

Social Research Projects: some Preliminary descriptive parameters

SAANZ Conference December, 2018

Charles Crothers

School of Social Science

AUT

Acknowledgement: Sanna Font-Wells assisted with this project while she was at Superu early in 2018.

(1) Government Social Research: Conceptual Distinctions

Over the last few decades there has been strong interest for credible analysis and evidence to facilitate government policy development and decision making with the aim of informing better outcomes for society. In NZ discussions this particularly falls under the responsibility of Ministries etc. for 'policy stewardship'. There is also policy interest in the utilisation of research. This includes how research is applied in the development of policy, as well as a concern with how evidence informs the outcomes of policy-making.

One way government agencies support the requisite research is by undertaking and publishing a range of social science research. Not sure if this =Social research (which is older term in this literature e.g. Bulmer, 1987). Key concept now is PRE: Policy research & evaluation. In the 2000s there was an emphasis on evaluation (e.g. Superu was seen as providing cross-government evaluative capacity). Apparently there has been a major change in emphasis from evaluation to policy research more generally with more of a forward-focus. Also there seems to have been a drop in interest in future studies?

There is variation in the way different government services handle social researchers. In UK there is a Social Research Profession (see Burnett & Duncan, 2008). In pre-reform NZ civil service 007s (I kid you not) were divided into advisory, investigating and research officers which I thought identified some crucial differences in job function,. (There were very few research offices but one held an almost academic detached position researching social issues concerning health and ethnic groups)

Nathan, Richard (2000): This research is used to help policy makers and funders know what works, and to:

- clarify or quantify a policy problem
- help inform the design of new policies
- evaluate a policy or how it is being delivered.

Various options are possible:

- translation of (academic) research
- Commissioning of (academic or consultancy) research
- Carrying out research themselves: This may be in-house or out-house.
- Policy transfer from other jurisdictions (cf Kingfisher, 2013).
- Other (e.g. Royal Commissions, Commissions of Inquiry, Working Groups – e.g. Owens (2015)).

In this nexus the intermediary position of government social research and researchers is largely invisible. While the commissioning of research is occasionally researched (although less so in the social research arena), questions of the characteristics of government funded research and how these change over time and agency are largely unknown. This paper does not provide a direct study of government social researchers but looks at the parameters of the products, although this should enable some inference about the properties of the researchers producing them.

Beyond a fairly descriptive research purpose the study could also be cast (although this needs more work) as an assessment of the extent to which explicit research agenda have in fact been realised. Research agenda which have been promulgated locally include Auckland Council (2015); Hong (2001); Superu (2015). [Cf Crothers' 2004 report on Research capacity in relation to Equal Opportunity for All, produced on secondment to MoRST.]

NZ is a small jurisdiction with a strong centralised government and some tradition of cross-government cooperation and provides a useful case study. Beyond attempting to plug a gap in the academic literature this study might point to needed infrastructure development: what might be done to allow better provision of government social research?

Key Questions for this research:

- what are aggregate numbers and characteristics of government social research?;
- how have these changed over time? and
- how they differ between agencies/agency-types/sectors and (over time) with Governments?

I am also interested to track the implementation of best practice research standards. For instance, is external peer review an established practice? Does the rate of peer review shift over time or agencies?

(2) *Literature*

Preston (2018) reviews reviews of NZ social research and describes the present picture.

Two reports in adjacent years (Morst, 2007, 2008) provide some statistics on the extent to which government departments are active in research. The survey amongst Govt. departments across the wider civil service found that almost a quarter of central Govt and nearly 10% of beyond central government surveyed research expenditure involved the socio-economic objective of “Social structures and relationships (includes education)”. Other categories included health, industrial development etc. However, more operational aspects such as consumer surveys were excluded by the definition used in this study.

2 local studies address adjacent topics: Eichbaum and Shaw have studied ministerial advisers while Lofgren & Cavagnoli (2015) carried out an online survey among 230 policy workers in New Zealand ministries and agencies in early 2015. Forbes & Keegan (2016) have reported on programmes aimed at “Helping Raise the Official Statistics Capability of Government Employees”. Crothers (2018) scours a Tertiary Education Union (TEU) survey for information on the views of university-based researchers in social sciences as opposed to those in mainstream teaching appointments.

Lunt (ed) (2003) is a very useful compilation of NZ Evaluation Research in the 2000s while Lloyd (1991) provides a case study on the clash between positivist and post-positivist research approaches based on his own experiences.

Major research programmes into research/policy interface have been variously carried out in several countries but with an Australian team (e.g. Newman, Joshua, Cherney, Adrian and Head, Brian W. (2017)) and a Canadian team (Amara, Landry) particularly prominent.

Direct studies of researchers are less frequent. The classical model is the study of the Dept. of Education in the UK (Kogan and Henkel, 1983). More recently Kattirtzi (2016) studied Government social researchers in the UK’s Department of Energy and Climate Change arguing that they fulfilled Providing a “challenge function”: as opposed to communication staff.

Amara et al (2004) provide (or rework) something of a conceptual scheme which might be deployed here.

Other studies have explored theory work from government researchers (e.g. Hampton & Adams, 2018) More generally see Ellwood, Thorpe, Coleman, (2013); Harman & Ollif (2004); Jacobson N, Butterill D, Goering P. (2004); Shields, John; Preston, Valerie; Richmond, Ted; Sorano, Yuko; Gasse-gates, Erika; Douglas, Debbie; Campey, John; Johnston, Leslev (2015); Owens S (2015) Tarling, Roger. (2011). And for wider influences on research (e.g. third sector research) see Han, Jun (2017) or Phillips & Goodwin (2014).

For a recent synoptic book see Parkhurst, 2016 and local studies which include Blewden, M., Carroll, P., & Witten, K. (2010) Witten & Hammond (2010). There is a considerable overseas literature of the relations between academic and government social research officials.

(3) *The Hub*

In 2014 The Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit (Superu) were legislatively tasked to “establish and maintain a database of social science research undertaken by or on behalf of the Government” (Section 8A, Clause 1e, and Families Commission Amendment Act 2014). To enact this function, Superu launched The Hub - an online database of government social science research and evaluation. In 2018 this was taken over by Superu.

The Hub seeks to better facilitate the use of evidence and best practice by social sector organisations. The chosen name of ‘The Hub’ was intended to support a perception of The Hub as a centre of research excellence, a central place of cross-government activity, and a repository.

The Hub achieves this by creating a central place where government funded social science can be published, downloaded and shared. The database only contains research that is published; this excludes any grey literature or work of an ad-hoc nature

The Hub soft launched in April 2015, containing social science projects from the Ministry of Social Development, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Justice. By February 2018 The Hub contained 6388 publications from 56 social sector entities.

Work is considered in-scope if it contains:

- A level of qualitative or quantitative analysis
 - Outputs from the evaluation of policy/delivery initiatives/pilots
 - Outputs from literature reviews/systematic reviews
 - Discussion of the issues, challenges or methodologies of social science research and evaluation.
- . Material from the following agencies (with estimates of size attached in brackets) is to be added:
- Oranga Tamariki (10 resources max.)
 - Maori Language Commission (10 resources max)
 - The Treasury (estimate of 200-500 resources)
 - State Service Commission (unknown, have an internal library)
 - The full collection of outputs from 1990-2002 (estimate of 100-300 resources).

(4) *This study: Data*

Files:

- ‘Projects’ refer to a body of work.
- ‘Publications’ refer to the individual documents that are part of a project.

‘Projects’ have been recoded to provide systematic characterisation of commissioning, carrying-out, subject-matter, methodology and target populations.

‘Publications’ has been recorded to identify the linked citation information for each project, providing further context.

Information includes:

- title,
 - format of report (e.g. pdf),
 - authorship,
 - commissioning agency/cies,
 - other agencies involved,
 - completion status,
 - date published and
 - a series of coded subject terms in parent/child relations.
 - The parent categories highlight top level areas, such as subject-matter, methodological and target populations.
 - The child codes describe themes within those areas, such as ‘Family Violence’, ‘Evaluation’ and ‘Youth’. The codes cover some 160 terms organised across 12 categories. (These are under revision).
- Limitations: The database is under revision to better identify separate projects and to obtain better alignment amongst the codes used (which have varied by each coder). It is also possible that earlier publications are underrepresented esp. in government sectors where there has been major reorganisation.

(5) Results

(5.1) Agencies

Number of Agencies: only 10% of projects involve multi-agency work.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	1.00	3299	90.7
	2, 2+	339	9.3
	Total	3638	100.0

Agencies were classified in terms of sector and type (mainstream v others with ‘Population Ministries’ separately identified).

Over two-thirds of projects emanate from mainstream Ministries dominated by Education, Health and Social Development

Other agencies can be very productive.

1st mentioned Agency provides a broad indication of where projects emanate. The Mainstream departments with well-established research divisions (and service responsibilities) predominate, Big hitters are MoEd and MOH but also HPA, MSDDOL.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Accident Compensation Corporation	22	.
	Broadcasting Standards Authority	22	.
	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority	3	.
	Careers New Zealand	5	.
	Centre for Housing Research Aotearoa New Zealand	37	1.
	Child Youth and Family	16	.
	Commission for Financial Capability	30	.
	Controller and Auditor-General	135	3.
	Creative New Zealand - Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa	19	.
	Department of Conservation	16	.
	Department of Corrections	32	.
	Department of Internal Affairs	54	1.
	Department of Labour (MBIE)	162	4.
	Education New Zealand	7	.
	Education Review Office	144	4.
	Families Commission	121	3.
	Health and Disability Commissioner	36	1.
	Health Promotion Agency	258	7.
	Health Quality and Safety Commission	53	1.
	Health Research Council of New Zealand	20	.
	Housing New Zealand Corporation	26	.
	Human Rights Commission	41	1.
	Inland Revenue Department	10	.
	Manatū Taonga – Ministry for Culture and Heritage	38	1.
	Ministry for Pacific Peoples	12	.
	Ministry for Women	39	1.
	Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment	94	2.
	Ministry of Economic Development	8	.
	Ministry of Education	627	17.
	Ministry of Health	620	17.
	Ministry of Justice	81	2.
	Ministry of Science and Innovation	32	.
	Ministry of Social Development	246	6.
	Ministry of Transport	1	.
	Ministry of Youth Development	5	.

National Health Committee	15	.
New Zealand Council for Educational Research	78	2.
New Zealand Education Council	1	.
New Zealand Film Commission	1	.
New Zealand Productivity Commission	35	1.
New Zealand Qualifications Authority	2	.
NZ On Air	22	.
NZ Police	53	1.
Office of Film & Literature Classification	20	.
Office of the Children's Commissioner	26	.
Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor	16	.
Privacy Commissioner	12	.
Social Investment Agency	3	.
Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee	1	.
Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit	53	1.
Sport New Zealand	45	1.
Statistics New Zealand	95	2.
Te Puni Kōkiri	58	1.
Tertiary Education Commission	25	.
The Office of the Children's Commissioner	1	.
The Treasury	2	.
Work and Income	1	.
Worksafe New Zealand	1	.
Total	3638	100.

A wide array of other agencies were involved: especially...

Campaign for Action on Family Violence	5
Building Research	3
Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand	6
New Zealand Convention Coalition	4
New Zealand Guidelines Group	4
OECD	5
The Treasury	5

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Mainstream Dept-Ministry	2580	70.9
	Other	1026	28.2
	Population Ministries	32	.9

Total	3638	100.0
-------	------	-------

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	health	1024	28.1
	education	884	24.3
	housing	63	1.7
	'populations'	308	8.5
	justice	219	6.0
	cultural	167	4.6
	ec development	306	8.4
	general	363	10.0
	welfare	304	8.4
	Total	3638	100.0

Sector * Type Crosstabulation

Sector			Type			Total
			Mainstream Dept-Ministry	Other	Population Ministries	
health	Count	620	404	0	1024	
	% within Sector	60.5%	39.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
education	Count	771	113	0	884	
	% within Sector	87.2%	12.8%	0.0%	100.0%	
housing	Count	0	63	0	63	
	% within Sector	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
'populations'	Count	114	178	16	308	
	% within Sector	37.0%	57.8%	5.2%	100.0%	
justice	Count	178	41	0	219	
	% within Sector	81.3%	18.7%	0.0%	100.0%	
cultural	Count	38	129	0	167	
	% within Sector	22.8%	77.2%	0.0%	100.0%	
ec development	Count	265	41	0	306	
	% within Sector	86.6%	13.4%	0.0%	100.0%	
general	Count	344	3	16	363	
	% within Sector	94.8%	0.8%	4.4%	100.0%	
welfare	Count	250	54	0	304	

	% within Sector	82.2%	17.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	2580	1026	32	3638
	% within Sector	70.9%	28.2%	0.9%	100.0%

(5.2) Periods:

		Year			Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	1996	1	.0	.0	.0
	1997	1	.0	.0	.1
	1999	2	.1	.1	.1
	2000	8	.2	.2	.3
	2001	42	1.2	1.2	1.5
	2002	49	1.3	1.3	2.8
	2003	65	1.8	1.8	4.6
	2004	88	2.4	2.4	7.0
	2005	182	5.0	5.0	12.0
	2006	224	6.2	6.2	18.2
	2007	278	7.6	7.6	25.8
	2008	296	8.1	8.1	34.0
	2009	319	8.8	8.8	42.7
	2010	354	9.7	9.7	52.5
	2011	279	7.7	7.7	60.1
	2012	301	8.3	8.3	68.4
	2013	323	8.9	8.9	77.3
	2014	295	8.1	8.1	85.4
	2015	255	7.0	7.0	92.4
	2016	159	4.4	4.4	96.8
2017	117	3.2	3.2	100.0	
Total	3638	100.0	100.0		

The average (both mean and median) is 2010 (sd of 3.8 years).

With political effects it is not clear what the length of lag is likely to be.

1st two terms of National Govt yielded as many projects each as in the last 2 terms of the previous Labour government, but numbers fell away in its last term: 60% of the those in the previous term.

The first term of the 5th Labour Government did not generate many projects, although this might be an historical gap in the recording of projects.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Labour -02	103	2.8
	Labour -05	335	9.2
	Labour -08	798	21.9
	National -11	952	26.2
	National-14	919	25.3
	National -17	531	14.6
	Total	3638	100.0

Status

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Commissioned	461	12.7
	Completed	3140	86.3
	Ongoing	36	1.0
	Upcoming	1	.0
	Total	3638	100.0

As expected more recent projects are more likely to be at the commissioning stage (25% of 2017 projects) but there is a considerable scatter of non-completed projects for earlier years that might repay further examination (why do some projects never complete?)

(4.3) Subject Terms

The recorded subject terms are used to indicate the types of topic and research methodology deployed – and how this varies over time (by term), by sector and agency type. Since methodology is common to all projects the greatest concentration of terms clusters there. The economy, health, demography & population generate high concentrations.

Term	No projects	% total projects
Advocacy & Support	398	10.9401
Communities	398	10.9401
Conflict & Safety	1053	28.9445
Economy	2179	59.8955
Education & Learning	2262	62.1770
Environment & Energy	240	6.5970
Families & Whānau	992	27.2677
Governance & Government	1435	39.4447

Health	2277	62.5893
Māori	543	14.9258
Population & Demography	2080	57.1743
Quality of Life & Wellbeing	1153	31.6932
Research Type	4594	126.2782
Social Diversity	707	19.4338
Technology & Communication	718	19.7361

Investigating what sort of investigations and subject-matters are covered by different sectors and types of agency is complex given the range of subject-terms available. Here we restrict an investigation to the mythologies deployed since these are common to all projects.

In terms of subject-matter it is likely (and completely unsurprising) that research work in most sectors very largely is focused on subject-matters pertaining to that sector. It might be of some interest to ascertain the extent to which there is cross-sector ‘leakage’ of subject-matters, but this is not investigated here. In addition, there is research which spans sectors by looking at underlying social entities, such as whanau/families. A next step would be to investigate which agencies (agency-types) take responsibility for such research work: to be attempts on another occasion.

Mainstream Ministries are slightly less likely to carry out literature reviews but substantially more likely to carry out evaluations and more likely to monitor. Involvement in international research or deployment of Kaupapa Maori methodologies doesn’t vary much.

Type		Literature Review	Evaluation	Research	Monitoring	International Research	Kaupapa Maori
Mainstream Dept- Ministry	Mean	.0647	.4407	.5112	.1787	.0512	.0132
	N	2580	2580	2580	2580	2580	2580
	Std. Deviation	.24609	.49657	.49997	.38316	.22037	.11406
Other	Mean	.0955	.1998	.7446	.0838	.0468	.0136
	N	1026	1026	1026	1026	1026	1026
	Std. Deviation	.29407	.40005	.43628	.27725	.21128	.11607
Pop Ministries	Mean	.0938	.3750	.5313	.0000	.0313	.0000
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32
	Std. Deviation	.29614	.49187	.50701	.00000	.17678	.00000
Total	Mean	.0737	.3722	.5772	.1504	.0498	.0132
	N	3638	3638	3638	3638	3638	3638
	Std. Deviation	.26126	.48345	.49407	.35747	.21746	.11412

There is marked consistency amongst sectors in terms of carrying out literature reviews ('populations' give them more attention and general less). Both generic research and evaluations are common across all sectors with the exception of cultural and economic development, but also housing. Monitoring is concentrated in the health sector. International research achieves a similar low level of attention across sectors. Only education has hosted Kaupapa Maori projects to any extent, and even then only for a minority of projects.

Over time literature reviews (and also generic 'research') have more recently declined, while evaluations have increased as a proportion. Investment in international research has remained low and varies somewhat across terms. 'Methodology' has increased but Kaupapa Maori remains fairly constant (surprisingly!).

Sector		Literature Review	Evaluation	Research	Monitoring	International Research
health	Mean	.0703	.4756	.5674	.2881	.0313
	N	1024	1024	1024	1024	1024
	Std. Deviation	.25580	.49965	.49568	.45309	.17408
education	Mean	.0611	.4050	.4683	.1052	.0611
	N	884	884	884	884	884
	Std. Deviation	.23962	.49117	.49928	.30699	.23962
housing	Mean	.0476	.2063	.7937	.0000	.0317
	N	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	.21467	.40793	.40793	.00000	.17673
'populations'	Mean	.1526	.1396	.7338	.0390	.0714
	N	308	308	308	308	308
	Std. Deviation	.36018	.34715	.44271	.19382	.25796
justice	Mean	.1050	.4338	.5799	.1279	.0457
	N	219	219	219	219	219
	Std. Deviation	.30729	.49673	.49470	.33469	.20923
cultural	Mean	.0719	.1198	.8204	.0359	.0299
	N	167	167	167	167	167
	Std. Deviation	.25903	.32566	.38504	.18667	.17093
ec development	Mean	.0784	.1601	.7941	.0556	.0621
	N	306	306	306	306	306
	Std. Deviation	.26929	.36733	.40501	.22944	.24172

general	Mean	.0193	.5124	.3994	.1791	.0193
	N	363	363	363	363	363
	Std. Deviation	.13771	.50054	.49046	.38393	.13771
welfare	Mean	.0855	.3388	.5822	.1020	.0987
	N	304	304	304	304	304
	Std. Deviation	.28012	.47409	.49400	.30311	.29873
Total	Mean	.0737	.3722	.5772	.1504	.0498
	N	3638	3638	3638	3638	3638
	Std. Deviation	.26126	.48345	.49407	.35747	.21746

Effect of Government Terms

Term		Literature Review	Evaluation	Research	Monitoring	International Research	Kaupapa
Labour -02	Mean	.0680	.2427	.6796	.0485	.0194	
	N	103	103	103	103	103	
	Std. Deviation	.25291	.43082	.46891	.21596	.13866	
Labour -05	Mean	.1075	.2478	.6299	.0567	.0687	
	N	335	335	335	335	335	
	Std. Deviation	.31016	.43236	.48357	.23165	.25325	
Labour -08	Mean	.0702	.3885	.5614	.1404	.0576	
	N	798	798	798	798	798	
	Std. Deviation	.25560	.48771	.49653	.34757	.23322	
National -11	Mean	.0777	.4254	.5200	.1670	.0452	
	N	952	952	952	952	952	
	Std. Deviation	.26789	.49467	.49986	.37319	.20778	
National-14	Mean	.0773	.4146	.5582	.2046	.0544	
	N	919	919	919	919	919	
	Std. Deviation	.26715	.49292	.49687	.40361	.22694	
National -17	Mean	.0452	.2825	.6836	.1205	.0320	
	N	531	531	531	531	531	
	Std. Deviation	.20793	.45063	.46550	.32588	.17621	
Total	Mean	.0737	.3722	.5772	.1504	.0498	
	N	3638	3638	3638	3638	3638	
	Std. Deviation	.26126	.48345	.49407	.35747	.21746	

Conclusion:

Superu has developed an important data-base, and SIA is now beginning to build on this from being a more or less passive custodian to a stake-holder with an active

interest in developing the knowledge. It is difficult to draw any conclusions about over- or under- researching although it seems clear that housing has had a limited investment.

References:

- Albert M; Laberge S, (1982) Confined to a tokenistic status: Social scientists in leadership roles in a national health research funding agency. *Social Science & Medicine* 185: 137-146
- Amara N, Ouimet M, Landry R. (2004) New evidence on instrumental, conceptual, and symbolic utilization of university research in government agencies. *Sci Commun.* 2004; 26(1):75-106
- AC (2015) Auckland Council Research Strategy and Priority Research Areas 2013 - 2016 Research Plans
- Backman, Carl (1987) Policy Research at the Congress: A Case Study of a Research Unit at the U.S. Senate. *The American Sociologist* 18 (4): 340-355
- Barrington, John (1995) Education policy and research: some reflections. *New Zealand journal of educational administration*
- Blewden, M., Carroll, P., & Witten, K. (2010). The use of social science research to inform policy development: Case studies from recent immigration policy. *Kotuitui.* 5(1), 13-25
- Bogenschneider K, Corbett TJ. (2010) *Evidence-Based Policymaking: Insights From Policy-Minded Researchers and Research-Minded Policymakers.* New York, NY: Routledge
- Bulmer Martin (ed) (1987) *Social science research and government: comparative essays on Britain and the United States.* CUP
- Burnett, Judith; Duncan, Sue (2008) Reflections and observations: An interview with the UK's first Chief Government Social Researcher. *Critical Social Policy* 28 (3): 283-298
- Eichbaum, C., and Shaw, R. (eds.) (2010) *Partisan Appointees and Public Servants: An International Analysis of the Role of the Political Adviser,* London, Edward Elgar 2010.
- Ellwood, Paul; Thorpe, Richard; Coleman, Charlotte. (2013) A model for knowledge mobilisation and implications for the education of social researchers. *Contemporary Social Science.* 8 (3): 191-206. DOI: 10.1080/21582041.2012.751496.
- Fleming, Grant Alan. (1989) The role of economists in New Zealand policy-making, 1912-1951: economic advice structures in development. Dept. of Economics, University of Auckland.
- Forbes, Sharleen; Keegan, Alan (2016) Helping Raise the Official Statistics Capability of Government Employees. *Journal of Official Statistics* 32 (4): 811-826. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/jos-2016-0042>
- Gollust SE, Seymour JW, Pany MJ, Goss A, Meisel ZF, Grande D (2017) Mutual Distrust: Perspectives From Researchers and Policy Makers on the Research to Policy Gap in 2013 and Recommendations for the Future. *Inquiry.* 54 doi: 10.1177/0046958017705465.
- Grande, D. Seymour, J.Meisel, Z. Gollust, S.E.Pany, M.Goss, A.Kilaru, A. (2014) Translating research for health policy: Researchers' perceptions and use of social media *Health Affairs.* 33(7):1278-1285

- Hampton, Sam & Rob Adams (2018) Behavioural economics vs social practice theory: Perspectives from inside the United Kingdom government. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 46 (1): 214-224.
- Han, Jun (2017) Social Marketisation and Policy Influence of Third Sector Organisations: Evidence from the UK. *Voluntas* 28 (3): 1209-1225. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9853-1>
- Harman, G.; Ollif, C (2004) Universities and government-sponsored contract research : an Australian case study. *Prometheus*, 22 (4): 439-455
- Hong, Bev (2001) *Improving the Knowledge Base for Social Policy: Strategic Knowledge Needs*. MSD
- Hutt, Marten and Philippa Howden-Chapman (1998) *Old wine in new bottles: the Public Health Commission and the making of New Zealand alcohol policy*. Institute of Policy Studies for the Dept. of Public Health, Wellington School of Medicine in conjunction with the Health Services Research Centre, Wellington.
- Jacobson N, Butterill D, Goering P. (2004) Organizational factors that influence university-based researchers' engagement in knowledge transfer activities. *Sci Commun*. 25(3):246-259.
- Kattirtzi, M (2016) Providing a “challenge function”: Government social researchers in the UK's Department of Energy and Climate Change (2010–2015). *Palgrave Communications* DOI: 10.1057/palcomms.2016.64
- Kim, Seoyong; Kim, Donggeun (2012) Does Government Make People Happy?: Exploring New Research Directions for Government's Roles in Happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 13 (5): 875-899.
- Kingfisher, Catherine (2013) *A policy travelogue: Tracing welfare reform in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Canada*. Berghahn Books
- Kogan, M. and Henkel, M. (1983). *Government and Research: The Rothschild Experiment in a Government Department*. London: Heinemann (reissued 2018)
- Lloyd, Mike (1991) Troubles with Team Research: A Personal Account of a Sociology Graduate Entering a Health Research Unit. *New Zealand Sociology* 6 (2): 177-190.
- Lofgren, Karl & Dona Cavagnoli (2015) The policy worker and the professor: understanding how New Zealand policy workers utilise academic research. *Policy Quarterly* 11(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26686/pq.v11i3.4546>
- Lunt, Neil (ed)(2003) *Evaluating Policy & Practise* Pearson
- Morst (2008) Public Sector Financing of Research 2007/08
- Morst (2007) Public Sector Financing of Research 2006/07
- Nathan, Richard (2000): *Social science in government: The role of policy researchers*, The Rockefeller Institute Press, Albany, NY, (New Edition), 2000
- Newman, Joshua, Cherney, Adrian and Head, Brian W. (2017) Policy capacity and evidence-based policy in the public service. *Public Management Review*, 19 2: 157-174. doi:10.1080/14719037.2016.1148191
- Owens S (2015) *Knowledge, Policy, and Expertise: the UK Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution 1970-2011*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Parkhurst, Justin (2016) *The Politics of Evidence: From Evidence-based Policy to the good governance of evidence*. Lons: Routledge.
- Phillips, Ruth; Goodwin, Susan (2014) Third Sector Social Policy Research in Australia: New Actors, New Politics. *Voluntas* 25 (3): 565-584.
- Preston (2018) *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. SUPERU
- Shields, John; Preston, Valerie; Richmond, Ted; Sorano, Yuko; Gasse-gates, Erika; Douglas, Debbie; Campey, John; Johnston, Leslev (2015) Knowledge Mobilization/Transfer and Immigration Policy: Forging Space for NGOs--the Case of CERIS--The Ontario

Metropolis Centre. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. 16 (2): 265-278

Superu (2015) *Social Sector Research Directions*.

Tarling, Roger. (2011) Relations between Government Researchers and Academics. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 50 (3): 307-313. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2311.2011.00666.x.

Witten, K., & Hammond, K. (2010). What becomes of social science knowledge: New Zealand researchers' experiences of knowledge transfer modes and audiences. *Kotuitui*. 5(1), 3-12

Winkler, Celia (2015) A policy travelogue: Tracing welfare reform in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Canada. *New Zealand Sociology*, 30 (4): 270-275.

<<https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=800961032455055;res=IELFSC>>
ISSN: 0112-921X.

Appendix				
Section	Term	No projects	% sections	% total projects
1.00	Research Type	4594	.	126.28
1.00	Evaluation	1355	29.49	37.25
1.00	Research	2102	45.76	57.78
1.00	Kaupapa Māori	49	1.07	1.35
1.00	Literature review	269	5.86	7.39
1.00	International Research	181	3.94	4.98
1.00	Methodology	91	1.98	2.50
1.00	Monitoring	547	11.91	15.04
2.00	Advocacy & Support	398	.	10.94
2.00	Advocacy	34	8.54	.93
2.00	Peer Support	28	7.04	.77
2.00	Self-Advocacy	28	7.04	.77
2.00	Support Groups	30	7.54	.82
2.00	Communities	398	.	10.94
2.00	Community Development	168	42.21	4.62
2.00	Non-Governmental Organisation (NGOs)	18	4.52	.49
2.00	Not for profit	23	5.78	.63
2.00	Philanthropy	13	3.27	.36
2.00	Voluntary & Community	56	14.07	1.54
3.00	Conflict & Safety	1053	.	28.94

3.00	Abuse & Neglect	79	7.50	2.17
3.00	Bullying	17	1.61	.47
3.00	Conflict & Conflict Resolution	74	7.03	2.03
3.00	Crime & Safety	280	26.59	7.70
3.00	Defence	13	1.23	.36
3.00	Emergency Services & Disaster Relief	20	1.90	.55
3.00	Family Violence	70	6.65	1.92
3.00	Human Rights & Civil Liberties	88	8.36	2.42
3.00	International Relations	40	3.80	1.10
3.00	Law & Justice	280	26.59	7.70
3.00	Prisons	45	4.27	1.24
3.00	Victims	47	4.46	1.29
4.00	Economy	2179	.	59.90
4.00	Economic Growth	125	5.74	3.44
4.00	Employment & Labour	657	30.15	18.06
4.00	Grants, Funding, Contracts & Fundraising	226	10.37	6.21
4.00	Housing & Homelessness	150	6.88	4.12
4.00	Income & Wealth	246	11.29	6.76
4.00	Inequality	134	6.15	3.68
4.00	Poverty & Child Poverty	55	2.52	1.51
4.00	Productivity	64	2.94	1.76
4.00	Retirement	53	2.43	1.46
4.00	Social Security & Welfare	118	5.42	3.24
4.00	Social Services	297	13.63	8.16
4.00	Unemployment	54	2.48	1.48
5.00	Education & Learning	2262	.	62.18
5.00	Absenteeism & Truancy	16	.71	.44

5.00	Community Education	19	.84	.52
5.00	Early Childhood Education	117	5.17	3.22
5.00	Education & Training	347	15.34	9.54
5.00	Pedagogy	158	6.98	4.34
5.00	Primary Education	89	3.93	2.45
5.00	Special Character Schools	32	1.41	.88
5.00	Sport & Extramural Education	18	.80	.49
5.00	Teachers	238	10.52	6.54
5.00	E-Learning	58	2.56	1.59
5.00	Literacy & Numeracy	146	6.45	4.01
5.00	Schools	526	23.25	14.46
5.00	Secondary Education	197	8.71	5.42
5.00	Special Education	50	2.21	1.37
5.00	Tertiary Education	251	11.10	6.90
6.00	Environment & Energy	240	.	6.60
6.00	Biosecurity	4	1.67	.11
6.00	Climate Change	2	.83	.05
6.00	Conservation	16	6.67	.44
6.00	Emissions	28	11.67	.77
6.00	Energy	6	2.50	.16
6.00	Environment	58	24.17	1.59
6.00	Food	24	10.00	.66
6.00	Natural Disasters	27	11.25	.74
6.00	Natural Resources	31	12.92	.85
6.00	Sustainability	20	8.33	.55
6.00	Transport	24	10.00	.66
7.00	Families & Whānau	992	.	27.27
7.00	Adoption & Fostering	1	.10	.03
7.00	Blended Families	5	.50	.14
7.00	Caregivers	62	6.25	1.70

7.00	Civil Partnership	0	.00	.00
7.00	Divorce	10	1.01	.27
7.00	Families & Whānau	466	46.98	12.81
7.00	Grand Children & Grandparenthood	10	1.01	.27
7.00	Heritage	2	.20	.05
7.00	Households	82	8.27	2.25
7.00	Marriage & Marital Relationship	18	1.81	.49
7.00	Parenting	252	25.40	6.93
7.00	Relationships	62	6.25	1.70
7.00	Same Sex	3	.30	.08
7.00	Siblings	4	.40	.11
7.00	Single Parents	15	1.51	.41
8.00	Governance & Government	1435	.	39.44
8.00	Governance & Kaitiakitanga	373	25.99	10.25
8.00	Leadership	134	9.34	3.68
8.00	Local Government	110	7.67	3.02
8.00	Policy	675	47.04	18.55
8.00	Public Service	143	9.97	3.93
9.00	Health	2277	.	62.59
9.00	Ageing	36	1.58	.99
9.00	Behaviour Management	56	2.46	1.54
9.00	Child Development	154	6.76	4.23
9.00	Child Mortality	36	1.58	.99
9.00	Diet & Nutrition	73	3.21	2.01
9.00	Disease	208	9.13	5.72
9.00	Drugs & Alcohol	337	14.80	9.26
9.00	Gambling	86	3.78	2.36
9.00	Hazards	128	5.62	3.52
9.00	Health & Safety at Work	54	2.37	1.48
9.00	Healthcare	817	35.88	22.46
9.00	Life expectancy	14	.61	.38
9.00	Mental Health	192	8.43	5.28
9.00	Obesity	21	.92	.58

9.00	Pregnancy	55	2.42	1.51
9.00	Teen Pregnancy	10	.44	.27
10.00	Māori	543	.	14.93
10.00	Hapū	28	5.16	.77
10.00	Hauora	5	.92	.14
10.00	Hinengaro	3	.55	.08
10.00	Iwi	47	8.66	1.29
10.00	Kāinga	1	.18	.03
10.00	kanohi ki te kanohi	4	.74	.11
10.00	Kaupapa	39	7.18	1.07
10.00	Manaakitanga	7	1.29	.19
10.00	Marae	9	1.66	.25
10.00	Mokopuna	1	.18	.03
10.00	Rangatahi	11	2.03	.30
10.00	Rūnanga	1	.18	.03
10.00	Taonga tuku iho	1	.18	.03
10.00	Te Āo Māori	86	15.84	2.36
10.00	Tikanga	28	5.16	.77
10.00	Tinana	3	.55	.08
10.00	Tipuna	1	.18	.03
10.00	Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi	33	6.08	.91
10.00	Wairua	6	1.10	.16
10.00	Wānanga	6	1.10	.16
10.00	Whakapapa	14	2.58	.38
10.00	Whānau	173	31.86	4.76
10.00	Whānau Ora	22	4.05	.60
10.00	Whanaungatanga	4	.74	.11
10.00	Whenua	10	1.84	.27
11.00	Population & Demography	2080	.	57.17
11.00	Armed Forces	1	.05	.03
11.00	Asian	31	1.49	.85
11.00	Children	410	19.71	11.27
11.00	Disability	146	7.02	4.01
11.00	International students	30	1.44	.82
11.00	Māori	259	12.45	7.12

11.00	Men	22	1.06	.60
11.00	Migrants	128	6.15	3.52
11.00	Older People	95	4.57	2.61
11.00	Pacific People	157	7.55	4.32
11.00	Population Shifts	81	3.89	2.23
11.00	Prisoners	50	2.40	1.37
11.00	Refugees	28	1.35	.77
11.00	Rural	19	.91	.52
11.00	Transgender	3	.14	.08
11.00	Urban	22	1.06	.60
11.00	Vulnerable & Disadvantaged	73	3.51	2.01
11.00	Women	141	6.78	3.88
11.00	Labour force	61	2.93	1.68
11.00	Youth	323	15.53	8.88
12.00	Quality of Life & Wellbeing	1153	.	31.69
12.00	Arts and Culture	67	5.81	1.84
12.00	Lifestyle & Standard of Living	278	24.11	7.64
12.00	Quality of Life	483	41.89	13.28
12.00	Resilience	42	3.64	1.15
12.00	Socio-economic status	170	14.74	4.67
12.00	Sport & Recreation	113	9.80	3.11
13.00	Social Diversity	707	.	19.43
13.00	Culture	154	21.78	4.23
13.00	Customs & Traditions	63	8.91	1.73
13.00	Discrimination	77	10.89	2.12
13.00	Gender	115	16.27	3.16
13.00	Language	118	16.69	3.24
13.00	Race & Ethnicity	123	17.40	3.38
13.00	Religion, Beliefs & Spirituality	25	3.54	.69
13.00	Sexuality	32	4.53	.88
14.00	Technology & Communication	718	.	19.74

14.00	Biotechnology	32	4.46	.88
14.00	Communicating	93	12.95	2.56
14.00	Engineering	3	.42	.08
14.00	Information & Communications Technology	201	27.99	5.53
14.00	Innovation	126	17.55	3.46
14.00	Media & Communications	121	16.85	3.33
14.00	Science & Technology	96	13.37	2.64
14.00	Social Media	46	6.41	1.26
184	184	184	169	184