

RESEARCH ARTICLE



## Policy education in Australia and New Zealand: towards a decolonized pedagogy

Michael Mintrom and Deirdre O'Neill

School of Social Sciences, Monash University Faculty of Arts, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

### ABSTRACT

Policy Education in Australia and New Zealand has flourished in recent years. As governments in each country have sought to redress the legacies of colonization, more effort has been made to incorporate indigenous perspectives into policy development. However, considerably more work is required with respect to codifying good practice. Much more could also be done to give indigenous issues a central place in university-based policy teaching. Decolonizing policy education holds the key to ensuring public policies are designed and implemented to effectively meet the needs of target populations and, more broadly, societal expectations for public policies and public services.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 30 November 2021  
Accepted 15 April 2022

### KEYWORDS

Public policy education;  
policy analysis;  
decolonization; Australia;  
new zealand

Policy education involves the conscious training of people to work in and around government on public policy issues. In its formal guise, conducted in university settings, policy education remains a relatively recent phenomenon. In its informal guise, policy education has been around for much longer. Even in the most rudimentary forms of government, there have always been advisors whose job it has been to keep leaders informed of developments in their jurisdictions and to suggest effective ways to address them. In writing *The Prince* (1513), Niccolo Machiavelli was consciously contributing to a tradition that he saw stretching back centuries. Here, our interest lies in reviewing the rise of policy education in Australia and New Zealand. While efforts to establish university-based policy education in these two countries started getting underway in the 1970s, it is only within the past two decades that policy education in Australia and New Zealand has flourished. Today, schools of government exist in both countries and the Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) leads efforts to train senior public sector leaders.

The societies of contemporary Australia and New Zealand have emerged from colonial encounters where British settlers did much to displace the existing indigenous social structures and impose their own. In terms of creating thriving and prosperous south seas replicas of European civilization, the settlers in these countries attained a lot of success, and they did so rapidly. Those colonizing actions – with their significant distinctions across the two countries – have been subject to a great deal of documentation, discussion, and debate. It is generally acknowledged that extensive harms were visited upon

**CONTACT** Michael Mintrom  [michael.mintrom@monash.edu](mailto:michael.mintrom@monash.edu)  School of Social Sciences, Monash University Faculty of Arts, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

indigenous populations, both intentionally and unintentionally. It is also important to note that indigenous peoples in each country do not fall into one homogenous category and that public policy should not treat them as if they did (Kukutai, 2004; MacDonald, 2016).

Here, we discuss the rise of policy education in Australia and New Zealand and suggest how it might fruitfully evolve. In doing so, we pay specific attention to the colonial heritage of these countries and how policy education can usefully incorporate a decolonized pedagogy. Throughout, the term 'a decolonised pedagogy' is frequently used. Therefore, it is important to define the term. As we will show, policy education in Australia and New Zealand has been strongly informed by models of policy education developed in other countries, especially the United Kingdom and the United States. Further, little effort has been made in Australia and New Zealand to seriously consider how suitable these imported models of policy education are to the unique contexts of these countries. As we will note further below, colonization in these countries has systematically disadvantaged many members of their indigenous populations. A decolonized pedagogy would explicitly acknowledge the factors that cause and perpetuate systematic disadvantage and seek to address them. Given that the purpose of policy education is to prepare people to play a significant part in the policy process, it is essential that such training pays close attention to the contemporary social context and how it emerged.

There has been significant discussion internationally of the need to decolonize university level teaching, and much of this discussion has focused on Africa and other parts of the developing world (Heleta, 2016; Lockett & Shay, 2020; Prinsloo, 2016). In Australia and New Zealand, important steps have been taken to indigenize university curricula (George, 2018; Maggie & Guerzoni, 2020; McLaughlin & Whatman, 2007 Universities Australia, 2017). These steps include explicitly holding respect for the place between indigenous and non-indigenous people as a space for negotiation of relationships, of creation and innovation. Lily George (2018) reports an example of a Māori pōwhiri, or welcoming ceremony, at the University of Auckland, in which a visiting international scholar was invited onto the university grounds through the traditional protocols whereby people are required to move through space, through a series of actions that acknowledge differences, then join people together (p. 109). Maggie and Guerzoni (2020) report on efforts at the University of Tasmania to have every subject at every level examined to consider how and to what extent current content and pedagogy reflect the presence of Indigenous peoples and the valid contribution of Indigenous knowledge. Further efforts are made to prioritize expert indigenous voices in the classroom, so that students can learn from rather than learn about indigenous peoples. Efforts have also been made to encourage cultural encounter through guided on-Country experiences. Further, a central pool of curated teaching resources has been established whereby academic staff can access pedagogical approaches that effectively bring students into authentic engagements with indigenous culture and world views. McLaughlin and Whatman (2007) likewise report decolonizing steps at the Queensland University of Technology (QUT). Honouring its commitment to the spirit of Reconciliation, QUT provided grants to enable faculties to embed indigenous perspectives into existing units of teaching and to investigate further options for embedding, such as creating new units, developing an Indigenous Studies major and broader

policy and curricula reform. The university also established an indigenous employment strategy to deliberately increase the number of indigenous academics working on campus.

Despite these steps taken to indigenize university curricula in Australia and New Zealand, there is little evidence of awareness in Australian and New Zealand universities of the need to decolonize public policy curricula. A decolonized policy pedagogy in contemporary Australia and New Zealand could do much to support both the redress of past wrongs and the nurturing of conditions whereby all individuals and communities can flourish on their own terms, being who they are and who they want to be.

A decolonized pedagogy does not necessarily mean that policy education in Australia and New Zealand needs to experience a revolution. But there is much work to be done. Specifically, we need to ensure that graduates of our degree programmes leave with the knowledge, skills, and interpersonal competencies necessary to support diverse and inclusive societies. The required training could take a number of forms. In this article we consider possibilities that can emerge when sophisticated means of data collection and analysis are combined with superior techniques of community engagement. More broadly, looking to the future, policy education should continue to draw upon a range of disciplines and apply concepts and analytical techniques emerging from them to promote conversations about well-chosen case studies and the lessons we might draw from them. We need conscious construction of multiple policy pedagogies. The common connection between them should be the desire to identify policy settings that are most enabling for specific groups of people within specific locations. This would represent a departure from policy training of the past and much of the policy training that is currently happening. That is why we speak of the need for a decolonized pedagogy.

The research question motivating this paper can be expressed as follows: How might policy education in Australia and New Zealand be reformed to effectively equip programme graduates for the policy challenges they can be expected to work on in the coming decades? The question assumes that the content of policy education is instrumental in equipping graduates with knowledge and skills that allow them to effectively participate in policy development. Of course, other political and social factors serve to shape and constrain the agency of individuals and groups working within specific structures. But many scholars in many fields have long noted that what people learn in their university courses can have a profound bearing on how they approach their subsequent work as professionals (Lemov, 2015; Schön, 1983). Following other policy scholars (Pusey, 1991; Weimer & Vining, 1989; Wilson, 1980), we believe that how policy professionals approach their work is strongly shaped by the content of the policy education they have received, and its underpinning principles and values.

To return to our research question, a sound effort to answer it requires knowing two things. First, how policy education is being conducted at present and, second, what policy challenges lie ahead. The first question can be readily answered, and we have sought to do so through conducting a comprehensive assessment of the content of the major policy programmes currently on offer in Australian and New Zealand universities. The second question calls for a more speculative answer. We claim that existing policy settings systematically disadvantage the first peoples of Australia and New Zealand. Evidence of that disadvantage is abundant. Increasingly, a consensus is emerging that this disadvantage has its roots in colonization (Gani & Marshall, 2022; Houkamau et al.,

2017; Moran, 2016). Therefore, a fundamental policy challenge in Australia and New Zealand now and in the future is to effectively address that systematic disadvantage. This might not be the only fundamental policy challenge facing these countries in the years ahead. But ignoring the challenge or simply wishing it away is a recipe for further systematic bifurcation of life chances among the populations of these countries. And continued bifurcation could result in many undesirable and avoidable forms of social dysfunction.

Having established how policy education is being conducted at present and that systematic disadvantage of indigenous peoples is a major challenge, we then consider what changes to contemporary education in Australia and New Zealand would equip program graduates to address that challenge. This leads us to propose four starting points for a decolonized pedagogy. Our approach to addressing our motivating research question is theory-driven and draws upon our own systematic empirical work and the theory-driven empirical work of other researchers from a variety of disciplines. By taking this approach in this research article, we model how other researchers in Australia and New Zealand and elsewhere can further explore ways to make policy education fit for the context where graduates will be contributing to policymaking.

### The rise of policy education in Australia and New Zealand

In Australia and New Zealand, as elsewhere, the field of public policy grew out of the field of public administration, although both fields owe intellectual and disciplinary debts to other fields such as law, economics, and political science. The teaching of public administration was embedded into university programmes in both countries during the 1930s. The demand for this teaching came initially from governments seeking to establish a cadre of officials exhibiting broad knowledge of governmental processes within the Westminster system of government. Indeed, opportunities were given in New Zealand at first and subsequently in Australia for public servants to take paid leave and attend university courses for this purpose. Academically, moves were afoot to bring the teaching of public administration within the orbit of broader studies of government and political science (Scott and Wettenhall, 1980). The first issue of the *Australian Journal of Public Administration* appeared in 1937. The journal has its origins in efforts by state-level chapters of the Royal Institute of Public Administration to create a profession of public administration in Australia. Close focus on public policy can be traced in Australia back to the strengthening and expanding of public administration as a discipline. The University of Sydney, which took the lead in developing public administration in the 1930s, started offering a course in public policy in 1961 (Wanna, 2003). In New Zealand, a similar dynamic occurred. Teaching of public policy emerged at Victoria University of Wellington in the 1970s, and began as an expansion of the scope of teaching relating to public administration.

Although efforts to establish sound intellectual capabilities in government bureaucracies in Australia and New Zealand can be traced back to before 1930, the 1960s saw many more young people entering universities to earn degrees. Subsequently, increasing numbers of graduates entered government service and worked on the design and administration of public policies. Skills in the assembly and analysis of evidence sit at

the heart of tertiary training and so people with a variety of disciplinary backgrounds find themselves able to contribute effectively to policy work. That said, graduates with degrees in law, commerce, and arts subjects have traditionally made up the preponderance of those contributing to the development of public policy. Some core analytical skills can prove especially helpful. These tend to have their basis in applied economics and statistics.

Stepping back from the Australia and New Zealand contexts, it is clear that the emergence of public policy as a specialization in the university setting had its most significant origins in the United States. This is where the discipline of policy analysis emerged most noticeably from its foundations in economics and statistics (Stokey & Zeckhauser, 1978). The Kennedy Administration opened the way for 'whiz kids' trained in quantitative fields like statistics, operations research, and economics to hold sway in the development of public policy. Robert McNamara personified these new actors in Washington DC (Radin, 2000). With a background in economics, mathematics, and philosophy, McNamara first applied his skills in business. He subsequently applied and honed his analytical skills by devising efficient and effective practices for the US Bomber Command during the Second World War. Following the war, he rose to the top of Ford Motor Company, before being invited by John F. Kennedy to lead the US Department of Defence. McNamara's systematic approaches to devising policy and budget proposals gained attention in and around government circles primarily because of their success. Leaders of other government agencies in Washington DC quickly sought to strengthen their own analytical firepower. This led to a demand for policy advisors with strong analytical capabilities (Mintrom & Williams, 2013).

Universities in the United States immediately began to respond to that demand. Economics departments strengthened their teaching of public economics. Harvard University's Master of Public Policy Program started being offered in the mid-1960s, around the same time as the Graduate School of Public Administration was renamed the John F. Kennedy School of Government. The University of California – Berkeley established the Graduate School of Public Policy in 1969.<sup>1</sup> The Harvard and Berkeley programs provided models for policy schools that emerged on many campuses across the US in subsequent decades. David Weimer and Aidan Vining, both graduates of the Berkeley program, state in the preface to their highly successful textbook, *Policy Analysis: Concepts and Practice* (first published in 1989) that they developed the book because they saw an acute need for it at the graduate level. They aimed to 'provide a strong conceptual foundation of the rationales for, and the limitations to, public policy' and to offer practical advice on applying advanced analytical techniques.

In Australia and New Zealand, courses in micro-economics and public economics were offered on most university campuses from the 1950s forward. Public law was also commonly offered in law schools. However, courses in public policy were rare until well into the 1970s, when they started to be offered in some programs in Political Science or Political Studies. While there has been a significant increase in the teaching of public policy, especially at the post-graduate level, in Australia and New Zealand in the past two decades, programmatic efforts remain limited. The degrees that focus on public policy

tend to have a small number of core courses, which students supplement with elective units. The core courses typically include at least one overview course on public policy, a course on policy analysis and a course on research methods.

In Australia, the emergence of public policy training out of the tradition of public administration came with a degree of controversy. This has been well-documented (Wanna, 2003). As the teaching of public administration in Australia developed, especially at the University of Sydney, conscious efforts were made to embed that teaching within the study of the economic, social and political forces which shape governmental activity. These efforts allowed for broad discussion about the origins of policy ideas, the interests that make certain ideas acceptable, and the relationship between government and other institutions in society. Such discussion found no place in traditional teaching of public administration. Moving into the early 1980s, public policy as a discipline was on the rise in Australia, while the study of public administration began to languish. As interest in public policy as a discipline expanded, the locus of the field shifted from the University of Sydney to the Australian National University. Other universities developed strong capacity for teaching and research relating to public policy. Debates about public policy as a discipline moved into interesting territory, with consideration being given to the drivers of public policy, such as party politics, the actions of interest groups, the media, and global forces. Today, graduate degrees in public policy, such as the Master of Public Policy, can be taken at most of the major universities in Australia. The Australian National University established the Crawford School of Public Policy in 2006, growing out of the earlier Asia and Pacific School of Economics and Government. The University of Melbourne established the Melbourne School of Government in 2013, with the intention that it would bring together strengths from three faculties – Arts, Business and Economics, and Law.

In New Zealand, by the late 1970s, Victoria University of Wellington had academics scattered across Law, Economics, Accounting, and Politics who exhibited interests in public policy issues, published in the field, and taught policy-related courses. Many became affiliated with the university's Institute for Policy Studies, which was established in 1983 as a space outside of government for in-depth assessment of contemporary policy issues. No other New Zealand university had this kind of concentration of academics with interests in public policy. The primary explanation would seem to be the proximity of Victoria University of Wellington to the centre of government in New Zealand. During the 1980s, efforts were made at Victoria University to strengthen the ties across these disparate policy-related offerings. This led eventually to the development of Victoria's School of Government, which was launched in 2002, and which then incorporated the Institute for Policy Studies. Victoria's School of Government remains the only one of its kind in New Zealand. It offers several Masters degrees, including a Master of Public Policy. The University of Auckland established a Master of Public Policy degree in 2007, and that degree is now housed within the University's Institute for Public Policy. In New Zealand today, students can find courses in public policy offered at most universities. But only Victoria University of Wellington has a strong concentration of public policy academics working together in a programmatic fashion.

In reviewing the teaching of public policy in Australia, Michael Di Francesco (2015) emphasized the consequences of public policy being primarily situated within Political Science or Political Studies programs. Such programs, like all Arts and Humanities programs in Australia, have been powerfully influenced by the British humanities.

Consequently, according to Di Francesco, 'US-style positivism has always faced challenges in gaining wide adherence' (p. 264). This same point could be made about the teaching of public policy in New Zealand. Graduates of most contemporary courses in public policy in these two countries emerge with a sound knowledge of conceptions of the policy process and understand how to structure policy problems for careful qualitative analysis. These are important skills.<sup>2</sup> Quantitative analysis, which has always been emphasized in public policy training in the US, tends to be treated as an optional part of the curriculum in Australia and New Zealand. An upside of this is that many people with strong humanities backgrounds who might otherwise have been put off from studying public policy at the graduate level end up thriving in these degrees. Meanwhile, those taking public policy degrees who desire to acquire tools for applied data analysis and financial analysis can typically enrol in electives offered by other disciplines, such as statistics, economics, and information technology. The upshot is that public policy training in Australia and New Zealand attracts students from a variety of backgrounds and adds value in a range of ways. There is no narrow orthodoxy of the kind that typically characterizes graduate programs in economics.

### The Australia and New Zealand School of Government

The Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) was created by a consortium of Australian and New Zealand governments, universities and business schools in late 2002 with a clear mandate to develop the next generation of public sector leaders. The impetus to create a single trans-Tasman school of government arose from a perception in bureaucratic circles that no institution in Australia or New Zealand had the capacity or the programmes to develop the managerial and policy skills urgently needed by government (Wanna, 2021). It is important to remember that, at that time, neither the Crawford School of Public Policy at the Australian National University nor the School of Government at Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand had been established.

Originally funded from endowments contributed by the Australian and New Zealand governments and the state governments of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, ANZSOG's membership expanded over time to include all the state and territory governments in Australia. As government membership expanded, so did the number of university members, whose role was to support the research and teaching functions within the new organization. ANZSOG would deliver its own programmes and conduct its own research, but the intention was not to supplant the existing public policy and public administration programs in Australia and New Zealand as some providers feared. Instead, ANZSOG created an entirely new set of offerings tailored to the requirements of the government owners. These include the Executive Master of Public Administration (EMPA), designed for mid-career officials. The programme was developed after extensive consultation with key stakeholders in government to ensure they addressed the priority needs of the participants and the governments that sponsored them. The EMPA degree is awarded by partner universities – not ANZSOG itself – because ANZSOG does not have the requisite formal tertiary institution status to award its own credentials. A recurring theme of much ANZSOG teaching is the concept of *public value*, which has origins in US public policy teaching models (Moore, 1995; Wanna, 2021).

ANZSOG's appointment in early 2017 of a new dean, former senior bureaucrat Ken Smith, coincided with the launch of a sector-wide strategy by all 39 universities in Australia, and their representative body Universities Australia, committing to important targets for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander student participation, success and employment in universities (See Universities Australia, 2017). The production of the ANZSOG *Indigenous Strategy 2017–2020* presaged a new direction in the teaching of public policy at ANZSOG. A review of ANZSOG's teaching and learning strategy prioritized a greater focus on inclusion and diversity, including developing Indigenous peoples in the school's programs and incorporating Indigenous perspectives and cultures across the education programs (Wanna, 2021). In the same year, ANZSOG announced that it was partnering with the Australian Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet to develop strategies to make public administration more responsive to the needs of Indigenous people and increase Indigenous involvement in government decision-making. The partnership began with a conference – *Indigenous Affairs and Public Administration: Can't We Do Better?* – which brought together 250 academics, public servants, academics and Indigenous leaders to discuss Indigenous policy. In 2019 another conference, *Reimagining Public Administration: First Peoples, governance and new paradigms*, turned the focus to policy processes and the involvement of Indigenous communities in every part of the policy cycle, from design to evaluation, as well as building Indigenous capability within public services and embedding Indigenous knowledge and culture. In the aftermath of the conference, ANZSOG committed to a number of actions to realize its vision for a new imagining of public administration in Australia and New Zealand. Two of those actions centred on educating public managers to improve their skills, capacity and leadership and expose them to the best thinking on public management. The first involved delivering targeted programs to support Indigenous public servants to achieve and succeed at senior leadership levels. The second was to embed Indigenous knowledge, culture and content across all ANZSOG teaching and learning activities, to ensure participants emerging from such programmes are culturally confident (ANZSOG, 2019). To support these and other initiatives, ANZSOG subsequently appointed three indigenous staff into newly-created indigenous advisor positions.

The decisions taken by ANZSOG to embed indigenous 'knowledge, culture and content' in its teaching of public policy places it at the forefront of efforts to decolonize public policy pedagogy in Australia and New Zealand. When researching for this article, we reviewed the units on offer within all major public policy degree programmes in Australia and New Zealand. We also discussed our preliminary findings with colleagues to check our perceptions. While other university-based policy programs have created opportunities for students to take elective subjects that introduce them to indigenous policy issues and to decolonization strategies, it is not apparent that they have felt the same compulsion as ANZSOG to speak directly to contemporary public sector agendas and to incorporate indigenous knowledge and viewpoints into all aspects of their activities as ANZSOG has done. To a degree, then, it is fair to say that ANZSOG has been seeking to lead in giving more emphasis to indigenous issues in its pedagogy.



## Acknowledging colonization and its consequences

Australia and New Zealand were colonized by representatives of the British Government after James Cook claimed the countries for Britain in 1770, during his voyage around the South Pacific. A fleet of eleven ships, known as the First Fleet, brought British settlers to Australia in 1788. Various colonial governments were subsequently established in both countries. During the years of colonization, large numbers of migrants arrived from Britain and other European countries. Lands that had been owned by indigenous peoples were taken – often with force. Massive disruptions followed, resulting in losses not only of land but of cultures and languages.

In New Zealand, some effort was made to establish peaceful relationships between the colonizers and the Maori tribes. Those efforts were exemplified in the signing in 1840 of the Treaty of Waitangi. This was an agreement between the Crown and Maori signatories which was intended to result in a level of peaceful co-existence and protection of all people living in New Zealand. However, much continued to be lost by Maori living in New Zealand. It was only following the passage of the Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975 that successive governments began to seriously respect the Treaty and its provisions. The Waitangi Tribunal, established in 1975, became an important institution in New Zealand for Maori to establish their historical land claims and to seek compensation from the Crown for past losses.

In Australia, limited efforts were originally made to find accommodations between Aboriginal peoples and British settlers. This has subsequently led to major disputes over land title. Those disputes continue. When the Labour government came to power nationally in 1972, it signalled a fundamental policy shift from assimilation to Aboriginal self-determination. A key element of this was Prime Minister Whitlam's recognition of the importance of land rights, informed by a series of sustained public protests, led by Aboriginal Australians. The Aboriginal Land Rights Commission (ALRC) was established in 1973. Led by Edward Woodward (later Sir Edward Woodward) this Commission was the first Commonwealth inquiry into Aboriginal land rights. The terms of reference tasked it with determining how to recognize and establish traditional rights in relation to land in the Northern Territory, and possible arrangements for vesting title to land in South Australia, Western Australia, and the Northern Territory.

Woodward's reports were published in 1973 and 1974. Recommendations included the transfer of ownership and oversight of Aboriginal reserves in the Northern Territory to Aboriginal Land Trusts, for mining in those areas to occur only with the consent of Aboriginal communities and for royalties to be divided, for access to Aboriginal land to require a permit, and for the Government to put aside money for the purchase of land for Aboriginal peoples. Based on the recommendations made by the ALRC, the Aboriginal Councils and Associations Bill and the Aboriginal Land (Northern Territory) Bill were passed by the House of Representatives in 1975. The Australian Government adopted the Aboriginal Land Rights (NT) Bill 1976. This is heralded as a key moment for Aboriginal land rights and has remained a foundation for on-going amendments. In 2008, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd made a formal apology to Australia's indigenous peoples, particularly the Stolen Generations whose lives had been deeply affected by past government policies of forced child removals and indigenous assimilation. Currently in Australia, efforts are underway in several states to establish treaties between the Government and Indigenous

peoples. The Victorian State Government is currently sponsoring the Yoo-rrook Justice Commission, a truth-telling commission authorized to scrutinize First People's experiences of systematic injustices, past and present, arising from colonization. Yet, as Diana Perche (2017) has documented, there have been episodes in contemporary Australian policymaking where gains from the past have been threatened by 'normalisation' efforts (influenced primarily by pursuit of economic rationalism) that have deliberately sought to ignore the specific needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island populations within Australian society.

Statistics collected in both Australia and New Zealand over the past century provide clear evidence that colonization of these countries has had devastating effects for large proportions of indigenous peoples. For example, in comparison with population members of European descent, Maori and Aboriginal peoples tend to acquire fewer formal educational qualifications (Bodkin-Andrews & Carlson, 2016; Statistics New Zealand, 2020a), have lower life-time earnings (New Zealand Treasury, 2018; Wiafe, 2016), suffer more health complaints (Maguire & Robson, 2016; Reidy, 2020), and have lower life expectancies (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2020; New Zealand Ministry of Health, 2018; Statistics New Zealand, 2021). In addition, Maori and Aboriginal peoples tend to own less property and are far less likely to own their own homes in comparison with population members of European descent (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2019; Statistics New Zealand, 2020b). Meanwhile, they are over-represented in unemployment statistics ("New Zealand Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment" 2021; Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2021), and in statistics on rates of prison incarceration (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021; Harper, 2020). We might conclude, therefore, as others have, not only that colonization has had serious and mainly detrimental effects on indigenous peoples in Australia and New Zealand, but also that public policies have failed indigenous communities. Given stark population distinctions in quality-of-life outcomes, we might expect that public policy education would make improving conditions for indigenous peoples a major focus. This has never been the case.

### **Towards a decolonized pedagogy**

In their various ways, governments in Australia and New Zealand have begun to grapple with the history of colonization in these countries, and the many adverse impacts it has had for indigenous peoples. These governments have also made concerted efforts to employ more professional staff who identify as indigenous and who bring their vital indigenous knowledge, perspectives, and connections to indigenous communities to their work. Looking to the future, public policy education holds the potential to contribute greatly to decolonization projects. But how that contribution is made calls for high levels of sensitivity on the part of university-based public policy academics. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith pointed out in her landmark contribution on *Decolonizing Research* (2012), academics, through their research activities, have often served either wittingly or unwittingly as agents of colonization. The risk remains that through their contemporary practices they will perpetuate detrimental outcomes for indigenous peoples.

That risk of perpetuating detrimental outcomes for indigenous peoples could be mitigated by universities making sustained and concerted efforts to appoint indigenous scholars with public policy expertise to contribute to public policy research and teaching.

Efforts should also be made to establish a strong pipeline of talent so that more indigenous scholars are available to make such contributions. Of course, there are systemic issues to be addressed here. University systems tend towards rigidity and can be inhospitable to scholars who have not kept within narrowly-defined conventional career paths. The challenge for university systems in these countries is to become more open to difference and welcoming of scholars who have accumulated knowledge and skills in non-conventional ways. In doing so, universities could become more hospitable places, where indigenous scholars could thrive. Others who have not necessarily followed conventional academic career paths could also benefit from this change. More broadly, such a change would be beneficial to students and the wider society.

Another, related, way to mitigate that risk is for academics to be more open to discussion and challenge regarding the choices they make when it comes to policy education. Moving towards decolonized pedagogy means being prepared to acknowledge the limitations and biases inherent in what we do. We should also be prepared to explore the powerful contributions that existing content and pedagogy can make – and have made – to advancing public policy development in these jurisdictions.

A major challenge that rapidly becomes apparent as we talk about colonization and decolonization is that actions and outcomes can prove ambiguous when it comes to placing interpretations upon them. Perhaps this is why discussion of these matters often results in awkwardness. Part of the journey to be taken involves giving voice to that awkwardness and then collectively working our way through it. Catherine Althaus (2020) has taken a step in that direction in her discussion of different paradigms of evidence and knowledge. That discussion resonates with insights emerging from earlier scholarship in sociology and related disciplines, where efforts have been made to understand the implications of the ‘frames’ we bring to everyday discussion (Goffman, 1974). Donald Schön long ago espoused the value of practitioners in areas like public policy being reflective about the interpretations they bring to any specific problems and encounters (Schön, 1983). Subsequently, through a series of case studies, Schön collaborated with Martin Rein to explore how explicit reflection on the frames we use to make sense of the world around us is an essential starting point from which to seek the resolution of seemingly intractable problems (Schön & Rein, 1995).

Reflection on the culturally-specific frames that permeate policy education is useful for helping us see the limited ways that such education in Australia and New Zealand has engaged with indigenous knowledge. But more can be said here. Our previous discussion of the rise of policy analysis in the United States and the introduction of public policy courses in Australia and New Zealand highlights additional forms of cultural bias. First, development of the social sciences in Australia and New Zealand has been heavily influenced by the British approach to teaching of the humanities. That approach has been somewhat dismissive of quantitative methods and more open to interpretive methods developed in fields such as History, Anthropology and Literature. Approaches to the teaching of public administration and public policy in Australian and New Zealand universities have been influenced by that tradition. Second, the quantitative approach to problem specification and solution assessment emerged during a particular historical period in the United States. The on-going ascendancy of that approach can be explained by its utility within a competitive, market-based economy. Methods of analysis that emphasize value for money or other ways of attaining optimal results under specific

constraints are powerful for focusing attention within policy discussions. But the limitations should also be acknowledged. Once quantitative approaches gain ascendancy, other forms of knowledge and the evidence derived from them tend to be given less weight in policy discussions. This style of policy analysis is not necessarily incompatible with other styles of policy analysis, but it does stand at the heart of much of the apparatus of contemporary government decision-making. And that decision-making has often supported the pursuit of outcomes that have favoured dominant groups in society and given short shrift to others (see, e.g. Pusey, 1991; Perche, 2017).

From the perspective of encouraging a decolonized policy pedagogy, the tension between traditions in policy teaching in both Australia and New Zealand can be treated as a distinct point of advantage, providing an entry point for deconstruction of narratives in education and the introduction of alternative perspectives. Consider, for example, the incongruity that often seems to lie between evidence and arguments derived from qualitative and quantitative research methods. Methodological heterodoxy creates opportunities for researchers to reflect on what they do, why they do it, and how they could find effective ways to engage with others in multi-method approaches to addressing research questions. Methodological heterodoxy and incongruity can be viewed as having an equivalence with forms of incongruity arising when cultural differences influence how people make sense of specific social processes, choices, constraints, and outcomes. Where might we go from here? We suggest four starting points. These concern, first, opening up dialogue about the contemporary policy context and how it disadvantages members of indigenous populations; second, training public policy students in negotiation skills; third, training public policy students to be more scrutinizing of evidence as it is presented and the narratives that privilege some forms of evidence over others; and, fourth, showing public policy students how powerful methods of policy analysis and evaluation can be deployed so that they advance the wellbeing and social outcomes of people who have been historically disadvantaged. We next discuss each starting point in turn, noting the analytical basis for why they are essential for developing a decolonized pedagogy.

First, to decolonize pedagogy, we need to be prepared to have open dialogue about the contemporary policy context, how it has been shaped, and how it perpetuates forms of bias that frequently disadvantage members of indigenous populations. Facing up to history and historical wrongs is frequently acknowledged as essential for moving ahead in constructive ways. That is why, for example, New Zealand had a Waitangi Tribunal and a program of Treaty Settlements (Hayward, 2019; Ward, 1991). It is also why the Australian state of Victoria is currently conducting the Yoo-rook Justice Commission (Walter et al., 2021). As things stand, people training in the area of public policy are rarely exposed to content that joins understanding of policy development with understandings of history. Government agencies in New Zealand have sought to address this gap by sponsoring staff members to attend short-course immersion experiences that introduce them to Maori culture and history. These are important interventions that could be usefully replicated in the Australian context. But universities could also do more in this space. The challenge is not just to introduce specific subject knowledge that has been lacking. The need also exists for training in holding difficult conversations. Listening matters here. Some recent developments where design thinking has been introduced into public policy education represent a step in the right direction. That is

because they encourage us to put aside prior expectations and really seek to understand how and why citizens and program clients engage with their context and with program services. Listening to understand the experiences of others can take time and patience. It also takes skill to be able to listen to confronting evidence and arguments and respond constructively. Moves towards decolonizing policy development call for policy designers to recognize the limitations of their knowledge and experience without letting unhelpful emotions cloud their responses. People receiving advanced training in public policy tend to have high levels of efficacy and those need to be tapped in ways that will contribute to better future outcomes. Deep respect, understanding, empathy, and the desire to move ahead through conversation and meaningful engagement are critical to allowing change to happen.

Second, to decolonize pedagogy, we need to train public policy students to be highly effective negotiators. To suggest that negotiation skills are needed is not to assume that the path towards decolonized policy development will be fraught with conflict. Certainly, it could be. But negotiation skills reduce the potential for conflict to escalate from points of contention. They equip people to identify potential areas of contestation within a set of deliberations and to think carefully about how to guide conversations through them. Negotiation, as any diplomat will attest, cannot proceed without time having been put into due diligence and understanding of how those with different views interpret specific situations (Mintrom, 2003). Therefore, the capability of effective negotiation should be viewed as an extension from the capability of deep listening, and the willingness to place yourself in contexts where familiar ways of understanding do not necessarily apply. Along with making more effort to develop negotiation skills, more effort should be made to ensure that all people trained in public policy have a sound understanding of how to act ethically (Mintrom, 2010). Ethical frameworks can usefully guide the framing of policy problems, the formulation of alternative approaches to addressing those problems, and the interactions with stakeholders that feed into both.

Third, to decolonize pedagogy, we need to become much more reflective about how we teach students of public policy to make use of evidence. What evidence is relevant to public policy decision-making? Catherine Althaus (2020) invites us to contemplate that question when she writes of recognizing, honouring, and celebrating Indigenous ways of knowing and being. As noted earlier, methods frequently treated as stock-in-trade for contemporary policy analysis – such as comparative institutional analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and implementation analysis – encourage us to focus on quite narrow lines of evidence, and pay much less attention to other relevant evidence. To a degree, efforts have been made to address these limitations through expansion of methods (see, e.g., Lunt et al., 2003; Mintrom, 2012). But there are broader issues here around the development of policy narratives. This is the terrain that Linda Smith (2012) invites us to consider in her critique of mainstream methods of social science investigation. As we move towards decolonizing pedagogy, we might encourage students of public policy to approach policy issues by asking, among other things: Who has been controlling the policy narrative? What evidence has been used to construct that narrative? What alternative narratives exist? How can the nuances of different cultural understandings lead us

to question current narratives? Many other questions along these lines could be developed. The point is to recognize the tendency for bias to creep into the construction of evidence and evidence-based understandings.

Fourth, to decolonize pedagogy, we need to show public policy students how powerful methods of policy analysis and evaluation can be deployed so that they advance the wellbeing and social outcomes of people who have been historically disadvantaged. We have already noted the risks of negative biases being integrated into the tools of policy analysis. But the tools themselves are not necessarily at fault here. To the extent that they are, augmentations and adaptations can be made to address bias, and we need to teach students how to do that. Recently, some efforts have been made to develop public policy in ways that use cutting-edge tools of analysis to support decolonizing initiatives. For example, in Bourke, New South Wales, analytical techniques associated with the investment approach to policy development have been used effectively to reduce incarceration of indigenous youth and to also reduce recidivism rates (Mintrom & Luetjens, 2018). In New Zealand, sophisticated tools of policy analysis were combined with historical inquiry to support the significant Treaty of Waitangi settlements processes that started in the 1990s (Hayward, 2019). More recently in New Zealand, the government combined an investment approach to policy analysis with close community engagement to create Whanau Ora (Smith et al., 2019). This strategy – which literally means ‘flourishing families’ – has been used to ensure that financial support for Maori communities has been effectively deployed, with very close input and control from members of those communities. Such examples suggest that, looking to the future, decolonized pedagogy could support cohorts of public policy students to apply advances in policy analysis in ways that are fully adapted to the decolonizing contexts they are working within.

These four suggested approaches to decolonizing public policy pedagogy are presented as starting points for discussion. The approaches are neither definitive nor exhaustive. But individually and collectively they indicate that much more could be done in Australia and New Zealand to ensure public policy education is fully attuned to the needs of the local context. While our focus has been on steps towards decolonizing pedagogy, moves along these lines would create benefits for the whole of society in these countries. This, we suggest, would be another very important benefit of decolonizing public policy pedagogy.

## Conclusion

Policy education has flourished in Australia and New Zealand in the past two decades. Today, schools of government exist in both countries and the Australia and New Zealand School of Government leads efforts to train senior public sector leaders, bringing together cohorts of ambitious bureaucrats from across the two countries. As governments in each country have sought to redress the legacies of colonization, more effort has been made to incorporate indigenous perspectives into policy development. But little of that effort has occurred in universities. While policy education is stronger in both countries than it has ever been before, that education does not appear significantly different from the kind of policy education that a student would receive in university programs in other countries, especially the United Kingdom and the United States. Much more could be done to give indigenous issues a central place in university-based policy

teaching. In this article, we have discussed the evolution of policy education in Australia and New Zealand and we have noted how colonization and its impacts have been acknowledged by governments in the two countries. Drawing inspiration from the literature on decolonization, we have then discussed some key features that a decolonized policy pedagogy might embody. Decolonizing policy education holds the key to ensuring public policies are designed and implemented to effectively meet the needs of target populations. As such, we contend that making public policy education more sensitive to the challenges created by the colonial past, and more focused on imparting the knowledge and skills needed to confront those challenges, would equip cohorts of policy analysts to contribute broadly to the advance of all groups of citizens in these highly diverse countries. This would be a valuable direction for reform of policy education in Australia and New Zealand in the years ahead.

## Notes

1. Aaron Wildavsky's *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, first published in 1979, contained an appendix on the structuring of a policy school, reflecting on what Wildavsky and his colleagues had achieved at Berkeley.
2. *The Australian Policy Handbook* in its multiple editions, exemplifies this approach – see: Althaus, Bridgman and Davis 2017.

## Author notes

This is the final version of a manuscript prepared for publication in the *Journal of Asian Public Policy* special issue titled 'An Emerging Regional Discipline? Policy Education, Public Policy Schools, and Pedagogy in Asia'.

## Acknowledgments

Thank you to Ruby O'Connor for her research assistance and to Verna Smith for initial advice on our research strategy. Thank you to Lindsey Te Ata o Tu MacDonald, Diana Perche, participants at the Australia and New Zealand Public Policy Network Conference, 31 January - 2 February 2022, four anonymous referees, and the editors of this special issue for comments on earlier drafts.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Notes on contributors

*Michael Mintrom* is a Professor of Public Policy and Monash University, where he serves as the Director of Better Governance and Policy.

*Deirdre O'Neill* is an Associate Professor at Monash University where she serves as Director of Public Policy Graduate Programs.

## References

- Althaus, C. (2020). Different paradigms of evidence and knowledge: Recognising, honouring, and celebrating indigenous ways of knowing and being. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 79(2), 187–207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12400>
- Althaus, C., Bridgman, P., & Davis, G. (2017). *The Australian policy handbook* (6th edn ed.). Allen & Unwin.
- ANZSOG (2019) *Reimagining public administration: First peoples, governance and new paradigms*. Post-Conference Report.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2021). 'Corrective services, Australia.' 25 November. Sourced at: <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/corrective-services-australia/latest-release>
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2019). 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people: A focus report on housing and homelessness.' (29 March). Sourced at: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/housing-assistance/indigenous-people-focus-housing-homelessness/contents/summary>
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2020, July 23). Indigenous life expectancy and deaths. *Snapshot*. Sourced at <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-health/indigenous-life-expectancy-and-deaths>
- Australian institute of health and welfare. (2021, September 16). Indigenous employment. *Snapshot*. Sourced at <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-welfare/indigenous-employment>
- Bodkin-Andrews, G., & Carlson, B. (2016). The legacy of racism and Indigenous Australian identity within education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(4), 784–807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.969224>
- Di Francesco, M. (2015). Policy analysis instruction in Australia. In Brian Head & K. Crowley (Eds.), *Chapter 17 in policy analysis in Australia: Contexts, themes, challenges* (pp. 261–282). Policy Press.
- Gani, J. K., & Marshall, J. (2022). The impact of colonialism on policy and knowledge production in International Relations. *International Affairs*, 98(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iab226>
- George, L. (2018). Stirring up the silence: What does decolonising anthropology in Aotearoa New Zealand really mean? *Commoning Ethnography*, 1(1), 107–112. <https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/ce/article/view/413910.26686/ce.v1i1.4139>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Harper, J. (2020, August 29). Why does NZ imprison so many Māori? *Newsroom*. Sourced at: <https://www.newsroom.co.nz/why-does-nz-imprison-so-many-maori>
- Hayward, J. (2019). Treaty of Waitangi settlements: Successful symbolic reparation. In L. Joannah, M. Michael, & P. 't Hart (Eds.), *Chapter 17 in successful public policy: Lessons from Australia and New Zealand* (pp. 399–422). ANU Press.
- Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 1(1), a.9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4012/the.v1i1.9>
- Houkamau, C. A., Stronge, S., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). The prevalence and impact of racism toward indigenous Māori in New Zealand. *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 6(2), 61–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ipp0000070>
- Kukutai, T. (2004). The problem of defining an ethnic group for public policy: Who is Maori and why does it matter? *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23(December), 86–108. <https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/journals-and-magazines/social-policy-journal/spj23/23problem-of-defining-an-ethnic-group-for-public-policy-who-is-maori-and-why-does-it-matter-p86-108.html>
- Lemov, D. (2015). *Teach like a Champion 2.0: 62 techniques that put students on the path to college* (2nd. ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Lockett, K., & Shay, S. (2020). Reframing the curriculum: A transformative approach. *Critical Studies in Education*, 61(1), 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2017.1356341>
- Lunt, N., Davidson, C., & McKegg, K. (Eds.). (2003). *Evaluating policy and practice: A new Zealand reader*. Pearson Education.



- MacDonald, L. T. A. O. T. (2016). Decolonisation starts in a name: Moving on from the colonial pretence that 'Māori' or 'indigenous peoples' are explanatory frames. *Political Science*, 68(2), 105–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032318716675654>
- Maggie, W., & Guerzoni, M. A. (2020). 'How a university can embed Indigenous knowledge into the curriculum and why it matters'. *The Conversation*. (16 October 2020). <https://theconversation.com/how-a-university-can-embed-indigenous-knowledge-into-the-curriculum-and-why-it-matters-147456>
- Maguire, G., & Robson, B. (2016, April 21). Aboriginal – Māori: How indigenous health suffers on both sides of the ditch. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/aboriginal-maori-how-indigenous-health-suffers-on-both-sides-of-the-ditch-48238>
- McLaughlin, J. M., & Whatman, S. L. (2007) embedding indigenous perspectives in university teaching and learning: Lessons learnt and possibilities of reforming/decolonising curriculum. In *Proceedings 4th international conference on indigenous education: Asia/ Pacific*, Vancouver, Canada. Published by Queensland University of Technology and accessed from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au>
- Mintrom, M. (2003). 'Conflict management'. Chapter 9 in *People skills for policy analysts* (pp. 197–228). Georgetown University Press.
- Mintrom, M. (2010). Doing ethical policy analysis. In J. Boston, A. Bradstock, & D. Eng (Eds.), *Public policy: Why ethics matters* (pp. 44-59). Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG), ANU E-Press.
- Mintrom, M. (2012). *Contemporary policy analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Mintrom, M., & Luetjens, J. (2018). The investment approach to public service provision. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(1), 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12250>
- Mintrom, M., & Williams, C. (2013). Public policy debate and the rise of policy analysis. In E. Araral Jr., M. Howlett, M. Ramesh, S. Fritzen, & W. Xun. (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public policy* (pp. 3–16). Routledge.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moran, M. (2016). *Serious whitefella stuff: When solutions became the problem in indigenous affairs*. Melbourne University Press.
- New Zealand ministry of business, innovation, and employment. (2021). 'Maori Labour Market Trends.' Sourced at: <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/business-and-employment/employment-and-skills/labour-market-reports-data-and-analysis/other-labour-market-reports/maori-labour-market-trends/>
- New Zealand Ministry of Health (2018). 'Life expectancy.' Sourced at: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/maori-health/tatau-kahukura-maori-health-statistics/nga-mana-hauora-tutohu-health-status-indicators/life-expectancy>
- New Zealand Treasury (2018). 'Statistical analysis of ethnic wage gaps in New Zealand.' Analytical Paper 18/03 (September). Sourced at: <https://www.treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2018-08/ap18-03.pdf>
- Perche, D. (2017). Economic rationalism and indigenous affairs: The project of "Normalisation". Chapter 5 in *Economic rationalism in Canberra: Twenty-five years on – five essays*. In A. Yeatman (Ed.), (*Working papers in the human rights and public life program no 5.*) (pp. 39-45). The Whitlam Institute and Western Sydney University.
- Prinsloo, E. H. (2016). The role of the humanities in decolonising the academy. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(1), 164–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215613608>
- Pusey, M. (1991). *Economic rationalism in Canberra: A nation-building state changes its mind*. Cambridge University Press.
- Radin, B. A. (2000). *Beyond Machiavelli: Policy analysis comes of age*. Georgetown University Press.
- Reidy, J. (2020, June 24). Bandid or cure: A major health review remains split on how to reduce persistent inequalities for Māori. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/bandaid-or-cure-a-major-health-review-remains-split-on-how-to-reduce-persistent-inequalities-for-maori-141118>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*.

- Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1995). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. : Basic Books.
- Scott, R. D., & Wettenhall, R. L. (1980). Public administration as a teaching and research field. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 39(3-4), 478–498.
- Smith Linda, T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Smith, V., Moore, C., Cumming, J., & Boulton, A. (2019). Whanou Ora: An indigenous policy success story. In J. Luetjens, M. Mintrom, & T. H. Paul (Eds.), *Chapter 21 in successful public policy: Lessons from Australia and New Zealand* (pp. 505-529). ANU Press.
- Statistics New Zealand (2020a). 'Education outcomes improving for Māori and Pacific peoples.' 15 June. Sourced at: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/education-outcomes-improving-for-maori-and-pacific-peoples>
- Statistics New Zealand (2020b). 'Housing in Aotearoa: 2020.' 8 December. Sourced at: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/reports/housing-in-aotearoa-2020>
- Statistics New Zealand (2021). 'Growth in life expectancy slows.' 20 April. Sourced at: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/growth-in-life-expectancy-slows#:~:text=Life%20expectancy%20at%20birth%20was,to%20live%20to%2084.4%20years>
- Stokey, E., & Zeckhauser, R. (1978). *A primer for policy analysis*. W.W. Norton.
- Universities Australia. (2017). *Indigenous strategy 2017-2020*. Canberra: Universities Australia.
- Walter, M., Bourke, E., Bell, K., Hunter, S.-A., & Atkinson, W. (2021, November 5). From dispossession to massacres, the Yoo-rook justice commission sets a new standard for truth-telling. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/from-dispossession-to-massacres-the-yoo-rook-justice-commission-sets-a-new-standard-for-truth-telling-170632>
- Wanna, J. (2003). Public policy and public administration. In Ian McAllister, Steve Dowrick, and Riaz Hassan (Eds.), *Chapter 23 in The Cambridge handbook of social sciences in Australia* (pp. 406–430). Cambridge University Press.
- Wanna, J. (2021). Delivering public policy programs to senior executives in government—the Australia and New Zealand school of government 2002–18. In T. Mercer, R. Ayres, B. Head, & J. Wanna (Eds.), *Chapter 4 in learning policy, doing policy interactions between public policy theory, practice and teaching* (pp. 83–106). ANU ePress.
- Ward, A. (1991). Interpreting the treaty of Waitangi: The Maori resurgence and race relations in New Zealand. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 3(1), 85–113.
- Weimer, D. L., & Vining, A. R. (1989). *Policy analysis: Concepts and practice*. Prentice Hall.
- Wiafe, O. K. (2016, February 11). Indigenous Australians retire with 27% less savings. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/indigenous-australians-retire-with-27-less-savings-50840>
- Wildavsky, A. (1979). *Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis*.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1980). *The politics of regulation*. Basic Books.