

SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA:2002-2010

BY

IDRIS.MUSA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

ABSTRACT

The federal government of Nigeria has over the years formulated policies and programme aimed at creating sustainable economic opportunity with a view to among others improving human development in Nigeria. In spite of these efforts, the security situation in the country remain precarious, property right laws seem not to have been strictly enforced while the infrastructure such as electricity supply, roads and rails are in a deplorable situation. Poverty has also been on the increase as life expectancy and literacy figures remain low. The objectives of this paper are to determine the levels of sustainable economic opportunity and human development in Nigeria and examine the relationship between the two variables. The research design was content analysis of data from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation and the United Nations Development Programme for Sustainable Economic Opportunity (SEO) and Human Development (HD) respectively. These were presented in tables and analysed using averages, percentages and chi-square distribution for test of hypothesis. The study revealed that both the levels of SEO and HD were low and that the level of SEO has affected the level of HD in Nigeria. The study recommended for strengthening of security and protection of life and property and protection of property rights. It also include revamping of infrastructure such as electricity, raits, roads and water. Others include rural development as well as administrative and financial sector reforms for effective service delivery and prudent financial management.

Key Words: Sustainable Economic Opportunity, Human Development.

INTRODUCTION

A sustainability revolution is taking place in the spheres of economic environment and human development. Although, there has been a changing emphases from economic, human and recently sustainable environmental development, the three core elements of sustainable development are mutually exclusive. The environment has to be sustained to ensure safe and continued transformation of natural resources for economic development. These natural resources are passive. Only developed human developments can transform them to facilitate sustainable economic and environmental development. An economically deprived state may as well find it difficult to develop her human resources. Therefore, sustainable economic opportunities need to be created.

The federal government in her National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS), emphasised the need to creating sustainable economic opportunities for human development among others (FRN, 2004 and 2008). In spite of these commitments, the country's basic infrastructure such as electricity, rails, and roads remain deplorable. Economic management policies are also less than effective (MO Ibrahim Foundation 2010). Life expectancy at birth is as low as 48.4. the mean years of schooling and Gross National

Product were only 5 years and \$2156 in Nigeria (UND2010). Why is the level of sustainable economic opportunity and human development low in spite of the policies enacted and programmes embarked upon aimed at creating sustainable economic opportunities and improving human development in Nigeria?

The objectives of this paper are to determine the levels of sustainable economic opportunity and human development in Nigeria the period 2002 – 2010 and examine the relationship between the two variables. Others are to identify the problems associated with creating sustainable economic opportunity and human development in Nigeria with a view to improving them. The Null Hypothesis (H_0) for the study states that the level of sustainable economic opportunity has not affected the level of human development in Nigeria. The Alternate Hypothesis (H_1) on the other hand states that the level of sustainable economic opportunity has affected the level of human development in Nigeria.

The Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2007) only identifies both sustainable economic opportunity and human development as some of the indicators of good governance without establishing causal relationships between them. Alkire (2010) only attempted definitions, critiques, and related concepts of human development without relating it to any variable while Fuentes-Nieva and Pereira (2010) discusses the disconnect rather than the connection between indicators of sustainability and human development. This study is to cover this knowledge gap. The current literature and reliable data will provide relevant information to researchers. The identification of gaps between policy and practice will enable human development policy makers and practitioners fine tune their strategies. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and International Assistance Agencies will also find the findings of the study useful in assessing specific country performance in sustainable economic opportunity and human development for possible intervention.

The study spans between 2002 and 2010. This can be justified on the bases of availability of data and for also being a period of return to democratic governance in Nigeria. Democratic regimes are expected to be more concerned with creating sustainable economic opportunity and enhancing human development than military dictatorships. The indicators of human development are; life expectancy, literacy rate and the Growth of Gross National Product. The indices of sustainable economic opportunity are; the effectiveness of economic management policies and the contribution of the private sector in accelerating economic growth. Others are the state of infrastructure and the state of the environmental and rural sectors. The research design was content analysis of data from the Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance for sustainable economic opportunity and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for data on human development. These were presented in tables and analysed using percentages. The chi-square distribution was used in testing the hypothesis postulated.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concept of sustainable development is relatively new in development literature. In spite of this, it has become a political and academic buzzword since the United Nations report "our common future" 1987 (Fuentes – Nieva and Pereira, 2010). Sustainable development as a concept, as a goal and as a movement spread rapidly and is now central to the mission of countless international organisations, national governments and corporate enterprises (Kates, Parris, and Leiserowitz, 2005).

Though very dynamic as a concept sustainable development can be seen as the ability of humanity and national governments to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without comprising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs (Kates, Parris and Leisorowitz, 2005). Three major components of sustainable development can be discerned in development literature. These are: sustainable economic development, sustainable human development, and environmental sustainability (Jingan, 2007).

This paper concerns itself with sustainable economic development (opportunity) and sustainable human development. While a universally acceptable definition of the concept of sustainable economic opportunity has not been arrived at, scholars and an institution (Nixon, 2009, Wilson Farher and Hanna, 2006, and Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2009) identifies indicators of sustainable economic opportunity. These include the provision of physical infrastructure such as constant and adequate energy supply, functional rails and roads, as well as the development of workforce and the industrial sector that business need to thrive (Nixon, 2009, Wilson, Farher and Hanna, 2006).

The Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2009) identifies economic management, the role of the private sector, the state of infrastructure and the environmental and rural sector. The economic management component consist of the quality of public administration, quality of budget management, level of inflation and public debt among others. Infrastructure component consist of the reliability of electricity and water supply as well as the extent of mobile phone, computer and internet usage. The role of the private sector include; competitive environment, the nature of business climate and the extent of access to credit among others. Access to agricultural land, water and rural financial services amongst others constitute the environmental and rural sector component of sustainable economic opportunity. These components are more comprehensive than those identified by Nixon 2009, Wilson, Farher, and Hanna, 2006 and represent the indicators of sustainable economic opportunity in this paper.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) which is globally acknowledged as the most reputable organisation in human development has defined human development with changing emphases from 1990 - 2009. These varies from enlarging people's choices, creating environment in which all people can expand their capabilities, expanding people's choices to lead lives they value and expanding people's choices, freedom and dignity (Alkire, 2010). In all the definitions advanced by the UNDP from 1990 - 2009, the issue of long healthy life, knowledge and resources for decent standard of life appeared dominant. This forms the nucleus of human development. Others include political freedom and human rights.

Development Scholars such as Jhingan (2007) Martinussen (nd), Neumayer (2010) and Todaro and Smith (2009), define the concept of human development using the view of the UNDP (1990) as a process of enlarging people's choices. Operationally, human development is determined by the extend of the level of literacy, life expectancy and income of the citizens. These arfe measured using an index (Human Development Index) which varies from 0-rand it is calculated as; $HDI = 1/3 (\text{Income Index} \text{ Longevity Index} \text{ Education index})$ (Neumayer, 2010). These indicators of human development according to MO Ibrahim foundation are health care delivery, education and poverty reduction. These are similar to those of the UNDP. The scholars such as Jhingan, 2007 and Martinussen (nd) and the UNDP contrasted economic growth with growth development. They asserts that, while economic growth

focuses on the expansion of one choice (income), human development embraces the enlargement of all human choices whether economic, social, cultural or political.

Reiterating the views of Haq (1995), Martinussen (nd) argues that a link between income growth and human welfare has to be created consciously through public policies which aim at providing services and opportunities as equitable as possible to all citizens. Jhingan (2007) asserts that economic growth is essential to human development as no country has been able to sustain the well being of its citizens without continuous growth. He however, adds that only healthy and educated people who contribute more to economic growth. This literature indicates that sustainable economic opportunity and human development as components of sustainable development are symbiotically interrelated as sustainable economic opportunity has the potentials of facilitating human development.

The theoretical framework for the study is the Developmentalist Paradigms of Institutions. Its proponents are Armsden (1989), Chang (2002), Evans (1995) (Jayadev, 2010). It was used by Jayadev (2010) as a framework in his study; *Global Governance and Human Development; Promoting Democratic Accountability and Institutional Experimentation* and published by the UNDP. The theory presents evidence of the crucial role of the activist state institutions must play in providing the enabling environment for accelerated economic and human development. According to the theory, a central function of developmental state is to provide means whereby the poorest and most vulnerable can enhance and invest in their own capacities. In relation to this study, the institution of the state must provide effective economic management, provide the infrastructure, stimulate the private sector and accelerate rural development to ensure sustainable economic opportunity. This is because, sustainable economic opportunity enables citizens and businesses improve their economic well being, reduce poverty afford education, and improve their health, increase life expectancy and widen their scope of choices.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The independent and dependent variables for the study are sustainable economic opportunity and human development respectively. The data on the independent and dependent variables were obtained from two reputable international organisations; the Mo Ibrahim foundation and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) respectively.

The Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria

The data on Sustainable Economic Opportunity (SEO) for 2002 – 2010 was derived from the Mo Ibrahim foundation. The criteria for determining the level of SEO are; the effectiveness of economic management, the agility of the private sector, quality of infrastructure as well as environmental and rural sector development. Nigeria's scores and rankings in SEO between 2002 – 2010 are present in table 1 below;

Table 1; Nigeria's Scores and Rankings in SEO 2002 – 2010

Year	Score (%)	Ranking (out of 53 African Countries)
2002	36.7	34
2003	35.5	38
2004	36.5	36
2005	37.3	36
2006	37.7	34
2007	40.3	33
2008	43.3	34
2009	42.6	34
2010	43.0	-

Source; Ibrahim Index of African Governance Scores and Ranks
www.moibrahimfoudnation.org

The data in table 1 above indicates that Nigeria's scores in SEO ranges from the lowest of 35.5% in 2003 to the highest of 43.3% in 2008. The average score for the country in SEO for the nine years was 39.2% which is a poor performance. The annual scores in SEO were also undulating with no record of steady improvements. Nigeria's rankings out of the fifty three (53) countries covered in Africa persistently ranges from 34 – 38. The country ranked far below the first half (27) in SEO rankings.

The Level of Human Development in Nigeria

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is globally acknowledged as the most authoritative source data on human development referred Human Development Index (HDI). The HDI was initiated by Mohbub ul-Haq in 1990 and adopted by the UNDP since then. It is now published annually. The components of Human Development (HD) as identified by the UNDP and used in this paper as; longevity as measured by life expectancy at birth, educational attainment as measured by a combination of adult literacy (2/3 weight) and combined primary, secondary, and tertiary enrolment ratio (1/3 weight). The other indicator is decent standard of living as measured by real Gross Domestic Product Per Capital based on Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) in terms of the Dollar. The HDI values vary from zero to one. Countries with an HDI value of less than 0.5 are considered to have a low level of human development. Those of 0.5 to 0.8 are classified medium while those above 0.8 a high level of HDI (Jhingan, 2007). The HDI values in this paper are further converted to percentages in order to follow with Nigeria's scores in SEO as presented in table 2 below.

Table 2; The Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002 – 2010)

Year	HDI Value	HDI (%)
2002	0.466	46.6
2003	-	-
2004	0.448	44.8
2005	0.402	40.2
2006	0.506	50.6
2007	0.511	51.1
2008	-	-

2009	0.419	41.9
2010	0.423	42.3

Source: Adapted from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index 2002 – 2010 Editions

The data in table 2 above shows Nigeria's HDI values from 2002 – 2010. These range from the lowest of 0.419 (.41.9%) in 2009 to the highest value of 0.511 (51.1%) in 2007. Data on HDI values for 2003 and 2008 could not be obtained from the UNDP. The seven years data obtained indicates that the country's HDI values were below 0.5 and rated low on the HDI scale for five years (2002, 2004, 2005 and 2010). The country however had HDI values of above 0.5 but less than 0.8 and rated medium on the HDI value scale in 2006 and 2007. However, the overall average HDI value for the seven years was 0.453 (45.3%). This average score rated the country low on the UNDP HDI value scale.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

The Null Hypothesis (H_0) state that the level of sustainable economic opportunity has not affected the level of human development in Nigeria. The independent and dependent variables are; sustainable economic opportunity and human development respectively. The level of significance (α) is 95%. Chi-square distribution (χ^2) and the statistical tool used for test of hypothesis with the aid of computer Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The decision rule in using χ^2 for test of hypothesis is reject H_0 if calculated χ^2 value is greater than critical value and accept the H_1 and vice versa. The computer SPSS product of the values of the independent and dependent variables in tables 1 and 2 above and presented in tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 below.

Table 3
Frequency Table

**Responses on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria
(2002-2010) (Independent Variable)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002	37	11.6	13.5	13.5
	2004	37	11.6	13.5	27.0
	2005	37	11.6	13.5	40.5
	2006	37	11.6	13.5	54.0
	2007	40	12.6	14.6	68.6
	2009	43	13.5	15.7	84.3
	2010	43	13.5	15.7	100.0
	Total	274	86.2	100.0	
Missing	System	44	13.8		
Total		318	100.0		

Table 4:

**Responses on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010)
(Dependent Variable)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2002	47	14.8	14.8	14.8
2004	45	14.2	14.2	28.9
2005	40	12.6	12.6	41.5
2006	51	16.0	16.0	57.5
2007	51	16.0	16.0	73.6
2009	42	13.2	13.2	86.8
2010	42	13.2	13.2	100.0
Total	318	100.0	100.0	

Table 5:

Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable) - Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable) Cross-tabulation

		Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010)						Total
		2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	
2002	Count	37	0	0	0	0	0	37
	Expected Count	8.9	0.1	5.4	6.9	8.9	5.4	37.0
	% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	100.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%
	% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	28.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13.5%
	% of Total	13.9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13.9%
	Residual	28.1	-0.1	-5.4	-6.9	-8.9	-5.4	
	Std. Residual	12.3	-0.5	-2.3	-2.9	-3.9	-2.3	
Adjusted Residual	19.1	-2.9	-2.1	-3.1	-3.1	-2.1		
2004	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Expected Count	8.1	8.1	5.4	6.9	8.9	6.4	37.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	27.0%	73.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	21.9%	80.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13.5%	
% of Total	3.8%	9.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12.8%	
Residual	2.7	20.9	-5.4	-6.9	-8.9	-6.4		
Std. Residual	1.0	8.5	-2.3	-2.9	-3.9	-2.6		
Adjusted Residual	1.7	10.0	-2.7	-3.1	-3.1	-2.7		
2006	Count	0	16	19	0	0	0	37
Expected Count	8.7	4.1	5.4	6.9	8.9	5.4	37.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	0%	48.6%	51.4%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	0%	40.0%	47.5%	0%	0%	0%	13.5%	
% of Total	0%	4.3%	5.1%	0%	0%	0%	13.8%	
Residual	-8.7	14.0	13.6	-6.9	-8.9	-5.4		
Std. Residual	-2.5	4.8	5.8	-2.9	-3.9	-2.3		
Adjusted Residual	-2.0	3.7	5.3	-2.7	-3.1	-2.7		
2008	Count	9	0	21	16	0	0	37
Expected Count	9.9	9.9	5.4	6.9	8.9	5.4	37.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	0%	0%	56.8%	41.2%	0%	0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	0%	0%	52.8%	51.4%	0%	0%	13.5%	
% of Total	2.4%	0%	5.7%	5.6%	0%	0%	13.9%	
Residual	0.3	-9.9	15.6	9.1	-8.9	-5.4		
Std. Residual	0.1	-3.6	4.7	3.6	-3.6	-2.3		
Adjusted Residual	-0.2	-3.8	7.6	4.1	-3.1	-2.7		
2010	Count	6	0	6	3	0	0	40
Expected Count	6.9	6.6	5.4	7.4	7.4	5.8	40.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	87.5%	12.5%	0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	66.0%	9.8%	0%	14.8%	
% of Total	1.5%	0%	1.5%	1.8%	1.8%	0%	14.8%	
Residual	-0.9	6.6	-5.8	3.6	-7.4	-5.8		
Std. Residual	-0.3	2.0	-2.4	1.0	-3.0	-2.4		
Adjusted Residual	-1.1	3.0	-2.2	1.1	-3.1	-2.2		
2012	Count	0	0	0	0	48	0	48
Expected Count	7.4	7.4	8.3	6.9	8.0	4.3	48.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%	0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	0%	44.0%	0%	16.7%	
% of Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	15.7%	0%	16.7%	
Residual	-7.4	-7.4	-8.3	-6.9	35.0	-4.3		
Std. Residual	-2.7	-2.7	-3.0	-2.8	12.4	-1.5		
Adjusted Residual	-2.9	-2.7	-3.0	-2.7	11.9	-2.0		
2010	Count	0	0	0	0	3	48	48
Expected Count	7.8	7.1	8.3	6.9	8.0	8.3	48.0	
% within Response on the Level of Sustainable Economic Opportunity in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Independent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	0%	7.5%	80.0%	100.0%	
% within Response on the Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002-2010) (Dependent Variable)	0%	0%	0%	0%	8.8%	100.0%	16.7%	
% of Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.4%	15.0%	16.4%	
Residual	-7.8	-7.1	-8.3	-6.9	7.7	35.0		
Std. Residual	-2.7	-2.7	-3.0	-2.8	2.6	11.5		
Adjusted Residual	-3.1	-2.7	-3.0	-2.8	2.1	10.8		
Total	Count	47	16	46	21	51	41	221

Table 6:

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	971.315 ^a	30	.000
Likelihood Ratio	782.203	30	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	253.897	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	274		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.40.

The calculated χ^2 value on table 6 above was 971.315 while the critical value at 95% level of significance and 30 df was 43.773. In this case, the calculated χ^2 value of 971.315 is greater than the critical value of 43.773. In accordance with the decision rule, H_0 which states that the level of sustainable economic opportunity has not affected the level of human development in Nigeria is rejected and the H_1 which states that the level of sustainable economic opportunity has affected the level of human development in Nigeria is accepted.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data in tables 1 and 2 indicates that both the level of sustainable economic opportunity and the level of human development were low between 2002 and 2010. From the test of hypothesis, it has been discovered that the low level of sustainable economic opportunity has affected the level of human development in Nigeria. Contrary to the provisions of the theoretical framework, the Nigerian state has not provided the enabling environment required for sustainable economic opportunity such as maintenance of security, peace and order, protection of property rights, functional infrastructure and effective public management. This has impacted negatively on the level of human development in Nigeria. In other words, an improvement in the level of sustainable economic opportunity among others can improve the level of human development in Nigeria.

In view of this, the study recommends for improvement in the quality of Public financial management. This can be achieved through capacity building and constant reform of the public service to enhance service delivery.

Concerted efforts should be made to provide enabling environment by maintaining and enforcing peace, law and order as well as protecting property rights. An improvement in the quality of infrastructure such as electricity, rails and roads and water will provide enabling environment for private business and industries to thrive.

The formulation and implementation of policies and programmes aimed at improving rural economies, accessibility to agricultural land and water as well as rural financial schemes will go a long way in improving the socio-economic well being of the people. This will enable them afford education and healthy life.

REFERENCES

- Alkire, S. (2010) *Human Development; Definitions, Critique and Related Concepts*, UNDP Human Development Reports Research Paper 2010/01 June, 2010 New York.
- FRN (2004) *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy*, Abuja, National Planning Commission.
- FRN (2008) *Second National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (2008 – 2011); the Seven Point Agenda*, Abuja, National Planning Commission.
- Fuendes – Nieva, R. and Ferreira, I. (2010) *The Disconnect between Indicators of Sustainability and Human Development*, UNDP Human Development Research Paper 2010/34, October, 2010, New York.
- Jayadev, A. (2010) *Global Governance and Human Development; Promoting Democratic Accountability and Institutional Experimentation*, UNDP Human Development Research Paper 200/06, June, 2010, New York.
- Jhingari, M.L. (2007) *The Economics of Development and Planning*, 39th Edition, Delhi, Vrinda Publications.
- Kates, R.R. Parris, T.M. and Leiserowitz, A.A. (2005) *What is Sustainable Development? Goals, Indicators, Values and Practice in Environment; Science and Policy for Sustainable Development (8 – 21)* Vol. 47, No. 3 Accessed from <http://www.herdref.org/erw.phb>
- Martinussen, J. (nd). *Introduction to the Concept of Human Development*, International Development Studies, Roskilde University.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2007) *Indices and Governance*, Accessed on November 12, 2008 from www.moibrahimfoundation.org
- Ibrahim Index of African Governance (2009) *2009 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summary*, Accessed on August 8th, 2010 from www.moibrahimfoundation.org
- Ibrahim Index of African Governance, 2002 – 2010 Editions, Accessed from www.moibrahimfoundation.org.
- Neumayer, E. (2010) *Human Development and Sustainability UNDP Human Development Research Paper 2010/05*, June 2010, New York.
- Nixon, J. (2009) *Sustainable Economic Development; Initiatives, Programme and Strategies for Cities and Regions*.
- Todaro, M.P and Smith, S.C. (2009) *Economic Development*, Tenth Edition, London, Addison Wesley.
- UNDP (2010) *Human Development Index and its Components*.
- UNDP *Human Development Index Reports, 2002 – 2010 Editions*
- Wilson, D., Farher, S. and Hanna, K. (2006) *Opportunities for Sustainable Economic Development in the Kaipara Harbour Region (New Zealand)*, Institute of Public Policy, AUT University.