>Division of labor concept contributes to lack of broad ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things differently</td>
<td>Media coverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk factors
Based on the findings, the following risk factors, which can endanger working participatively in a bureaucratic organization can be identified.

Lack of active relationship management - A risk factor can be considered to be a lack of active relationship management based on analysis of agendas, sub-agendas, and specific interests. A comprehensive process, such as the development of the Action Program for Youth Development and the introduction of the National Platform for Youth Development, touches many plans, propositions, and feelings of others that others involved may not always be aware of. The risks include being surprised by developments, omitting to involve the necessary people, and encountering—or not even being aware of—forces against the process that cannot be reversed.

Political dynamics in the political and organizational arena - Changes in ministers and high-level civil servants pose a risk factor, because of the catching up that is required in such instances with each new person concerning a complex process, but also because each new person brings a new subagenda to the table, which takes time to comprehend. Besides changes in positions, developments in the area of related policies or comparable projects also pose a risk factor. It can lead to a trade-off between focus on actual priorities and effective relationship management. One may feel obliged in order to maintain the support of an important stakeholder to temporarily change focus or pace, while not losing the actual goal out of sight. This risk also includes the fact that unrealistic expectations can take shape due to unforeseen developments, which can be hard to manage.

Lack of “skin in the game” for participants - A risk concerning participation is identified in not being able to get beyond the desire of participants to influence developments just by talk, and not being able to create actual co-ownership and co-responsibility. There is a challenge in getting from collaborative planning to collaborative implementation, and making participants feel co-responsible for what is happening. There must be “skin in the game” on their part; otherwise the participants can form a “wall of willingness” without actual and active support for the propositions. The risk consists of the process resulting in all talk, but not enough results, due to a lack of collaborative action and co-responsibility.

Division of labor concept contributes to lack of broad ownership - Inherent to the bureaucratic structure, tasks and responsibilities are divided and functions are created for specific tasks. This results, however, in many people feeling responsible only for his or her specific task, without feeling any ownership
for the total end result, especially in the case of a collaborative process in which several ministries are involved. This can result in nobody taking ownership of the overall process to accomplish joint results, because the inter-ministerial process is not a fixed and formally identified part of the function. This is a big hindrance to collaboration and participation. Additional “cut through” structures and processes are required, for which people are also willing and stimulated to take co-ownership.

**Media coverage** - It is desirable to have coverage in the media for participative processes, because it can contribute to awareness and support, and it also can stimulate people to participate. Media coverage also poses a risk factor, however, because inaccurate or selective reporting may create wrong perceptions with stakeholders and the broader public. Politicians are especially sensitive to media reports. The media are of course free to report what they want, but to mitigate risks, it requires investing in relationships with journalists who are willing to look at background information and the full context of the process. Another risk involving media coverage is the presence of media during sessions, especially dialogues. Often, a dialogue requires safe space for participants to express their ideas and opinions. Under the watchful eye of the media, participants may feel exposed and less prone to share openly and freely what they know, think, or feel. Limited media access to such sessions can limit this risk, as well as an understanding with the media about limitations with respect to audio-visual recordings.

**RESEARCH QUESTION 2** - How can participation of citizens be organized/shaped in a parliamentary democracy where the formal power is in the hands of an elected body of representatives, who create an executive government?

This research question relates to the fact that whatever participation has taken place in the course of a policy development process, the eventual decision-making power in a representative democracy is in the hands of elected officials, who may or may not support the propositions and outcomes of the participative process. The question addresses ways to avoid a potential clash or contradiction between the desired decision based on participative bottom-up input, and the top-down decision making. This question thus focuses on how to avoid that the interests as defined from the bottom up contradict the interests from the top down. How can they be matched or aligned to a certain extent, to mitigate a potential conflict? Although the chosen representatives are in a literal sense fully representing the electorate, the diversity and wickedness of many problems prohibits elected officials from being able to represent the electorate on all issues during the complete course of the electoral cycle. The knowledge democracy is
characterized by an electorate that has dispersed interests and cannot be represented in the full sphere of his or her diversified interests by one particular party or politician. In a formal sense, though, the representative system provides an unlimited mandate for decision making in all areas of life to elected officials for the full electoral term. The research question focuses on how the top-down and bottom-up interests can be aligned to avoid possible conflict, which would lead to rejection of the propositions that result from a participative bottom-up process.

Table 6.15 summarizes aspects that play a role in shaping participation in a representative structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-level political support for a bottom-up process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let them experience it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad base for participative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use formal and regular decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not create a new “external” plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work evidence based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation early on in policy development cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High-level political support for a bottom-up process** - The process in Curaçao is quite unique in the sense that it originated in government with the explicit requirement to seek bottom-up participation, both in developing the action program, as well as in implementing it. This contributed highly to the credibility and support for the program and the platform, especially when seeking support from direct stakeholder groups like the youth. The high-level political support from the start also avoided an uphill battle with the eventual propositions that require approval on the political level. The ownership in government as a starting point reduced the risk of an uphill battle in which the aspect of convincing takes considerable effort.

**Let them experience it** - The effect of personally participating in sessions, and especially in dialogues with youth, has been mentioned various times to have a positively energizing effect. The positive energy has its effects on participants, and creates expectations of the possibility for better results. It also contributes
to the willingness to take co-ownership for the program. This is also the case with politicians, whether in executive functions or in parliament. Their personal involvement and experiences in sessions, and especially the dialogues with youth, created a positive feeling. This contributed to the chance that they would take political ownership of it, which indeed they did, by formally accepting the action program as the context for youth development in the coming years.

**Broad base for participative process** - Politicians are sensitive to public support. The Action Program for Youth Development included the involvement of a great variety of stakeholder groups, who have had ample opportunity to express their contributions, and they also validated the consolidated result in the form of an action program. This is considered to be advantageous to political support, because with broad involvement and support in the community, it becomes harder for a new political coalition after elections to set the program aside. Broad support in the community also contributes to the acceptability of the outcomes, because deviation from the propositions means taking a stand against the view of a broad basis in the community that has worked on the propositions.

**Use formal and regular decision making processes** - The decision-making aspect required extra attention in the aspect of long-term viability. At various times stakeholders have brought forward their preoccupation as to the sustainability of the Action Program for Youth Development beyond elections. One of the aspects discussed to mitigate this risk is to provide a formal legal basis for the national platform, as has been done in the government decree that is the basis for the National Platform for Youth Development. But, it was also discussed to include the action program in the regular and formal processes, such as the budgeting process. The idea for developing inter-ministerial program financing for youth development has been incorporated in the formal budget of 2016, which has been approved by parliament. Adding to existing processes, such as the regular budget cycle in an operational year, contributes to sustainability on the long term. Propositions that have no relation to existing procedures are easier to put aside, based on political preference.

**Do not create new “external” plans** - Anything that feels like an add-on to already overloaded agendas at ministries is likely not to end up as a priority. Ministers also have a strong focus on their existing plans and policies (either accepted or in development) and might feel that new propositions can be a threat to their own priorities. To avoid this, a strong focus and consistent message of the action program has been that the platform and the secretariat are there to align
and reinforce existing activities of ministries in the area of youth development, and not to develop new and possibly competing activities. To align and prioritize all existing actions is the specific aim. This helps to avoid that ministries may see their own plans and activities threatened by the action program and the work of the secretariat and the platform.

**Work evidence based** - In a complex field such as youth development, with many individually operating ministries and stakeholders, knowledge is dispersed, often based on partial experiences in the field, and not analyzed and consolidated. A strong focus on working evidence based can reduce the occurrence of conflicting knowledge, based on different experiences that stakeholders may have, originating in working in their own area as part of a complex field. Working with facts and analysis can contribute to co-creating new common knowledge, as a basis for propositions. Evidence-based propositions diminish the chance that the propositions can be easily rejected for political preferences. Facts are hard to deny when political discussions towards decision making take a subjective turn.

**Participation early on in policy development cycle** - Participation early on in the process of policy development stimulates the articulation and interchanging of ideas and positions. In a highly complex policy area, it takes time to create insight and understanding between groups and with politicians about the variety of perceptions and opinions. Finding common ground and choosing among alternative options is central to the process of policy development. If participation forms an integral part of the policy development phase, where alternatives can be discussed and evaluated, and the full context of a topic can be taken into account, this will contribute to the common support for the propositions that are laid out to the political level for eventual decision making. The fact that the decision has been broadly discussed also makes it less easy to put them aside based on political preference, since this may have an electoral effect. Participation, in the sense of actual influence on the development of propositions, also avoids a possible effect that ministries may feel they need to “defend” what they have developed as propositions against outside influences. A joint route avoids such sensitivities and creates room for the development of common views, and an understanding (through a dialogic approach) about why one alternative action is preferred over another in the decision making.
RESEARCH QUESTION 3 - What tensions with respect to power in policy development and decision making does this bring forward, and how can this be addressed?

This research question relates to the fact that power plays a specific role in participative processes, referring to political power as well as organizational power. The former research question focused on the process and content aspects related to dealing with possibly diverse interests. This research question addresses hierarchical, social, and political power dimensions that play a role in the complex process of providing space to involve others, where formal responsibilities and power are at stake.

Table 6.16 summarizes the identified political and organizational power aspects and how to address them.

Political power aspects

Representative as a full legitimacy of knowledge - Political representatives in parliament and in government have the formal right to take decisions in all policy areas during their term. This can be, and in practice sometimes is, interpreted as a full legitimacy of knowledge in all areas. Especially in young democracies and in the absence of a well-developed civil society, this can lead to a political perception of being elected as “we know what the people want and need, and how it needs to be done.” The fact that representatives operate in an electoral win–lose system may contribute to such a perception about legitimacy of knowledge based on election results. Political representatives form part of a competitive system with winners and losers. Winners obtain seats in parliament, and a majority of seats creates the political power to form an executive government. The losers, on the other hand, either are not considered representative if they did not meet the electoral threshold, or, if they obtain representative power but do not form part of the majority, they have the limited power of controlling the executive government and approve or reject propositions. The political practice of legitimacy of knowledge and the win–lose system play a role in the risk that politicians may exclude ideas that do not originate in the winning political parties and/or politicians, and the full-out rejection of ideas that may be perceived as coming from the opposite side.

To address this, it requires that representatives (on both sides of the win–lose spectrum) need to be included in the participative process to create co-ownership, and not just be confronted with the outcomes at the point of decision making. The inclusion must, however, not be so intensive that it can be seen as political labeling of the action program on either side to avoid touching the win–lose sensitivities.
### Table 6.16  Identified tensions in relation to power and how to address them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POLITICAL POWER TENSIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>HOW TO ADDRESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Representation as a full legitimacy of knowledge | • Coalition and opposition parties need to be included to create co-ownership  
• Avoid political labeling |
| Political priorities based on partial perceptions versus expressed community needs | • Analyze political agendas and sensitivities  
• Communication with, and involvement of, politicians  
• Careful balancing act  
• Trade-offs without effecting fundamental core of propositions |
| Respect for political responsibilities | • Make explicit to manage expectations  
• Create appeal and ownership on political level |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ORGANIZATIONAL POWER TENSIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>HOW TO ADDRESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Turf fights between specialized departments | • Appreciate specialized knowledge in the bigger picture  
• Sense making on higher aggregated level to create opportunities for sharing, collaboration, and new knowledge creation |
| Personal or collegial envy | • Sensitivity to, and insight into, organizational and community networks, and personal interrelations  
• Conscious facilitation |
| Fear of broader accountability | • New horizontally collaborative and participative structures with explicit consent of higher management  
• Participation is tolerated or even stimulated, not punished |
| Knowledge is power | • Sharing knowledge as a force for empowerment and enrichment (individual level and group level)  
• Physical and mental spaces where participants feel free and are stimulated to share and co-create  
• Stimulated by quality of facilitation and types of interactions in sessions  
• Sensitivity for group dynamics |
Political priorities based on partial perceptions versus expressed community needs

Politicians have achieved a position as a representative based on political points of view and plans that have been communicated to, and supported by, the electorate, as well as personal appeal. Their political positions and ideas logically originate from education, experience, ideology, and also knowledge acquired through relationships with others. In complex policy areas, however, the wickedness of problems poses that no matter how broad the education, experiences, and networks of politicians are, their personal and political views can hardly represent more than a few aspects of any complex and dynamic policy field. Nonetheless, the subjective views have been presented often as campaign promises that need to be fulfilled. This can create tensions between such political preferences and messages, and what is identified in participative processes as expressed community needs, which stem from the combined knowledge of various stakeholders and are based on discussions in an evidence-based and broader context. The power aspect in this is related to the fact that in decision making there is no actual need for a politician to accept deviances from his or her partial or subjective view, because the election results reflect the fact that a politician in charge already represents the majority. This provides room for political interpretation, deviation, or even dismissal of expressed community needs in participative processes.

To address this, it requires that careful consideration be given to the political context and the sensitivities therein. Identifying and analyzing political agendas can provide insight into possible connections, both in content and in choice of language, between political priorities and community needs. Careful communication and also involvement of politicians in the process can avoid that a possible gap exists, or is perceived as such, between political priorities and community needs. It requires a conscious and continuous balancing act, involving even trade-offs to the extent that it does not violate the fundamental core of the propositions that result from a participative process.

Respect for political responsibilities

In the end, the elected politicians are responsible for decisions by the government. Though this may seem a highly obvious statement, it needs to be made explicit during participative processes to all involved. When people have actively and enthusiastically participated in a process such as the Action Program for Youth Development, they are positively charged towards realizing the outcomes. They want nothing more than to see the propositions pass the formal decision making process, and will be highly disappointed if they do not pass.

In order to manage expectations and not contribute to such possible tensions,
it is necessary to communicate the formal responsibilities clearly and draw a line for participants between “contributing to” something by participating, and actually making decisions and being responsible for it. This message is also important to politicians in order for them not to feel overly pressured into a certain direction of decision making. In optimal circumstances in a participative process, the tensions will not appear, because the decision making is prepared in a way that it appeals to, and has ownership on, the political level.

Organizational power aspects

Turf fights between specialized departments - Bureaucratic organizations have delegated tasks to departments for which these departments are held responsible. This has the positive effect of clear accountability, but the flipside can be oversensitivity for the “ownership” of policy areas, activities, or projects. Participation of stakeholders, and even collaboration with other departments or ministries, can in such cases be experienced as invasive. Bureaucratic organizations often also have specialists that have developed profound knowledge about specific topics or policy areas. Involving others in their area of expertise may evoke a defensive attitude towards their specialized area of knowledge and an unwillingness to be open to new knowledge.

In order to address this, a context can be created in participative processes, in which specialized knowledge is appreciated, but as part of a bigger picture and on a higher, more abstract level. When connections in knowledge are made at a slightly higher aggregated or strategic level, the specialists can see their place in the bigger picture and how they uniquely contribute to it. This is also the case on the level of operational activities. The key is to transcend the perceptions from the “what” to the “why” level. This kind of sense making on an aggregated level creates opportunities for sharing, collaboration, and the creation of new knowledge that does not exist in the comfort zone of the daily operational activities and specialized, but partial, knowledge. Inevitably, the famous quote popularly attributed to Albert Einstein comes to mind: “The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at, when we created them.”

Personal or collegial envy - Bureaucratic organizations are populated by social beings, even though the rationalization of work was the basic thought behind the forming of bureaucracies. The personal and professional experiences of people, both positive and negative, as well as the work environment and culture, play a role in how people perceive new projects and processes. Envy, either on a professional or personal level, can be an overpowering force and sometimes hard to recognize. It causes that people can be against something
by the mere fact of who else is involved, or who initiated it. Depending on their sphere of influence in the organization, colleagues driven by envy can cause a resistance that is hard to understand or mitigate, because of its social-emotional origin. In participative processes, this also plays a role in the involvement of stakeholders, especially in small communities such as Curaçao, where relationships exist and develop in closely knit networks of mostly familiar faces. Perceptions and experiences with others who are involved influences whether people want to associate themselves with a project or process, or rather would not. To address this requires sensitivity to, and insight into, organizational and community networks, and otherwise interrelations between people who are identified as desirable to participate in a process. These insights as such do not mitigate envy or disassociation based on personal perceptions, but they can facilitate how to deal with such sensitivities in for instance sending out invitations, and also how to facilitate sessions as to the group dynamics that can be expected.

**Fear of broader accountability** - Bureaucracies and their hierarchical characteristics do not provide an organizational context that is conducive to extending people’s responsibilities beyond the formal accountability for specific tasks or functions. Still, the reality is that the significant (and thus often wicked) policy challenges cannot be solved by each person and every department perfectly performing its formally delineated tasks. The Aristotelian concept of *the whole is more than the sum of its parts* can be identified as a determining factor for success in complex areas. But, a hierarchical structure does not stimulate people to go beyond formal duty and to seek synergetic effects by collaborating with others. Depending on leadership and organizational culture, this may be even considered dangerous, if it is not explicitly supported by the direct manager or even higher management. Building new horizontally collaborative and participative structures in a bureaucratic organization, therefore, requires the explicit consent of higher management. The fear of stretching professional accountability beyond direct duties and responsibilities can only be mitigated by the certainty that this is tolerated or even stimulated, and will not be punished in a direct or indirect sense.

**Knowledge is power** - The “knowledge is power” concept has various angles that play an undeniable role in bureaucratic organizations. The concept relates to individual knowledge, relational knowledge, specialized knowledge, and various other forms of knowledge. They have in common that the knowledge is used as an instrument to exert power, whether real power or perceived power. It can be considered the root cause of hesitance, or even the unwillingness, to share knowledge, which is crucial to collaboration in participative processes.
This can be addressed by creating spaces in participative processes where sharing knowledge is not perceived as a risk for losing power, but as a force for empowerment and enrichment, both on the individual and group levels. Creating spaces in this context relates to physical and mental spaces where participants feel free and are stimulated to share and co-create. This can be positively influenced by the quality of the facilitation and the types of interactions with others and knowledge sharing exercises that are used during sessions. Being sensitive to group dynamics and adapting to it is instrumental in this.
PART THREE

CONCLUSIONS, REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the main conclusions of the research into governance for the knowledge democracy. It develops the findings and analysis of the research into conclusions in three ways. It starts with conclusions towards the problem statement for the research presented in Chapter 1. Secondly, conclusions are presented in the form of adaptations to the initial framework for governance of the knowledge democracy developed in Chapter 2. The initial framework, which was based on theoretical synthesis, is combined with the findings from the action research in Curaçao. This leads to an adapted governance framework for the knowledge democracy, which now reflects both theoretical and empirical insights. In addition, a dynamic model has been developed to visualize the dynamics that are to be expected, based on this research, when transforming towards participative and knowledge-driven governance. This dynamic model, as well as the governance framework, can be considered to be a contribution to the theories regarding participative governance in knowledge democracies.

7.1 CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

In the first chapter of this thesis, the problem statement is formulated as follows: In the context of the knowledge-based democracy, how can governance and government be adjusted effectively, to allow for the sustainable participation of citizens and stakeholders, specifically within bureaucratic structures, while honoring the foundations and mechanisms of the political democracy common in the modern world?

The problem addresses the governance paradox many nations and communities face: there is an inability to adjust the formal structure of the bureaucratic system and govern-
ment on the short term to the requirements of the knowledge democracy, but there is also an eminent need and desire for at least more integral, participatory, and interactive governance mechanisms. This desire stems from challenges concerning development planning and compliance with fundamental principles of transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency, as well as the need to face the complex “glocal” issues of the 21st century. An important aspect in this is how to deal with decision making related to participatory initiatives within a democratic representative system. Participative processes stretch and expand the democratic influence to the preparation of policies and decision making, which traditionally is the exclusive terrain of bureaucrats and executive power in government. The research was aimed at identifying how participative processes can become sustainable in bureaucratic environments.

The research, both from a theoretical and an empirical perspective, shows that working in a sustainable way towards participative governance with inclusion of knowledge and action from citizens and stakeholders, and based on collaboration with and between governmental departments, is not an adjustment, but an actual transformation of governance. A value-based transformation that touches processes, cultures, relations, and power structures. The transformational aspects relate to the fact that, especially when adapting governance within current representative systems, a profound change in mindset is needed with political representatives, executive government, and public servants, as well as with citizens and stakeholders in civil society in order to make the new governance sustainable. The required change in mindset is connected to interrelated questions about who has usable knowledge, who prepares and takes decisions, who is responsible to undertake action in a community, and how power is perceived and applied. In a new mindset, knowledge is accepted to be found in all levels and circles of the community, not exclusively in government and with experts. The process of preparation and actual decision making should be considered a joint effort and responsibility, which is not exclusive, but highly inclusive, with special attention to the voiceless and otherwise vulnerable groups in communities. With respect to undertaking action in the community, the perceived lines between government and being governed should blur to a great extent, creating space for non-governmental actors to take co-responsibility for developments and actions in the community. The concept and discourse of power should be adapted to a relational approach, where power is not conceived as absolute, but dynamic and shifting, depending on relations between actors on either side of the power balance. Without a change in mindset, existing attitudes and practices will not be adjusted, and the current mechanisms at work in the governance of communities will prevail, maintaining the unsatisfying results.

A second aspect directly related to this is the need for new ways of human interaction based on a dialogic approach. The dialogic approach is a fundamental other way of interaction, based on learning and the development of joint actions. Through the dialogic
approach, new capacities are developed or enhanced, with regard to empathizing with multiple and contradictory points of view and seeking space for a joint way forward without conflict. Based on the research, the dialogic approach is very well suited for bringing multiple players to the table, from variety of backgrounds and with a diversity of views, but who interconnect at the complex challenges that their community faces. The two points mentioned, a new mindset and other ways of human interaction, require the recognition that the path towards participative governance is a difficult process that needs professional guidance, as well as support from the political and executive top of government. Many things can happen from the bottom up with regard to participation, but for real and sustainable transformative changes, the government must be explicitly involved, supportive, and sincere in its participative goals. In addition to professional guidance and top-level support, network approaches to cooperation—as a sort of overlay over existing bureaucratic structures—can help overcome hierarchical and interdepartmental boundaries, even if such network approaches reflect more a process than an actual new formal structure.

If there is a new mindset in place, dialogic processes are put in place, and there is professional guidance for networked collaboration with support from the political and executive top of government, then the setting is optimal for developing sustainable participative and knowledge driven governance within existing bureaucratic structures and within a democratic representative system.

7.2 GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK FOR KNOWLEDGE DEMOCRACY REVISITED

In Chapter 2 the design of a governance framework for the knowledge democracy was presented based on an initial literature review. It is worthwhile to revisit this framework, based on the findings, and in relation to further literature analysis, as discussed in Chapter 6.

In this subchapter the elements of the governance framework are reevaluated to add or adapt elements, based on the research and further literature analysis. The framework does not present an absolute view on how knowledge driven and participatory governance should be organized. It functions as an exploratory view on appropriate governance aspects that fit the requirements of knowledge driven communities that seek a transformative approach to how their community is governed. As such, the framework presents the elements that play a role in the transformation, and could be taken into account in designing participative governance systems. In this abstract form, the framework is less of a prescription, but presents an analytical and design view in the form
of relevant aspects and considerations in relation to the transformation of governance systems for the knowledge democracy.

Based on the findings of the research and the further literature analysis, the following adaptations and considerations are proposed (with additions in bold text). The proposed adaptations are explained in this subchapter. The findings do not give reason to remove any of the aspects from the initial framework. It does provide a basis to add to several of the governance aspects.

The adaptations are explained in more detail with each aspect in the following sections.

Identity building - The “why” aspect has been adapted to “building identity.” It was originally focused on the question: why should the leadership of a community choose this path of participative governance? Considering the discussions about the role of identity in Chapter 4, these aspects of sense making for the community through “purpose” and “outcome” are now connected to identity building as a comprehensive approach towards internal cohesion of the community.

In the aspect of “outcome,” “value driven” is added, since the dynamic democratic and systemic developments point in the direction of a profound change in value systems, as reflected in paradigms and expressed through attitudes. “Transformation” is added because within bureaucratic structures and representative systems, actual transformative change is required to provide space for inclusive and knowledge driven participation. This implies adaptations of hearts and minds/paradigms, as well as practices. Looking at current developments, transformative adaptations to governance do not seem optional, but irreversible. Proactive governments, institutions, and organizations can reap the benefits of inclusive development, resulting in increased well-being, while resistant governments, institutions, and organizations can expect an uphill battle against bottom-up movements that will shake up known structures. Within bureaucracies and the system of representative democracy, to reach transformative change requires a transformative mindset of the leadership to overcome the non-participative structures and processes and provide space for participation and knowledge co-creation. The significance and uniqueness of “place” is further stressed by adding “place-based glocal challenges” to the outcome, especially given the tensions in the triad between economic, social, and environmental developments. Where the first two aspects have a global playing field, the social aspects remain significant in the local place-based context.
Table 7.1  Framework for governance for the knowledge democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Building Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Citizen participation in policy development and knowledge-based decision making leading to community/city competitive development and conflict resolution, resulting in higher quality of life, with transparency and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Value-driven transformation of paradigms and attitudes towards collective/shared responsibility and action, in the context of sustainable development and place-based glocal challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Participative Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Place-based collective wisdom, including implicit knowledge, data driven, co-creation, transparency, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time path</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Emergent, fluent, flexible, process orientation (not a project), tailor made to social and cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Inclusive, broad (also the “voiceless”), direct by target groups (not only representatives of representative organizations), active citizens' role in co-creation and co-responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Learning approach, holistic, reflexive, generative, dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Inside out (sharing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments / mechanisms</td>
<td>Place based, variable and interactive, dialogic approach, shared vision/identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on who</td>
<td>Policymakers, decision makers, citizens, and civil society (balancing interests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of power</td>
<td>Empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy, actual shift of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participative processes - The “how” aspect is adapted to “participative processes,” taking the kind of aspects into account that are categorized under this label in the framework. They all refer to interactive processes in participative governance. In the aspect of “participation” the role of “active citizens” is added, in light of the discussions about the role of citizens in renewal of democratic governance, and the propositions in deliberative theories about an active co-ownership and shared responsibilities for citizens. For this reason an “active citizens’ role in co-creation and co-responsibility” is added. In the aspect of “approach,” “dialogic” is added in the aspect of the overall approach to governance, in addition to it being mentioned already as an instrument. This stresses the importance and potential effect of a true dialogic approach in governance as such, in a more fundamental sense than just being used as a deliberative instrument.

Impact - The aspect of “what” is adapted into “impact” to emphasize the eventual goals of renewed governance for the knowledge democracy. The impact can be considered transformational, if indeed it has impact on all governmental and non-governmental players in the community, and if in the end an actual shift of power takes place from the democratic representatives and executive government towards stakeholders and people in the community.

7.3 DYNAMIC MODEL OF GOVERNANCE FOR KNOWLEDGE DEMOCRACY

This subchapter describes a dynamic model for governance that has been designed based on the analysis of the consolidated findings of this research, as reflected also in the framework. It aims to visualize the transformative changes that can take place towards a knowledge-driven governance, and the main dynamic aspects that play a role in this. This model of transformative governance can be considered a contribution to both the theories and the practices of knowledge driven and participative governance for communities.

The shape of circles represents the internal connectedness and external differentiation that characterizes a community. The circles show four layers, with the democratically elected representative body in the middle. The second layer is the executive government, while the third layer is formed by all non-governmental actors in the community, including inhabitants. The fourth layer is the identity that contributes internally towards place-based cohesion, while externally it functions as a differentiating factor from other
The identity is expressed through discourse and other forms of identity representation, which projects on the outside world a vision of the community, about what it stands for and what it means to accomplish.

The yellow arrow represents dialogic processes that take place in and between three layers: the community, government, and democratic representatives. The arrow points both ways, since dialogic processes can and should take place throughout the three layers, and should be initiated and supported by all layers as well. The smaller arrows in the circles project the fact that these processes should be of a continuous nature.

The three blue arrows represent the knowledge base, the action base, and the power base. The knowledge base arrow starts at identity and crosses all four circles. It reflects the use of a broad knowledge base, including all the layers, and also the link to the identity of the community as a basis for how it wants to develop. The arrow of the knowledge base points two ways to underscore the exchange of knowledge between communities.
the democratic representatives, the government, and inhabitants and stakeholders in
the community.
The action base arrow covers only the circles of government and the community. It
excludes the layer of democratic representation, since based on the principles of the
trias politica, modern democracies function with a separation of powers. Government is
the executive power, but the basis for action should be expanded towards the commu-
nity, based on aspects such as co-creation and co-responsibility of actively involved
citizens. As such, the fact that it points one way represents the aspect of abolishing the
sometimes perceived strict line between government and those being governed.
The power base arrow runs in one direction from democratic representation, through
government, and towards the community actors. This reflects the actual shift of power
from those that have formal legislative and executive power, towards the less powerful
players in the community. The actors in the community are not fully powerless in current
circumstances, since elections and lobbying are used to exercise power and influence.
But, the transformative goal is to empower the community to become co-creators who
carry co-responsibility based on actual influence, and even decision-making power,
which is for instance the case in participatory budgeting processes.

This model is not prescriptive; instead, it aims to describe the aspects that play a role in
transforming governance systems towards being participative and knowledge driven.
Along that transformative path, tensions can be expected and choices made on the
lines of these arrows. The model can serve as a practical tool for discussions and
considerations in communities that seek to expand participative practices. The model
can assist in discovering the dynamics that may come to the forefront when introducing
more participative governance. It reflects and stimulates questions to be discussed
about which and whose knowledge should be included and how the various types
of knowledge should be valued, what is the active role of non-government actors and
citizens with regard to being co-responsible, and also how do the formal executive
and representative actors see their position towards power; are they willing to share
and shift the power deeper into the community? The model contributes to such discus-
sions and can contribute to making conscious choices about the level of transformation
of governance a community seeks. It provides a systems view on participative gover-
nance as a transformative process for communities, underscoring the interrelatedness
of aspects and the dynamics between players that can be expected. Looking back
at the research, this dynamic model reflects in a highly abstract way the complexity of
interrelated and interdependent aspects that come to the forefront when considering
transformation to a participative and knowledge driven governance system.
This research was initiated with an open mind towards what could be of influence on
the design of governance for the complex requirements of the knowledge democracy.
By choice it was not delimited beforehand by approaching the issues from within the boundaries of a specific discipline. The research has been operationalized by both theoretical analysis, as well as an action research process with the aim to provide complimentary information from the theoretical and practical perspective. The dynamic model is a result of the consolidation of these two approaches. It describes the practical findings in the form of the dynamics at play at the knowledge base, the activity base and the power base through dialogic processes when options are considered with respect to transformation of the governance of a community. The model also implicitly reflects choice options in theoretical concepts such as legitimacy in knowledge and decision making. Depending on how far a community and its representative and executive leadership are willing to stretch the knowledge base to the outer layers, the choice reflects the view on which knowledge is considered legitimate and worthwhile to consider in decision making. The same counts for power and empowerment. Considerations can be made as to where the basis of power should be, and to what extent the community is considered empowered to act. When projecting the desires for far reaching, or more modest, transformative changes to governance on the dynamic model, it also reflects the values of the community towards democratic aspects such as self determination and self rule. The arrow of the action base reflects the choice point for citizens and stakeholders to verify if they are just seeking knowledge sharing and decision making power, or if they are also seeking to co-create, take co-responsibility, and be accountable for the governance of their community. Doing so would tighten the gap between government and being governed and broaden the basis of accountability. If the choice is made to work with dialogic processes through all the layers, this would reflect values of inclusiveness and contribute to democratic principles such as public opinion forming and will formation.

The model can provide support and guidance when modeling discussions about the desired governance approach for a community. As such it contributes to answering questions posed by Quick and Bryson (2016) which they consider important for further theory development. The first question relates to “how much participation is desirable and workable?” (Quick & Bryson, 2016, p. 165). The arrows in the dynamic model provide the basis for discussion in communities on the various complex aspects that this simple question encompasses. The question can only be answered in the specific context of a community, it is place-based and depending on culture and values, and local desires and capacities.

The dynamic model provides a basis for discussions in communities about the level of transformation that a community wants with respect to their governance. The model reflects the shifts and types of tensions that can be expected as shifts take place on the
aspects of the knowledge base, the action base and the power base. Considering these aspects and possible tensions up front provides a basis for the development of a shared view on the level of transformation that a community is aiming for.

The second question that Quick and Bryson pose cannot be answered based on this research, but the significance of the question is underlined based on the findings, especially if the action base is stretched towards players in the community. Quick and Bryson describe the push-down trends towards decentralized services and responsibilities involving a variety of non-government actors and note that this provides opportunities as well as concerns “over where and how public participation can occur to ensure the accountability, transparency and responsiveness of these governance actors” (Quick & Bryson, 2016, p. 165). These are fundamental considerations that need to be taken into account and further developed based on research.
REFLECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This final chapter focuses on reflections and recommendations, exploring the wider meaning of the insider action research process in Curaçao and the possible extrapolation to other contexts, and as such outlines the theoretical contributions for the scientific community. The research process focuses on seeking a fitting governance for the knowledge democracy amid highly dynamic changes in the world, with the empirical research taking place in Curaçao.

In the first chapter, the global signs of the transitional changes in societies were discussed, and the failure of current governance systems in many areas, creating a fuzzy horizon as to where society is heading. Many systems no longer serve the changed, dynamic, and diversified demands of citizens in the knowledge democracy, who seek place-based meaning among globalizing trends, and seek an active role in forming their future, independent of established structures and systems. The still rather elastic and fluid concept of knowledge has been discussed in Chapter 2 from a variety of contexts, as well as the increasing role of cities in the knowledge era, and the democratic mechanisms that are under stress in representative electoral systems.
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Global and local developments combine into “glocal” development challenges for governments. Cities are of major importance with respect to the development of sustainable governance, since over half the world population lives in urban areas and the numbers are expected to continue increasing. This puts cities at the heart of sustainable development at a global scale. That cities take their ever more glocal role seriously is illustrated by the fact that in September 2016 the inaugural convening took place of the Global Parliament of Mayors, as proposed by Benjamin Barber (2013) as an addition to other worldwide city networks. Chapter 2 concluded with an initial framework for governance in the knowledge democracy.

In Chapters 3 and 4, as a context for the empirical case, the challenges of the small country Curaçao were discussed, both in the preparation of a new government and new governance structure for the “city-state” Curaçao, as well as the challenges that have surfaced since the implementation in October 2010.

Based on the findings of the research that have been presented in Chapters 5 and 6, and the conclusions discussed in Chapter 7, the first subchapter of this closing chapter discusses the limitations of the research. The chapter continues with an in-depth reflection from the first-, second-, and third-person perspectives of this research, as well as reflections related to quality aspects of the research. The last subchapter discusses recommendations that stem from this research.

8.1 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The specific findings of the action research into the case study can only be interpreted in direct relation to the Curaçao case, where the process of creating an Action Program for Youth Development in a highly participative fashion, and as a new way of interactive collaboration within a bureaucratic structure, was developed in the specific cultural, organizational, and democratic context of this young city-state. The design and the approach of this participative process in Curaçao was founded, however, on a synthesis of various theories concerning knowledge in organizations, societies, and democratic developments, as reflected in the initial framework for governance in the knowledge democracy in Chapter 2. In Chapter 7 the findings have been juxtaposed with theory and processed in an adapted framework and a dynamic model. In the framework, the theoretical concepts, as well as the empirical findings, have been extrapolated to a more abstract view on the variety of aspects that are related to transforming governance into a more participative and knowledge-driven system. As such, the framework is not prescriptive, but analytical, and looks at governance as a holistic system with various influences to consider. Considerations to the aspects mentioned should always take place in relation to the local culture, processes, and
systems. At this aggregated level, the governance framework functions as a frame of reference, describing the considerations towards a transformative approach of governance. If indeed a transformation—the most far-reaching version of change—can take place, depends on the desired purpose and outcome for the specific community. The Curaçao case reflects a less ambitious, but nonetheless significant, change towards a more participative and knowledge-driven governance. It has worked with highly participative processes through a dialogic approach, but within bureaucratic structures and in the end depending on decision making in the existing executive and representative structures. Though the process produced adaptations in organizational and political power aspects, there was not an actual shift of power. In this sense, and in relation to the framework, the Curaçao case was not transformative.

From a social constructionist viewpoint, the framework and the influence of the various aspects can only be considered in the network of social relations in the specific social context in which it is applied. The considerations may be different across cultural and socially different societies, but all aspects are of influence. The framework represents a holistic view on what aspects to take into account when working towards renewed governance.

The Curaçao case specifically focused on a bureaucratic organization and its related aspects. In most organizations some form of hierarchy and a division of labor exists. Depending on the processes, structures, and organizational culture, this means that other organizations may also experience to some extent the challenges with regards to internal and external collaboration based on shared goals. The considerations as presented in the framework therefore are valid, and some, but not all, may be applicable in the context of other organizations.

The dynamic model for transformative governance reflects the transformative path that communities undergo when aiming towards participative, knowledge-driven governance in a representative democracy. On that path, tensions can be expected, and choices made, which are presented in a holistic way in the dynamic model. The specific type of tensions and their intensity is dependent on the local social and cultural circumstances, but they can be considered applicable in any situation of changing governance towards participation and co-creation. The dynamic model provides on the abstract level a systems view on participative governance as a transformative process for communities. It reflects, in a highly abstract way, the complexity of interrelated and interdependent aspects that come to the forefront when considering and implementing transformation to a participative and knowledge-driven governance system in communities.
The process of this research has been extensive and at times highly intensive, with major developments over time in how I have approached the research. I started out with a traditional positivist approach and a desire to compare vision development processes between cities by building a comparative framework with validated variables. But, the research developed into a personal, professional, and scientific journey of discovery into the broad scope of options for qualitative research, and into new scientific paradigms from a social constructionist perspective. Applying insider action research, and thus being closely involved from my professional capacity, made me discover new personal mindsets and alternative points of view that began to fit together in a logical way. Action research provided cohesion to a variety of thoughts and aspects that I have been thinking about and analyzing in recent years.

In this subchapter I elaborate on three perspectives of insider action research, explaining the learning moments from the personal (first person), professional (second person), and scientific (third person) perspectives. I close this subchapter with reflections on quality aspects of this research, and with recommendations.

8.2.1 First person reflections

In this section I elaborate on what this research has meant on a personal level. This research process has provided me a journey of discovery and development in more ways than I had imagined possible when I started. I expected mainly cognitive development and insights, but other main points from a first-person perspective that I have taken with me include the approach of systems thinking, various valuable spin-off effects from my scientific research in my professional work and my private life, renewed energy, and a clearer outlook on the seemingly confusing developments that take place in these transformative times.

I realized from the start that I had chosen an uphill battle, because of my non-academic background, and the fact that I opted for research concerning the concept of knowledge democracy, which is still emergent and crosses various scientific boundaries. This meant that I had to carve out and design the scientific path I would follow; there was no designated field upfront in which I would be working on a well-delimited topic, and contributing to a specific scientific field. I compared it many times to cross-country running—moving off the beaten track, without designated trails to follow, but with a destination in mind. I realized that this poses risks, since I have to take the readers of this dissertation with me and try to make them understand the cross-country field and roads I have chosen, and explain the final destination and show how this contributes to already existing roadmaps and travel guides, metaphorically speaking.

As described in this thesis, the journey brought me to twists and turns along the way,
through easy valleys and dense forests, but also encountering cliffs and sometimes steep hills. Reaching the destination took longer than I had hoped beforehand, but in the end it has led to a more in depth and fundamental approach in the research than I originally foresaw. I cherish the experiences of the journey and highly enjoy the destination. And, most importantly, I feel eager to continue further journeys.

The most significant turn I made was to let go of the separation between professional and scientific work, both mentally as well as in practice. Mentally, I lived in separated worlds for the larger part of the journey. I had my professional work, and next to this I practiced and learned the scientific approach in my spare time. This is related to the volatile work surroundings, especially since I started working for government in 2010, but it is also related to my own mental framework, that science is something that I also practice, but next to other activities. It was not until I gained profound insight into action research and its fundamental *spirit of inquiry* (Coghlan, 2011) that the separation between the two worlds started to blur. Unconsciously at first, I started making considerations in my work practice that were based on the insights from my scientific research. The scientific knowledge I gained seemed applicable more often in my daily planning and decision making, especially with regards to the transformation processes going on in government. In my research journal I read back about the feeling I had, that in guiding the discussions about the projects for more integral and participative government, I relied more and more on my scientific knowledge and insights. It took me quite some time to accept, and to be quite honest, gain enough courage, to actually opt for insider action research. It felt right and wrong at the same time. It took me quite a while to see the strong benefits of a “merger” between my professional and scientific worlds; and to see that that just doing what needs to be done to enhance your organization, but to do it in a scientifically sound way, leads to a win–win, with mutually significant benefits. This has along the way developed into a conviction that especially action research has great potential in organizational practice. Beyond this thesis I have continued to apply it and stimulate others to do so, too. The projects discussed in this thesis did not end when the formal empirical research ended, but they still continue to develop within the Curaçao government. And, I try to guide and stimulate them with the spirit of inquiry in mind and in practice.

Other insights that I gained are related to systems thinking. I am by nature inclined to look at “the bigger picture” and seem to be able to connect a large amount of dots and focus on complex processes and how these are influenced. Thinking in systems with its interrelated aspects and influences is an important aspect of action research, which is one of the reasons it appeals to me. Through this process I learned to see and recognize the interdependencies and influences, and the added value to consider the whole as more than the sum of its parts.

One of the most valuable experiences I carry with me is the power of reflection. During
the research process the team reflected often as part of the learning process, and also
due to the highly dynamic circumstances we were involved in. Weekly sessions of the
core team, where reflection and planning were combined in overlapping learning
cycles, enabled us to move swiftly and consciously amid the many influences and
developments. Reflexivity is what made it possible to pave the way while walking on
muddy grounds, and not just following a predesigned route. We also learned that
focusing too much on who is missing at certain events makes one lose sight of the
people that are present and their unique contributions. It sharpened our antennas for
sensing opportunities and being able to promptly react on them. Reflexivity is now a
constant factor in my way of working and even organizing meetings. It helps connect
and optimize what is happening and look forward, while learning from what has
happened in the immediate past.
I gained respect for, and curiosity about, something that I still cannot really compre-
prehend. We have had many instances of lucky moments and seemingly organic develop-
ments that made things fall into place, which we were not able to explain. We did
not plan for it, and they were too many to just ignore such instances. Some refer to it
as the law of attraction, originally described in 1906 by Atkinson (Atkinson, 1906)
or as Synchronicity (Jaworski, 2011). The idea behind this is that thoughts are energy
fields that attract and reinforce each other. So positive thoughts can attract other posi-
tive thought, and thus trigger events. Since I experienced such synchronistic happen-
ings so specifically, I am triggered to learn more, despite my natural skepticism about
such topics.
One specific thing I learned to apply, and will cherish, is Schein’s ORJI cycle (Schein,
2013, p. 88), which divides the human mental reaction process into four phases:
observation, reaction, judgment, and intervention. The cycle helps me to analyze
communication and my reaction to what is being communicated, before I might leap
into a perhaps emotionally guided or otherwise biased intervention. It helps to recog-
nize biases and filters, and more rationally judge an inclination to react. This to me is
very valuable, even though I already consider myself more rationally than emotionally
driven. It enriches my options to consciously chose how to react, and this gives me an
edge in building and maintaining personal and professional relationships, especially
in sensitive or tense situations.

8.2.2 Second-person reflections
In this section I elaborate on what this research has meant on a collaborative and orga-
nizational level.
From the second-person perspective, doing action research in bureaucratic surround-
ings is especially challenging. Structures and processes are designed on the bureau-
ocratic principles of hierarchy and division of labor and are hard to circumvent or break
through. We developed the research process and organized it around a network structure to try and overcome this. The challenge in this is to go from “cooperation” to “collaboration”; from being friendly and cooperative and sharing information, to actually aligning goals and also resources across the organization (Ashkenas, 2015). Collaboration is much more profound in terms of alignment of common needs and goals, and especially in assigning resources to achieve the goals. Nothing in a bureaucracy is designed for internal, nor external, collaboration beyond departmental lines, vertical as well as horizontal. We have learned that building interpersonal relationships and identifying needs is crucial in making collaboration happen, both internally and externally. The dialogic approach, as another way of interacting and creating alternative settings for meetings, added great value to breaking through the rigid structures, processes, and perceptions. It helped to drag people away from their regular inclinations, connotations, and perceptions, and created space for new thinking.

From my position on the high end of the hierarchy, and especially combining my managerial and co-researcher roles, it has taught me to be very aware of my roles and to use the roles consciously to achieve the desired change. It often involved asking questions instead of directing and telling, and considering for instance approaching deadlines from the various perspectives. It also involved organizing a new kind of settings for meetings and with different people participating. The traditional hierarchical approaches can be put at a distance, as long as—from a leadership perspective—a manager creates the safe surroundings for it, and is aware of the indirect influence a manager’s presence and way of acting in meetings has. This means that even a top-level manager is responsible for the end result, and sometimes needs to be absent (and even invisible), and needs to allow space for things to happen without a predestined outcome in the form of a successful result. That is hard; I have no other words for it. I needed to let go, let things happen, and trust on the abilities of others to make it work. And, in that space, based on trust and professionalism, great things happened, but not without very cold chills often running on my back, to be honest.

When we were happy with the initial willingness for collaboration, we encountered the second level of collaboration, which was more challenging. The first level, getting people to recognize the value and need to work together, was achieved beyond expectations as to the time it took to create the awareness. But, the second level of actually bringing it into practice and sticking to it proved to be much more difficult. It required constant investment in relationships, identifying shared goals that have at least the same or higher priority as departmental goals. The key is to win the hearts and the minds of people across the organization. They need to be involved, and also personally experience the added value, to see what is in it for them, to get them to act on it. Related to this is the aspect of how far ahead to plan in insider action research processes. The “normal” way is to plan ahead with milestones and points of measure-
ment, and to bring everything in place that is needed to achieve the end result. But, if the end result is fuzzy, planning becomes more like sketching alternative options along the way, with a destination in mind, but not a specific route. Action research, especially in a bureaucratic organization, requires flexibility and creativity, because of the inherent iterative approach through learning cycles. This poses challenges to planning and also to budgeting cycles and responsibilities. Since in this case I was in a top-level position, I could manage this, based on my formal authority in the organization. Without the top-level support it is hard, if not impossible, to overcome such challenges. In the collaborative sphere I had to bring all involved at ease with this, both employees in my own department, as well as colleagues at the top level in other ministries. They needed to be aware of the iterative and somewhat open-ended approach, and become comfortable with it.

With respect to the focus of the researcher and the organization, it is worthwhile to examine Coghlan and Brannick’s quadrant model (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014, p. 123). The quadrant model distinguishes between intended self-study in action for the researcher and the system. In the Curaçao case, both had the intention for self study, mainly because of the dual goal of the Action Program for Youth Development. The creation of an action program was a goal in itself, but at the same time it was a pilot for a new way of working for the Curaçao Government: collaborative, participative, and knowledge driven. The research thus had most elements of quadrant 4, with the focus on self-study of both the researcher and the system.

This had role implications in various settings. In the core team of researchers—consisting of the secretary-generals, the president and secretary of the National Platform for Youth Development, and process consultants—my role was to safeguard the dual focus, not just accomplish the content of the Action Program for Youth Development through dialogic sessions, but also to reflect and document what worked well, and what did not come to bear fruit in this collaborative and participative way of working. This required continuous attention and regular reminding. The secretary-generals were aware and supported the idea of a new way of working, but in the day-to-day work practice, departmental considerations often win over the goal of cross-departmental collaboration. We invited the ministries to have people participate in the project teams according to the network structure, and in order to make it attractive, we dug deep inside the motivation aspects of what is in it for me. In many cases we could identify an aligned need between having a colleague participate in one of the project teams for youth development, and the direct responsibilities in their own department. But, in practice, departments often still feel they will “lose” a colleague for their own work purposes, or it is hard to get political support for inter-ministerial collaboration. The dual focus, on the other hand, helped to gain attention from departments that were less directly involved and interested in youth development as a theme. We could appeal to
them based on the fact that this was a pilot for a new way of working for government. To foster and stimulate the dialogic approach we chose to train extra internal facilitators who could support in more wide ranging application throughout government of the dialogic approach. This worked, but it takes time, because it proved to be a challenge when dialogue is not yet an established approach, and potential facilitators are not sure what they apply for.

An aspect that plays a role in the challenges in the Curaçao case is the scale of the organization. We had top-level support through the Council of Secretary-generals, and worked based on an assignment from the Council of Ministers. But, to start a change process from the top level in an organization with over 3,700 employees divided over nine ministries, each with their own internal departments, takes time to develop and implement. It seems paradoxal: without top-level support, change capacities are seriously reduced to an uphill battle. But, with top-level initiative, it takes time to work downwards and across the organization, especially if the organization is separated by bureaucratic structures. The research in Curaçao focused on the development of the Action Program for Youth Development. In that initial phase of writing and validating the program, the change capabilities were certainly not yet visible throughout the organization, and we tasted the challenges ahead of us. Since the acceptance of the action program by the government, we have initiated many more actions and approaches, based on continuous learning and reflection, to positively influence the change capabilities in the Curaçao Government, trying to permeate the status quo, and bringing positive energy to those who are open to do better as government.

Figure 8.2 Matrix of the focus of the researcher and system (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014)
8.2.3 Third-person reflections

The third-person reflections refer to the wider positioning and relevance of the research. This concerns disseminating the research in the wider scientific community and reflecting on extrapolating the results in more general terms to other contexts and organizations. The Curaçao case is unique in several senses. Not many municipalities or small nations have the opportunity to redesign their government and governance. I will discuss this from two perspectives: the national perspective and the organizational perspective. From the national perspective, the constitutional position of Curaçao is relevant to discuss. The action research has been undertaken on the island of Curaçao, a city-state with constitutional autonomy within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. As such, the focus is quite unique, since there are not many nations with only one level of government. Most nations, due to the larger scale, have regional and municipal governments with specific authority and responsibility defined for each level of government. From a national perspective the Curaçao case is in this sense quite unique and incomparable to other nations. The one-tier government structure provides the full set of responsibilities—from planning, through policy development, budgeting, law making, to actual service execution and policy implementation—to one governmental organization and within one democratic layer.

Another aspect to consider from this national perspective is the democratic structure. Curaçao has a representative democracy like most western countries, where senators are chosen by the electorate to represent them in parliament. From the 21 seats in parliament, a majority coalition needs to be formed as the basis for an executive government with a cabinet of ministers. This is not unique and is comparable to most other western democratic systems. The democratic processes are also comparable. The democratic practices, however, vary according to the type of democracy. Curaçao is a rather young democracy that obtained autonomous responsibilities after the colonial period in 1954. In democracies with a longer history and tradition, the democratic practices vary, and so do aspects such as the role of politics in the governance system and the desire towards more or less transformative governance.

From an organizational perspective it is relevant to consider that the governmental organization of Curaçao is organized like many other governmental organizations on national, regional, and municipal levels, namely based on bureaucratic principles. This is characterized by horizontal and hierarchical structures in which labor and responsibilities are allocated along these horizontal lines. The research questions have been formulated to specifically address this aspect, since this is a reality for many governmental organizations on various levels. The findings into these aspects as discussed in Chapter 6 to a certain extent can be extrapolated to comparable organizations. Most of the challenges of organizing participative structures in bureaucratic organizations can be generalized, but the way to address such challenges is influenced by
the specific social and cultural context. It is for this reason that I constructed the framework for governance in the knowledge democracy and the dynamic model using an analytical design view, with considerations of a set of aspects that play a role when considering transformative governance, not as a prescriptive framework for how it should be done. The way the aspects mentioned in the framework and the dynamic model are addressed and considered varies depending on particular social-cultural circumstances of the organization and the community. However, since the framework is based on a combination of theoretical synthesis and action research, it is expected to cover governance aspects in general terms.

Another influence from the organizational perspective to consider in relation to the broader relevancy of the research is the fact Curaçao is a city-state, with governance responsibilities and local challenges that are—as for complexity, but not scale—comparable to those of middle and large scale cities with the same broad set of policy areas and public services for their community. Given the increasingly impacting role of cities, as discussed in this thesis, many cities face policy challenges, as well as governance tensions in the context of the knowledge democracy, in which citizens require a more interactive and knowledge-based approach. For cities, therefore, the governance framework may be more applicable than for national governments. Being aware of some of the specific aspects of Curaçao, early on in the research I decided to model towards a more general approach with the governance framework, as well as the dynamic model. This also helped to keep a helicopter view on the progress and the results, and in trying to avoid tunnel vision and getting absorbed by the intricate details of this complex research.

8.2.4 Quality reflections

In reflecting on the quality of the research, I relate back to seven criteria as presented by Bradbury (2015, p. 8), since these criteria reflect the views on quality from a range of action research scholars as developed and articulated in recent decades. The seven criteria are:

- Quality requires articulation of objectives
- Quality requires partnerships and participation
- Quality requires contribution to action research theory-practice
- Quality requires appropriate methods and process
- Quality requires actionability
- Quality requires reflexivity
- Quality requires significance

It is hard, if not impossible, to perform action research in which all of these criteria are met optimally. There will always be trade-offs and choices to be made within the constraints of the research process. If this is done in a transparent and conscious way,
then that in itself contributes to a clear view on the quality aspects as they have played a role. In this section I discuss the ways in which the quality aspects have been considered in this research.

The articulation of objectives refers to “the extent to which the AR actually addresses its objectives” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8). The problem statement in this research is to explore in the evolving era of knowledge democracy, how governance can be shaped to provide for processes for sustainable participation of citizens and stakeholders, which can be applied within a bureaucratic structure, while honoring the mechanisms of representative democracy. This has been researched using three specific research questions:

1. What participative structures or processes can be applied within a traditional bureaucratic government structure, where policy development is a non-participatory process? What are success factors and risks?
2. How can participation of citizens be organized/shaped in a parliamentary democracy where the formal power is in the hands of an elected body of representatives, who create an executive government?
3. What tensions with respect to power in policy development and decision making does this bring forward, and how can this be addressed?

The research findings in Chapter 6 directly relate to these questions, on a detailed as well as a more abstract level. As to the quality aspect, the objective has been met. The findings present detailed answers to the research questions, and the analysis on a more abstract level addresses the problem statement that has been formulated, based on the governance paradox described in section 1.2.1.

The quality aspect of partnerships and participation refers to “the extent to, and means by which, the AR reflects or enacts participative values and concern for the relational component of the research. By the extent of participation, we are referring to a continuum from consultation with stakeholders to stakeholders as full co-researchers” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8). In the Curaçao case, the range of stakeholders in designing and in validating the Action Program for Youth Development was broad and very diverse, both in government, and in the community. We aimed to make the participative aspect and the action learning explicit by addressing this during sessions, and also in describing it in the action program. Specific subchapters have been dedicated to explaining the action research and learning approach. In practice, ample considerations have been given to who should be involved and why, with as a starting point a stakeholder’s knowledge and experience as to the various themes, not a person’s position or function. The scale of the government organization posed challenges in
this respect. The research was a pilot for a new way of working, but the development of the action program was an experimental pilot project for it, in which not all 3,700 players of the organization could be involved. With regard to youth development and the specific stakeholders related to this theme, I think we did the optimum for what was possible within the constraints of time and objectives. We have taken explicit efforts to involve the youth themselves. We ran into the dilemma of representation at a certain point. Have we involved enough and sufficiently diverse groups of youth to represent most youth in Curaçao? The evaluation forms show high diversity of participants in age, income, social-economic status, and education level. But, it is hard to determine if it was fully representative, given the five development themes in the action program. I do think we have been as inclusive as possible, by working across neighborhoods, age groups, and education levels. We have also tried to make participation a continuous focus in the next phases of the action program, which are beyond the scope of this research, by designing an implementation structure that continues the dialogic approach, and includes stakeholders in the actual implementation during the next phases.

The quality aspect of contribution to action research theory-practice refers to “the extent to which the AR builds on (creates explicit links with) or contributes to a wider body of practice knowledge and/or theory, that it contributes to the AR literature” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8). This aspect has been addressed by amply discussing the scholarly views on knowledge democracy and related scientific topics, but also by the exploratory design of the framework for governance of the knowledge democracy and the dynamic model. In this framework and the dynamic model, the themes have been extrapolated on an abstract level, based both on the research findings as well as on synthesis of scientific theories.

The quality aspect of appropriate methods and process refers to the extent to which to AR process and related methods are clearly articulated and illustrated. By illustrated we mean that empirical papers ‘show’ and not just ‘tell’ about process and outcomes by including analysis of data that includes the voices of participants in the research. (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8)

In this research various methods have been used. Next to the principles and characteristics of action research, specific methods were used such as dialogic approach, action learning, and template analysis. The methods and specifically the way they have been applied have been described in detail in Chapter 5. Detailed data from the research have been presented to provide a view on the direct voices of the stakeholders that have been involved in the research. Also, an analysis on a more abstract
level has been discussed. The choice for the amount of data to publish is in general a trade-off between providing enough data for insight into, and support of, the analysis, with saturation of findings and readability.

The quality aspect of actionability refers to “the extent to which the AR provides new ideas that guide action in response to a need” (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8). Providing new ideas in response to a need is highly context sensitive. In the Curaçao case the Action Program for Youth development was a direct response—initiated by the government—to tragic events that had cost the lives of young people. These events produced a shared desire for a more structural approach to youth development, instead of addressing specific youth problems that only reflect symptoms of underlying flaws in overall youth development. This structural approach as such was new to Curaçao. The fact that this resulted in the preparation of an action program based on action research with direct participation of stakeholders was also new to the Curaçao Government, as well as the Curaçao community. The dialogues on the five themes of youth development produced new ideas for solutions and approaches that had not been discussed earlier. Within the government several new ideas were brought forward as to how to better work together and in a more participative way. This is reflected in the network approach for the implementation of the action program through tiger teams. Also, the dialogic approach was a new aspect in the Curaçao Government that has been translated into training of internal dialogue facilitators, to stimulate that within government dialogue can be used in other settings as well.

The quality aspect of reflexivity refers to

the extent to which self-location as a change agent is acknowledged. By self-location we mean that authors take a personal, involved, and self-critical stance as reflected in clarity about their role in the AR process, clarity about the context in which the AR process takes place, and clarity about which led to their involvement in this research. (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8)

My role in this action research project has been described explicitly from the three AR perspectives of first, second, and third person, on a detailed as well as on a more abstract level. The aspect of reflexivity has had an impacting meaning for both myself in my various roles, as well as on the research process. The choice for conscious, and also continuous, reflection contributed to a richness in findings and the ability to deal with the high level of complexity and dynamic developments in this insider research. The quality aspect of significance refers to
the extent to which the insights of the AR are significant in content and process. By significant we mean having meaning and relevance beyond their immediate context in support of the flourishing of persons, communities and the wider ecology. (Bradbury, 2015, p. 8)

This aspect is highly context sensitive, and to a certain extent also highly subjective. The people who have been positively affected will easily express and share their positive feelings, while the skeptics mostly tend to withhold their criticism, even in evaluations. But, based on the evaluations of the sessions, we have experienced many instances in which the people involved were filled with renewed energy and hope for better perspectives for our youth. Specifically, the participation through dialogic approach was highly appreciated and greeted warmly as something that needed repetition, both within government and in the community. The reflexivity and dialogic approach have, therefore, been continued beyond this research process, with increasing effects on people, as well as collaborative processes. In how far the actual change capability has been positively affected, however, is still to be seen in the implementation of the action program. The sustainable effects of significance, in the sense that people have been structurally influenced, can only be determined or sensed after some time and beyond the initial enthusiasm after the energized meetings.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Just like other areas, the scientific field is experiencing a transformative period. Technological breakthroughs present themselves at high speed, and an increase in multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches, produce exciting advances in a range of scientific fields. Social sciences have an especially important role in this, to analyze, stimulate, and guide these fast-paced developments, connecting dots and seeking meaning behind developments. Taking the critical approach of the UNESCO report (2010) on social sciences in relation to the knowledge divide in mind, this can prove to be a challenge. Can social sciences keep up the pace fast enough and refocus to help make sense of and help guide the wide scale transformations taking place? Various initiatives have been taken in relation to the knowledge divide, such as the launch in 2012 of the UNESCO chair in Community-based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education in 2012, focusing specifically on the collaborative role of universities and communities. I consider it highly desirable in this dynamic era that the institutions for higher education focus on their social responsibility, beyond traditional scientific aims. The options for providing practical significance on the organizational and community level through scientific research are immense. The action research process
in Curaçao has shown me on personal, professional, and scientific levels what a great added value science has provided to the change process in Curaçao. Without a scientific approach based on action research principles and practices, we would not have come this far with these results. I also noticed highly intertwined interests between science, organizational, and even community goals and practices. Such synergies must be optimized to support and guide sustainable systemic change.

Based on the research, I see extensive opportunities, and even an inherent need, on the managerial work floor for action research into relations, processes, systems, and structures. I recommend managers to deepen and enrich their knowledge and practice with scientific methods, especially action research, because of the obvious synergetic and generative effects. But, I also identify a scientific need to make sense of, and help shape, the transformations going on in high speed in organizations and communities. The thousands of participative and deliberative processes around the world affect more communities every day and lead to intensified discussions about our democratic systems and processes. The forming of new theory, based on these practices, is highly desired to help shape these developments.

I also recommend not only to explain and describe, but also to work towards future forming research as described by Gergen (2014). We work with mostly 20th century (and older) principles in the 21st century, amid massive shifts in values and paradigms. Leaders and managers need to be aware and learn to cope with and guide such developments, so that the people in our communities and organizations can flourish. Bureaucracy and other forms of hierarchical organizations fitted a specific development in a certain time. But, new ways of organizing have been developed in recent decades, focusing more on what it takes to make humans function properly and optimally, instead of a focus on organizational results accompanied by processes and structures to which humans must adapt. The challenge for science, and social science in particular, is to make sense of all this and provide explanatory and also generative insights.

Action research has the unique and enormous potential to cross the divide between science and practice, and is especially powerful based on its generative potential. Action research can not only explain, but also help shape developments. Science, thus, is not just descriptively and analytically applied to find out about the world “as it is,” but also “what it could be” (Gergen, 2015, p. 287). I find the words of Gergen highly appealing with AR as future forming science. This implies extending the application of science into the daily realm, beyond the scientific world. I am naturally inclined to pragmatism, and was in my high school years somewhat hesitant about opting for scientific studies. I chose my initial (vocational) journalism training consciously. During my MBA studies, I gained more appreciation for a scientific approach, recognizing that a scientific basis is required for—in positivist terms—rigor and validity. Entering
my PhD journey, I was challenged to combine my pragmatic stance with a scientific approach. In action research I found the ideal balance: a scientific approach and significance, but within a pragmatic and even generative context. That fits me, and I expect many more change agents in management and in society. I think it fits many more leaders and managers with a drive to renew their communities and organizations with the people in mind, both clients and employees and citizens. I am fascinated by the broad range of options, the fast and varied developments within the family of action research, and how it can add value to more traditional quantitative research and provide instruments for managers, leaders, and employees that are open to enhancing and transforming their life and work in practice.

In discussing governance for knowledge democracy, the role of data and technology is undeniably relevant to consider. The topic of expanding the use of information and communication technology (ICT) was brought forward in several of the youth dialogues in Curaçao. The data however, did not provide sufficient basis and direction for conclusions related to these aspects. It was the mere significance of ICT developments and applications that was brought to the forefront. Societies and their ways of interacting, as well as the way public services are provided by governments to their communities, have dramatically changed in the last two decades. And, how technology might further impact our societies and interactions is only beginning to be discovered. Some developments are leading to market disruptions, as shown by Uber and Airbnb. For governments, and in relation to governance, there is a range of aspects to consider, such as the smart cities concept, which is now widely used in both the scientific and consultancy world, relating to the use of data for operational management, planning, and strategy development. The systematic use of large data in urban environments is seemingly endless, from smart grids for an optimal balance between conventional and renewable energies, to infrastructural planning based on transportation data, to geographical information systems (GIS) to visualize a variety of data for specific regions and neighborhoods. All such data use can stimulate knowledge creation and provide the basis for smart systems to monitor, plan, and strategize community developments.

A second recommendation to consider related to ICT is e-government, the general term used for the application of information and communication technology for web-based public services of governments to its communities. Besides the obvious cost-effectiveness and ease-of access considerations, aspects of good governance and economic development are also important in relation to e-government. By reducing person-to-person administrative transactions, corruption is made harder and transparency is stimulated. International organizations, such as UNDP and the World Bank, stimulate the use of information and communication technology (ICT) and promote digitalized services to enhance quality of service and fight corruption, and thus stimulate economic development through increased investments and the easy start up of economic activities.
A third aspect to consider is that technology facilitates interactive communication via various channels and can be used for interactive purposes related to communication and information sharing. In relation to governance, it stimulates transparency and can contribute to inclusiveness, since there is an increasing amount of communities with high internet penetration, even among hard to reach groups, especially via portable devices. There are also technological developments that require consideration, because they may lead to systemic disruptions, resulting in revolutionary breakthroughs in the way the current systems work, especially in relation to transactions and registration of all kind of properties. While Uber and Airbnb show serious signs of disruption of traditional markets, technology like blockchain, also known as distributed ledger technology (DLT), may alter the most fundamental transactional systems that societies have come to rely on in recent centuries. An essential feature of blockchain technology is that transactions can take place without middlemen or independent institutions. The best known example of blockchain technology is the bitcoin, but this is just one “product” of the technology. Tapscott and Tapscott (2016) recently provided a comprehensive, yet compact description in an HBR article.

Blockchain technology is complex, but the idea is simple. At its most basic, blockchain is a vast, global distributed ledger or database running on millions of devices and open to anyone, where not just information but anything of value – money, titles, deeds, music, art, scientific discoveries, intellectual property, and even votes – can be moved and stored securely and privately. On the blockchain, trust is established, not by powerful intermediaries like banks, governments and technology companies, but through mass collaboration and clever code. Blockchains ensure integrity and trust between strangers. (Tapscott and Tapscott, 2016)

The transactions are organized in blocks, hence the name blockchain, and each transaction is marked in relation to earlier transactions. One of the most implicating and possible effects is the fully transparent basis it provides. Trust and distrust are set aside as a factor in the transaction, since every transaction is saved, and thus verifiable, throughout the distributed network. This makes banks, and all other agencies and institutions, including governments, that normally form the independent and trustworthy “middleman” possibly obsolete in this respect. The financial services sector is investing major efforts in research and development. World Economic Forum (WEF, 2016, p. 14) reported that over 90 central banks are engaged in discussions about DLT, while 80% of banks are expected to initiate DLT projects in 2017. The technology can be used for a large variety of registrations and transactions, from home properties and land registries, to voting and intellectual properties. The technology is as of yet explor-
atory, but many projects using blockchain technology are underway. In the financial services sector alone, 1.4 billion USD has been invested in DLT in the past three years (WEF, 2016, p. 14).

Other recent technological developments that can be recommended for further research concern the role of mapping and graphical representation of data. Infographics and the art of storytelling in the form of short cartoon movies are widely used to attractively and comprehensibly represent complex issues. Khanna (2016) shows how mapping and the subsequent analysis of the underlying developments can lead to new worldviews. Khanna presents such an alternative view, arguing that global connectivity through communication, energy, and transport networks is the decisive factor for megaregions, not nation-states, in the 21st century. He proposes that “connectivity has replaced division as the new paradigm of global organization” (Khanna, 2016, prologue, para. 5). His view through data mapping “generates new visions of how we organize ourselves as a species. Global infrastructures are morphing our world system from divisions to connections and from nations to nodes” (Khanna, 2016, a journey around the world, para. 8). Khanna aligns with Barber (2013) in his view that megacities are more important than nation-states and will be the defining unit of organization in this century. These examples illustrate that, in relation to governance for the knowledge democracy, the use of data and technology is highly relevant to consider in all of its possibilities, given the rapid developments.
SUMMARY

Fast-paced and multi-dimensional transformative developments on a global scale have put governance systems under severe pressure. Systems and structures that were once considered reliable beacons of assurance have tumbled or have come under severe scrutiny, not only in the financial world, but also in the democratic context. The development of knowledge cities and societies is deeply embedded in a global sustainability agenda, balancing economic aspects with ecological and social aspects of development (Carillo, 2006; Florida, 2002; Landry, 2000; Unesco, 2005). However, there is an as of yet unanswered question about how to fit more knowledge-based and participative governance into our current democratic system of representation, which shows signs of becoming dysfunctional (Castells, 2005; In’t Veld, 2010; Van Reybrouck, 2013). In representational political systems, the democratic activities of citizens are mostly limited to voluntary participation in cyclical voting processes. The limitations of this approach can be heard in a growing body of criticism, and is also visible in the many projects and processes across the globe that provide a more interactive and participative role for citizens within the structure of traditional representative democracy. The increasing amount of participative initiatives and projects around the world, mostly on municipal level, seem to indicate that there is a growing explicit desire to apply more direct democratic influence. So the question arises of what are the options and mechanisms somewhere between the two democratic “extremes” of pure representation and direct democracy. How do we facilitate and stimulate more influence and co-creation from citizens and stakeholders in society in dealing with wicked problems, while the formal decision power is still in the hands of a small group of chosen representatives? Especially since many governmental organizations are organized by bureaucratic principles that are not conducive to participation, knowledge sharing, and co-creation. Another important aspect to consider in this context is how to deal with decision making related to participatory initiatives within a representative system, where the actual decision-making power is in the hands of
the chosen representatives in parliament and the government that these representatives create and support. Is there room for participative influence amid political considerations? Tensions may occur when decisions and policies are prepared on a participative basis with involvement of citizens, stakeholders, and civil society, once they are put before political executives and parliament to approve. Therefore, the problem statement for this research is: in the context of the knowledge-based democracy, the question arises how governance and government can be adjusted effectively, to allow for the sustainable participation of citizens and stakeholders, specifically within bureaucratic structures, while honoring the foundations and mechanisms of the political democracy common in the modern world. This study takes place amid a field of relatively new scientific concepts that can be

Figure 2.2 Schematic representation of research developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Zadar (Makelearn): A critical look at citizen participation processes in knowledge-based societies within the framework of representative (parliamentary) democracies (Tissen &amp; Van Rijn, 2013)</td>
<td>A governance approach that is conducive to knowledge driven participatory processes in democratic systems based on representation.</td>
<td>Analysis of vision-oriented “top-down” participative mechanisms and “bottom-up” approach from the knowledge/participation perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
considered elastic and even fluid. The current transitional period produces concepts that emerge and develop, but it will take time to see which concepts dissipate, and which ones will evolve and take a permanent shape. For now an exploratory and interdisciplinary approach is required to analyze the complex governance challenges. Therefore, the first part of the research is oriented at discovering and analyzing the various theoretic concepts related to governance in the knowledge democracy. An initial framework for governance for the knowledge democracy based on theoretical synthesis has been developed. The analysis has lead to a shift from looking at knowledge-driven vision processes in cities as such, to the governance context in which such processes take place, and the tensions that this may bring about. Figure 2.2 summarizes the research developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma model as a comparative framework for analysis of vision development between cities. Involvement &lt;-&gt; consultation Co-creation &lt;-&gt; top-down implementation Tolerance &lt;-&gt; conservatism Knowledge &lt;-&gt; Information The language of care &lt;-&gt; the language of war Dialogue &lt;-&gt; talk Experimentation &lt;-&gt; consolidation Action &lt;-&gt; words Common values &lt;-&gt; general values Uniqueness &lt;-&gt; copy cat</td>
<td>Focus on vision development processes in cities (comparative) Focus on interests and governance tensions with regard to participative processes Focus on different governance contexts with regard to participative processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall structure and guiding principles and processes of traditional representative democracies offer limited options for active citizen participation. Traditional electoral systems seem not to be entirely satisfactory anymore to deal with the dynamic involvement of creative citizens.

Transformation to the knowledge democracy requires new governance structures and processes that fit the transformational changes, requiring major shifts in the way communities and organizations work. The vision driven/decision making processes mostly reflect transitional change, but do not reflect the intention of fundamental transformation to a new form of governance for the knowledge democracy.
Figure 1.1 Timeline of the multi-layered and iterative research process

Track of PhD Research process (Chapter 1, 2, 7 & 8)
- Final Thesis: Transformative Governance for the Knowledge Democracy
- Dynamic Model: Transformative Governance for Knowledge Democracy
- Adjusted Framework for Governance for Knowledge Democracy based on Curacao Case Study
- Initial Framework for Governance for the Knowledge Democracy based on theoretical synthesis
- Analysis of vision oriented ‘top down’ participative mechanisms and ‘bottom up’ approach from the knowledge / participation perspective.
- Comparison of knowledge developments in business and in communities, focusing on the strategic and economic significance of a knowledge based approach.
- Comparative analysis of business literature on knowledge management, and projected on vision development processes in cities, resulting in a dilemma model.

Track of Action Learning on Organizational Level (Chapter 3 & 4)
- Evaluation and reflection cycles
- Template Analysis
- Concept Template Analysis

Track of the case study Action Plan Youth Development Curacao (Chapter 5 & 6)
- Case Study Validation Phase
- Case Study Design Phase
- Case Study Exploratory Phase
- Evaluation and reflection cycles
The initial framework for governance for the knowledge democracy based on theoretical synthesis leads to the question if the theoretical framework represents a set of aspects and concepts that are comparable to what can be learned from participative processes in practice. What would emerge from participative governance in practice that supports, rejects, or adds to the initial theoretical framework? To challenge the theoretical framework, an action research process in Curaçao provides for a case study where one can discover what comes to the forefront when designing and practicing participative governance. This research approach results in a multi-layered and iterative research process: 1) the overall thesis level related to the problem statement with various intermediary deliverables, 2) the level of action learning in the government organization with respect to participative governance, and 3) a case study level directed at the project to develop the Action Program for Youth Development.

Curaçao poses an interesting case in the context of governance. The unique fact that Curaçao was a “country to be” and the island-level government of Curaçao and federal-level government of the Netherlands Antilles had to merge led to a series of deliberations before 2010 about the type of governance the small young country needed. Summarizing the governance developments in Curaçao since 2010 as seen through the eyes of experts, civil servants, and stakeholders shows that Curaçao as a country—in its quest for an autonomous status in the Dutch Kingdom—has ended up being a single island nation with less autonomous powers compared to before 2010, when it was still part of the five island nation called the Netherlands Antilles. The lack of governmental responsibility for the former Antillean islands, however, has led towards a general perception in Curaçao that the island—now freed from the “burden” of the smaller islands—enjoys increased autonomy. Contrary to apparent logic, this perception about increased autonomy has not been followed in the run up to 2010 by an identified need, or indeed a process, of nation building for Curaçao in the sense of creating a path to the future development of the country. Since 2010, the integration of the former national and island-level organizations into one new single level of government, which was based on high ambitions, did not materialize. On the contrary, the government organization since 2010 has not been perceived as being more effective or efficient. The government does not live up to expectations and lacks a long-term vision, internal coordination, and stability. The political and executive management of the country has been organized in a political structure of a representative parliamentary democracy reflecting the classic “trias politica,” and in a rather bureaucratic organizational structure of nine ministries. But, the actual “nationwide agenda” to layout the future direction of development of the Curaçao society together with stakeholders and citizens is left afloat. This is highly influenced by the dynamics in the political arena, which is not conducive to nation building based on shared vision. Subsequently, hardly
any processes, structures, or mechanisms are in place to fill the vacuum towards participative governance as such, or in the context of a process towards nation building or integral policy development.

Curaçao, like many other communities, thus is facing a governance paradox. There is an inability to adjust the formal structure of the bureaucratic system and government on short term to the requirements of the knowledge democracy, but there is also an eminent need and desire for at least more integral, participatory, and interactive governance mechanisms in order to deal with the challenges concerning development planning and compliance with fundamental principles of transparency, good governance, participation, and efficiency, as well as to face the “glocal” issues of the 21st century. The question arises how to combine a bureaucratic structure with the desire for a more participative and transparent governance.

The action research in Curaçao aims to discover what insights emerge from practice with respect to governance options. These results are analyzed to see what supports, contradicts, or adds to the governance framework that resulted from the theoretical synthesis. The combination of the theoretical synthesis and the Curaçao case study is then further developed in a dynamic governance model that relates to the challenges as proposed in the problem statement.

The challenges confronted in the fragile country Curaçao illustrate the distinct need for model development to analyze the interdependency between government, governance, and national vision and/or identity. The Curaçao case shows that building an effective and efficient government apparatus in itself is not enough to create participative sustainable development. The relationship to identity building is evident, given the fact that “a nation is a symbolic community constructed discursively” (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, p. 154). This implies that dialogic processes can be used to create a discourse on the vision of the future of the country as a binding focal point in the process of creating a national identity.

Considering the problem statement presented in Chapter 1, and the research developments as reflected in the sub-studies, more detailed questions surface related to the lingering aspects with respect to creating a fitting governance for a knowledge driven democracy.
The research questions for the action research in Curaçao are formulated as follows:

1. What participative structures or processes can be applied within a traditional bureaucratic government structure, where policy development is a non-participatory process? What are success factors and risks?

2. How can participation of citizens be organized/shaped in a parliamentary democracy where the formal power is in the hands of an elected body of representatives, who create an executive government?

3. What tensions with respect to power in policy development and decision making does this bring forward, and how can this be addressed?

These research questions have been addressed through an action research project focused on the design of an Action Program for Youth Development that is meant to become a multi-year participatory process, based on co-creation and co-execution, between government, social partners, stakeholders, and NGOs. This takes place within a traditional bureaucratic structure of government and in the context of a representative democracy. The aim of the Action Research is the development of the Action Program for Youth Development as such, but it is also considered a pilot for a new way of working for the Curaçao Government. This implies that it is twofold approach: as a project in itself aiming at the development of the action program, and also on organizational level as an action learning process on how to work more participative and interactive in a bureaucratic structure.

The development of the Action Program for Youth Development took place in three phases:

- **An exploratory phase** (July 2014–December 2014) in which various stakeholders were consulted to identify challenges with regard to youth development, and also possible solutions. It resulted in the proposal for a National Platform for Youth Development and the proposal to design an Action Program for Youth Development under the guidance of the platform. These proposals were approved in December 2014 by the Government of Curaçao.

- **A design phase** (January–April 2015) in which the national platform was formed and became operational, and a draft was prepared of the Action Program for Youth Development, based on multi-stakeholder consultations, including ministries and youth dialogues. Research was performed to develop a vision and comprehensive approach to youth development and ensure the action program is evidence based.

- **A validation phase** (April–August 2015) in which the draft of the action program was validated through sessions and dialogues, and an overview was produced of all youth development-related activities and projects of both public and private sector. Based on the consultations, priorities were selected and validated for implementation in 2015 and 2016. Also, a new financing approach was devel-
oped and introduced, involving public and private sector funding. A structure and process were developed for the implementation phase of the action program.

The case study research mainly covers the phases of design and validation. Some aspects and developments that took place during the first phase of exploration are taken into account based on available data. The choice was made to use template analysis (King, 2012) for the analysis of data, as a way to deal with the extensive amount and level of complexity of the data. Template analysis (TA) as described by King (2012, p. 426) is a style of thematic analysis, which brings a balance between structure in the analytical process and flexibility towards the specific research project. This particular research used a total of 29 documents in a variety of forms and lengths as data sources in the application of TA. A digital tool was used (Qualitative Data Analysis Miner) for data input and analysis, resulting in a TA in the form of a codebook.

Figure 6.2  Codebook visualized on category level
The research, both from a theoretical and an empirical perspective, shows that working in a sustainable way towards participative governance with inclusion of knowledge and action from citizens and stakeholders, and based on collaboration with and between governmental departments, is not an adjustment, but an actual transformation of governance. A value-based transformation that touches processes, cultures, relations, and structures, including power structures. The transformational aspects relate to the fact that especially when adapting governance within current representative systems, a profound change in mindset is needed with political representatives, executive government, and public servants, as well as with citizens and stakeholders in civil society in order to make the new governance sustainable. The required change in mindset is connected to interrelated questions about who has usable knowledge, who prepares and takes decisions, who is responsible to undertake action in a community, and how power is perceived and applied. In a new mindset, knowledge is found in all levels and circles of the community, not exclusively in government and with experts. The process of preparation and actual decision making should be considered a joint effort and responsibility, which is not exclusive, but highly inclusive, with special attention to the voiceless and otherwise vulnerable groups in communities. With respect to undertaking action in the community, the perceived lines between government and being governed should blur to a great extent creating space for non-governmental actors to take co-responsibility for developments and actions in the community. The concept and discourse of power should be adapted to a relational approach, where power is not conceived as absolute, but dynamic and shifting, depending on relations between actors on either side of the power balance. Without a change in mindset, existing attitudes and practices will not be adjusted, and the current mechanisms at work in the governance of our communities will prevail, maintaining the unsatisfying results.

A second aspect that directly related to this is the need for new ways of human interaction based on a dialogic approach. The dialogic approach is a fundamental other way of interaction, based on learning and the development of joint actions. Through the dialogic approach, new capacities are developed or enhanced, with regard to empathizing with multiple and contradictory points of view and seeking space for a joint way forward without conflict. Based on the research, the dialogic approach is very well suited for bringing multiple players to the table, from a variety of backgrounds and with diversity of views, but interconnect at the complex challenges that their community faces.

The two points mentioned, a new mindset and other ways of human interaction, require the recognition that the path towards participative governance is a difficult process, needing professional guidance as well as support from the political and executive top of government. Many things can happen from the bottom up with regard to participation, but for real and sustainable transformative changes, the government must be
explicitly involved, supportive, and sincere in its participative goals. In addition to professional guidance and top-level support, network approaches to cooperation—as a sort of overlay over existing bureaucratic structures—can help overcome hierarchical and interdepartmental boundaries, even if such network approaches reflect more a process than an actual new formal structure. If there is a new mindset in place, dialogic processes are put in place, and there is professional guidance for networked collaboration with support from the political and executive top of government, then the setting is optimal for developing sustainable participative and knowledge-driven governance, within existing bureaucratic structures and within a democratic representative system.

Table 7.1  Framework for governance for the knowledge democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Identity</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Citizen participation in policy development and knowledge-based decision making leading to community/city competitive development and conflict resolution, resulting in higher quality of life, with transparency and accountability</td>
<td>Value-driven transformation of paradigms and attitudes towards collective/shared responsibility and action, in the context of sustainable development and place-based glocal challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Processes</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Time path</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Instruments / mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Place-based collective wisdom, including implicit knowledge, datadriven, co-creation, transparency, and accountability</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Emergent, fluent, flexible, process orientation (not a project), tailor made to social and cultural context</td>
<td>Inclusive, broad (also the “voiceless”), direct by target groups (not only representatives of representative organizations), <strong>active citizens’ role in co-creation and co-responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Learning approach, holistic, reflexive, generative, <strong>dialogic</strong></td>
<td>Inside out (sharing)</td>
<td>Place based, variable and interactive, dialogic approach, shared vision/identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Impact on who</th>
<th>Location of power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on who</td>
<td>Policymakers, decision makers, citizens, and civil society (balancing interests)</td>
<td>Empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy, actual shift of power</td>
<td>Empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy, actual shift of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial framework for governance in the knowledge democracy has been further developed, based on the insights from the action research process. The added aspects are bolded in Table 7.1. The framework does not present an absolute view on how knowledge driven and participatory governance should be organized. It functions as an exploratory view on appropriate governance that fits the requirements of knowledge driven communities that seek a transformative approach to how their community is governed. As such, the framework presents the elements that play a role in the transformation, and could be taken into account in designing participative governance systems. A dynamic model for governance has been designed based on the analysis of the findings of this research, as reflected in the framework. It aims to visualize the transformative changes that can take place towards a knowledge-driven governance, and the main dynamic aspects that play a role in this. This model of transformative governance can be considered a contribution to the theories on knowledge driven and participative governance for communities.

Figure 7.1. Dynamic model of governance for knowledge democracy
The shape of circles represents the internal connectedness and external differentiation that characterizes a community. The circles show three layers, with the democratically elected representative body in the middle. The second layer is the executive government, while the third layer is formed by all non-governmental actors in the community, including inhabitants. The fourth layer is the identity that contributes internally towards place-based cohesion, while externally it functions as a differentiating factor from other communities. The identity is expressed through discourse and other forms of identity representation that projects on the outside world a vision of the community, about what it stands for and what it means to accomplish.

The yellow arrow represents dialogic processes that take place in and between three layers: the community, government, and democratic representatives. The arrow points both ways, since dialogic processes can and should take place throughout the three layers, and should be initiated and supported by all layers as well. The smaller arrows in the circles project the fact that these processes should be of a continuous nature.

The three blue arrows represent the knowledge base, the action base, and the power base. The knowledge base arrow starts at identity, and crosses all four circles. It reflects the use of a broad knowledge base, including all the layers, and also the link to the identity of the community as a basis for how it wants to develop. The arrow of the knowledge base points two ways, to underscore the exchange of knowledge between the democratic representatives, the government, and the inhabitants and stakeholders in the community.

The action base arrow covers only the circles of government and the community. It excludes the layer of democratic representation, since based on the principles of the *trias politica*, modern democracies function with a separation of powers. Government is the executive power, but the basis for action should be expanded towards the community, based on aspects such as co-creation and co-responsibility of actively involved citizens. As such, the fact that it points one way represents the aspect of abolishing the sometimes perceived strict line between government and those being governed.

The power base arrow runs in one direction from democratic representation, through government, and towards the community actors. This reflects the actual shift of power from those that have formal legislative and executive power, towards the less powerful players in the community. The actors in the community are not fully powerless in current circumstances, since elections and lobbying are used to exercise power and influence. But, the transformative goal is to empower the community to become co-creators who carry co-responsibility based on actual influence, and even decision making power, which is for instance the case in participatory budgeting processes.

This model is not prescriptive; instead it aims to describe the aspects that play a role in
transforming governance systems towards being participative and knowledge driven. Along that transformative path, tensions can be expected and choices made on the lines of these arrows. It provides a systems view on participative governance as a transformative process for communities, underscoring the interrelatedness of aspects, and the dynamics between players that can be expected. Looking back at the research, this dynamic model reflects in a highly abstract way the complexity of interrelated and interdependent aspects that come to the forefront when considering transformation to a participative and knowledge-driven governance system.
Snelle en multidimensionale transformatieve ontwikkelingen op wereldwijd schaal hebben governance-systemen onder zware druk gezet. Systemen en structuren die werden beschouwd als betrouwbare bakens van zekerheid, zijn omgevallen, of staan onder sterke druk, niet alleen in de financiële wereld, maar ook in de democratische context. De ontwikkeling van kennis-steden en kennissamenlevingen is diep ingebed in een mondiale agenda van duurzaamheid, waarbij er gebalanceerd wordt tussen economische, ecologische en sociale aspecten van ontwikkeling (Carillo, 2006; Florida, 2002; Landry, 2000; Unesco, 2005). Echter, er is een tot nu toe onbeantwoorde vraag, over hoe meer op kennis gebaseerd en participatief bestuur past in het huidige democratische systeem van vertegenwoordiging, dat tekenen van disfunctionaaliteit vertoont (Castells, 2005; In’t Veld, 2010; Van Reybrouck, 2013). In representatieve politieke systemen worden de democratische activiteiten van burgers meestal beperkt tot vrijwillige deelname aan cyclische processen van stemmen. De beperkingen van deze aanpak worden in toenemende mate gekritiseerd, en dat is ook zichtbaar in de vele projecten en processen over de hele wereld die een meer interactieve en participatieve rol van burgers binnen de structuur van de traditionele representatieve democratie bieden. De toenemende hoeveelheid participatieve initiatieven en projecten in de hele wereld, vooral op gemeentelijk niveau, lijken indicatief voor een toenemende expliciete wens om meer directe democratische invloed te laten gelden. Daarmee rijst de vraag: wat zijn de mogelijkheden en mechanismen ergens tussen de twee democratische ‘extremen’ van pure representatie en directe democratie. Hoe kunnen we faciliteren en stimuleren dat er meer-invloed is door co-creatie met burgers en belanghebbenden in de samenleving in het omgaan met ‘wicked’ problemen, terwijl de formele macht tot besluitvorming nog steeds in de handen is van een kleine groep van gekozen vertegenwoordigers? Vooral omdat veel overheidsorganisaties worden aangestuurd op basis van bureaucratische principes die niet bevorderlijk zijn voor participatie, kennisdeling en co-creatie. Een ander belang-
rijk aspect dat aandacht verdient in dit verband, is hoe om te gaan met besluitvorming inzake participatieve initiatieven in een representatief systeem, waar de eigenlijke beslissingsbevoegdheid in handen is van de gekozen vertegenwoordigers in het parlement en de regering die deze vertegenwoordigers creëren en steunen? Is er ruimte voor participatieve invloed temidden van politieke overwegingen? Er kunnen spanningen optreden wanneer besluiten en beleid worden voorbereid op een participatieve basis met betrokkenheid van burgers, belanghebbenden en het maatschappelijk middenveld, op het moment dat deze worden aangeboden aan politieke bestuurders en het parlement ter goedkeuring.

Daarom is de probleemstelling voor dit onderzoek: in het kader van de op kennis gebaseerde democratie, hoe kunnen het bestuur en de overheid effectief worden
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Zadar (Makelearn): A critical look at citizen participation processes in knowledge-based societies within the framework of representative (parliamentary) democracies (Tissen &amp; Van Rijn, 2013)</td>
<td>A governance approach that is conducive to knowledge driven participatory processes in democratic systems based on representation.</td>
<td>Analysis of vision-oriented “top-down” participative mechanisms and “bottom-up” approach from the knowledge/participation perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samenvatting

(her)vormd om duurzame participatie van burgers en belanghebbenden mogelijk te maken, met name binnen bureaucratische structuren, terwijl de fundamenten en de mechanismen van de politieke democratie, die gebruikelijk zijn in de moderne wereld, worden gerespecteerd.

Dit onderzoek geschiedt in een nog niet afgebakend gebied van relatief nieuwe wetenschappelijke begrippen die kunnen worden beschouwd als elastisch en ook vloeibaar. De overgangsperiode die we momenteel beleven, produceert concepten die ontstaan en zich verder ontwikkelen, maar de tijd zal leren welke concepten verdwijnen, en welke zullen evolueren en een permanente vorm aannemen. Op dit moment is een verkennende en multidisciplinaire aanpak nodig om de complexe governance-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma model as a comparative framework for analysis of vision development between cities.</td>
<td>Focus on vision development processes in cities (comparative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement &lt;&gt; consultation</td>
<td>Focus on interests and governance tensions with regard to participative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creation &lt;&gt; top-down implementation</td>
<td>Focus on different governance contexts with regard to participative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance &lt;&gt; conservatism</td>
<td>Transformation to the knowledge democracy requires new governance structures and processes that fit the transformational changes, requiring major shifts in the way communities and organizations work. The vision driven/decision making processes mostly reflect transitional change, but do not reflect the intention of fundamental transformation to a new form of governance for the knowledge democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &lt;&gt; Information</td>
<td>The overall structure and guiding principles and processes of traditional representative democracies offer limited options for active citizen participation. Traditional electoral systems seem not to be entirely satisfactory anymore to deal with the dynamic involvement of creative citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of care &lt;&gt; the language of war</td>
<td>Dialogue &lt;&gt; talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue &lt;&gt; talk</td>
<td>Experimentation &lt;&gt; consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation &lt;&gt; consolidation</td>
<td>Action &lt;&gt; words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action &lt;&gt; words</td>
<td>Common values &lt;&gt; general values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common values &lt;&gt; general values</td>
<td>Uniqueness &lt;&gt; copy cat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figuur 1.1  Chronologie van meervoudig gelaagd iteratief onderzoeksproces

Track of PhD Research process (Chapter 1,2,7 &8)

- Final Thesis; Transformative Governance for the Knowledge Democracy
- Dynamic Model Transformative Governance for Knowledge Democracy

2016

- Adjusted Framework for Governance for Knowledge Democracy based on Curaçao Case Study
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2014

- Analysis of vision oriented ‘top down’ participative mechanisms and ‘bottom up’ approach from the knowledge / participation perspective.

2013

2012

2011

2010

2009

2008

- Comparative analysis of business literature on knowledge management, and projected on vision development processes in cities, resulting in a dilemma model.

2007

Track of Action Learning on Organizational Level (Chapter 3 & 4)

- Template Analysis Case Study

- Case Study Validation Phase

- Case Study Design Phase

- Case Study Exploratory Phase

Track of the case study Action Plan Youth Development Curaçao (Chapter 5 & 6)

- Evaluation concept Template Analysis

- Evaluation and reflection cycles

- Youth Development as pilot for Integral Management in SG Council

- Initiative for Integral Management in SG Council
uitdagingen te analyseren. Daarom wordt het eerste deel van het onderzoek gericht op het ontdekken en analyseren van de verschillende theoretische concepten met betrekking tot governance in de kennisdemocratie. Een eerste raamwerk voor governance van de kennisdemocratie op basis van theoretische synthese is ontwikkeld. De analyse heeft geleid tot een verschuiving van het kijken naar kennisgedreven visie processen in steden als zodanig, naar de governance context waarin dergelijke processen plaatsvinden, en de spanningen die dit kan veroorzaken.

Het eerste raamwerk voor de governance van de kennisdemocratie op basis van theoretische synthese, leidt tot de vraag of het theoretisch kader een reeks aspecten en concepten vertegenwoordigt die vergelijkbaar is met wat geleerd kan worden van participatieve processen in de praktijk. Wat zou er voortkomen uit participatief bestuur in de praktijk; wat wordt ondersteund, verworpen, of draagt bij aan het oorspronkelijke theoretische kader? Om het theoretische kader te toetsen, is een actie onderzoeksproces in Curaçao opgezet, met een case study waarin we kunnen ontdekken wat zich voordoet bij het ontwerpen en beoefenen van participatief bestuur. Deze onderzoeksaanpak resulteert in een meervoudig gelaagd en iteratief onderzoeksproces: 1) het algemene thesis-niveau met betrekking tot de probleemstelling met diverse tussentijdse mijlpalen, 2) het niveau van action learning in de overheidsorganisatie ten aanzien van participatief bestuur, en 3) het case study niveau gericht op het project om een Actieprogramma voor Jeugdontwikkeling te produceren.

Curaçao is een interessante casus ten aanzien van governance. Het unieke feit dat Curaçao een ‘land-in-wording’ was, en de overheidsorganisaties op eilandelijk niveau van Curaçao, en op federaal niveau van de Nederlandse Antillen, moesten fuseren, leidde tot een reeks van besprekingen vóór 2010 over het soort bestuur dat het kleine jonge land nodig had. Uit een samenvatting van de governance-ontwikkelingen op Curaçao sinds 2010, zoals gezien door de ogen van experts, ambtenaren en stakeholders, blijkt dat Curaçao als land - in zijn zoektocht naar een autonome status binnen het Nederlandse Koninkrijk - uiteindelijk een eilandnation is geworden met minder autonome bevoegdheden ten opzichte van vóór 2010, toen het nog deel uitmaakte van de 5 eilanden tellinge natie genaamd de Nederlandse Antillen. Het ontbreken van de verantwoordelijkheid voor de voormalige Antilliaanse eilanden, heeft echter geleid tot een algemene perceptie in Curaçao dat het eiland meer autonomie geniet nu het bevrijd is van de ‘last’ van de kleinere eilanden. In tegenstelling tot wat logischerwijs verwacht zou kunnen worden, werd deze perceptie over meer autonomie in de aanloop naar 2010 niet gevolgd door een geïdentificeerde behoefte, of zelfs een proces, om tot natievorming voor Curaçao te komen in de zin van het creëren van een gezamelijk pad naar de toekomstige ontwikkeling van het land. Sinds 2010, en
de integratie van het voormalige nationale en eilandsniveau tot één nieuwe enkele laag overheid, die was gebaseerd op de hoge ambities, zijn de verwachtingen niet uitgekomen. De overheidsorganisatie sinds 2010 wordt niet gezien als effectiever of efficiënter, integendeel. De overheid voldoet niet aan de verwachtingen, en mist een langetermijn visie, interne coördinatie en stabiliteit. Het politieke bestuur en het uitvoerend management van het land zijn georganiseerd in de politieke structuur van een representatieve parlementaire democratie, op basis van de klassieke ‘trias politica’, en in een nogal burecratische organisatiestructuur van negen ministeries. Maar de werkelijke ‘landelijke agenda’ om de toekomstige richting van de ontwikkeling van de Curaçaose samenleving samen met belanghebbenden en burgers vorm te geven, is niet tot stand gekomen. Dit wordt sterk beïnvloed door de dynamiek in de politieke arena, wat niet bevorderlijk is voor de opbouw van de natie op basis van gedeelde visie. Als gevolg daarvan zijn er nauwelijks processen, structuren of mechanismen aanwezig om het vacuüm richting participatief bestuur op te vullen, noch in het kader van een proces naar nation building, noch in de ontwikkeling van integraal beleid. Curaçao wordt dus, net als veel andere gemeenten, geconfronteerd met een bestuurlijke paradox. Er is een onvermogen om de formele structuur van het bureaucratisch systeem en de overheid op korte termijn aan te passen aan de vereisten van de kennis-democratie, maar er is ook een eminentie behoefte en wens voor tenminste meer integrale, participatieve en interactieve bestuursmechanismen om te kunnen omgaan met de uitdagingen rond ontwikkelingsplanning, de naleving van de fundamentele beginselen van transparantie, goed bestuur, participatie, en efficiency, en tevens om de ‘glocal’ uitdagingen van de 21e eeuw tegemoet te treden. De vraag rijst hoe een bureaucratische structuur te combineren is met het verlangen naar een meer participatief en transparant bestuur.

Het actieonderzoek op Curaçao heeft als doel om te ontdekken welke inzichten in de praktijk ontstaan met betrekking tot governance opties. Deze resultaten worden geanalyseerd om te zien op welke punten het ondersteunt, tegenspreekt, of bijdraagt aan het governance-raamwerk dat gemaakt is op basis van theoretische synthese. De combinatie van de theoretische synthese en de Curaçaose case study, zal dan verder worden ontwikkeld in een dynamisch governance-model dat betrekking heeft op de uitdagingen zoals aangegeven in de probleemstelling.

De uitdagingen waarmee het kwetsbare land Curaçao wordt geconfronteerd, illustreren de duidelijke behoefte aan modelontwikkeling voor de analyse van de onderlinge afhankelijkheid tussen overheid, bestuur en nationale visie en/of identiteit. In de case study in Curaçao blijkt dat het opbouwen van een effectieve en efficiënte overheidsorganisatie op zich niet voldoende is om op duurzame wijze participatieve
ontwikkeling te realiseren. De relatie tot identiteitsbepaling wordt duidelijk, aangezien de “natie een symbolische gemeenschap is, die discursief is geconstrueerd” (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, blz. 154). Dit houdt in dat dialogische processen kunnen worden gebruikt om een discussie over de visie op de toekomst van het land als een verbindend centraal punt te creëren in het proces richting een nationale identiteit. Uit de probleemstelling zoals die is gepresenteerd in hoofdstuk 1, en de ontwikkelingen zoals geschetst in de deelonderzoeken, ontstaan meer gedetailleerde vragen, gerelateerd aan de aspecten die van belang zijn bij het creëren van passende governance voor een kennisgedreven democratie.

De onderzoeksvragen voor het actie onderzoek op Curaçao zijn als volgt geformuleerd:

1. Welke participatieve structuren of processen kunnen worden toegepast binnen een traditionele bureaucratische overheidsstructuur, waarbij de ontwikkeling van beleid een non-participatief proces is? Wat zijn de succesfactoren en risico’s?

2. Hoe kan de participatie van de burgers worden georganiseerd / vormgegeven in een parlementaire democratie waar de formele macht in handen is van een gekozen orgaan van vertegenwoordigers, die een uitvoerende overheid te creëren?

3. Welke spanningen met betrekking tot de macht in de beleidsontwikkeling en besluitvorming brengt dit met zich mee, en hoe kan dit worden aangepakt?

Deze onderzoeksvragen zijn toegepast in een project van actie onderzoek, gericht op het ontwerp van een Actieprogramma voor Jeugdontwikkeling, en waarvan het de bedoeling is dat het een meerjarig participatief proces wordt, gebaseerd op co-creatie en co-uitvoering tussen overheid, sociale partners, stakeholders en NGO’s. Dit gebeurt binnen een traditionele bureaucratische structuur van de overheid, en binnen het kader van een representatieve democratie. Het doel van het actie onderzoek is de ontwikkeling van een Actieprogramma voor Jeugdontwikkeling als zodanig, maar het wordt ook beschouwd als een pilot voor een nieuwe manier van werken voor de Curaçaose overheid. Dit houdt in dat het een tweeledige aanpak heeft: als een project dat is gericht op de ontwikkeling van het actieprogramma op zich, maar ook op organisatorisch niveau als een action learning proces over hoe te komen tot een meer participatieve en interactieve werkwijze binnen een bureaucratische structuur.

De ontwikkeling van het actieprogramma vond plaats in drie fasen:

onder leiding van het platform. Deze voorstellen werden in december 2014 goedgekeurd door de regering van Curaçao.

**Een ontwerp fase** (januari-april 2015), waarin het Nationaal Platform werd opgericht en operationeel werd, en er een ontwerp werd voorbereid van het actieprogramma Jeugdontwikkeling, op basis van multi-stakeholder overleg, waaronder ministeries en (jeugd) dialogen. Er werd ook onderzoek gedaan om te komen tot een visie en alomvattend aanpak van jeugdontwikkeling, en ervoor te zorgen dat het actieprogramma evidence-based is.

**Een validatie fase** (april-augustus 2015), waarin het ontwerp van het actieprogramma werd gevalideerd door middel van sessies en dialogen, en een overzicht werd geproduceerd van alle jeugdactiviteiten en -projecten van zowel de publieke als de private sector. Op basis van het overleg werden de prioriteiten geselecteerd en gevalideerd voor de uitvoering in 2015 en 2016. Ook werd een nieuwe financieringsaanpak ontwikkeld en geïntroduceerd, met een combi-

---

**Figuur 6.2 Codeboek gevisualiseerd op categorie niveau.**

- **THE WHAT**
  - Content aspects
  - Sessions
  - Inclusiveness in participation
  - Learning process
  - Doing things differently

- **THE HOW**
  - Teamwork
  - Risk factors
  - Attracting opportunities
  - Working mechanisms
  - Implementation governance

- **Designing Appropriate governance**
  - Leadership
  - Political dynamics

- **Politics and Power**
  - Understanding interests
  - Promote (political) support
De case study heeft hoofdzakelijk betrekking op de fasen van het ontwerp en de validatie. Met sommige aspecten en ontwikkelingen die plaatsvonden tijdens de eerste fase van verkenning zal ook rekening worden gehouden op basis van de beschikbare gegevens. Er is gekozen voor de methode template-analyse (King, 2012) voor de analyse van de gegevens, als een manier om te kunnen omgaan met de omvangrijke hoeveelheid en de complexiteit van de gegevens. Template analyse zoals beschreven door King (2012, blz. 426) is een stijl van thematische analyse, waarbij een evenwicht ontstaat tussen de benodigde structuur in het analytisch proces, en de flexibiliteit die een specifiek onderzoeksproject vergt. In dit specifieke onderzoek zijn in totaal 29 documenten gebruikt in verschillende vormen en lengtes als databron bij de toepassing van TA. Een digitaal instrument werd gebruikt (qualitative data analysis miner) voor gegevensinvoer en analyse, resulterend in een template analyse in de vorm van een codeboek.

Het onderzoek, zowel vanuit een theoretisch als het empirische perspectief, toont aan dat het werken op een duurzame manier in de richting van participatief bestuur met integratie van kennis en handelen van burgers en belanghebbenden, en op basis van de samenwerking met en tussen overheidsinstellingen, geen aanpassing is, maar een echte transformatie van governance. Een op waarden gestuurde transformatie, die processen, culturen, relaties, en (macht) structuren raakt. De transformationele aspecten hebben betrekking op het feit dat, met name bij aanpassing van de governance binnen de huidige representatieve systemen, het een diepgaande verandering in de mindset vergt bij politieke vertegenwoordigers, de uitvoerende overheid en ambtenaren, maar ook bij burgers en belanghebbenden in het maatschappelijk middenveld, om de nieuwe governance duurzaam te maken. De benodigde verandering in mentaliteit heeft te maken met een reeks samenhangende vragen over wie bruikbare kennis heeft, wie bereidt besluitvorming voor en neemt beslissingen, wie is er verantwoordelijk voor om actie te ondernemen in een gemeenschap, en hoe wordt macht gezien en toegepast. In een nieuwe mindset, wordt kennis aanvaard die te vinden in alle niveaus en kringen van de gemeenschap, niet alleen bij de overheid en deskundigen. Het proces van voorbereiding en daadwerkelijke besluitvorming moet worden beschouwd als een gezamenlijke inspanning en verantwoordelijkheid, die niet exclusief, maar zeer inclusief is, met speciale aandacht voor de ‘voice-less’ en anderszins kwetsbare groepen in de gemeenschap. Met betrekking tot het ondernemen van activiteiten in de gemeenschap, moet de lijn tussen de regering en degene die worden geregeerd in grote mate vervagen, en er moet ruimte ontstaan voor niet-overheids actoren om medeverantwoordelijkheid te nemen voor de ontwikkelingen en activiteiten in de
gemeenschap. Het concept en de benadering van macht moet worden omgebogen naar een relationele aanpak, waarbij macht niet als een absoluut, maar als een dynamisch en flexibel gegeven wordt gezien, die afhankelijk is van de betrekkingen tussen actoren aan weerszijden van het machtsevenwicht. Zonder een verandering in mentaliteit, zullen de bestaande opvattingen en praktijken niet worden aangepast, en zullen de huidige mechanismen in de governance van onze gemeenschappen zegevieren, resulterend in de actuele onbevredigende resultaten.

Een tweede aspect dat rechtstreeks verband houdt hiermee, is de behoefte aan nieuwe vormen van menselijke interactie gebaseerd op een dialogische benadering. De dialogische benadering is een fundamenteel andere manier van interactie, gebaseerd op leren en de ontwikkeling van gezamenlijke acties. Door de dialogische benadering worden nieuwe capaciteit ontwikkeld of verbeterd, die betrekking hebben op empathie creëren ten aanzien van meerdere en tegenstrijdige standpunten, en op het zoeken naar ruimte voor een gezamenlijke weg vooruit zonder conflict. Uit het onderzoek blijkt dat de dialogische benadering zeer geschikt is voor het werken met meerdere spelers aan een tafel die weliswaar een verscheidenheid hebben aan achtergronden, en een diversiteit aan meningen vertegenwoordigen, maar die zich onderling verbonden voelen op de complexe uitdagingen waarmee hun gemeenschap wordt geconfronteerd.

De twee punten die genoemd zijn, een nieuwe mindset en andere manieren van menselijke interactie, vereisen dat erkend moet worden dat de weg naar participatief bestuur een moeilijk proces is, dat professionele begeleiding, en ook ondersteuning nodig heeft van het politieke en uitvoerende bestuur van de overheid. Veel dingen kunnen gebeuren vanuit een bottom-up benadering met betrekking tot participatie, maar voor echte en duurzame transformatieve veranderingen, moet de overheid nadrukkelijk betrokken, ondersteunend en oprecht zijn in haar participatieve doelstellingen. In aanvulling op de professionele begeleiding en top-level support zal een netwerk benadering - als een soort laag over de bestaande bureaucratische structuren - kunnen helpen om hiërarchische en interdepartementale grenzen te doorbreken, zelfs al weerspiegelen dergelijke netwerk benaderingen meer een proces van samenwerken, dan een echte nieuwe (formele) structuur.

Als er sprake is van een nieuwe mindset, en als er dialogische processen zijn ingevoerd onder professionele begeleiding, en er netwerken zijn gerealiseerd voor samenwerking, met steun van het politiek bestuur en de ambtelijke top van de overheid, dan is er sprake van een optimale setting voor de ontwikkeling van duurzame participatieve en kennisgedreven governance, binnen de bestaande bureaucratische structuren en binnen een democratisch representatief systeem.
Table 7.1  Framework for governance for the knowledge democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING IDENTITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen participation in policy development and knowledge-based decision making leading to community/city competitive development and conflict resolution, resulting in higher quality of life, with transparency and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value-driven transformation</strong> of paradigms and attitudes towards collective/shared responsibility and action, in the context of sustainable development and place-based global challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATIVE PROCESSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Place-based collective wisdom, including implicit knowledge, datadriven, co-creation, transparency, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time path</strong></td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Emergent, fluent, flexible, process orientation (not a project), tailor made to social and cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>Inclusive, broad (also the &quot;voiceless&quot;), direct by target groups (not only representatives of representative organizations), <strong>active citizens' role in co-creation and co-responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td>Learning approach, holistic, reflexive, generative, <strong>dialogic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Inside out (sharing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruments/mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>Place based, variable and interactive, dialogic approach, shared vision/identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact on who</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on who</strong></td>
<td>Policymakers, decision makers, citizens, and civil society (balancing interests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of power</strong></td>
<td>Empowerment of citizens/stakeholders within representative democracy, actual shift of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Het initiële raamwerk voor governance voor de kennisdemocratie is verder ontwikkeld, op basis van de inzichten uit het actieonderzoek proces. De extra toegevoegde aspecten worden gemarkeerd en vet weergegeven in tabel 7.1. Het raamwerk is niet bedoeld als een absolute visie op hoe kennisgedreven en participatief bestuur moet worden georganiseerd. Het functioneert als een verkennende visie op adequate governance die aan de eisen voldoet van kennisgedreven gemeenschappen die een transformatieve benadering zoeken van hoe hun gemeenschap wordt bestuurd. Als zodanig presenteert het raamwerk de elementen die een rol spelen bij de transformatie en die bij het ontwerpen van participatieve bestuurssystemen in aanmerking kunnen worden genomen.
Op basis van de analyse van de bevindingen van het onderzoek, zoals ook weergegeven in het raamwerk, is een dynamisch model voor governance ontworpen. Het doel is om de transformatieve veranderingen die plaatsvinden in de richting van kennisgedreven governance, en de belangrijkste dynamische aspecten die daarbij een rol spelen, te visualiseren. Dit model van transformatieve governance kan worden beschouwd als een bijdrage aan de theorieën over kennisgedreven en participatief bestuur voor gemeenschappen.

De vorm van een cirkel vertegenwoordigt de interne verbondenheid en externe differentiatie die een gemeenschap kenmerkt. De cirkels tonen drie lagen, met het democratisch gekozen representatieve bestuur in het midden. De tweede laag is de uitvoerende overheid, terwijl de derde laag wordt gevormd door alle niet-gouvernementele actoren in de samenleving, met inbegrip van inwoners. De vierde laag is de identiteit die intern
bijdraagt aan plaatsgebonden cohesie, terwijl het naar buiten toe functioneert als een onderscheiddende factor ten opzichte van andere gemeenschappen. De identiteit wordt uitgedrukt door middel van discourse en andere vormen van representatie van identiteit, waarmee op de buitenwereld een visie van de gemeenschap wordt overgebracht inzake waar de gemeenschap voor staat, en wat wordt beoogd om te bereiken. De gele pijl geeft dialogische processen weer die plaatsvinden in en tussen de drie lagen: de gemeenschap, de overheid en democratische vertegenwoordigers. De pijl wijst in beide richtingen, aangezien dialogische processen kunnen en moeten plaatsvinden tussen de drie lagen, en ze moeten ook worden geïnitieerd en ondersteund door alle lagen. De kleinere pijlen in de cirkels geven weer dat deze processen een continu karakter hebben. De drie blauwe pijlen geven de kennisbasis, de actiebasis en de machtsbasis weer. De kennisbasis pijl begint bij identiteit, en doorkruist alle vier de cirkels. Het weerspiegelt het gebruik van een brede kennisbasis, met inbegrip van alle lagen, en ook de link naar de identiteit van de gemeenschap, als basis voor de manier waarop de gemeenschap zich wil ontwikkelen. De pijl van de kennisbasis wijst in twee richtingen, om de uitwisseling van kennis tussen de democratische vertegenwoordigers van de overheid en de inwoners en belanghebbenden in de gemeenschap te onderstrepen. De actiebasis pijl doorkruist alleen de kringen van de overheid en de gemeenschap. Het sluit de laag van democratische vertegenwoordiging uit, vanwege de uitgangspunten van de trias politica; moderne democratieën functioneren met een scheiding der machten. De overheid is de uitvoerende macht, maar de basis voor actie moet worden uitgebreid naar de gemeenschap, op basis van aspecten als co-creatie en medeverantwoordelijkheid van actief betrokken burgers. Het feit dat de pijl wijst in één richting, heeft betrekking op de afschaffing van de soms waargenomen strikte lijn tussen regering en degenen die worden geregeld. De machtsbasis pijl loopt vanuit de democratische vertegenwoordiging, via de overheid, in de richting van actoren in de gemeenschap. Dit weerspiegelt de werkelijke verschuiving van de macht van degenen die formeel de wetgevende en uitvoerende macht hebben, in de richting van de minder krachtige spelers in de gemeenschap. Actoren in de gemeenschap zijn niet volledig machteloos in de huidige omstandigheden, omdat verkiezingen en lobbying worden gebruikt om macht en invloed uit te oefenen. Maar het transformatieve doel is om de gemeenschap te kracht te geven om ‘co-creators’ te zijn die medeverantwoordelijkheid dragen, gebaseerd op werkelijke invloed en zelfs beslissingsbevoegdheid, zoals dat bijvoorbeeld het geval is in participatieve budgetteringsprocessen. Dit model is niet normatief, in plaats daarvan richt zich op de aspecten die een rol spelen bij het transformeren van governance op weg naar meer participatie en kennisgedrevenheid. Langs dat transformatieve pad, kunnen spanningen worden verwacht,
en keuzes worden gemaakt, op de lijnen van deze pijlen. Het model voorziet in een systeembenadering van participatief bestuur als een transformatief proces voor gemeenschappen, waarbij de verwevenheid van aspecten en de dynamiek die tussen spelers kan worden verwacht, worden benadrukt. Terugkijkend op het onderzoek, weerspiegelt dit dynamische model op een zeer abstracte manier de complexiteit van de met elkaar verbonden en onderling afhankelijke aspecten, die zich voordoen bij het overwegen van transformatie naar een participatief en kennisgedreven governance-systeem.
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GOVERNMENT DECREE NATIONAL PLATFORM YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

On the recommendation of the Prime Minister, Minister of General Affairs, acting in accordance with the wishes of the Council of Ministers;

Having read:
the motion of the Staten (parliament) calling for an integrated approach to fighting crime;

the final conclusions of the Kingdom Conference of April 2, 2014, stating that every child in the kingdom has a right to a good childhood as envisaged by the International Convention of Children’s Rights, and decides to install an joint task force on children’s rights;

on February 6, 2014 between the Government, the ‘Sentral General Trahadonan di Corsow’ (CGTC), the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CoC), the ‘Sentral di Sindikatonan di Kòrsou’ (SSK) and the ‘Business Association Curaçao’ (VBC) closed protocol agreements for completion of the national dialogue process ‘Korsou ta Avansá’;

the protocol of cooperation signed on July 25, 2014 between the Minister of Education, Science, Culture and Sport (OWCS), the Minister of Social Development and Welfare (SOAW) ai, the Minister of Health, Environment and Nature (GMN) and the Minister of Justice;

the Youth Development Action Plan for an integrated approach to the creation of optimal development opportunities for the youth on August 5, 2014;
Considering:
that a stable, healthy and positive youth development is crucial for the further development of our country;
that in recent decades by a complex combination of social factors (including economic, political, social, cultural) a considerable proportion of our young people has evolved in the opposite sense;
despite great efforts by the government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other stakeholders, this negative trend to date could not be reversed;
that this is partly explained by the fact that the government, NGOs and stakeholders have failed to jointly develop and support a comprehensive vision and policy, and an effective implementation structure for the (desired) youth development;
that as a result there is a lack of focus on agreed priorities, goals and strategies, which has led to fragmentation of resources, people and results;
it is desirable that, on the basis of a jointly developed and defined vision, a comprehensive, results-oriented and effective policy and a proposed implementation structure for the short and long term should be developed in close cooperation between the government, NGOs and stakeholders (including target group itself), while using existing and new knowledge, experience and initiatives within and outside of Curaçao;
that it is therefore desirable to set up a platform to develop an integrated and results-oriented focus for the short and long term, with works with a vigorous hand to facilitate and coordinate an effective interplay between the relevant government departments, stakeholders and NGOs;

Has approved of:
Article 1
There is a National Youth Development Platform ('Plataforma Nashonal pa Desaroyo di Hubentut'), hereinafter called ‘the Platform’.

Article 2
The Platform has the following tasks:
1. To develop a shared vision of integrated and result-oriented youth development between government, NGOs and stakeholders on the basis of identified problem areas;
2. The development of a National Action Program for Youth Development ('Programa di Akshon Nashonal pa Desaroyo di Hubentut') containing priorities in the short and long term, a structure for powerful control and an effective interplay between the relevant government departments, stakeholders and NGOs;

3. Coordinating the National Action Program for Youth Development with organizations in civil society that can act as a sounding board;

4. To guide and monitor the development and implementation of the National Action Program for Youth Development.

Article 3
The Platform consists of:

1. representatives from government, unions and employers’ organizations;
2. an appointee by the Council of Ministers, in consultation with the National Dialogue Platform ‘Korsou ta Avansá’, with demonstrated knowledge and adequate experience of the work, as chairman;
3. yet to appoint representatives of NGO’s active in the field of child welfare and youth development and related fields.
4. Other groups from civil society also active in the areas mentioned in the second paragraph;
5. NGO’s, as referred to in the third paragraph, and the groups referred to in the fourth paragraph, shall, immediately after this National Decree comes into force, be approached by the chairman of the Platform with the request to nominate their candidates.

Article 4
The Platform regulates its operations and meets as often as is necessary for proper implementation of its work.

Article 5
The Platform reports quarterly in writing to the Council of Ministers on its activities.

Article 6
The platform is supported by a Secretariat. To the Secretariat will be designated, by the Minister of Social Development, Labor and Welfare (SOAW) and the Ministry of Justice one or more administrative officers, who will be employed full-time. External support for the platform is also possible.
Article 7
The Secretariat has the following tasks:

1. Supporting the platform with all common secretarial, coordinating, research and administrative work;

2. To identify and formulate problem areas, risk and success factors, challenges and possible interventions regarding the development of youth on the basis of available information, and (scientific) research;

3. Developing the contents of a National Action Program for Youth Development (Programa di Akshon Nashonal pa Desaroyo di Hubentut) in which practical solutions are proposed for the main problem areas and challenges to be worked out in an integrated and informed way in solutions and concrete interventions, and where a choice is made regarding priorities to implement interventions and the main results to be achieved;

4. The focus of the National Action Program for Youth Development includes the following development areas towards the youth:
   - employment (including link between education and labor market)
   - education
   - training and education (including pre / after school care, attention to sports, creative expression, culture and citizenship and social responsibility)
   - social circumstances (family and community)
   - compliance with international treaties, including the Convention on the Rights of Children
   - (youth) crime
   - health (preventive and curative)
   - vulnerable groups of children / young people with physical and / or mental disability

These development areas may, where so desired, be detailed in sub-plans.

5. The Secretariat will include the youth, and organizations that represent them, in the planning and will consult them and use their input in the planning and implementation.

6. The secretariat can organize workgroups for the execution of its tasks as defined in the first to the fourth paragraph.

7. The Secretariat will, in the exercise of its functions and the fulfillment of the working groups, seek cooperation with relevant ministries, organizations and groups to achieve her goals. It also engages in all those activities that contribute to promoting the healthy development of youth.

8. The Secretariat shall report monthly to the platform on the results and formulate concrete proposals for overcoming any barriers in the implementation of the National Action Program for Youth Development.
Article 8
The costs related to the implementation of the tasks of the Secretariat, as referred to in Article 7, are for the financial year 2014 for an amount of Naf 25,000 charged to the Fund for Combating Crime in the Ministry of Justice and Naf 50,000 be charged to the budget heading 176102.4684 (social care other grants and contributions) of the Ministry of SOAW. Interministerial funding will be organized in the form of program funding for the financial year 2015.

Article 9
The Platform is canceled after its work is completed in the opinion of the Council of Ministers.

Article 10
This decree shall take effect from the date of signing.
Fast-paced and multi-dimensional transformative developments on a global scale have put governance systems under severe pressure. Systems and structures that were once considered reliable beacons of assurance have tumbled or have come under severe scrutiny, not only in the financial world, but also in the democratic context. There is an as of yet unanswered question about how to fit more knowledge-based and participative governance into our current democratic system of representation, which shows signs of becoming dysfunctional. In representational political systems, the democratic activities of citizens are mostly limited to voluntary participation in cyclical voting processes. The limitations of this approach can be heard in a growing body of criticism, and is also visible in the many projects and processes across the globe that provide a more interactive and participative role for citizens within the structure of traditional representative democracy. Participation poses challenges to bureaucratically organized government organizations. And tensions may occur when decisions and policies are prepared on a participative basis with involvement of citizens, stakeholders, and civil society, once they are put before political executives and parliament to approve.

This book takes an in depth look at these developments and presents the results of action research into transformative governance for the knowledge democracy.