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Abstract

The research addresses the question of which economic factors are important for improving the economic development of Aboriginal/Indigenous Peoples within Australia and which factors hinder their economic development progress, with reference to homo-social reproductive activities and lateral violence. The research examines Aboriginal/Indigenous and non-Indigenous management structures and management practices within organizations and government agencies that develop and implement strategies and policies that impact upon Aboriginal/Indigenous Australians.

The research undertakes a mixed methods research analysis of the levels of investment, or lack of investment, in the five major factors of economic development suggested by Meier (1984), which include land, labour, capital, investment in education and entrepreneurship. In addition to these factors, the research examines Aboriginal/Indigenous social and cultural values and various government policies that impact on Australia’s Indigenous people. More specifically, the study interrogates the levels of funding provided for management, governance and policy and program development and implementation. The research also investigates how an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system is developed within the Aboriginal/Indigenous socio-economic development framework, and how homo-social reproductive activities and Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviours interrelate with the management, governance and policy processes and outcomes within these areas.

Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour and homo-social reproductive activities relate to the employment and/or consultation of Aboriginal people/groups and/or individuals that are of the same and/or lesser ability or knowledge than those managing the organization. The research will therefore explore the role of these types of activity in relation to the consultative processes used to develop strategies and policies impacting on Australia’s Aboriginal/Indigenous Peoples. The research will specifically look at similar research by Kanter (1977), Elliot and Smith (2004), and others who have studied how these managerial practices are used to exclude certain genders and/or racial groups. Finally, the research looked at how these activities are developed and sustained over time, and whether the factors and mechanisms associated with Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour and homo-social reproduction theory operate within the
Aboriginal/Indigenous economic development framework, is the central concern of this research.
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1.1 Introduction

Since the colonization of Australia in 1788, the Aboriginal Peoples of Australia have been subject to the dispossession of their land and resources, and have suffered at the hands of oppressive and controlling practices and policies. Despite the 1967 Commonwealth Referendum to recognize the Aboriginal Peoples in their own country conducted by the Commonwealth of Government, and despite the Affirmative Action and Self-determination paradigm of the 1970s, and many billions of dollars being spend on the socio-economic advancement of Aboriginal Peoples in Australia, the question still remains; ‘Why has the level of Aboriginal socio-economic development of Aboriginal Peoples in Australia remained at such a poor level as it is?’

Therefore, this research aims to shed some light on this question, and why policies and programs continue to underperform. It demonstrates the development of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system that is operating within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework and the impact that homo-social reproduction activities is having on the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples.

To this end, Chapter 1 introduces the research issues and the theoretical propositions upon which the research has been based. The chapter further outlines the way in which the several specific factors and mechanisms of Aboriginal organizations and policy development impact upon the management structures, governance, and policy development areas within the framework of Aboriginal socio-economic development. The structure of Chapter 1 is illustrated in Figure 1.1
The research initially undertaken by Kanter in 1977 investigated why women, African Americans and other minorities struggled to progress into middle and senior management positions within corporate America. The research project applied the factors and mechanisms of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory to investigate the work practices engaged in by persons of authority and/or power with similar characteristics as themselves (similar) within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. These persons of authority included managers, boards of governance and policy-makers were seen to employ practices that excluded dissimilar individuals and/or groups from gaining employment, positions on organization boards of governance and/or committees as well as positions of influence relating to policy development.

Prior to the development of Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction, it could be argued that these systems of management and governance were a result of ‘bureaucratic kinship’ as suggested previously by Moore in 1962. In the case of Australian Aboriginal management, governance and policy development, it could be suggested that these
bureaucratic kinship systems had their origins in the Aboriginal Protectionist Period of Australia’s Aboriginal management, governance and public policy history, which commenced in the 19th Century and have continued to operate and at times thrive during the 20th century and still operate up to the present.

1.2 The research problem

For the past several decades, both Commonwealth and State governments have endeavoured to develop and implement strategies and policies to improve the socio-economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples. However, despite good intentions, outcomes have consistently fallen short of the expectations of both the governments that implemented them and the Aboriginal People whose lives they were meant to improve. These strategies and policies have seen vast amounts of financial assistance spent in the areas of land transfers, education, training and employment as evidenced by the Australian Commonwealth’s Indigenous Expenditure Report of 2014. This expenditure report indicates that 30 billion dollars was spend on Aboriginal programs across Australia during the past financial year. Approximately five billion dollars of this funding was directly allocated to Aboriginal community-based organizations at the micro level, yet Aboriginal unemployment during this period was at 17 percent despite a labour force participation rate of 51 percent and an increase in the level of education attainment (year 12) of 37 percent (Australian Commonwealth’s Indigenous Expenditure Report of 2014).

The underperforming results from the management, governance and policy development and implementation of the $1.0 billion dollars of Aboriginal programs have also been reflected in the New South Wales Auditor-General’s Report (2011). The Report states:

To date the Two Ways Together Plan (the Plan) has not delivered the improvement in overall outcomes for Aboriginal people that were intended. Stronger partnerships between the government and Aboriginal people are only beginning to emerge. The disadvantage still experienced by some of the estimated 160,000 Aboriginal people in NSW is substantial. For example, the unemployment rate for Aboriginal people is at least three times higher than the rate for all NSW residents (New South Wales Auditor-General’s Report 2011, p. 2).

The outcomes of consistently poor policy development and implementation was best described by the New South Wales Ombudsman Report in 2011 which has identified
that over the past decade, valuable resources have been wasted on failed programs that have frustrated Aboriginal leaders. Aboriginal leaders are tired of seeing valuable resources wasted on poorly targeted “off the shelf” programs and a lack of coordinated planning around funding, design and delivery of critical services of government agencies (New South Wales Ombudsman Report, October 2011).

This research considered that the problem involved the question of how an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system developed within the framework of Aboriginal socio-economic development. The research also looked at how this affected the management, governance and policy development structures of Aboriginal organizations and/or agencies tasked with the responsibility of improving the socio-economic development of Australian Aboriginal Peoples. More specifically, the research investigated how these structures are formed and how they then impact upon the culture, leadership, governance, productivity and policy development within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. The research proposed that there was a theoretical basis to the problems relating to homo-social reproduction activities. The research approaches the research problem by means of the following Research Model depicted in Figure 1.2.

In addition to approaching the research in terms of the Research Model identified above, the research problem was investigated in terms of the following two paradigms: Firstly, the Qualitative Paradigm that ‘reality is socially constructed and arises out of a social interaction’ and secondly, the Critical Theory Paradigm that ‘Reality is socially constructed in such a way as to constrain human action’ (McMurray 2011, pp. 1-108).

The researcher argues that an Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship System has developed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework and that homo-social reproduction activities are socially constructed to constrain the behaviour and effectiveness of Aboriginal management, governance and policy development processes, mechanisms and structures in order to preserve the status quo or more specifically, the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system.
Figure 1.2: The development process of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system

Homo-social reproduction activities in this sense relate to the employment and/or consultation processes used by Aboriginal people/groups and/or individuals that are of the same and/or lesser ability or display a similar or lesser knowledge than those employed within the organizations and agencies, in addition to those undertaking the consultation and/or policy development activities within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework (Elliot & Smith 2004).

Specifically, this research explores how these homo-social reproduction activities are developed and sustained through self-interest activities such as the use or misuse of power relationships, networks, intimidation and threats of violence and/or threats of
withdrawing financial assistance for projects and programs. The research specifically investigates how these activities develop, why they develop, and how are they sustained. It then describes the negative results of these activities, and suggests possible strategies for overcoming them.

To fully appreciate the effect of Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and its impact upon the success or failure of Australian Government policies pertaining to the socio-economic development of its Aboriginal People, and therefore the focus of the research problem, the reader needs to gain an understanding of the socio-economic development history of Australia’s Aboriginal People prior to and since the colonization of Australia. The starting point to understanding the problems that have been experienced by Aboriginal people since colonization is to consider the post-colonial definition of economic development. Nineteenth Century anthropologists describe development as a social evolutionary process of transformation from ‘savage’ to a more ‘civilized’ status in terms of Western standards of living. This economic development transformation process requires changes in the social, cultural and political systems under which a community or group operates, to effect a change in the attitudes, motives, values and norms of that community or group (Banerjee & Sinha 2002).

This transformation process, and changes in the social, cultural and political systems of a community or society are necessary to achieve the true purpose of economic development is best described by Mehta (1984). Mehta argues that the purpose of economic development is to provide everyone with ever increasing opportunities for a better life and that this is achieved by an equitable distribution of income and other social recourses to raise the level of employment, education, health, housing and social and cultural wellbeing. Mehta also argues that racial, ethnic and social inequalities must be reduced to hasten development. The factors identified by Mehta are the factors that Aboriginal Peoples in Australia struggle to overcome and/or have control over.

This transformation or change in the socio-economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal People will only occur at the direction and behest of the dominant individuals and/or group(s) that are setting the agenda. This is particularly the case in relation to the policy development, implementation, management and governance processes and practices that influence the use of factors of production such as natural
resources, capital investment, labour and entrepreneurial talent, as referred to by Meier (1984) and Burton (1961). Moore (1965), also argued that socio-economic development and growth rates will be dependent not on social change *per se* but on the attitudes and behaviours of individuals and/or groups of individuals that command authority and influence within the economic development framework.

Since the European colonization of Australia, the success rate of Australian Aboriginal socio-economic policies and programs has been affected by this *Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system* and these factors and mechanisms of control and oppression. Specifically, policies and programs have been characterized by the repetitive and deliberate restrictions on accessing the necessary factors of production, the intervention and control over the social, cultural and political transformation tools from the traditional Aboriginal cultural paradigm, protectionism, affirmative action/self-determination, and most recently, the capacity building paradigms.

The following outline of Australia’s Aboriginal People’s socio-economic history, although not exhaustive, will provide the background and groundwork for understanding the management, governance and policy development problems that Aboriginal People have experienced over the past century. This will also lay the foundation for the justification for the research project and the examination of the relevance of Kanter’s 1977 theory of homo-social reproduction and reproduction activities.

The following brief history demonstrates the Australian Aboriginal People’s exposure to repetitive dispossession, oppressive and controlling management, governance policies and practices. It will also indicate that an *Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system* had developed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, and that the principles and mechanisms of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory were well entrenched. Evidence of it can be found in the management, governance and policy development practices and paradigms that prevailed within the field of Australia’s Aboriginal Affairs portfolio/regime dating back to the Aboriginal Protectionist Era of the late 18th century. This has continued to the present, as depicted in the Aboriginal Management and Policy Development Framework Model outlined in Figure 1.3.
The Pre-Colonization and the Traditional Cultural Paradigm (Pre-1788)

Prior to the European colonization of Australia in 1788, Aboriginal communities and society in general operated within a structure centered on strict social, cultural and political rules and regulations held together by a strong kinship system. These factors that held Australia’s Aboriginal society together were identified by such scholars as Berndt and Berndt (1964), Elkin (1958, 1964, 1969), and Fortes (1969) but it was Beckett (1958, 1965) who highlighted that these strong kinship ties within Aboriginal society of the pre-colonial era began to work against Aboriginal people in the post-colonial era. Beckett (1965, p. 7) notes:

[that after many decades of contact and change, kinship is still the basic idiom which governs behaviour and mobility. Any type of success and monetary accumulation among local individuals is siphoned off through the dynamics of kinship.]

The social, cultural and political structures within Aboriginal communities/society, held
together by strong kinship relationships, would prove to be both a blessing and a burden as Aboriginal people adapted to the ever changing social, cultural and political environment they now found themselves living in. This ever-changing environment would see Australia’s Aboriginal People living on missions or reserves located at the fringes of the rapidly expanding colony.

The Aboriginal Protectionist Era and the Protectionist Paradigm (1850s – 1968)

The effect of the Aboriginal Protectionist Era, can best be described by the Parliament of New South Wales Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly Report on Aborigines (1981, p. 9), which stated:

When their land was expropriated the Aboriginal people had no alternative economic base, nor did society offer them any. Aborigines were neither wanted nor needed as a labour force … this caused the Government of the day to develop a policy of ‘protection’. This policy led to the development of dependency by the Aborigines on the new settlers. Concentrated on reserves… The reserve system quickly became a self-perpetuating one of institutionalization, leading to effects of the personality which included apathy and loss of both initiative and self-sufficiency… The paternalism which so characterized the policies of ‘the Protection Board’ was reinforced by authoritarianism.

As a result of a shift in the governments’ attitude and the enactment of ‘Protectionist’ policies towards Australian Aboriginal Peoples during the late 19th century and 20th century, Aboriginal missions or reserves were established, generally on the fringes of white European settlements. This led to a marked increase in the destruction of Aboriginal traditional culture, a rapid increase in the level of economic dependence on government ‘welfare’ and a marked increase in racial tensions and racial discrimination. The Protectionist policies of the governments and the subsequent destruction of ‘traditional’ economic, social, cultural and political structures of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples resulted in a strengthening of kinship relationships as a mechanism to survive the new environment in which they now found themselves.

The socio-economic and political problems caused by the governments’ Protectionist Policies and the Protectionist era in general were highlighted by Rowley in 1970 and 1971, in his three-volume study on the policies and practices of government during the growth of the Australian economy and the political landscape (Rowley 1970, 1971a, 1971b). Yengoyan (1979, p. 393) interpreted Rowley’s study as follows:
Rowley not only discussed the colonial policies which intensified the destruction of Aboriginal society, but also points out how issues of racism, land rights, wages and unemployment, and relative deprivation characterized the plight of Aborigines…. While Australian policy has varied from complete integration to cultural assimilation to social accommodation to ‘cushioning the dying pillow’ none of these policies have alleviated the current socio-economic conditions of the Aboriginal.

The Protectionist policies, and the Protection era in general, exposed Aboriginal people to a bureaucratic management, governance, policy development and policy implementation system/process that would become the cornerstone of how Aboriginal organizations would be managed and governed and how policies would be developed and implemented for decades to come. This bureaucratic kinship system, as described by Moore (1962), would be strengthened by the already strong Aboriginal kinship framework within Aboriginal communities. The shift in government policies relating to Australia Aboriginal Peoples, coincident with the impending Self-Determination Era of 1970-2000 meant that this bureaucratic kinship system would go on to dominate the way in which Aboriginal organizations were established, managed and governed.


After the 1967 Commonwealth Referendum to recognize Aborigines as citizens in their own country with similar rights to all other persons within the Commonwealth of Australia, the federal government had increased its powers to make laws relating to Aboriginal Peoples, enacting concurrent powers for both Federal and State to make laws in relation to Aboriginal matters. Following the referendum, the change in attitude and therefore policy directions saw a shift away from a system of strict control and repression imposed by the state, the church and the private sectors of the economy. A system of self-management and self-determination was introduced, tempered by indirect bureaucratic controls via the utilization of a myriad of external advisors and/or the creation of hybrid Aboriginal community-based organizations and government agencies involving both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal bureaucrats.

These hybrid community-based organizations and/or representative agencies were generally controlled by white bureaucrats (or ex-bureaucrats) employed at the senior levels of management, governance and policy-making levels of the organizations. The
overall result of these organizational structures was that there was an explosion in the number of Aboriginal organizations at the micro, meso, and macro levels of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework being influenced by bureaucratic practices and a considerable increase in the speed at which the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system began to establish itself.

It could be argued that the control and oppressive methods deployed and administered by the mission managers employed by the church and/or government agency was dressed up and moved into the newly established Aboriginal Affairs Portfolios and community-based organizations. The overall impact of this quasi self-determination and self-management approach to Aboriginal Affairs was a continuation of a covert policy of control to the detriment of ‘real’ progress in Aboriginal socio-economic development.

**Contemporary Aboriginal Environment and the Capacity Building Paradigm (2001-2015)**

Over the past two decades, all forms of governments within Australia have been developing strategies and policies to improve the socio-economic development capacity of Australia’s Aboriginal People in terms of education and skills development. Reasons for the failure to significantly improve the skill levels of Aboriginal People over this time, despite significant investment in the major factors that contribute to economic development, including those identified by Burton (1961) and Meier (1984) such as land, labour, capital, investment in education and entrepreneurship, have not yet been understood. This has resulted in serious questions being asked as to why, despite vast amounts in investment in this area, no significant progress is being made (Meier et al. 1984; Burton et al. 1961).

A major factor for this failure has been the inability of politicians, policy makers, managers and boards of governance to fully understand the theoretical basis of the problem. In addition, they fail to understand how these theories interacts and influence the social, cultural and political values and systems of the Aboriginal community/society, and the self-interest of managers within Aboriginal organizations and government agencies. The impact of these factors has been articulated by Jacobsen, Jones, and Wybrow (2005), Moore (1965) and Mehta (1984), who highlight the strong
The interrelationship between these factors and the socio-economic development of Australian Aboriginal People.

Therefore, the objective of this research is to investigate the relevance and application of Kanter’s (1977) homo-social reproductive theory and its underlying mechanics, principles and practices that are being used by managers and policy makers within the context of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system operating within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. The research project examines the impact of this kinship system and the homo-social reproduction practices on restricting the management, governance and policy goals and expectations of the Aboriginal Peoples of Australia.

1.3 The importance of the problem

The need and importance of why this research project has been undertaken, can best be summed up by the New South Wales Ombudsman in his response to the New South Wales Auditor-General’s Report in 2011, where he identified that:

> Over the past decade, valuable resources have been wasted on failed programs that have frustrated Aboriginal leaders. Aboriginal leaders are tired of seeing valuable resources wasted on poorly targeted “off the shelf” programs and a lack of coordinated planning around funding, design and delivery of critical services of government agencies.” (New South Wales Auditor-General’s Report – Performance Audit: Two Ways together-NSW Aboriginal Affairs Plan 2011, p. 1).

Unfortunately, the financial waste and failure of Aboriginal programs has been consistent over the past century, and consequently, the level of Aboriginal socio-economic development has been consistently poor despite significant levels of funding being allocated by all forms of governments throughout Australia. Therefore, the aim of the research is to investigate whether there is a consistent theoretical basis as to why this is occurring and to recommend possible changes to the way Aboriginal organizations and agencies within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework are managed and governed and how policies and strategies are developed and implemented in a more cost-effective way.
The research problem affects the 548,370 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples of Australia, or approximately 2.5 percent of the Australian population and their organizations and the policies that impact upon them (Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census 2011, pp. 1-3). This research is concerned with how Aboriginal organizations are managed and governed, and how this impacts on the organizations and its members. In addition to this, the research will also investigate how government policies are developed and implemented, and how effective they are in creating a more cost-effective outcome. Finally, the research will investigate the use of homo-social reproduction activities by managers of Aboriginal organizations and government agencies and the impact that these activities have on the organization or agency and the people that they represent.

The research specifically investigates how these management and governance structures are created, by whom, and how they affect Australian Aboriginal People’s socio-economic development. The research investigated how the management of organizations impact on the organizational culture, not only to its detriment but also the detriment of good policy and cost effective program outcomes. Similarly, the research will investigate how policy makers consistently use homo-social reproductive activities in their consultative processes that ultimately result in wastes valuable resources and poorly targeted programs. The research will specifically investigate how management and policy development structures are created with particular reference to organizational culture, leadership, governance, participation/performance and policy development within them, and who is allowed to participate in their creation.

1.4 Research objectives

The research shows how an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system has developed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework and that the problems of homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities are being experienced throughout the management, governance and policy development structures. These activities occur not only at the local (micro) organization level but at both the State (meso) and National (macro) levels of Aboriginal organizations and/or agencies across the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework and severely influence the operation and outcomes of Aboriginal organizations and programs.
The research demonstrates the development and operation of an *Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system* within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, and the effect of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities on Aboriginal management, governance and policy development and implementation structures and processes. The research also shows how these activities impact on Aboriginal organizations and/or agencies and their culture, leadership, governance, participation/performance and policy development.

The research identifies areas of concern in this field of study, with the view of identifying mechanisms to modify the behaviour of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and the homo-social reproduction activities and behaviour of managers and policy makers operating in this manner. These mechanisms may take the form of new management education programs being developed, new forms of leadership, changes to organization cultural practices, new governance regulations, new consultative practices and legislative changes at both the State and Commonwealth levels of government.

### 1.5 Concept of homo-social reproduction activities

The concepts of homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities can be traced back to social exchange theories and network theories of Homans (1961), Tagiuri (1958), and Thibaut and Kelley, (1959) and operationalized by such scholars as Lazerfield and Merton 1954; Coleman 1957; and Laumann (1966), involving the tendency for people of a *similar* nature to interact. More specifically, the concepts of homo-social reproduction theory and of homo-social reproduction activities can be traced back to Moore’s 1962 theory of bureaucratic kinship systems and it is these systems that the research project will endeavour to show (Moore 1962).

The investigation shows how an *Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system* has developed over time. It also shows how this system has taken on the characteristics of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and transformed Aboriginal organizations and agencies that operate within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework into an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. This study demonstrates how the system reproduces itself through the employment and promotion of persons with similar characteristics at the micro, meso and macro levels of the Aboriginal economic
development framework today to the detriment of Aboriginal socio-economic advancement.

The research shows how decision-makers within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system use homo-social reproduction activities and mechanisms to restrict particular types of persons based on gender, race, knowledge and skills, in order to protect their positions of power and influence and to dominate the decision-making processes across the Aboriginal socio-economic framework. The study specifically looked at the research by Kanter, Elliot and Smith, Granovetter, Burt and Dressel and others, who researched practices that excluded gender and racial groups such as women and black Americans from gaining employment within white male dominated businesses and corporations. The research will attempt to prove that these types of practices restrict the overall growth and entrepreneurial capacity of the organizations and confines policy development and implementation to social welfare outcomes.

1.6 Thesis overview

Chapter 1 has identified the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system as the problem that is hindering Aboriginal socio-economic development within Australia. The chapter explained how it is occurring, why it is occurring, where it occurs and the subject of the research. In Chapter 2, Research Issues, a more detailed understanding of the problem is presented by means of a review of literature concerning the relevant theories and previous studies. Chapter 3 provides a discussion of the methodologies adopted for this study, and Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the data. Chapter 5 presents conclusions drawn concerning the relationship between the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and the failure of Australian Aboriginal People to achieve socio-economic success, and make suggestions for remedying this situation. The structure of the thesis is illustrated in Figure 1.4.

Figure 1.4: Thesis Structure
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CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH ISSUES

2.1 Chapter introduction

As outlined in Chapter 1, this study investigates three specific areas that the researcher believes impact on the success or failure of Aboriginal economic development policies and programs specifically aimed at Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, namely:

(i) Management of Aboriginal organizations and agencies or government departments;
(ii) The governance of boards and/or committees; and
(iii) Policy and program development and implementation

The objectives of this research project were to investigate the underlying theoretical system that explains why management, governance, policy development and implementation practices, do not achieve the expected level of success. It seeks to explain why the level of Aboriginal economic development is directly affected by the quality of these three specific factors.

Additionally, the research project investigates the repetitive nature of these underlying theories system and practices, by analysing the effect that homo-social reproductive activities have on the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal people. In particular, the research identifies the specific mechanisms of homo-social reproductive activities that are used to facilitate and maintain systems of management, governance and policy development operating within the economic development sphere of Aboriginal Affairs within Australia.

A more detailed discussion of these objectives, and a review of the relevant literature are presented in this chapter. The structure of Chapter 2 is illustrated in Figure 2.1.
2.2 Background and rationale for the study

For several decades since the 1967 Commonwealth Government’s Referendum regarding the recognition of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, all forms of government, including Commonwealth, State and Local governments within Australia have been developing strategies and policies to improve their economic development. The failure to significantly improve the level of Aboriginal socio-economic development over this period, including those identified by Meier (1984) such as land, labour, capital, investment in education and entrepreneurship has continued to elude governments at all levels. This has occurred even though considerable investment of approximately thirty
billion dollars annually across all Aboriginal government programs, including approximately five billion dollars annually being directly allocated to Aboriginal community-based organizations (Indigenous Expenditure Review 2014).

This failure to significantly improve Aboriginal economic development can be attributed to a failure to invest in transforming changes in the social, cultural and political systems, under which a community or group operates, to change the attitudes, motives, values and norms of that community or group (Banerjee & Sinha 2002). The transformation process and changes in the social, cultural and political systems of a community or society are necessary to achieve the true purpose of economic development as defined by Mehta (1984). Mehta argues that the ultimate purpose of economic development is to provide people with opportunities to have a better life. He goes on to argue that to achieve this requires a more equitable distribution of income and other social resources as would otherwise occurs, to promote justice and the efficient use of resources, to increase the levels of employment, education, health, nutrition, housing and social and cultural well-being. Mehta (1984) goes on to argue that racial, ethnic and social inequalities must also be significantly reduced to achieve social and cultural wellbeing in an effort to maximize the increase in employment, education, health, housing and overall sustainability.

Unfortunately, as the underlying theories of the research project’s research issues/literature review show, this transformation will only yield significant results and ‘real’ progress in Aboriginal economic development, if decision-makers are completely committed to change, as suggested by Moore (1965, p. 82), who states, ‘However, progress depends not on the existence of social change but on the direction which human beings deliberately bring to that change’. The failure of politicians, policy makers, managers and boards of governors/directors to fully understand the underlying basis of the problems of Aboriginal economic development, has resulted in the continual failure of Aboriginal economic development programs to achieve the objectives that have been established and/or expected. The strong interrelationship between the theoretical basis of the economic development policies and programs problems being faced by Aboriginal people, and the socio-cultural values and self-interest of those responsible for developing and managing such policies and programs within Aboriginal organizations and government agencies, has been articulated by
Jacobsen, Jones and Wybrow (2005). These authors emphasize the impact of these factors on the growth and effectiveness of Aboriginal organizations, and associated socio-economic development of Aboriginal Australians.

2.2.1 The macro-level significance of the research problem

This study proposes that there have been significant impacts on Aboriginal economic development in Australia at the macro level of government over the past century. The creation and continued influence and effect of a bureaucratic kinship system has resulted from a consolidation of bureaucracy theory, network theory and social capital theory activities. This system has then strengthened over time, across all levels of the Commonwealth Government’s Aboriginal economic development framework. This has been achieved through the management, governance and policy development and implementation areas of funding and support at the community-based Aboriginal organizations, State-based Aboriginal departments and/or agencies and Commonwealth-based departments/agencies. This research approaches the interrogation of the impact of this system through the lens of homo-social reproduction theory and reproductive activities.

2.2.2 The meso-level significance of the research problem

This research argues that problems concerned with homo-social reproductive activities within the Aboriginal economic development framework, and the bureaucratic kinship system operating at the macro level of the Aboriginal economic development framework, is also found across all the States and Territories throughout Australia. This effect is widespread and its continued influence and effect on Aboriginal economic development is also the result of this system that had been created by a consolidation of bureaucracy theory, network theory and social capital theory and activities operating at the Commonwealth level of the Aboriginal economic development framework. This system has strengthened over time within State government departments and/or agencies assigned to improve the socio-economic development outcomes of Aboriginal Peoples.

This research also investigates the impact of this system at the meso level, through the

Theoretical approach of homo-social reproduction theory and reproductive activities. It shows the significant influence that this system has had/has on state-based Aboriginal Affairs programs and policies at the meso level of government.

2.2.3 The micro-level significance of the research problem

To assess the nature and the impact of the bureaucratic kinship system at the local (or micro) level of the Aboriginal economic development framework, this study argues that the bureaucratic kinship system that operates at both the macro and meso levels of the framework, also operates across the micro or grass-roots level of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. At this level of the framework, its impact is widespread and arguably, this is where it has its greatest impact on Aboriginal economic development.

The research, and the literature review, will show that the effect at this level is also the result of the bureaucratic kinship system’s influence, created by a consolidation of bureaucracy theory, network theory and social capital theory and activities operating at both the macro (Commonwealth) and meso (State) levels of the Aboriginal economic development framework and that the influence and power welded at both these levels filtered down to the local systems of management, governance and policy making. The effects of the bureaucratic kinship system at the local or micro level has also then strengthened over time, thus resulting in considerable negative impacts on the socio-economic development outcomes for Aboriginal Peoples, particularly since the Aboriginal self-determination paradigm of the nineteen seventies.

The interrelationship of these areas of impact of homo-social reproduction on the framework for promoting the socio-economic development of Aboriginal people at all levels of government, is depicted in Figure 2.2. The bureaucratic kinship system is built partly on the Bureaucracy Theory model, developed by Max Weber (1947, p. 328), considered to be the ‘father’ of bureaucracy, who defined it as:

Referring to an organization of administrative hierarchy characterized by loyalty to the office, a highly specialized division of labor, and impersonal relationships based on prestige, power and control.

Figure 2.2: Impacts of homo-social reproduction

This bureaucratic form of power and control of people, resources and other factors including the work environment and political processes was further developed and promoted by such theorists as Bendix (1956), Darrendorf (1959), Braverman (1974), and Wolf and Fligstein (1979). Elliot and Smith (2004, p. 365) explain the bureaucratic model as follows:

Power, defined as “control over resources, people, and things” … is an essential aspect of social stratification… we focus on… power: authority and control over others in the workplace. Weber ([1914] 1968) conceptualized this dimension of power as a form of “legitimate authority” because it derives from organizational positions that people occupy rather than from the people themselves.

Power over people, resources and all other policy factors that impacted upon Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, was strengthened by what Wilfred Moore (1962, pp. 1-292) described as a bureaucratic kinship system which, in the case of Australia’s Aboriginal
Peoples, were developed throughout the Aboriginal Protection Board’s assimilationist era, further built upon during the self-determination era, and continued under the government capacity-building eras during the period 1990 and 2000.

Secondly, this power over people, resources and other factors of policy, management and governance of Aboriginal socio-economic development can be expressed in terms of network theory, as explained by Markovsky and Willer (1988, p. 220):

> As structural theories, network-exchange theories attempt to explain how macro-properties bear upon micro-units within structures. Concretely, they try to show how network structures affect the power of actors to extract valued resources in their exchanges with others.

Finally, such power over people, resources and all other factors impacting on Aboriginal policy, management and governance was further strengthened by the adoption of Social Capital Theory. This theory came to prominence in the 1960s by the following scholars (Homans 1961; Blau 1964; Emerson 1962, 1972; Bienenstock & Bonacich 1992, 1993, 1997; Lovaglia 1994, 1995; Rice 2002; Thye 2000, together with others who argued that social capital or social exchange theory is inexplicably linked to social status and networks, levels of influence, coalition formations and opportunistic behaviour.

Additionally, the power of the actors referred to by network and network theories, include the power exerted by political structure and political actors identified by Pfeffer (1981), who goes on to argue that there are multiple and distinct interests in organizations, each pursuing its own, occasionally parochial objectives. The decisions that result from the interplay of these interests are a result of the more powerful actors and their interests being able to get more of what they want (March 1966). That power and/or political activity or ‘clout’ is used in decision making, primarily where conflict among actors and their interests are concerned and when the issue(s) being decided upon are critical (Pfeffer 1981; Pfeffer & Salancil 1974).

The broad effect of these historical theories that created this bureaucratic kinship system governing the framework of Aboriginal economic development and/or schools of thought, form the evolutionary basis of the parent discipline and the immediate research discipline. The immediate discipline is concerned with assessing the impact and/or the effect of the repetitive nature of this system, described by Peter Shergold, former Head of
the Commonwealth Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation, a major player in the development, implementation and management of policies and programs throughout all levels of government, as follows:

Peter Shergold has lamented how little he achieved for Indigenous Australians, in his two decades as a senior public servant… “I look back on those years as a period of failure, judged against the criteria of equal opportunity and social mobility, human rights and civic responsibility, control and empowerment”… I can think of no failure in public policy that has had such profound consequences… Finally, it is absolutely vital that political risk aversion or administrative caution does not stand in the way of public and social innovation (Karavelas 2013, p. 5).

In spite of this admission of failure, Shergold was one of the first persons to be appointed by the current Commonwealth Coalition Government, to the Indigenous Advisory Council, the new peak advisory body to advise the Commonwealth Government on the proposed ‘new’ policy direction of the government, as reported by Karavelas (2013, p. 5):

Peter Shergold will take one of the five seats on the prime minister’s Indigenous advisory council… Dr. Shergold will use his strong working knowledge of how departments have delivered indigenous programs to overhaul failing systems… Most of the public servants I worked alongside did their best. Yet, after two decades, the scale of relative disadvantage suffered by indigenous Australians remained as intractable as ever. I can think of no failure in public policy that has had such profound consequences.

This admission of failure on Shergold’s part can best be summed up by Noel Pearson, who stated:

Shergold identified three lessons learned in a “demanding and wickedly complex field”.

First, far too many well-meaning government initiatives simply end up compounding the problem of passive welfare and learned helplessness.

Secondly, that government programs designed and regulated to the most exacting of ethical standards, continued to be disconnected from the outcomes that they were meant to deliver.

Thirdly, governments are still not willing to tailor services to local needs or to transfer responsibility and decision-making to the community”. (Pearson 2013, p. 19)

Pearson went on to explain that Shergold’s belated insights angered him because
he zeros in on what can be called passive service delivery where the conventional politicians and Indigenous Affairs bureaucrats would not know what could possibly be wrong with this kind of service delivery. While passive income may be well understood, passive services are not.

Noel Pearson continues, identifying the problems of too much government intervention, as identified by former US senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan in the early 1960s. Moynihan had argued that too much government involvement in service delivery gives rise to a very large industry that ends up becoming self-serving. He also argued that if there had been failure in Australia’s Affairs portfolio during the previous decade, it was during a period when the mainstream bureaucracy, NGO’s and outsourced service delivery providers had been the principal actors.

With the continued outsourcing of Aboriginal socio-economic development policy development, implementation and the reappointment of persons similar to that just mentioned involving Peter Shergold, the question needs to be asked whether the government(s) are destined to repeat their failures of the past. This repetitive nature of policy failures at the macro, meso and micro levels of government, non-government organizations (NGO’s) and private for-profit consulting organizations, forms the basis of the proposed research and the basis of the antecedent theories that underpin the parent discipline within this literature review.

The repetitive nature of the problems associated with improving the socio-economic standing of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples through the development and implementation, management and governance of better Aboriginal policies, was also identified by Martin, in his discussion paper in response to Noel Pearson’s proposals for Aboriginal welfare reform where he states

> The involvement of government in social change would carry its own risks, since despite rhetorical support for Indigenous self-determination, government is inherently incapable of moving beyond its own dominating rationale. (Martin 2001, p. viii).

The research findings and the literature review will therefore investigate the evolution of the bureaucratic kinship system, and how bureaucracy theory, network theory and social capital theory combine to repeatedly underpin the problems that exists within the framework of Aboriginal policy development and implementation, management and
governance practices, within government and non-government agencies, in their attempts to improve the socio-economic standing of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples. This study therefore investigates how the overall impact of this system and its repetitive nature, are continuously and consistently repeated over decades, and whether this theoretical system has an impact on the outcomes of Aboriginal economic development.

The repetitive nature of this system is the focus of the research’s parent discipline, and the mechanisms of homo-social reproductive activities. In addition, the research will investigate the effect of homo-social reproduction and the reproductive activities of the system, on the Aboriginal economic development framework, by examining agencies tasked with developing and implementing policies, management and governance practices at the macro (Commonwealth), meso (State) and micro (local) levels.

2.3 The theoretical basis of the bureaucratic kinship system

This section presents and discusses the bureaucratic kinship system from the point of view of bureaucracy theory, network theory (including paradigms, structures, cooperative, coordinated, collaborative and recent developments), and social capital theory.

2.3.1 The development of the bureaucratic kinship system

It can be argued that there are several underlying theories effecting Australian Aboriginal development, where they act as a system to impact the socio-economic and political order within the sphere of Aboriginal policy development and implementation. The overall outcome is that changes in Aboriginal society and culture emerge as a reaction to and result of social and institutional structures and shifts in organizational power.

Such changes can primarily be attributed to three specific theories that combine to impact upon the attitudes, motives, values and power structures that operate within Aboriginal societies, particularly within.

(i) Aboriginal community-based organizations.
(ii) Government agencies charged with delivering programs to improve the socio-
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economic standing of Aboriginal Peoples; and

(iii) Policy development structures and practitioner groups

As illustrated in Figure 2.3, the three theories that combine in this manner to act as a system that ultimately impacts upon the outcomes of Aboriginal policy development and implementation, management, governance are:

(i) Bureaucracy theory.
(ii) Network theory; and
(iii) Social capital theory

These three theories, acting as one bureaucratic kinship system, strongly influence the outcomes of Aboriginal economic development policies and practices, and form the basis of the parent discipline of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and subsequent homo-social reproductive activities that are repeated over time. The research proposes that these theories form the focus of this study and the immediate discipline of evaluating the effect of this system on the Aboriginal economic development framework of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples.

The theories that formulated the creation of the bureaucratic kinship system and the parent discipline of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory are by no means exhaustive, but provide a greater understanding of the organizational, political and structural problems that have developed over the first one hundred years since Australia’s Federation. The structures established and/or strengthened during this period significantly impacted on the social, political, economic and cultural aspects of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, particularly during this period, seen as the Aboriginal Assimilationist period of Australia’s history with respect to the nation’s first Peoples.
Figure 2.3: Theoretical basis of the bureaucratic kinship system

As illustrated in Figure 2.3, Bureaucratic Theory, Network Theory and Social Capital or Social Network Theory combine to create the bureaucratic kinship system, with the fourth theory of homo-social reproduction identifying the way in which the system is repeated over time. This system and its repetitive nature has, and continues to have, a considerable effect on the outcomes of policies, management and governance structures that form the Australian Aboriginal socio-economic development framework operating at, and collaborating between, the three levels of Aboriginal socio-economic development activities. These levels of the framework include the Commonwealth government sector, the State government sector and the Aboriginal community-based non-government sector.

2.3.2 Theory One: Bureaucracy theory

A discussion of bureaucracy begins by defining the term bureaucracy, particularly in the context of this research. The appropriate definition of bureaucracy, in this case, is provided by Laski (1930, p. 70), who defines bureaucracy as:
A system of government the control of which is so completely in the hands of officials that their power jeopardizes the liberties of ordinary citizens: the characteristics of which include a passion for routine in administration, the sacrifice of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decisions, and a refusal to embark upon experiment: in extreme cases resembling a hereditary caste manipulating the government to its own advantage.

However, Weber (1947, p. 328) defined bureaucracy as:

An organization of administrative hierarchy characterized by loyalty to the office, a highly specialized division of labor, and impersonal relationships based on privilege, power, and control.

Both definitions are relevant to this research since, when combined, they describe the issues of control, power and privilege as well as the mechanisms of how these three elements of bureaucracy work together to establish a system that tends to be highly specialized and segmented, inflexible, rigid, regimented and manipulative.

Weber identified the mechanisms upon which the system of bureaucracy developed in his much recognized theory on social and economic organization, later translated into English by Henderson and Parsons, and discussed by O’Conner (2002, p. 5), who states that:

Weber’s (1947) brilliant paradigmatic studies describe bureaucracy in its purest form, consistently displaying the characteristics of rational legal authority as:

- A continuous organization of official functions with rule boundaries
- Specialization via specified spheres of competence in a division of labor
- A clearly defined organization of offices based on the principle of hierarchy
- Rules which require qualifications and training to understand and administer
- Impersonality by via equality of treatment for all clients of the organization
- Appointment and promotion on the basis of merit and not bias or favour
- Payment on the basis of rank accompanied by pension rights
- Separation of public and private life in terms of interests and finances
- Strict, systematic discipline and control of day-to-day work
- Decisions, acts, and rules formulated and recorded in writing…

According to Weber, this system and structure of bureaucratic organizations was the most rational and most efficient method of controlling the operations and functions of the State/Government. The structures and systems of authority and control outlined by Weber were legitimized by the very laws rules and regulations laid down by the very
State that created them. This bureaucratic form of authority and control of people, resources and other factors including the work environment and political processes was further developed and promoted by such scholars as Bendix (1956), Darrendorf (1959), Braverman (1974), and Wolf and Fligstein (1979).

Weber’s bureaucratic structures, mechanisms and/or methods of operation represented the ‘ideal’ optimally efficient organization were also described as:

‘Iron Cages’ where organizations replace groups of equal individuals by structuring element of work while transforming social action into rational action employing rational calculation, and where bureaucracy turns work into a more predictable and more controllable output (Seeck & Kantola 2009, p. 243).

These ‘iron cages’, modules or departmental structures completely replaced the freedoms of individuals and/or groups of individuals to manage their organizations and work environments in terms of capital, resources and productivity, resulting in a bureaucratic system that was virtually indestructible and controlled by hierarchical decision-makers with legitimate authority (Weber 1978; Barker 1993; Clegg 1990).

Under Weber’s ‘ideal’ model of bureaucracy, these ‘iron cages’ represented a system restricting the freedoms of individual workers and groups of workers, as well as their ability to show initiative and innovation within their working environment. Consequently, Weber’s ‘ideal’ bureaucracy reduced the ability of individual and/or groups of individuals to develop power bases within the workplace.

Prior to Weber’s prescriptions, Taylor, Gant and Frank and Lillian Gilbreth had developed and promoted the Scientific Management Principles, taking the concepts of control and power within the workplace to a different level. In this respect, they saw management within organizations, and bureaucrats in particular as having direct control over the way in which workers performed and completed their daily tasks.

Management under this scenario, selecting the fastest and most efficient workers and placing them in specific work units and using them as benchmarks for other workers or work units to emulate, provided incentive-based salaries to encourage workers to adopt the faster more efficient ‘scientific’ methods. These incentive-based mechanisms, implemented by management within bureaucracies or bureaucratic organizations, were
well described by Edwards (1979, p. 148), as follows:

Bureaucratic control is distinguished from other systems by employing incentives aimed to evoke behaviour that makes bureaucratic control succeed. Such an indirect path intensifies work, by rewarding behaviour relevant to the control system, rather than to the work itself and imposes new behaviour requirements on workers.

Although Weber’s ideal bureaucratic organizational structure faced criticism from such authors as Merton, Selznick, Burns and Stalker, and Gouldner and Blau, many of its characteristics or methods were adopted across a wide spectrum of the industrial, political, social and economic landscapes. Whereas Weber’s ‘iron cages’ of bureaucratic organization controlled the physical movement and methods of work of employees within the workplace or working environment, Weber’s concepts of modularization or departmentalization also allowed management within these environments to develop mechanisms to control the new behaviour requirements of workers.

These new control mechanisms within bureaucratic organizations were aimed at controlling the physiological and psychological aspects of the worker and the working environment. These new workforce/employee control mechanisms were analysed by Bendix (1962), Aucoin (1997), and Blau and Meyer (1971). As Bendix (1962, p. 488) states:

The nature of the relation is contested. Formal structures can be highly consequential but also a façade or empty shell, overwhelmed by informal structure and external resource distributions.

Aucoin, and Blau and Meyer, proposed that:

Organizational structure was not the only factor involved, and that administrative organization could provide a framework in place of an “iron cage” dictating administrative mentality, behaviour, and outcomes. Formal organization charts and procedural manuals provide variable explanatory power, while manipulating formal organization is a more or less precise instrument delivering different results in different contexts (Olsen 2005, p. 8, as cited).

The new frameworks that began to develop amongst the workforce/employee groups within the bureaucracy, or bureaucratic structures, gave rise to new forms of behaviour
and ‘norms’ being established. These new forms of behaviour and the development of ‘norms’ relating to the operating practices of the workforce/employees and administered and enforced by the workforce/employees themselves resulted in bureaucrats becoming a strong and influential status group controlled by the decision-making processes in relation to the administration, political and economic decisions being made within government. Beetham (1984, p. 75) describes this as:

Knowledge protected by secrecy, not only made bureaucracy an effective administrative instrument, but a strong force in promoting its own interests and outlook… Inevitably such an apparatus will exceed its functions to control determinants of policy where the rule of bureaucracy co-exists with the bureaucratic organization.

This view is supported by several scholars who argue that the bureaucratic apparatus and the employees within it tend to ‘look after themselves’ using threats and inducements to achieve mutual benefits for the whole groups (Anderson 2000; Gilbert 1989; Heckscher & Applegate 1994; Heckscher & Donnellon 1994; March & Simon 1958). Weber and Foucault, proposed that the actors or employees become subjected to and/or subjects of the power and discipline of the group as a whole, and take on similar attitudes and behaviour, which dominate the department and/or the organization. The individual members of the module or department are then disciplined, punished and/or rewarded according to the self-protectionist normative rules and regulations that govern the overall group, department and/or the organization as a whole.

Foucault argues that the constant monitoring and evaluation of the individuals, as well as the overall group, module or department, act as a controlling mechanism to ensure that the interests of the group or organization are maintained. This view is shared by Deleuze (1995) and Esmark (2006), who conducted analysis of factory workers, where negotiated salary levels and working conditions were used to create competition and loyalty amongst employees of the organization and to the group as a whole within the organization. As Deetz (1992, p. 37) observed of such situations, ‘Disciplinary power is omnipresent in every perception, every judgment, and every act’ (Deetz 1992, p. 37).

Foucault (1977, p. 3) argues that:

The perfect disciplinary apparatus would be a control system based on a single
observing gaze that would see everything. However, in order to increase its productive function, the gaze has been broken down into smaller elements. This new type of surveillance has also taken into account the activity, promptness, and skills of men. The penalty governs as it compares, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes, and differentiates and hence normalizes.

Foucault considered that such a control mechanism was ‘…a constructive capacity, both enabling and constraining’ (Foucault 1980, p. 1). Crozier takes the self-interest argument of Foucault (1977), Deleuze (1995), Esmark (2006) and others to another level, where the creation of behavioural and disciplinary norms, established by the power groups of employees, within a bureaucratic organization of bureaucracy, is implemented and governed by persons in positions of power. These senior levels include senior managers, team leaders and other professional experts to create a system or regime of bureaucratic ‘elites’. These bureaucratic ‘elites’ wield considerable power over the organization’s resources, decision-making and policy processes, and maintains and enforces a work environment that is constantly monitoring employee behaviour, job performance as well as applying strict penalties or punitive action to keep members of the groups and/or the organization loyal to the self-interests of the groups as a whole.

Crozier’s position regarding the creation of bureaucratic ‘elites’, formulated in 1970, is articulated by other scholars, including Courpasson (2000) and Hales (2002. For example, Courpasson (2000, p. 149) writes:

According to Crozier… elites are ‘milieus of managers gathered by a network of cooperative relationships and a rivalry based on complicity and protection’ (Crozier 1979: 158). In this conception, elites are like communities, grounded on similar stakes of power and of destiny thus characterized by ambivalence between solidarity and competition. In elite groups, individuals face the same kind of threats and the same fragility against the ‘struggle for positions of privilege.

Courpasson also argues that the normative system of behaviour created by groups within the workplace or organization and their performance, is only successful if the whole of the hierarchy is part of the group, which he refers to as ‘flexible corporatism’. In addition, he argues that this group’s complicity is reliant on their ability to control the resources of legitimization that the group can create. The power and control created by these professional ‘elites’ is governed by two specific mechanisms: firstly, the level of autonomy that the group as a whole agrees to or accepts in exchange for increases or
gains in performance of the groups as a whole; and secondly, the solidarity of the group when it comes to revealing mistakes and/or failures in group performance, productivity and/or policy outcomes.

Perrow (1986) and Courpasson (2000) claim that bureaucracy and bureaucratic power are tools to legitimize the control of large numbers of people or particular groups of people by just a few people (bureaucrats). These authors point out that this legitimacy is rarely regulated, this results in nepotism, collusion and power of reputation. Perrow (1986, p. 26) makes the following statement:

Bureaucratic rules aim at reducing the discretionary power that some people have over others. It is also a protection against sanctions or blame. Rules are not good or bad as such; they are often accused of promoting conservatism, but they are simply part of a system: [rules] ‘protect as much as they restrict; coordinate as much as they block; orientate effort as much as they limit; allow diversity as much as they restrict it.

Edwards maintains that these controls take several forms including simple control, structural control, technical control and bureaucratic control. Simple control is the normal control that bosses have over their subordinates, whereas structural control, which includes technical control, refers to the control that bosses have over the physical environment that employees work and operate in. Bureaucratic control refers to the social structures and environment that employees have to work and operate in (Edwards 1979, p. 148). Barker adds that these controls eventually become a communal value system that controls the actions of all employees within the organization and that this communal value system strengthens the iron cage that Weber refers to in his bureaucracy model, through strong peer group pressure and arguments of rationality (Barker 1993, p. 408).

It could be argued that the impact of this bureaucratic behaviour has resulted in what Moore calls Bureaucratic Kinship, since his ‘Bureaucratic Kinship Theory’ describes a communal value system of self-interest and control specific to bureaucrats and bureaucratic organization (Moore 1962).

2.3.3 Theory Two: Network Theory

This bureaucratic kinship ‘system’ that has been impacting on the economic
development framework of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples has been strengthened by the development of networks and the development of Network Theories.

**Definition of Networks:**
The network theory paradigms discussed above share elements of two common definitions of what constitutes a network as expressed first of all by Brass (2004, p. 795), who states that:

> We define a network as a set of nodes and the set of ties representing some relationship, or lack of relationship, between the nodes. We refer to the nodes as actors (individuals, work units, or organizations).

Similarly, Borgatti and Halgin (2011, p.1 169) define a network as:

> A set of actors or nodes along with a set of ties of a specific type (such as friendship) that links them. The ties interconnect through shared end points to form paths that indirectly link nodes that are not directly tied. The patterns of ties in a network yield a particular structure, and nodes occupy positions within this structure.

**Mechanisms of Networks:**
As suggested by the above definitions, networks involve strategic relationships of individuals and/or groups within the organization and external to the organization including how these individuals and/or groups collaborate, how they communicate with each other, and how goods and services are exchanged within the network. The conceptualization of network also involves how work flows between individuals and/or groups, the level of influence that individuals and/or particular groups have throughout the network, and the degree of overlapping individual and/or group positions/memberships such within an organization and/or network structure.

These definitions and mechanisms have been attributed to the formation of networks within both public and private sector organizations, and have led to many different types of network paradigms and theoretical structures being identified and formulated as part of the overall influence of network theories (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011, p. 1168)

**2.3.3.1 Historical development of network theory paradigms**
Historically, there has been a multitude of theoretical statements and schools of thought
regarding the development of networks and network theory, including statements provided by Blau (1964), Blalock and Wilken (1979), Bredemeier (1978), Burgess and Huston (1979), Cook (1987), Ekeh (1974), Emerson (1976), Gergen (1969), Heath (1976), Homans (1974), Thibaut and Kelley (1959) and Tuner (1986). The application of network theories that have involved ethnographic, institutional and historical analyses have been provided by many researchers (Earle & Ericson 1977; Elkin 1953; Emerson 1981; Polanyi 1944; Sahlins 1972). It could be argued that many of these authors/scholars frame their theories around the work of Granovetter’s strength of weak ties theory and Burt’s theory of structural holes (Burt, 1992; Granovetter 1973).

Granovetter’s (1973) strength of weak ties argues that networks develop around two premises: Firstly, that the stronger the ties or relationships are between two people and/or groups, the more likely they will socialize together and this will result in further ties or relationships with mutual third parties that are *homophilous* or similar to themselves and/or the group. Secondly, Granovetter argues that bridging ties or connections that do not directly link a person or group can provide a source of information and/or ideas that are not already circulating within his/her current network.

Burt’s theory of structural holes, by way of contrast, focuses on the development of social capital and the formation of networks and network ties based on individual and/or group egos. Here, the focus is on developing network ties with individuals and/or groups that socialize and develop relationships/ties outside their immediate network. This in turn creates the opportunity for the development of wider networks being formed through the increased development of social capital (Burt 1992, pp. 307-332).

Recent applications of network-exchange theories to inter-organizational relations, backward and forward integration of the firm, community structure, historical development of moderm exchange relations, and exchange processes in antiquity are given by a variety of authors (Hansen 1981; Loukinen 1981; Gilham 1981; Galaskiewicz 1985; Skinner & Guiltinan 1986; Lind 1987; Willer 1987). These statements, reviews and applications relating to network theory, can be classified into five schools of thought: paradigms of self-interest, social exchange and dependency, mutual interest and collective action, cognitive networks and homophily (Katz et. al. 2004).
1. Self-interest network paradigm, is where individuals form strong group relationships in order to maximize the collective goals and desires of the group as a whole, and according to Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992, p. 119) who claim:

Individuals consider the creation of ties as an investment in the accumulation of social resources or “social capital” which according to (Coleman, 1988, 1990; Lin 2001; and Burt, 1992, 1997, 1998, 2001) result in the securing of opportunities and benefits from which they can all profit.

2. Social exchange and dependency network paradigms were promoted by Homans (1950), who argues that individuals and groups formed strong bonds in order to exchange what they considered valuable resources and that the long term survival and or maintenance of these bonds were dependent on the value of the payoffs associated with them.

In the 1970s, Emerson expanded on Homans’ paradigm by looking at the power dependence that existed at the inter-individual and inter-group levels of the network and the abilities of individuals and groups to reduce their dependence on others and to increase the dependence of others on them. This power dependency argument is, according to Katz, the glue that binds individuals and groups together as part of a network of exchange within organizations (Katz et al. 2004, p. 316).

3. Mutual interest and collective action network paradigm argues that a network of individuals or groups are motivated to collaborate together for the benefit of the group as a whole and that the interests of each individual within the group are overridden by the interests of the group as a collective. The network in this paradigm mobilizes and pools their skills and resources to leverage for benefits to be enjoyed by all within the network/group and to the exclusion of those individuals and groups outside the collaborative network group. This particular network paradigm was articulated by Samuelson in 1954 within the realm of Public Goods Theory and later developed by such scholars as Fulk, Flanagan, Kalman and Monge (1996), Monge, Fulk, Flanagan, Kalman and Ryan (1998) and Lessig (2001) and their arguments regarding the collective network collaborative use of intellectual property.

4. Cognitive network paradigms included the theories of trans-active memory
systems and cognitive consistency. Trans-active memory theory of networks builds its theory around the skill sets and expertise of the network group communications system to leverage the skills and expertise of other individuals within the network and/or within other groups with similar or different skills and expertise (Wegner 1987, 1995; Hollingshead 1998; Moreland 1999).

Hollingshead, Fulk and Monge (2002) argue that trans-active memory theory of networks can also, to some extent, explain the theory of public goods and the motivation of individuals and/or groups to establish collaborative networks to increase their collective ability to secure resources and mobilize collective/group action within their workplace. (Hollingshead et al. 2002). Cognitive consistency theory, on the other hand, argues that networks are built and maintained around whom members of the group/network like and is supported by Heider’s balance theory which was further developed by Harary, Norman, and Cartwright in 1965 and later by Holland and Leinhardt in 1975, and best described by Katz et al. (2004, p. 316) who states:

In common parlance, this argument is captured by the aphorism 'we like to be friends with friends of our friends' and the occurrence of tension when our friends are not friends with one another.

5. The homophily paradigm of network theory is focused upon the concept of network formation based on similarity, best described by Katz et al. (2004, p. 316) as:

“Members are more likely to create communication ties, with other group members who they deem to be similar. In colloquial terms, “birds of a feather flock together”.

Brass (1995, p. 5), on the other hand observes, that;

“Similarity is thought to ease communication, increase predictability of behaviour, and foster trust and reciprocity”.

It is this homophily paradigm of network theory and the work of Sherif (1958), Byrne (1971) and Kanter (1977) and others, which will form the basis of the parent discipline of the research to explain in detail how and why this newly created bureaucratic ‘kinship’ system that impacts on the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’ has repeatedly manifested itself. Katz et al. (2004, p. 317) argues that:
A key issue for theories of homophily is determining the criteria used to evaluate similarity. Homophily has been studied on the basis of similarity in age, gender, education, prestige, social class, tenure and occupation… the manner in which individuals categorize themselves influences the extent to which they associate with others who are seen as falling into the same category.

2.3.3.2 Network theory and its impact on government bureaucratic structures

The network theories and associated paradigms identified above have led to the development of several forms of network structures being developed over recent decades, and have impacted significantly on the management and operation of bureaucratic structures within both the private and public sectors. These new network structures include:

1. The ‘New Governance’ Model of network

Hales argues that public sector employees are restricted in the way they make decisions and operate within their working environment, because of strictly defined roles and responsibilities organized in a hierarchical and procedure based structure, which is strictly transmitted and monitored by sets of hierarchical management teams. The organization’s managerial behaviour is guided and circumscribed (or controlled) by various hierarchically structured levels of management and senior management and their associated levels of responsibilities and authority. Such controlling mechanisms occur across all levels of operation and policy development and implementation (Hales, 2002).

These rigid controls lead to criticisms and claims that the ‘normal’ bureaucratic structures restricted and/or impeded the ability of public servants to develop new and creative ways of improving the delivery of public sector programs to the community at large. These criticisms also resulted in new form of bureaucracy, that consisted of networks of collaborative individuals and/or groups of individuals that transformed the bureaucracy from a structure based on discipline to one based more on self-governing network and, subsequently, changing the way power manifested itself across the bureaucracy.
This ‘new governance’ model focused on a new form of social co-ordination, one that steers its network members and the public at large via negation, consensus and co-ordination. According to Jessop, this ‘new governance’ model is ‘…dialogic rather than mono-logic, pluralistic rather than monolithic, heterarchic rather than either hierarchic or anarchic’ (Jessop 2000, pp. 11-32). According to Kickert, these new forms of networks can be defined as, instrumental, interactive or institutional in their perspective on public sector governance (Kickert 1997).

In the instrumental form of governance, the focus is on government steering decision-making processes when regulatory instruments do not work, that this steering process involves incentives, communicative instruments and/or covenants and as Kickert suggests, that it involves a network of government controllers and individuals and or groups of controlees. For example, government departments/agencies within the framework of Australia’s Aboriginal economic development and Aboriginal community-based organization and/or Aboriginal communities, dependent on government assistance. This interpretation of how bureaucratic network operate is supported by Ostrom (1989, p. 68), who argues that ‘steering’ of decision-making behaviour and/or processes by the bureaucracy, is a form of ‘steering centrism’:

State-centric traditional public administration, or bureaucratic administration, assumes that there will and should be a single dominant center of power because the more power is unified and directed from a single center the more responsible and efficient it will become. Democratic administration, by contrast, should not be monopolized by a single structure of authority.

As Kooiman comments, a shift in the way governments or bureaucrats work and operate in terms of a top-down approach to one where the bureaucratic form of network(s) involves a process and/or a system of leaders controlling non-leaders by shifting the way government or bureaucracy operates, through the sharing of tasks and responsibilities via co-regulation, co-steering, co-production and co-guidance (Kooiman 2000). In terms of the interactive form of network governance, the focus shifts from the steering processes of controllers to a process involving government actors collaborating collectively using their positions by strategically adjusting their management, policy development and implementation processes for the mutual benefit of the group/network. Within this network governance structure, mutual dependencies of the individuals or
groups in the government or a particular government portfolio area, act as ‘intermediaries’ to facilitate cooperation between the various participants, such as Aboriginal organizations/communities, to achieve their goals.

Meier, O’Toole and Nicholson-Crotty (2002, p. 4) sum up the effect of networks within the public sector structures by stating:

> Multiple levels of governance have influences on the system; street level personnel, management-level personnel, agency levels; and political overseers all often influence program performance.

Finally, institutional forms of network governance take into account not only the individuals within the network and/or their interactions, but the institution as a whole and the norms, behaviour and authority that set out the rights and responsibilities of the individuals within the network. Within this structure, the focus is on how the group/network is established, changes and/or replaced over time as well as the culture that operates within structure.

Other forms and focus of network(s) influencing the way bureaucrats and bureaucracies have worked and operated, within the bureaucratic kinship system, developed over the past century and now dominates the Australian Aboriginal economic development “framework” has been the Cooperative, Coordinated and Collaborative Network Model(s) (Agranoff 2006; Agranoff & McGuire 2001; Brown & Keast 2003; Innes & Booher 2010; Kamensky & Burlin 2004; Keast 2003, 2011; Keast et al. 2004; Kickert et. al. 1997; Koppenjan & Klijn 2004; Mandell & Keast 2011).

The scholars advocate that successful networks require considerable evaluation of the nature and strength of relationships that exist and/or potentially exist between individuals and group/network members and/or potential network members. In this context, the establishment of the network requires strategic approaches to how the network is established, who will be included in the network and how the network will be managed. This strategic approach will determine the strength of the network’s ability to leverage their skills and their power-base within the organization to bring about change and/or rewards. The strength of the network(s) and its ability to leverage its skills and power will be determined by what Brown and Keast define as the ‘3 Cs’ of
horizontal relationships within networks, namely, cooperative network models, coordinated network models and collaborative network models.

2. **Cooperative network models**

The Cooperative Network and the level of cooperation of actors that operate within them, focuses on the level of cooperation between members of the network. The stronger the level of cooperation between members the greater their ability is to leverage their skills and power-base to bring about changes to work practices and/or rewards. Cooperative networks generally include professional bodies/groups that typically share routine information and may, in terms of the bureaucratic kinship system and the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’. They also include senior executives within the government’s Aboriginal economic development portfolios, managers of community-based organizations and Board members of organizations and government representative bodies (Brown & Keast 2003; Keast et al. 2007).

3. **Coordinated network models**

Coordinated Networks and the degree of coordination are generally established between all organizations and/or government departments involved in the delivery of goods and services to improve efficiency. Within these networks, organizations/departments remain independent but coordinate their activities to deliver their goods and services and according to Provan and Milward, most networks interact in this manner. A good example within the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’ is the strong relationships that have developed between government agencies and Aboriginal community-based organizations and their management and Boards governance to delivery their respective services. Within these networks, the members/actors tend to remain the same over long periods of time, which in turn affects the overall delivery, performance and outcomes (Provan & Milward 1995, 2001).

4. **Collaborative network models**

Collaborative Networks and the degree of collaboration are established when individual organizations realize that the way in which they operate, no longer works. These types of networks are prevalent within the government’s Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’ and form a major focus the new Ochre Policy strategies of the New South Wales government and the Commonwealth government’s “new” Indigenous
Advancement Strategy, which had been developed out of the recognition that past methods of developing and implementing Aboriginal economic development strategies and programs have failed and were identified in the following government reports such as the New South Wales Ombudsman Report, (2011), the New South Wales Auditor-General’s Report, (2011) and the Commonwealth Government’s: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision: 2012 Indigenous Expenditure Report (2012). These reports indicate that the past several decades of collaboration between the Commonwealth and the State Governments in relation to Aboriginal economic development policies and program implementation failed to deliver the desired outcomes of government and the Aboriginal Peoples.

Ines and Booher (2000, p. 7) argue that

[m]embers of the collaborative network know that they are dependent on each other and in order to be effective, they must rely on each other and goes beyond just resource dependence, data needs, common clients or geographic issues but involves a need to make a collective commitment to change.

To achieve the goals of collaborative networks, requires high risk strategies to change the way each independent group(s) think and operate and convince them that to achieve each other’s goals and objectives, requires recognition of their interdependence on each other and their collective need to change the way they all operate. This requires the dominant members of the network, such as government departments within the Aboriginal economic development framework, to persuade less dominant group members, such as community-based Aboriginal organizations, to adopt a common set of goals and objectives that are relevant to the whole network. In this regard, Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001, pp. 179-205) claim that “…synergy is the defining feature of collaboration and is the way collective working gains advantage over single agents”.

Alternatively, according to O’Flynn (2009, p. 115):

Where the parties [in a network] develop a willingness to enhance each other’s capacity for mutual benefit and common purpose, collaboration occurs. Here the parties share risks, responsibilities and rewards; they have high levels of trust, longtime commitments and they share turf.
Keast (2011) takes a different tact and argues that for collaborative network to be successful, the relationships that exist within them must be mobilized, managed and leveraged to secure the collective goals and objectives of the whole network/group.

The foregoing will still not occur, until what Lasker, Weiss and Miller define as the development of synergistic value inherent in collaborative networks is established and that the independent members adopt a new focus of interdependence and installing a new group/network focused on operating as one. (Lasker et. al 2001). Unfortunately, this synergistic relationship development and/or collaborative value development will not occur without managers, policy makers and board members, across the entire Aboriginal economic development framework, having the ability to build and maintain strong relationships across the framework. Managers, policy makers and organizational Board members need to develop the ability to identify and capitalize on the opportunities to change the way individuals and/or groups within the framework operate, but more important, they need to have the ability to ‘take’ all levels of the framework, including the Aboriginal public at large, with them.

Unfortunately, it can be argued that the NSW Ombudsman’s Report (2011), the NSW Auditor-General’s Report (2011) and the Commonwealth Government’s: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision: 2012 Indigenous Expenditure Report (Commonwealth of Australia 2012), clearly shows that the collaborative network has failed. The report indicates that government agencies operating within the Aboriginal economic development framework, has failed to create a whole of portfolio focus and commitment as well as ‘take’ all the members of the network with them.

This failure to ‘take’ all the members of the network operating within the Aboriginal economic development framework, could be attributed to differing attitudes and behaviours of individuals and/or groups within the framework. The need for similar, or the same attitudes and behaviour was identified as a major factor for the success of networks by Eggers and Goldsmith, who claim that ‘[i]t requires attitudes and behaviour not commonly developed a part of the typical public manager’s experiences’ (Eggers & Goldsmith 2004, p. 166). Keast (2011, p. 229) expands this idea by saying that what is required is:
[b]ig picture thinking, flexibility and being able to work in emerging norms, roles and values, skills of engagement such as establishing support and genuine dialogue and the ability to negotiate shared practices and outcomes.

It can be argued that these factors have never existed and/or operated, or operated successfully, within the Aboriginal economic development framework for several decades. This lead to the overall conclusion, as identified in the government’s own reports, that the government collaborations in policy development and program delivery have failed (Eggers & Goldsmith 2004; Keast 2011).

A major factor influencing the establishment and impact of networks operating within the ‘new governance’ model of government and/or bureaucracy is that of the political system within which such networks established them and operate. The political system at the local, regional, State, and Commonwealth levels determines the impact that the various networks have and may determine:

- The type of social, economic and political structure(s) that get established and operate:
- What organizations and/or agencies are created to bring about change:
- Where and how these organizations and/or agencies are situated within the political structure(s) and how much power they wield:
- What incentives and/or inducements are required to establish networks of cooperation, coordination and collaboration between organizations and/or agencies:
- How effective these organizations and/or agencies will be in driving change and or improvements within the local, regional, State and Commonwealth Aboriginal economic development frameworks.

Leftwich (2006, p. 18) best describes the impact that the political system has on networks when he argues that:

The political system is deeply implicated in and influenced by the wider economic, social and cultural systems which are its environment, and from which emerge agents with demands, influences and opposition, as well as support for, and withdrawal from, the system…Policies … may originate in demands, influences and oppositions emerging from the wider society…Alternatively, they may originate in and reflect the interests, intentions and goals of the elite, or policy-makers.
Leftwich also argues that the political system and its influences on the networks that operate within it leads to the creation of *gatekeepers* and *lobbyists* that wield considerable power and influence that ultimately determines the substance and detail of policies and programs. The power and influence of *gatekeepers* and *lobbyists* may ultimately lead to certain individuals and/or groups subverting and/or undermining policy development and program implementation. This, it could be argued, is one of the major reasons why management, policy development and program implementation within the Aboriginal economic development framework have failed in the past several decades despite of good intentions of government(s) and considerable levels of funding.

The impact of political power on collaborative networks is assessed further by the study of Rodriguez, Langeley, Béland and Denis (2007, p. 150) on mandated collaborations, imposed by a third party, such as government mandated collaborations between departments, government agencies and external parties. These external organizations include such organizations as non-government organizations, including Aboriginal community-based organizations and representative bodies.

It is the power, or more specifically the misuse of power within these types of mandated collaborations that have developed over several decades of Aboriginal policy-making, implementation and management of Aboriginal socio-economic development that is the concern of this study. These authors and others also argue that in general, collaborations between inter-organizational parties operate on a voluntary basis and in a ‘clan’ like fashion between the government hierarchy and generally the external non-government organizations (Hardy 2003; Lawrence 1999; Ouchi 1980; Phillips 2000). However, in mandated collaborations ‘clan’ like behaviour is not enough; it is the bureaucratic methods of operation, management and formalized rules and regulations and constant performance monitoring and evaluations involving what Clegg and Hardy describe as the four dimensions of power, that controls the network’s relationships and their success and/or failure within mandated collaborations (Clegg 1989; Hardy 1994).

These dimensions are as follows:
The first dimension, called decision-making power, implies the direct use of power sources such as resources and formal authority by some actor to obtain the compliance of others... The second type of power... is procedural power... to control the decision agenda... The third type of power is symbolic power... and the fourth type of power is systematic power. (Rodriguez et al. 2007, p. 181).

It is these types of mandated collaborations, and power mechanisms that are forced upon Aboriginal communities and/or individuals. It is their misuse, across all levels of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, that creates what Warren Mundine (2014, p. 18), the Chairperson of the Commonwealth Government’s Indigenous Advisory Council, calls a ‘bureaucratic mire’. Hirst (2015, p. 12) describes this situation as ‘existing for the past 40 years and involving an ever changing parade of bureaucrats consulting them and as it turns out, not being able to deliver for them’.

2.3.3.3 Recent development(s) of Network Theory

More recent developments within the spectrum of network theory, collaborative behaviour and bureaucratic power, authority and politics has shifted its focus onto the formation and operation of “Dark Networks”. These networks focus on illicit and/or illegal and corrupt behaviour and includes activities which relies on the position of the individual(s) and the power that he/she may wield within the organization. Corrupt behaviour, is defined by Jávor and Jancsics (2013, p. 2) as:

The abuse or misuse of authority for personal, subunit, or organizational benefit... and includes factors such as hiding and collusion in relation to access to or use of the organizations resources, restricting information and the ability to establish and manipulating organizational rules, values and procedures.

Jávor and Jancsics also claim that the misuse of power and corruption within an organization can become embedded in the structures of the organization and that corruption over time eventually becomes institutionalized. This institutionalized corruption can occur at three different levels within the organization: Firstly, at the top or senior level(s) of management within the organization, it is established and maintained by what Thompson, calls the dominant coalition or senior network of managers, who control the actions and behaviour of other employees within the
organization. The dominant coalition of senior managers within the organization have total control over the essential resources required by the organization to carry out its set function(s) and therefore operate effectively (Thompson 1967). Within the Aboriginal economic framework, these dominant coalition members could/would include senior executives within the various Commonwealth and State Government departments and agencies assigned to develop, implement and manage Aboriginal economic policies including those within the Aboriginal representative bodies and community-based organizations.

The second level of dark network activities is the Middle-Level Mediator Zone. This level or zone of activity is where

[s]pecialists, organizational professionals, expert groups, and middle managers are employed within the organization, and that their source of power is their expertise and that top-ranking actors (the dominant coalition, are dependent on them for their skills and their access to certain kinds of information (Jávor & Jancsics 2013, p. 7).

It is at this level of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, state-based public sector and advisory groups that the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system is at its most prevalent and at the height of its activities and dominance.

According to Steers (1977), this middle-level of the network structure(s), or more specifically the dark network structure(s), serves two functions: firstly, to implement or operationalize the decisions of the senior management or dominant coalition; Secondly, to protect the dominant coalition from possible threats of change to within the system and from any threats from external sources such as, in the case of the Aboriginal framework, Aboriginal pressure groups advocating change, media attacks calling for change and minor political parties calling for changes to the way the system operates (Steers 1977, pp. 7-8).

The relationship between this middle-level of the dark network and the dominant coalition is, according to Feldman in Jávor and Jancsics’ article (2013, p. 8),
Based on trust and has a political as well as a technical aspect. The basis of the middle level’s power derives from its almost exclusive control over the technical system and over organizational boundaries as well as intermediate decisions of the organization… and has its own interests and power that provide considerable potential for maneuvering and making formal and informal bargains.

Within the Aboriginal economic development framework, this middle-level or mediator zone of the bureaucratic kinship system would include middle management within the Commonwealth and State governments as well as middle management within Aboriginal representative bodies and Aboriginal community-based organizations.

The final level of *dark network* activities is the *bottom level* encompassing the lowest level of the organization and is described by Nichols and Armstrong in Jávor and Jancsics’ article (2013, p. 8) as:

Having less room to maneuver discretion because their performance is less abstract and esoteric. Even-though they do have influence and/or control over major decisions or critical resources, their level of influence and control is at the local level where they are able to control and/or effect the outcomes of programs/policies between the organization and external parties… In informal negotiations and deals with outsiders, street-level bureaucrats often neglect formal organizational goals.

It is at the level of the *dark networks* that operate at the bottom-level of the Aboriginal economic development framework, that the greatest potential exists for bureaucrats to neglect formal organizational goals in relation to policies and programs outcomes, by doing deals with *dominant coalitions and middle-level managers* within the community-based organizational level(s) that the bureaucracy funds. Also, it is at these levels that bureaucrats can do deals with private sector organizations that tender for project(s) funded within the Aboriginal economic development framework. Wherever these types of *dark networks* can be established throughout the Aboriginal economic development framework, wherever illicit and/or illegal and corrupt networks are established with particular or selective Aboriginal departments, community-based organizations and private sector corporations, the outcome will be as follows:
It concentrates on meeting the targets and requirements only of strong and influential external stakeholders who have a vested interest in the organization (for example the government or funding bodies). At the same time, less powerful and influential stakeholders – usually the (poorer) citizens and community the organization should serve – get little or even no attention (Diefenbach 2009, p. 896).

The overall effect of dark networks, according to Diefenbach, is that staff, community members and private sector organizations that are not caught up, or a member of the network, over time become disillusioned and cynical of the political, policy development and management processes within the framework itself. This in turn makes it even more difficult to achieve positive changes over time, because the current system has been in existence and operating for several decades and has produced a high output/low commitment public sector and community-based non-government sector.

The effect of dark networks established by senior management, middle management and those employed and operating at the coalface, within the Australian Aboriginal socio-economic development framework is best described by Philip Selznick in O’Toole & Meier (2003, p. 11) as follows:

Agencies and their management must develop support in their setting and that doing so can mean sacrificing the primary agenda of policy and program outcomes, particularly if it involves social change, in the interests of survival… the more the public policies and/or programs are designed to alter the existing order, the greater the threat of the policies and/or programs to those who benefit most from the status quo.

2.3.4 Theory Three: Social Capital Theory

The final contributing theory to the formation and operation of the Aboriginal Bureaucratic kinship system is Social Capital/Network Theory. It can be argued that it is Social Capital/Network Theory that provides the glue that binds the members of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship network(s) together, and the stronger the glue, the stronger the network or dark network behaviour becomes.

The strength of the glue established through social networking and the level of social
capital attained is explained by Granovetter (1973), by his formulation of the strength of weak ties (SWT) theory. Granovetter argues that networks develop around two premises: firstly, the stronger the ties or relationships between two people and/or groups, the more likely they will socialize together and this will result in further ties or relationships with mutual third parties that are *homophilous*, or similar to themselves and/or the group, as indicated in Figure 2.4.

**Figure 2.4: Homophily Ties**

![Homophily Ties Diagram](source)

Source: Developed from Borgatti & Halgin 2011

Within an homophilic environment, A and B have strong ties, and A and C have strong ties, then it is assumed that B and C, who are acquaintances, will have at least a weak tie because of the premise that people who are similar will form ties with people who are also similar in character. Secondly, Granovetter also argues that bridging ties or connections that do not directly link a person or group can provide a source of information and/or ideas that are not already circulating within his/her current network. Within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system, it is these connections that provide many of the ideas within the Aboriginal economic development framework. The problem that exists is that person(s) gathering the ideas do not have the knowledge and/or skills to implement them. These two propositions are depicted in Figure 2.5, which illustrates the connections that are developed through social networking and the development of social capital.
Figure 2.5: Bridging Ties

Source: Borgatti & Halgin 2011

Bridging ties are formed between an individual and/or group and an external party that is not directly linked to that individual and/or group. The advantage of these types of bridging ties is that they can be a source of new information and/or ideas that are generally not already circulating or known by the individual and/or groups. In Figure 2.5, A has a weak (bridging tie) relationship with G who through his/her acquaintances, provide an additional source of information.

Granovetter (1979) also argues that strong organizational networks, through social networking activities can develop strong social capital by forming strong relationships with external individuals and/or groups at the local, State, Federal and global/international levels. This area of social/capital network formation has, and continues to be developed, within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework and is a major cause of why organizational and policy goals are not achieved.

Burt’s (1992) theory of structural holes, on the other hand, focuses on the development of social capital and the formation of networks and network ties based on individual and/or group egos. Here, the focus is on developing network ties with individuals and/or groups that socialize and develop relationships/ties outside their immediate network. This in turn creates the opportunity for the development of wider networks being formed through the increased development of social capital as indicated in Figure 2.6.

Figure 2.6: Ego or social ties

Here, within a closed network, the information B gets from X will most likely be the same information that he would get from Y. However, in the case of A and his/or network, because A has established several network relationships with different external groups and has a greater chance of receiving better and more reliable information that may help A perform better in his/her workplace.

Borgatti and Halgin argue that there are two distinct characteristics of network theory and in particular social network/social capital theory that make networks effective within the organization and across organizations. The first is the structure (or make up) of the network (including the social network and the development and maintenance of social capital) and the position within the organization and or across organizations. Borgatti and Halgin’s argument is a reflection regarding the position of the network, including the social network and the development of social capital. This view is similar to that expressed by Jávor and Jancsics (2013) study relating to the three levels of formation of networks, and/or the types and degree of network activity occurring. Whether these activities occur at the top level of the organization (the dominant coalition), the mid-level of the organization (mediator zone) or the bottom of the organization (the coal face) (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011; Jávor & Janesics 2013).

The second distinct characteristic of networks, including social networks and the
formation and maintenance of social capital, is the flow and distribution of information. Nodes or people and/or groups that are embedded in closed and or excluded networks, including social networks where strong ties exist, tend to receive the same/similar information. On the other hand, nodes or people or groups that operate in open and more socially connected network of similar social/professional groups, will receive better quality and broader information and/or new ideas relevant to their organization and/or workplace, which would otherwise be available.

The extent of these types of social networks and the likely spread of influence that these can have is clearly identified by Burt’s 2004 study relating to structural holes. He identifies the extent of social networks and social capital development at either the local community, regional, federal and corporate levels within and across group specializations. The formation and extent of these social networks and the considerable spread of their influence and/or control can be seen in Figure 2.7.

**Figure 2.7:** Possible connections via social networking.

![Possible connections via social networking](image)

Source: Burt 2004

Burt (2004, p. 339) explains Figure 2.7 thus:
This figure shows a sociogram in which lines indicate where information flows more routinely, or more clearly, between people or groups, which are represented by dots. Solid lines indicate stronger flow. The defining features of the social structure are clusters of dense connection linked by occasional bridge relations between clusters… Whether communities in a geographic region, divisions in a corporation, groups within a profession, or members of a team, people specialize within clusters and integrate via bridges across clusters.

By adding the additional and equally distinctive and vital characteristic of network power and authority, derived through social networking and the subsequent accumulation of powerful levels of social capital, as proposed by Cook and Emerson, one can easily see how networks are located within the three structural levels identified earlier across an organization (Cook & Emerson 1978).

In the case of the Aboriginal economic development framework, it can be influenced and/or controlled to the extent identified by Phelps, Lovering, and Morgan (2003), where powerful networks of actors control the key physical, political, economic, social and technical resources of an organization, industry or government portfolio area of policy responsibility, referred to as institutional and/or organizational capture. The authors explain this phenomenon as ‘institutional capture’ in which the host institution is locked into the strategic imperative of the firm…this example illustrates the importance of understanding the politics of the firm and its networks at different organizational scales.

In conclusion, the change in the bureaucratic and institutional structures that have governed socio-economic development activities since the establishment of the Aboriginal Protection Board and the Aboriginal Welfare Board of the early 1900s has changed considerably since the rigid administrative structure proposed by Weber. These changes saw a dramatic shift towards self-interest, increases in bureaucratic power and influence and the creation of several layers of networks established and maintained throughout the bureaucratic Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. These changes have come about by the practical application of network theories and the formation and strict maintenance of social networks and the development of social capital over the past several decades. The impact that these changes have had on the government bureaucratic institutions at the macro (Commonwealth), meso (State) and local (micro) levels as well as the community-based grassroots non-government
organizations (NGOs) such as Aboriginal organizations and representative bodies has been considerable. The high social and economic costs of these changes to the institutional framework charged with improving the socio-economic status of Aboriginal Peoples has lead both the Commonwealth and State governments undertaking several investigations to determine the reasons for this after several decades of funding numerous policy initiatives and policy programs.

Aboriginal socio-economic conditions for Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples remain poor. Several reports from the New South Wales Auditor General, the New South Wales Ombudsman and the Commonwealth Productivity Commission, continue to state the problems of poor management structure, poor governance, poor policy development mechanisms and poor implementation strategies. At the same time, they continue to fail to understand and identify the underlying deep-rooted theoretical and practical causes of the problems associated with the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, the bureaucratic kinship system, which have developed from the strong self-interest networks and the strong social capital structures that bind them together.

The effect of weak government and non-government institutions such as that identified as operating within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, was well described by Blakely (1994), when he inferred that economic development requires well run and managed institutions and institutional arrangements to be able to design, fund and govern economic development strategies to ensure success. He explained that the success of any economic development strategies is dependent upon the capacity and capabilities of bureaucrats and managers to develop, initiate and implement economic development plans and decisions, and is critically associated with the strength of the institutional framework (Blakely 1994).

This view is also as supported by Woolcock and Narayan (2000, p. 13), who argue that:

In societies (or communities) with good governance and high levels of bridging social capital, there is complementarity between state and society; economic prosperity and social order are likely. But when a society’s social capital inheres mainly in primary social groups disconnected from one another, the more powerful groups dominate the state to the exclusion of other groups. Such societies are characterized by latent conflict.
The basis for the long-term impact of the bureaucratic kinship system on the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, which has formed over the past several decades, forms the theoretical focus of the Parent Research Discipline and the theory of homo-social reproduction, first proposed by Kanter in 1977.

### 2.4 Parent Discipline: Homo-social reproduction theory

The final element of the theoretical basis for exploring Aboriginal socio-economic development policies of successive governments and agencies within Australia is homo-social reproductive theory, which constitutes the parent discipline of this research. Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and homo-social reproductive activities, developed in 1977, explains the factors and mechanisms resulting in the employment of people with similar social background and/or characteristics, and organizational experience. It explains the way in which communication and social capital development between actors, and uncertainty in job evaluations, work together to produce power differences that are created within the workplace environment (Kanter 1977). Homo-social theory explains why the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system is repeated over time, and is therefore responsible for the slow progress in Aboriginal economic development.

#### 2.4.1 Factors and mechanisms of homo-social reproduction theory

According to Dressel, Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproductive activities are actively pursued by or through the following factors and mechanisms used by the dominant group/network within the organization, this is generally the management and/or senior management within the organization. Dressel, Hatfield and Gooley (1993) identify the factors illustrated in Figure 2.8.
Factors of homo-social reproduction are:

1. Similarity of gender, attitude, race, social background and characteristic, and organizational experiences is used by middle and senior management within and across organizational structures to select and/or recruit employees and promote staff within the organization. In applying this process, management effectively ensures that middle and senior management thinks and behaves in a similar manner to them and that the organization over time will maintain and/or protect the status quo in terms of management practices and policy development and implementation.

2. Ease of communication according to Dressel, is a term used by middle and senior management to justify its decisions to employ persons of similarity. This therefore assists them in reproducing their attitudes, values and overall environment of control in terms of management and policy development and implementation within the organization.

3. In terms of social capital, according to Dressel, it is at middle and senior
management levels within an organization that the degrees of social capital come to the fore. Middle and senior managers in their endeavours to surround themselves with similar individuals, and protect themselves within the organization will employ and/or promote those individuals that they consider have the strongest attributes.

The strength of these attributes will have been determined by the degree of social capital that would have been developed between individuals within the organization, wanting to move up the promotional ladder, in addition to those external to the organization who are wanting to gain employment within the organization and middle and senior management, not only through professional interaction but also social interaction.

4. Uncertainty in their positions and/or job evaluation, of middle and senior management encourages the employment of *similars* in an endeavor to establish, reproduce and enforce an organizational culture of protection within the organization. The closer in attitude and values the *similars* are, the less uncertain managers become in their positions and the stronger homo-social reproductive activity becomes within the organization.

5. Loyalty values takes precedence over performance and therefore becomes the norm within the organization, particularly within the management structures, but over time loyalty towards management and the organization takes precedence and the overall performance and effectiveness of the organization declines. One can argue that this aspect of organizational behaviour has been a factor in why the outcomes of Aboriginal socio-economic development has failed to achieve significant results over the past several decades. The research will attempt to show that this loyalty to management/managers and the organization has hampered the progress of Aboriginal socio-economic development.

6. Dressel argues that the more closed the management, organization, networks or bureaucratic kinship system is, the easier it is to keep the *outsider* out of the organization. He also argues that this behaviour also keeps outsiders out of senior decision-making circles/structures within the organization and that it is

easier to develop and implement homo-social reproductive activities and maintain the status quo at the detriment of good management practices and good policy development and implementation.

7. The overall issue for management and the organization as a whole becomes an issues of “human capital” and best practice versus “social capital” and homo-social reproductive activities that will maintain and protect management.

Figure 2.9: Mechanisms of homo-social reproduction

Source: Developed for the Research Project

Mechanisms of homo-social reproduction:

The factors of homo-social reproduction that Dressel argues, underpins Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction, prevail as a result of the mechanisms used by managers within organizations to ensure that the organization’s protective culture is such that it protects their interests include:
1. The policy of dominating the recruitment or selection panels with similars, or persons that hold similar attitudes and values as those held by management within the organization, or in terms of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, safeguards those employed across the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system of organizations and agencies.

2. Ensuring that the selection process is and remains *confidential* and that the process of determining who can apply for positions is predetermined by management. This process ensures that the dominant members of the selection panel are secretly aware of which type of candidates are favoured by management within the organization.

3. Management within the organization predetermines the advertisement and the language that is to be used, as a screening process to determine *similar*; for example, whether the position will only be advertised internally or whether it will be advertised externally or advertised to both audiences. The mechanism most favoured by the majority of organizations and agencies across the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework is, internal advertising of the vacant position.

The language used in the advertising, then assists the dominant group on the selection panel to determine whether an applicant is familiar with the “language” used within the organization and acts as an indicator of whether the candidate is for example currently employed within a public or private sector environment, or, alternatively, whether they are familiar with the culture that operates within the organization.

4. Management also controls where and how to advertise for new employees. That is, whether to restrict the recruitment process to internal applicants only, therefore increasing that prospect of employing *similar* s. In cases where the position is advertised externally, several prequalification or pre-selection questions are included often asking applicants to answer questions that are organizational or portfolio specific and unfamiliar to external candidates. This mechanism ensures that internal and external candidates are differentiated and
that external candidates are placed at a disadvantage from the outset because they are unfamiliar with the culture of the organization and lacking in social capital.

5. Management also ensures that the dominant similars on selection panels impose a requirement of candidate or applicant fit within the organizations and that an element of this requirement of fit is that they have similar values as those within the organization. These values include the adherence to homo-social reproductive activities to protect the system that operates. In the case of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, to ensure that new employees, or the promotion of existing staff, “fit” the similarity criteria of management in an endeavor to protect the values within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. Often this mechanism works to the detriment of good management practices and policy outcomes within the framework.

6. To achieve the objective of employing or promoting similars management will either personally select individuals to be on selection panels and/or direct others such as human resource managers, to select certain types of people to be on the selection panels. This, in their view, will ensure that people with similar values and characteristics will be employed and/or promoted and therefore ensuring the protection of the organization and the status quo.

Alternatively, managers will directly recruit suitably acceptable individuals with similar values and characteristics to take up positions within the management team(s) of the organization and once again protecting the culture and values of the organization and the status quo.

7. The elimination of better candidates by management and/or the organization is facilitated by the dominant similars on the selection panel formulating negative responses to superior skills and qualifications of persons considered dissimilar to those preferred by the dominant group on the panel and therefore the management within the organization.

Finally, a candidate is eliminated simply by having superior qualifications and
experience at the short-listing phase of the selection process owing to a fear amongst the dominant *similar* that the candidate will progress faster up the management structure than they will. Alternatively, the highly qualified external candidate is eliminated through fear that they may expose the failings of the management and/or the organization.

This aspect of the elimination of *better* candidates was identified by a fellow Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) candidate during his symposium presentation. The candidate made the statement that, when applying for jobs, do not put in your application that you have a Master of Business Administration (MBA) or even a DBA, or to be more specific anything above a Certificate IV, because the panel automatically thinks that you are after their job and will not give you an interview. This employment behaviour is again designed to ensure that only people with similar characteristics and values are employed within the organization and the overall protection of the status quo.

8. Another mechanism often used to facilitate homo-social reproductive behaviour within an organization is the rejection of superior candidates based on the argument that their skills and qualifications are too specialized. In terms of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, an example of this type of behaviour experienced by the researcher is, that your qualifications are too specialized for the position and that we are looking for someone with a broader knowledge of the area. Alternatively, ‘that we are looking for someone with more grass-roots knowledge’ or that ‘the organization is looking for a person with more experience in public policy development’.

9. This employment behaviour is designed to ensure that only people with similar characteristics and values as those already employed within the organization are employed and that highly skilled and qualified individuals do not gain access to employment within the organization. Therefore, eliminating the prospect of uncertainty for existing staff and eliminating the prospect of *forced* change in management practices and the pressure to improve performance either on an individual employee basis and/or an organizational performance basis.
10. Another mechanism identified by Dressel and commonly used to implement homo-social reproductive activity in terms of discrediting superior employment candidates, is for the dominant *similar* on the selection panels to band together to discredit the references of superior candidates so that the minority members of the panel feel intimidated into accepting the views and recommendation of the majority panelists.

A good example of this type of behaviour is when external candidates list references that are outside the system and the view taken by the dominant group on the panel is that it does not reflect the skills and experience of the candidate in terms of the environment to that which the position relates. This behaviour in conjunction with other identified mechanisms ensures that the organizational culture and management characteristics continue to operate to the detriment of best management practices and overall organizations performance.

11. The overall impact of the mechanisms identified above is to reinforce to views of the dominant *similar* and their preference to employ persons of similar characteristics and values, which can only be found in candidates that are currently employed within the organization. In terms of the current research and in terms of the Aboriginal socio-economic development frame, can only be found in persons currently employed and/or trained within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system.

12. Another mechanism identified by Dressel, and used by the dominant *similar* on selection panels, is providing strong support for the candidate that has been predetermined by management within the organization as the preferred candidate to be given the position. With the dominant *similar* making up the majority on the selection panel, minority members tend to feel compelled to support the views expressed by the dominant group who are generally employed within the organization or within the portfolio area relevant to the position.

The effect of this compulsion to support the dominant group’s recommendation, once again ensures that only persons with similar characteristics and values as those that already dominate the organization are employed. The overall effect is
the homo-social reproduction of the characteristics and values of the management and the organization to the detriment of good or best management practices and performance of the staff and organization.

The research project will endeavor to show that the network and social capital aspects of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system that has developed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework also applies this mechanism of homo-social reproductive activity to maintain the “system”.

12. To ensure that management’s predetermined candidate is selected, the dominant similars on the selection panel will strongly dismiss any negative comments directed at their preferred candidate by the minority members of the panel. This has the effect of intimidating the minority members of the panel and places pressure on them to accept the views of the dominant majority. Once again this ensures that management’s predetermined candidate, with similar characteristics and values as those held by the management and the organization are maintained.

13. The overall impact of the behaviour of the dominant similar on the selection panel is that the minority members of the panel are treated with less respect and their comments and opinions are given less weight to any decision-making processes that the panel applies. The minority members of the panel begin to feel that they are just there to make up the numbers and “rubber stamp” the decisions of the dominant similars. This may be the case even though the minority members of the panel may come from other sections of the organization, or in the case of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, come from other areas of the Aboriginal portfolio.

The overall impact of this behaviour is that minority members of the panel are, or feel, reluctant to question the views of the majority even though there are better candidates for the position that could bring about medium to long term increases in management and organizational performance as well as improvements in the socio-economic development of Aboriginal Peoples across the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework.
14. The overall impact of these homo-social reproductive mechanisms and activities is, that the ideology of the dominant *similar* within the panel and within the management and the organization is not only maintained but strengthened over time. That as more and more persons of similar characteristics and values increase their presence across all structural levels of the organization and in the case of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, across all levels of the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio are employed, the system is maintained.

The effectiveness of the use of these factors and mechanisms of homo-social reproduction are borne out in Stafsudd’s 2006 study of 507 senior executives employed within the largest Swedish corporations. Stafsudd’s study shows that the senior executives within the Swedish corporation were reasonably homogenous, but this homo-social reproductive behaviour or homogeneity also developed at several structural levels within the same management group.

The study also argues that this type of behaviour is influenced by the characteristics and values of supervisors, top management team members and the organization in general. The study also argues that the homo-social reproductive activities and behaviour is at a more interpersonal level and suggests that this is brought about by individuals forming strong networks and developing high levels of social capital not only within the top management team but across the organization.

The results of Stafsudd’s study supports Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction but also supports and/or confirms similar work such as Vroom’s 1964 expectancy theory of recruiting members similar those within the top management team within the organization. The results also support Byrne’s 1971 similarity-attraction theory and Schneider’s 1987 attraction-selection-attrition theory that argues that people are recruited and/or dismissed according to perspectives of interpersonal behaviour.

Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory which is based on the *similarity of actors* is also supported by Brass and Labianca (1999, p. 13), who have added gender, culture, jobs selection, socialization processes, as well as reward and/or punishment systems as characteristics of similarity. They argue that the process involved in homo-social
reproductive activities, and therefore homo-social reproductive theory, is best described as a rational concept that is:

Influenced by the degree to which an individual is similar to other individuals relative to how similar he or she is with everyone else. Due to culture, selection and socialization processes, and reward systems, an organization may exhibit a model demographic or personality pattern… Thus an individual’s similarity … may determine the extent to which he or she is central or integrated in the interpersonal network and the extent to which he or she acquire social capital or benefits from the organization.

Erickson provides an additional characteristic within the workplace that can also be attributed to homo-social reproductive activities and the theory of homo-social reproduction, which is similarity in attitude which is developed primarily through social interaction with similar others (Erickson, 1988). Brass and Labianca (1999, p. 15) also support Erickson’s argument relating to attitude as a characteristic of homo-social reproductive activity by proposing that attitude similarity formation is a part of the cohesion approach of social networking and social capital accumulation within similar groups/individuals within the workplace and is a direct function of proximity:

The cohesion approach suggests that attitude similarity is a function of proximity. Directly linked individuals will likely have more similar attitudes that indirectly linked individuals. The underlying process is social influence, the more frequency and emphatic the communication between the two actors, the greater the likelihood of each adopting the attitudes or values of the other.

Brass and Labianca (1999, p. 16) also argue the existence of an alternative approach to the cohesion argument, one of structural equivalence, where individuals adopt similar attitudes to those that occupy similar positions within the workplace and/or network;

Structural equivalence suggests that individuals compare themselves with, and adopt similar attitudes and behavior of, those others who occupy equivalent positions in the network…Thus manager’s attitudes and values are typically more similar to other managers than to the attitudes and values of subordinates.

The increase in homo-social reproduction activity as described above, leads to a structuralization of attitudes and behaviour within the network and/or workplace particularly at the management and senior management levels as suggested by Coleman

(1990, pp. 307-332). This in turn gave rise to ever increasing power differences within the network and/or workplace were managers or actors who could command or control vital resources increased the dependence of others on them. It is suggested by Brass that organizational power brought about by homo-social reproductive activities is a function of two measures of centrality, closeness (or access) and control over resources and that both measures have been shown to contribute to reputational power and promotion within organizations (Brass 1984).

Brass (1985, p. 329) also found that:

Links beyond the workgroup and workflow requirements…were related to influence. In particular, closeness to the dominant coalition in the organization was strongly related to power and promotions. The dominant coalition was identified as a clique analysis of the interaction patterns of the top executives…social capital of information may depend on whom an actor has relationships with.

Pfeffer (1989), and Ferris and Judge (1991) argue that the levels of power and influence gained through the development of social capital and homo-social reproductive activities within the network and/or workplace spilled over into the area of recruitment of staff within the organization. Pfeffer, Ferris and Judge also argue that credentials and hiring standards within organizations are often the result of political contests within organizations. Those that are in power seek to perpetuate their power and further build coalitions and alliances by setting criteria and selection applications most like themselves (Pfeffer 1989; Ferris & Judge 1991).

Burt and Ronchi’s (1989, p. 25) analysis of the social networks, social capital and homo-social reproductive activities of managers can provide a good example of how these types of influences, power and activities once introduced into the fabric of an organization and its management structure(s) can result in losing control of the organization:

Analysis of the social connections shows how a manager had virtually taken control of the company years earlier by hiring family, friends, and friends of friends, almost exclusively from a particular geographical location.
2.4.2 Current Status of the parent discipline within the Aboriginal economic development “framework”

The current available research in this area, almost entirely relate to the use of homo-social reproductive activities by senior managers within businesses and corporations to exclude persons of gender and race, particularly women and black Americans. The proposition that homo-social reproductive theory and homo-social reproductive activities are restricted to companies and organizations controlled by white middle class and white upper class males for reasons such as familiarity, comfortableness and trust is refuted by Smith and Elliott’s 2002 study. Their study builds on Kanter’s homo-social reproductive concepts by introducing the concept of co-ethnic reproduction. Smith and Elliott argue that top management teams within the decision-making process, of any racial and/or ethnic background endeavor to employ and/or promote person of similar characteristic, values including those of the similar racial and/or ethnic background.

The principle of co-ethnic reproduction introduced by Smith and Elliott’s 2002 study becomes relevant in explaining the development, over time, of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and its transition from being dominated entirely by white Anglo-Saxon bureaucrats during the Aboriginal Protection Board era, followed by a co-ethnic hybrid top management team system since the 1970’s. This principle has manifested itself in the present era as recent policies and programs are being designed to increase the level of Aboriginal people employed at the middle and senior management levels.

Elliott and Smith’s 2004 research relating to race, gender and workplace power, reinforced their argument of co-ethnic reproduction. Elliott and Smith examined previous research relating to Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities arguing that the research undertaken by the researchers provided no empirical evidence to show that homo-social reproduction activities undertaken were exclusive to organizations dominated by white top management teams. They argue that this type of behaviour occur across different types of groups and within different organizational contexts.

This, in the context of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and the Aboriginal socio-economic develop framework, the management, governance and policy

Development decision-making structures and processes changed over time to include Aboriginal “elites” that rose through the system only to apply the same homo-social reproductive mechanisms to control organizations. Blackmore and Barty’s 2004 paper reinforces how the factors and mechanisms of homo-social reproduction and homo-social reproductive activities of selection panels are used to select those candidates preferred by senior management. In their paper, they argue that selection processes are deliberately made too complex and intrusive to the point where they become a disincentive for people to lodge an application. Additionally, internal candidates are much higher rated compared to ‘outside’ applicants and that the culture of the organization strongly supports the selection of internal similars because they are thought to be more trustworthy and support the existing culture of the organization and that of management.

In 2006, Stafsudd’s study of homo-social reproductive theory and homo-social reproductive activity within the major corporations of Sweden, showed that this type of behaviour and activity not only occurred within the top management structures but across the organizations themselves and tended to be even more structured according to even stronger and more specific characteristics and values such as nationality, age and tenure.

Stafsudd’s research also showed that Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproductive activities within organizations is also supported by several other theories including Byrne’s 1971 selection-attraction theory, Schneider’s 1987 attraction-selection-attrition theory, Schneider and Weigold’s 1989 self-categorization theory and Vroom’s 1964 expectancy theory.

Seeck and Kantola’s (2009, p. 252) research discussion the notion of “governmentality” and the “dark side” of bureaucratic control brought about homo-social reproductive systems and behaviour. They argue that the actors that dominate the organizations’ use both the systems’ structures and techniques that ensure that the characteristics and values of the dominant similars and the organization remain. Seeck and Kantola discuss both the system of governance and the techniques used to control persons within the organization:
We try to include in the analysis both the system and techniques of governance and the governed subjects. Focusing on the links between them: how are the links between the system and subjects produced, and with what consequences.

Lindgren and Forsberg’s 2010 conference paper on regional policy and homo-social structures and Karlsson’s 2012 paper on regional policy, social networks and informal structures looked at how Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities occur across structures and how they can influence the development and implementation of regional economic development.

Karlsson for example argues that national and regional economic development is dependent on the interaction of government structures, corporations or organizations and influential individuals and their ability to impose constraints or facilitate activities relating to innovation, entrepreneurship and investment that are considered essential for national and regional economic development. He argues that the reason for this is that the institutional frameworks can

- Reduce transformation and production coast;
- Increase trust among economic and social actors;
- Improve entrepreneurial capacity;
- Increase learning and relational mechanisms; and
- Reinforce networks and cooperation among actors

(Karlsson 2012, pp. 1-17).

The impact of the institutional framework referred to by Karlsson can support the view of the researcher in relation to the institutional impact being experienced by the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework by the institutional structures that operate within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. There has been no research, known to the researcher, undertaken in this area whereby Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and homo-social reproductive activities have been studies to explain the theoretical basis of why Aboriginal economic development via management, governance and public policies has continued to fail in their endeavors to improve Aboriginal economic development in Australia.
There have been several research studies undertaken by both state and commonwealth agencies into the cost effectiveness of government programs and the causes of mismanagement of Aboriginal organizations, which have identified that management, governance and policy development and implementation have been a consistent problem in terms of improving the socio-economic outcomes of Government programs. Unfortunately, these studies have failed to look deeper into why these programs/policies and strategies continue to fail and to determine whether there is long-term theoretical basis to the overall problem.

Therefore, even though Kanter’s 1977 homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproduction activities interact with bureaucratic theory, network theory, social networks/social capital theories combine as a source of influence and power within an organization. This influence and power which is applied by “white” top management teams within the workplace is based on similarities of gender, race, backgrounds, skills education. The principles and mechanics of how this theory and related theories are implemented are relevant to how the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system is established and operates.

The findings of this research will show how the application of several theories and homo-social reproductive activities by dominant groups employed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework creates an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. The research will also show how organizations engage with similar others and excludes dissimilar others from participating in the management, governance and policy development and implementation processes operating within this system. Furthermore, the research will show that Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social-reproduction activities are the cause of the reproduction of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system, and its subsequent outcomes, are a legacy of the colonization of Australia. This was legacy that was developed a century ago and was implemented across the Aboriginal socio-economic development “framework”. This Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship “system” continues to have a significant impact within Aboriginal community-based organizations and government agencies throughout the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework through their organizational culture, power relationships and management and consultative practices. These factors combine with the mechanisms and practices of homo-social reproduction to shape the
organizations to the detriment of certain groups and the overall economic progress of Aboriginal Peoples.

The gap in the parent discipline that this research will provide

The gap in the research is that there is no known recognition of the bureaucratic kinship system and Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and its mechanisms and practices to explain the outcomes of economic development failures within the Aboriginal economic development framework. Also, there is no known recognition or acceptance of how this system has been constantly repeated over the past century and how this system has excluded individuals and/or groups from participating in the management, governance and policy development and implementation processes within the Aboriginal economic development framework. That this exclusion is on the basis of similarity and/or dissimilarity to the dominant actors within the framework.

The research therefore aims to investigate whether the theory of homo-social reproduction of the bureaucratic kinship system is applicable to Aboriginal economic development and whether its mechanisms are implemented throughout the Aboriginal economic development framework. Whether, these mechanisms operate across the macro, meso and micro levels of the framework, within the community-based organizations, State departments/agencies and/or Commonwealth departments/agencies to the detriment of Aboriginal economic development outcomes.

Current literature on the topics associated with the failures of Aboriginal socio-economic development public policy and development, clearly indicate that there are several problem areas including the management, governance and policy development and implementation of projects and programs within the Aboriginal economic development framework but they fail to identify the underlying, and theoretical, cause of the problems. The failing of Australian Aboriginal socio-economic development public policy will be further elaborated on within the researcher’s discussion of the immediate discipline area of the research.

2.4.3 General developments in implementing the parent discipline

The aim of the research is to examine the application of the homo-social reproductive nature of the bureaucratic system that has developed within the Aboriginal economic
development framework to the problems of Australia’s Aboriginal economic development policies and program failures. In response to the lack of research on the applicability of Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory and lateral violence within Indigenous organizations, the aim of this research project is to test the factors and mechanisms of the theories and their application to the problem(s) of why Australia’s Aboriginal People’s economic development continues to be so slow.

2.5 The immediate discipline

The immediate discipline of the current research is employed to explain what has been the effect of the homo-social reproduction and associated reproductive activities of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system on the Aboriginal economic development framework. Therefore the question is: what has been the effect of the reproduction of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system on the behaviour and performance of managers, organization directors and policy-makers working in the field of Aboriginal socio-economic development over the past one hundred years and more specifically overs the past several decades?

The effect on Aboriginal socio-economic development from the continued reproduction of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system has been identified by several observers of Aboriginal development and in several Commonwealth and State government reports on the effectiveness of past and current policy settings. Sutton (2001, p. 125) argues that the long-term trends of Aboriginal disadvantage has reached a critical stage and that there is no longer time for a continued attitude of complacency, and that the rhetoric of empowerment and self-determination policies and programs, particularly since the 1970s, has been a disastrous failure:

The trend of what is called ‘Indigenous disadvantage’ in Australia does not show enough signs of improvement in critical areas to allow for any further complacency…The contrast between progressivist public rhetoric about empowerment and self-determination and the raw evidence of a disastrous failure in major aspects of Australian Aboriginal affairs policy since the early 1970s is now frightening.

Sutton also argues that this failure is not exclusively the result of the Commonwealth and State bureaucrats but also the fault of the Aboriginal community-based non-government organizations that grew out of the 1970 Whitlam government era of shifting
power and decision-making processes into the hands of Aboriginal Peoples via policies of empowerment and self-determination. As Sutton (2001, p. 129) explains:

Unfortunately, the goodwill of the mandarins of policy in the 1970’s was not always matched by their knowledge of the local facts of Aboriginal societies… As the late Francis Yunkaporta of Aurukun once put it, officials visiting remote communities tend to be *tippin’ elbow* (i.e. looking at their watches) as the afternoon of their brief transit in the tropics wears on. A shift over recent decades from non-Indigenous to an increasingly Indigenous officialdom has not necessarily altered these patterns dramatically. Bureaucracy is bureaucracy in anybody’s language.

Martin, on the other hand, argues that much of the failure to achieve significant progress in Aboriginal socio-economic development is due to how politicians, bureaucrats and policy makers conduct the debate with such a vitriolic and unnecessary demonization of Aboriginal people. They avoid any meaningful consideration of the knowledge, values, views and practices of Aboriginal Peoples when developing and implementing policies and programs. This occurs even in regard to the move away from empowerment and self-determination policies to those of capacity building and the use of more economic market-based policy frameworks since the 2000s. Policy and program objectives of improving the socio-economic outcomes for Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples has failed, even though incentive-based programs and a carrot and stick approach has been applied.

Although Martin concedes that market-based policies and programs have a considerable role to play in improving the socio-economic development prospects of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, it should not be the only mechanism used when developing Aboriginal socio-economic development policies, programs and strategies. Martin (2006) goes on to argue that not only do Aboriginal People need to change but bureaucracies also need to change.

### 2.5.1 The current status of the immediate discipline

The effect of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and homo-social reproductive activities on the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework has been identified in recent times by several Commonwealth and State government reviews and reports on the effectiveness of Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and programs. For example, the Commonwealth Government’s Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations in their 2010 analysis of Aboriginal/Indigenous community-based
organizations, found that the major problems associated with their failure had been poor management and/or poor governance by their respective Boards of Directors. The result of these failures in management and governance has been the inevitable failure to develop suitably appropriate community-based policies, but also failure to deliver government policies and much needed projects and/or programs to improve the socio-economic development of Aboriginal people. The Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations in analyzing the key characteristics of why Aboriginal community-based organizations have failed because ‘... their directors and staff have failed in the performance of their duties… or by management exercising poor control of the corporation's operations (Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations 2010, p. 70).

The Australian Government’s Strategic Review of Indigenous Expenditure in 2010 identified similar problems associated with the policy development, policy implementation and the management and governance of Aboriginal community-based and Aboriginal representative agencies. The government’s review found that:

> [past approaches to remedying Indigenous disadvantage have clearly failed and new approaches are needed…The key challenge from this point lies not so much in further policy development as in effective implementation and delivery…The Commonwealth’s total expenditure…amounts to $3.5 billion annually…maintained over many years, has yielded dismally poor returns to date (Strategic Review of Indigenous Expenditure 2010, p. 11).

The review, even though this statement indicates that not much more needs to be achieved in policy development, goes on to indicate that highly centralized decision-making through government bureaucracies or bureaucrats are an inhibitor to addressing and/or identifying issues relating to Indigenous/Aboriginal socio-economic development, and were reluctant to devolve decision-making processes and/or authority in relation to funding of Aboriginal programs. The review argued that:

> Some agencies were very supportive… and already have a devolving operative environment. Other agencies though were more cautious about devolving funding decisions to local and regional or even State or Territory office staff… (Strategic Review of Indigenous Expenditure 2010, p. 309).

The New South Wales Ombudsman’s 2011 review of Aboriginal expenditure in relation to policies, projects and programs for the advancement of Aboriginal Peoples socio-economic development over the past several decades, indicate that the failures relating to those policies and programs go further than that suggested by the Commonwealth governments’ Office of Registrar of Indigenous Corporations. The Ombudsman’s report does not confine the problems to the management and governance of community-based organizations but states that they are also attributable to State and Commonwealth government bureaucracies, as follows:

*The Strategic Review of Indigenous Expenditure* found that in relation to addressing Aboriginal disadvantage, substantial government investments have “yielded dismally poor returns to date” and that in order to reverse this, “the need is not so much for higher levels of spending as to use existing resources…far more effectively…” Too often, programs are inadequately designed, poorly targeted and their effectiveness not evaluated…In order for current resources to be more effectively utilized, there needs to be a different approach to the way that governments plan, fund and deliver services (NSW Ombudsman Report 2011, p. 5).

The New South Wales Ombudsman’s report goes on to argue that for any significant improvements to occur in the socio-economic development of Aboriginal Peoples, policy development and program implementation must be shared by government departments/bureaucracies and Aboriginal Peoples themselves, as follows:

The history of Aboriginal policy and program development in NSW has been agency-centric. This has resulted in programs being narrowly focused, often disjointed and lacking in flexibility. To make the changes necessary, it is essential that Aboriginal affairs be seen as core business for all agencies. This change needs to be driven from the centre of government (NSW Ombudsman Report 2011, p. 4).

The New South Wales Auditor-General’s (2011) report on expenditure on Aboriginal policies projects and programs also support the views expressed by the Office of the Registrar for Indigenous Corporations and the New South Wales Ombudsman’s Report in their review of the New South Wales Two Ways Together Plan. The Auditor-General’s Report (2011, p. 4) argues that:
[The Plan] has not delivered the improvement in overall outcomes for Aboriginal people that was intended... The Plan has raised public awareness of the need to address Aboriginal disadvantage. It has also provided an opportunity for government agencies to work together at a regional level to deliver funded services better... agencies need to be more publicly accountable.

2.5.2 The gap in the literature

The gap in the research area shows that there is very little or no recognition of Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and homo-social reproductive activities to explain why Australian Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and programs continue to fail. The research therefore aims to investigate whether the Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction is applicable to Aboriginal organizations and or policy development and what the impact is on Aboriginal economic development.

2.6 The research domain

The research and the literature review has concentrated on the formation and development of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship “system” that has established itself within the Aboriginal economic development “framework”. In addition to this, the research will investigate the application of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and homo-social reproductive mechanisms used by the Aboriginal bureaucratic “system” to restrict the socio-economic development outcomes of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples. The research and the literature review also looked at the use and the effect of this Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship “system” across the macro, meso and micro levels of the Aboriginal economic development “framework” and its impact on the level of Aboriginal socio-economic policy and program success.

Finally, the research and the literature review has investigated current problems within the Aboriginal economic development “framework” to determine whether the underlying theoretical cause of these problems have been the result of the creation of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system that has been consistently repeated over several decades from the use of mechanisms associated with Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory as indicated by the current literature identified as relevant to the research problem.
2.6.1 The research problem

The research is concerned with the question of what economic factors are important for the economic development of Aboriginal Peoples within Australia, and what theoretical factors hinder their economic development. Particular reference is made to homo-social reproductive activities and the formation of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. The research will look at the areas of Aboriginal management, governance and policy development structures and management practices within organizations and government agencies intended to develop and implement strategies and policies that impact upon Aboriginal Australians and how these structures and practices are influenced by Kanters’s homo-social reproductive theory.

2.6.2 The research objective

The research objective therefore is to test whether an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system operates within the Aboriginal framework and whether the factors and mechanisms of Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory impact on Australia’s Aboriginal socio-economic development. The research examines the practices of managers, boards of governance and policy-makers within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework in terms of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system.

2.6.3 The research question

For the past several decades, both State and Commonwealth governments have endeavored to develop and implement strategies and policies to improve the economic development of Australia’s Indigenous people only to consistently fail. The strategies and policies have seen vast amounts of financial assistance, land transfers and investment in education and training.

The research question therefore is: What is the theoretical basis of Aboriginal economic development failures and the impact of homo-social reproductive activities on the management, governance and policy development processes within Australia’s Aboriginal economic development framework?

The research aim is to examine how an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system has
developed within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. Additionally, the aim is to define how homo-social reproduction activities are developed and sustained through self-interest activities such as the use or misuse of power relationships, across the management, governance and policy development structures of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. The research will explore how these activities develop, why they develop, how are they sustained, and what are the negative effects and possible strategies for overcoming them. As reflected in the 2011 Australian Social Justice Commission Report. As a result, the overall research aim is to build a management model for Aboriginal managers, Boards of governors and policy makers to integrate into their management, governance and policy-making practices. It will provide a possible solution to the problems faced by Aboriginal organizations and policy makers who need to develop better management, governance and policies in order to improve Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples’ economic development opportunities and outcomes. The research problem is the fact that there is no practitioner model for changing the homo-social reproductive ‘culture’ of Aboriginal organizations and government agencies.

2.6.4 The research hypotheses

The research study’s null hypothesis (H₀) is:

- There is no theoretical basis and/or system to explain why Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and program repeatedly fail;
- That there is no theoretical basis to the repeated failure of Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and programs; and
- That there is no need to propose the development of a new management model to overcome Aboriginal socio-economic development policy and program failures

The alternative research hypothesis (H₁) is that:

- That there is a theoretical basis and/or system to explain the repeated failure of Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and programs;
- That this system has a theoretical basis to it; and
- There is a need to develop a management model to overcome these failures within the Aboriginal economic development framework.
The research proposes that managers, Boards of governance and policy development and implementation practitioners within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework, operate within an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system that is influenced by Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and homo-social reproductive activities through the implementation of the factors and mechanisms associated with the theory by the dominant group and/or network.

2.7 Chapter summary

The literature review clearly provides evidence that there are several major factors that contribute to economic development, including land labour, capital, investment in education and entrepreneurship. Even though vast amounts of funding continues to be invested in these areas, Aboriginal economic development continues to grow at a slow pace. The proposed research and subsequent literature review set out to answer this question by investigating whether the problem of slow Aboriginal economic development has an underlying theoretical cause. To gather the necessary evidence to support the proposed research proposition, an appropriate method must be developed. The method to be used to gather this information will be identified and explained in detail in Chapter 3.
In the beginning, there was Quantitative Research. A few years later, there was Qualitative Research. And then Mixed Methods was born, as a separate child of these parents…researchers should be conversant with the basic methodologies and methods of both schools as well as a number of others, including systematic reviews, evaluation, documentary research and so on (Robinson 2007, p. 388).

In case studies, the richness of the phenomenon and the extensiveness of the real-life context require case study investigators to cope with a technically distinctive situation: There will be many more variables of interest than data points. In response, an essential tactic is to use multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion (Yin 2009, p. 2).

3.1 Chapter introduction

As identified in Chapter 2, a system based on bureaucratic, network and social capital theories has developed and consistently and persistently been reproduced within Australia’s Aboriginal management, governance and policy frameworks. The theoretical framework of Kanter's homo-social reproductive theory explains the activities and practices within dominant groups to exclude persons of similar characteristics. However, in this case, there is no recognition of the mechanisms that have created the ‘system’ and/or no recognition of the theory that could explain the ‘system’ and its application within Australia’s Aboriginal management, governance and policy frameworks.

To address the research problem, the objective was to investigate the decision-making process within the fields of Aboriginal management, governance and policy development. To conduct this investigation, the model adopted for planning the research process was that put forward by Aaker (2001). This chapter therefore adopts a 13 Section format as represented in Figure 3.1.
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3.1.1 Research methodology applied

The research applied a mixed methods research methodology using case study research described by Neuman (2006, pp. 42-43) to involve the following features:
“Case study research examines many features of a few cases. The cases can be individuals, groups, organizations, movements, events, or geographic units. The data on the case are detailed, varied and extensive. It can focus on a single point in time or a duration of time…Case studies enable us to link micro level, or the actions of individuals, to the macro level or the large scale structures and processes…across-case research compares select features across numerous cases. It treats each case as the carrier of the feature of interest…it is sometimes possible to study the same issue using case study and an across-case research design.”

Leonard-Barton, 1990, pp. 248-266) further argues that:

“a case study is a history of a past or current phenomenon, draw from multiple sources of evidence. It can include data from direct observation and systematic interviewing as well as from public and private archives. In fact, any fact relevant to the stream of events describing the phenomenon is a potential datum in a case study…”

Finally, Voss, Tsikriktsis, & Frohlich (2002, p. 197) argues that:

“A case study is a unit of analysis in case research. It is possible to use different cases from the same firm to study different issues, or to research the same issue in a variety of contexts in the same firm…Case study research data are not just collected by interviews. Frequently questionnaires are also used in collecting data within across cases.”

The researcher has applied this interpretation of case study research to develop a mixed methods approach to both the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques used in the research. The researcher has investigated cases involving individuals and groups within the micro, meso and macro levels of the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. In doing so, the research has applied three decades of direct observation and systematic discussions with public and private archives and scholarly articles to develop both qualitative and quantitative research tools.

The quantitative tool used in the research was a survey questionnaire (800), developed in association with several academic advisors, supervisors and Aboriginal colleagues. The advice provided by the academic advisors, supervisors and Aboriginal colleagues included but was not limited to the following:

- the definition of the Aboriginal framework;
- the types of organizations to include in the framework;
- the levels of the framework to research;
• the variable to be used as the basis for the research questions;
• the need to apply the same variable to all levels of the framework;
• the need to apply the same variables to all the focus areas of the research;
• to mix up the order of the questions;
• to keep the questionnaire to a reasonable timeframe;
• to test the questionnaire on a small sample group (forum) before undertaking a full-scale data collection process;
• were possible, interview the participants and discuss the nature and purpose of the research prior to asking them to complete the self-administered questionnaire; and
• select at random, as best you can, the research participants /organization equally across the three levels of the Aboriginal framework

The qualitative tools used in the research project also included a questionnaire that was developed from the quantitative analysis results and the incorporation of the above advice from the researchers’ academic advisors and supervisors. The qualitative questionnaire and the research objectives were, as with the quantitative questionnaire, discussed with the research participants prior to them completing the form. In addition to this, the researcher utilized the standard qualitative techniques such as listening at a forum style discussion, observations and interviews, followed by data coding, data interpretation and analysis.

3.2 Justification for a combined exploratory and descriptive research

The purpose of Chapter 3: Methodology is to follow a systematic approach of inquiry used in academic business research enhancing logic to a study. It can be viewed as an organized, systematic, scientific investigation undertaken for the purposes of identifying an answer to a specific problem (Sekaran 2003). Hallebone and Priest (2009) also state that a research approach should comprise a philosophy of science, a study’s reasoning and logic, a methodology, stance and methods. They represent a methodology of investigative theory and there are three approaches generally considered for DBA research. They are experimental or cause-and-effect research, exploratory research, and descriptive research (Neuman 2006). Neuman summarized the three approaches, which
are described in Table 3.1.

### Table 3.1: Summary of Three Major Research Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Experimental</strong></th>
<th><strong>Exploratory</strong></th>
<th><strong>Descriptive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test theoretical predictions or principle.</td>
<td>Familiarized with basic facts, settings and concerns.</td>
<td>Provide a highly accurate and detailed picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance and elaborate a theoretical explanation.</td>
<td>Create a general mental picture of a phenomenon.</td>
<td>Create or classify a set of categories or types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend a theory to new issues or themes.</td>
<td>Formulate and target questions for future research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support or disprove an explanation or prediction.</td>
<td>Generate new concepts, speculations or hypotheses.</td>
<td>Clarify a sequence of steps or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link issues or themes to a theory.</td>
<td>Decide the feasibility of carrying out research</td>
<td>Document a causal process or mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide which explanation is the best or most appropriate.</td>
<td>Develop techniques for measuring and locating future data.</td>
<td>Report on the background or context of a phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Neuman 2006, p. 34

### 3.2.1 Experimental or cause-and-effect research

When a good theory already exists and where a study can be conducted, experimental or cause-and-effect research serves to build a causal relationship between variables to provide a detailed comparison between an accepted theory and the research findings (Neck 2010; Zikmund 2003).

Experimental research, in general, is characterized by a study whereby some independent variables can be controlled by the researcher to measure their causal effect on the dependent variable of interest (Wong, 1999). Experimental research should be conducted in either an artificial environment such as a laboratory or a controlled field.
environment, which simulates a real world situation (Zikmund, 2003; Sekaran, 2003). As a result, experimental research has better internal validity over the other two forms of research. However, because the study needs to be conducted in a controlled environment or a laboratory created by the researcher, it may not be a good simulation of the real world. Therefore, the research findings may not hold up when generalized to relate to the real world. Thus, experimental research tends to present a relatively lower degree of external.

This research aimed to explore several theories including the theory of homo-social reproduction and their impact on Australia’s Aboriginal economic development by examining the practices of managers and boards of governance within Indigenous organizations and agencies. As a result, the behaviour of managers and policy makers within government agencies needed to be established to improve the economic development of Aboriginal People in terms of Kanter’s Homo-social Reproductive Theory. In view of this, the cause-and-effect type of experimental research was not considered to be suitable for this study.

3.2.2 Exploratory research
Exploratory research, as the name suggests, is often undertaken when the research is to explore a situation where either not much is known or not much information is available and a deeper understanding is required (Zikmund 2003; Cooper & Schindler 1998; Sekaran 2003). Zikmund 2003) also describes exploratory research as, the initial study undertaken to clarify and define the nature of a research problem before further investigation is undertaken. Wong (1999) suggests that exploratory research be used to segment a broader problem into smaller, accurately manageable sub-problems in order to investigate the issues in-depth. Yin (2009) stipulates that when available literature or existing knowledge about the study is poor, a new research study is likely to follow the traits and approach of an exploratory research. Exploratory research is more commonly conducted in the early phase of a field of study to obtain a better understanding of the research problem (Wong & Neck 2013).

As discussed in Chapter 2, Research Issues, this research investigated a less well-defined problem, noted in the researcher’s professional practice, which is also backed
up by a gap revealed in extant literature. The research objective, as discussed previously, was to build an exploratory management, governance and policy model to analyse economic factors in the context of improving the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples. The research will also resolve a consistent problem area in developing appropriate strategies and policies to improve Aboriginal economic development, which has seen considerable amounts of financial investment, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail.

As a result, the exploratory research approach was deemed to be appropriate for this study. Although researching in a situation where an ambiguous research problem exists, exploratory research is carried out to define the nature of the problem, although exploratory research is often criticized for using unrepresentative samples selected on a non-probabilistic basis (Rubin & Babbie 2005). Another criticism is that this exploratory approach lacks the ability to generalize results because the research findings could be viewed as being based on the researcher’s own interpretation (Zikmund 2003). One method to overcome these shortcomings, as suggested by Wong and Neck (2013), is to use multiple investigative approaches such as adapting both exploratory research with descriptive research.

3.2.3 Descriptive research

Descriptive research is often used to approximate the distributions of a population with the characteristics of interest, and to discover the association of different variables (Emory & Cooper, 1991). Neck (2010, p. 15) also suggests that ‘Descriptive Research is used when considerable knowledge is available, but the topic needs to be refined. It is customary to use a survey approach employing specially designed questionnaires for the purpose of obtaining relevant data’. Another goal of the descriptive research approach is to help the researcher build a profile or to describe certain aspects of the phenomenon of interest from individuals, groups, organizations, industries and other perspectives (Sekaran 2003). It is particularly appropriate for the following research purposes:

- to understand the characteristics of a group within an organization
- to think systematically about certain aspects within an organization
- to offer ideas for further probing and study; and
• to make a specific decision (Sekaran, 2003).

Therefore, to produce accurate and precise descriptive profiles of groups, strategies and policies, a combined approach of exploratory and descriptive research was selected.

3.3 Justification for realism research paradigm

Of the four major research paradigms summarized in Table 3.2, a realism paradigm was selected as most appropriate for this research. Justification for this choice of paradigm, and for rejection of a positivist, constructivist or critical theory approach for this study is discussed in the following sections.

3.3.1 Positivism

As Table 3.2 indicates, the positivist position does not fit well with a qualitative approach to research, because the positivist view is predominantly concerned with scientific measurement of ‘independent facts about a single apprehensible reality’ (Healy & Perry 2000, p. 119). While positivists separate themselves from the world they study, the other three types of researchers (constructivism, critical theory and realism) explore complex social phenomena that require working with people and real-life experiences (Christie et al. 2000, pp. 1-36). Some researchers even argue to the point that a positivistic view is not suitable when research involves humans and their life experiences (Healy & Perry 2000, p. 119).

This research involved the study of Aboriginal Australians’ perceptions and behaviours, and so positivism was not considered for this research. Furthermore, reflecting on Murray (2009) and Wong and Neck’s (2013) summary on positivism (Table 3.2), further justification not to select positivism was made on the basis that this research was conducted within an environment over which the researcher had no control. Also, as this research is not about testing an established theory or to find a causal relationship of a set of variables as in positivism research, positivism was not justified as a paradigm for this research.
### Table 3.2: Summary of paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Assumption (Ontology)</th>
<th>Purpose (Epistemology)</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Research Inquiry Direction</th>
<th>Researcher’s Role</th>
<th>Respondent’s Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Social facts based on objective reality independent of the researcher</td>
<td>Value free objective findings</td>
<td>Predominantly quantitative based on verification of hypotheses, experiments and surveys</td>
<td>Measurement and analysis of causal relationship of variables which is generalizable across context and time</td>
<td>Objective and remote</td>
<td>Respondent is remote from the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Reality is socially constructed out of social interaction</td>
<td>Subjective findings</td>
<td>In-depth interviews, participant observations based mostly on grounded theory research</td>
<td>Reconstruction, revision of belief through interpreting multiple realities constructed via pattern matching</td>
<td>Up close and personal</td>
<td>Respondent is close to the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Theory</td>
<td>Reality is socially constructed in such a way as to constrain human interaction</td>
<td>Interactive and value mediated findings</td>
<td>Action research, focus groups and participant observations</td>
<td>Contradictions which leads to change revealed through critique of contextual or historical insights</td>
<td>Empathetic understanding</td>
<td>Respondent is close to the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realism: case study</td>
<td>Reality is real but given imperfectly and probabilistically so</td>
<td>Modified and objective findings of probably true nature</td>
<td>Predominantly qualitative based on action research, convergent interviews and case study research</td>
<td>Development of knowledge of reality which is otherwise difficult to apprehend</td>
<td>Neither independent nor involved</td>
<td>Respondent is the researched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2: Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Positivism: Hypothetico deductive quantitative</th>
<th>Constructivism: Phenomenological-inductive qualitative</th>
<th>Critical Theory: action research</th>
<th>Realism: case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Reduction/aggregation of data to numbers</td>
<td>Capture the lived experience of informants</td>
<td>Data gathered to support justification for change</td>
<td>Triangulate multi-source data sources to express an identified process through discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Falsify null hypothesis based on statistical tests</td>
<td>Identify recurring themes and patterns in the search for meaning</td>
<td>Present recommendations to empower members of the oppressed group studied</td>
<td>Information rich, contextual and non-statistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Rigour, reliability, internal and external validity</td>
<td>Research authenticity and trustworthiness</td>
<td>Theoretical consistence with historical insights</td>
<td>Research credibility, confirmability, transferability and construct validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td>Explanations from a controlled condition which can be generalized across context and time</td>
<td>Generalization ability is limited</td>
<td>Generalization ability is limited</td>
<td>Only tentative explanations for one specific context and time are possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from McMurray 2009; Wong & Neck 2013

3.3.2 Constructivism

Denzin and Lincoln (2003) describe a constructivist approach to research as being based on relativist ontology, subjectivist epistemology and naturalist methodological procedures. Therefore, constructivists’ research tends to exclude concerns about the external reality, such as economic, policy and technology considerations (Hunt 1991). In other words, constructivists view truth as ‘a particular belief system held in a particular context, and they are interested in the values which underpin the findings’ (Healy & Perry 2000, p. 120).

However, this research has relied on respondents’ reactions to external reality to investigate the issues and propositions identified earlier and to develop an exploratory
style management instrument to analyse economic factors in the context of improving the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples. Additionally, to propose a process to resolve the problem areas in Aboriginal economic development strategies and policies which have seen considerable financial investment, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail and/or produce poor results. Therefore, constructivism was also not selected for this research.

3.3.3 Critical theory

Critical theorists are concerned with what is hidden, in terms of how to liberate and empower the oppressed group (Guba & Lincoln 1994). The critical theory paradigm is typically used to investigate social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values over a long period of time in the study of ethnographic and historical events (McMurray, 2009). However, this research did not seek to influence the consciousness of respondents but rather to study how the three research propositions can be developed into a theory about developing a suitable management model, to analyse economic factors in the context of improving the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples.

Additionally, the research did not propose a resolution to the problem areas that exist within the frameworks of developing strategies and policies for the improvement of Aboriginal economic development which have seen considerable financial investments, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail or consistently produce poor results. Based on the above argument and Table 3.2 summary, the critical theory paradigm was not regarded as suitable for this research.

3.3.4 Realism

Realists maintain a view suggesting it is practically impossible to be totally objective and that subjectivity is inevitable (Godfrey & Hill 1995; Guba & Lincoln 1994; Merriam 1988; Wong & Neck 2013). Realism assumes that actual social phenomena can only be imperfectly and probabilistically apprehended because of researcher’s limited capacity and resources. As Perry (1997, p. 554) advises, within a realist paradigm, the perception of an actual social phenomenon is “a window on to reality from which a picture of reality can be triangulated with other perceptions”.
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Therefore, it is safe to conclude that realism can provide elements from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives to support triangulation of data (Healy & Perry, 2000). Realism is also described as post-positivism (Denzin & Lincoln 1994) and neo-post-positivism (Miles & Huberman 1994) because it is consistent with the view that it is practically impossible to be totally objective and that subjectivity is inevitable. Therefore, based on the information in Table 3.2 and the above arguments, realism paradigm was selected for this study. This research involved investigating a ‘real-life’ phenomenon in an environment where the researcher had no control. Again, most importantly, this research was about developing a new theoretical model rather than testing an existing theory. As a result, the realism paradigm was determined to best suit this research.

3.4 Justification for mixed-method research design

The factors considered in making the choice to use a mixed method approach for this study are summarized in Table 3.3.

3.4.1 The design approach: quantitative, qualitative or mixed-methods

Quantitative research follows a hypothetico-deductive approach to test a hypothesis (Neuman, 2006). However, this research was about developing an exploratory management instrument to analyse economic factors in the context of improving the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, and propose strategies and policies to improve the Australia’s Aboriginal People’s economic development. A pure quantitative approach would not work when the phenomenon under study, is difficult to measure and quantify for a context-rich study.

Qualitative research follows a phenomenological-inductive approach to induce a theory surfaced from human values, interpretative schemes, mind maps, belief systems and rules of living to understand the reality interpreted through respondents’ views of their world (Cavana et al. 2001). Qualitative design therefore generates rich, detailed data that leaves the respondents’ perspectives intact while providing a context based on their behaviour (Yin 2009).
Table 3.3: Comparison of qualitative and quantitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test hypothesis that the researcher begins with.</td>
<td>Capture and discover meaning once the researcher becomes immersed in the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts are in the form of distinct variables.</td>
<td>Concepts are in the form of themes, motifs, generalizations, and taxonomies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures are systematically created before data collection and are standardized.</td>
<td>Measures are created in an ad hoc manner and are often specific to the individual setting or researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data are in the form of numbers from precise measurement.</td>
<td>Data are in the form of words and images from documents, observations, and transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory is largely causal and is deductive</td>
<td>Theory can be causal or non-causal and is often inductive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures are standard, and replication is frequent.</td>
<td>Research procedures are particular, and replication is very rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis proceeds by using statistics, tables, or charts and discussing how what they show relates to hypotheses.</td>
<td>Analysis proceeds by extracting themes or generalizations from evidence and organizing data to present a coherent, consistent picture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, as the researcher’s goal was to generalize from the findings across time and place to improve the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples, a purely qualitative approach would not have been ideal as qualitative research findings may vary greatly between researchers (Sekaran 2003).

When generalizability issues and the study of a phenomenon beyond the researcher’s control are the core of the research study, in this case, to analyse economic development factors in the context of improving the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples and a management model to resolve problem areas within the framework of developing more appropriate strategies and policies which that have in the past seen
considerable financial investment, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail and/or produce poor results, mixed-methods research was more appropriate when considering research instruments (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4: Quantitative / qualitative research characteristics and design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>How much?</td>
<td>What, how and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td>Isolates and defines variables and tests</td>
<td>Defines general concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesizing data</td>
<td>Searches for patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow lens (deductive)</td>
<td>Wide lens (inductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Participant-observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randomized controlled trials</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic reviews and meta-analysis</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Rich description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Process-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalizability</td>
<td>Context emphasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Traynor et al. 2010.

In this case, not only did the researcher seek answers to both ‘what’ and ‘how’ types of research questions relating to the economic development of Australia’s Aboriginal People, but also sought to develop a prediction management tool, and address the issue of generalizability. Hence, it is apparent that mixed-methods research was more suitable for this study.
3.4.2 Mixed-method design approach

We will look back in several years and see that it was the graduate students who promoted mixed methods research and who taught their faculty the importance of this approach to inquiry and the value of not adhering strictly to either quantitative or qualitative approaches. The students will be more interested in how best to address their research problems than the politics of methodology (Creswell 2009, p. 106).

Creswell (2003) defines a mixed method approach as one in which the researcher collects, analyses, and integrates both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or in multiple studies in a sustained program of inquiry. Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) highlight five major points when considering mixed-methods research design. These points are pertinent to the way in which both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected, analysed, and integrated in a single study or over multiple studies. Table 3.5 provides further substantiation for the justification of mixed-methods research design.
Table 3.5: Key characteristics of mixed-method research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed-methods Research Design</th>
<th>Indigenous Economic Development Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation</strong> tests the consistency of findings from different instruments.</td>
<td>In this case, triangulation reduced some of the threats influencing the research result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complementarity</strong> clarifies and illustrates results from one method with the use of another method.</td>
<td>In this case, On-site observation (Aboriginal organizations, government agencies and policy practices) added additional insights into the practice of Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive theory and application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong> results from one method shaping subsequent methods or steps in the research process.</td>
<td>In this case, Survey Questionnaire (Aboriginal organization, governance group and individual perspectives) indicated the necessity for a follow-up expert discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong> stimulates new research questions or challenges results obtained through one method.</td>
<td>In this case, a survey questionnaire assisted in the investigation of whether Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities existed and provided an insight into how Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction was perceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansion</strong> provides richness and detail to the study exploring specific features of each method.</td>
<td>In this case, understanding of Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and Kanter’s homo-social reproduction theory and its mechanisms combined and expanded the breadth of this study and more than likely encouraged more general debate on Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship systems and Kanter’s homo-social reproductive mechanisms and practices and supported the development of collaborative research in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Green et al. 1989; Wong & Neck 2013

In summary, within a realist paradigm, at mixed-methods research design is appropriate for this study, in terms of generalizability, validity, reliability and rigour of the research.
3.5 Justification for case study research

This section presents the characteristics of case study research method, in order to justify the choice of case study methodology for this research. Table 3.6 presents the choices of method that were considered in the process of selecting case study methods as the most appropriate for this research. Yin (2009) compares the key characteristics of five major research methods: experiment, survey, archival analysis, history, and case study:

Table 3.6: Relevant situations for different research methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Form of research Question</th>
<th>Requires control of behavioural events?</th>
<th>Focuses on Contemporary events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, Why?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, What, Where, No Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many, How much?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, What, Where, No Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many, How much?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, Why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>How, Why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yin 2009, p. 8

In expanding on the characteristics of case study research, Yin explains (2009, p. 18), that it is an empirical methodology, which:

a. investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when
b. the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident;
c. copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as a result;
d. relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge
in a triangulating fashion, and as another result; and
e. benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to
guide data collection and analysis

Case study research is defined by its own systematic procedures entailing design logic, data collection techniques and specific approaches to data analysis (Yin 2009). In the present study, case study research helped to capture ‘reality’ and details by studying a phenomenon in its natural context. Developing and refining concepts for further study (Cavaye 1996) are also built in. Table 3.7 displays additional characteristics of case studies of key relevance to this study.

Table 3.7: Key characteristics of case study research relevant to the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Research</th>
<th>Indigenous Economic Development Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenon is examined in a native/cultural environment</td>
<td>This study investigates the three levels of influence within the field of Aboriginal socio-economic development. Organizational management, organizational governance and Aboriginal economic policy development. Across three levels of activity community organization level, State Government level and Commonwealth government level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple means of data collection</td>
<td>Data collection is self-administered questionnaire and structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or few entities are examined</td>
<td>Several entities at the community level and two entities at State Government and Commonwealth Government agency levels are studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit complexity is studied intensively</td>
<td>This study is focused on analysing the management, governance and policy development practices within the ‘framework’ of Aboriginal Socio-Economic Development and the effect of Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities and the capability and/or capacity for organization to change across the three levels of operation within the ‘Framework’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Research</th>
<th>Indigenous Economic Development Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More suitable for exploration, classification and hypothesis development stages of the knowledge building process</td>
<td>To develop a new management model for Aboriginal organizations and agencies to implement into their management, governance and policy development practices to improve Aboriginal socio-economic development outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No involvement of experimental controls or manipulation</td>
<td>This study was the management, governance and policy development practices with Aboriginal community organizations, State and Commonwealth government agencies involved in Aboriginal socio-economic development activities which the researcher has no control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent and dependent variables may not be specified in advance</td>
<td>Two steps: 1. Self-administered questionnaire survey. 2. Follow-up structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research findings derived depend heavily on the investigator’s integrative powers</td>
<td>Research results depend on self-administered questionnaire and structured interviews and descriptive nature of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in site selection and data collection methods could take place as the investigator develops new hypotheses</td>
<td>Owing to the researcher’s capability and limited resources, site selection and data collection was evolving during the progress of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful in the study of ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions because these deal with operational links to be traced over time rather than with frequency or incidence</td>
<td>This study was on ‘how’ and on ‘why’ Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities have developed within the area of Aboriginal socio-economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on contemporary events</td>
<td>This study was about the current management, governance and policy development practices within Aboriginal socio-economic development structures over the three levels of influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Benbasat 1987

Yin (2009, p. 2) further summarized three criteria, which distinguish case study research from other types of social science research methods. Case study research is generally the preferred method when:

1. ‘How’ or ‘why’ questions are being posed;
2. The investigator has little control over events; and
3. The focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context.

However, Darke et al. (1998, p. 280) points out that there are four situations when case study may not be appropriate when:

1. A phenomenon is well understood and mature;
2. Constructs already exist and are well developed;
3. Understanding of how and why a certain phenomenon occurs is not of interest; and
4. Understanding of the contexts of action and the experiences of individuals in a single setting is not relevant.

Table 3.8: Criteria for selecting case study research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for case study selection</th>
<th>Justification for this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions are being posed</td>
<td>Yes, as the ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are on ‘how’ and ‘why’ Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homosocial reproductive activities have developed within the area of Aboriginal socio-economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the investigator has little control over events</td>
<td>Yes, this is to study the management, governance and policy development practices within Aboriginal organizations and government agencies over the three levels of its operation where the investigator has little control over events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context</td>
<td>Yes, the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within the Australian Aboriginal socio-economic development framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yin 2009

This study set out to build an exploratory management model to analyse economic factors in the context of improving the economic development outcomes of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples and resolve problem areas in strategy and policy development which have seen considerable financial investment, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail or produce poor results/outcomes. Table 3.8
presents further arguments to justify selecting case study method for this study.

Although the study positively fits the three ‘yes’ questions of Yin’s criteria when case study research method may be appropriate, additional justification should also be argued for where case study research method may not be appropriate. Darke et al., (1998) lists four criteria where case study research method may not be appropriate (Table 3.9).

Based on the three ‘yes’ answers to the criteria for when case study research may be appropriate (Yin, 2009) and the four ‘no’ answers to the situation where case study research may not be appropriate (Darke et al., 1998), case study research method was selected for this study. The following sections present key criteria for designing and conducting a quality case study research project.

3.6 Case study design components

A research design is a sequence of logical components that link the empirical data to the research questions and, eventually, to the research conclusions Yin (2009, p. 26), describes research design colloquially as:

A logical plan for getting from here to there, where here may be defined as the initial set of questions to be answered, and there is some set of conclusions (answers) about these questions.

Five research components pertinent to case study, in this case mixed-methods multiple case studies, are:

1. research question(s);
2. research proposition(s);
3. unit(s) of analysis;
4. linking of data to the propositions; and
5. criteria for interpreting the findings: research description and rival explanation (Yin 2009, p. 27).
Table 3.9: Justification for selecting case study research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (Darke et al., 1998) where case study research may not be appropriate when</th>
<th>For this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A phenomenon is well understood and mature</td>
<td>No, this research was to develop an exploratory management instrument to analyse socio-economic development factors in the context of improving the socio-economic development opportunities of Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples and resolve problem areas within the framework of developing strategies and policies to improve socio-economic development opportunities for Aboriginal Peoples. Which over time have seen considerable financial investment, land transfers and investment in education and training only to consistently fail or produce poor results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs already exist and are well developed</td>
<td>No, there was a lack of knowledge in the field of empirical studies of the impact of Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities within the Aboriginal socio-economic development arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of how and why the particular phenomenon occurs is not of interest</td>
<td>No, this study was to increase the understanding of ‘How and ‘Why’ Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities are developed and maintained with Aboriginal organizations and government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the contexts of action and the experiences of individuals in a single setting is not relevant</td>
<td>No, the understanding of the contexts of action and the experiences of individuals at local, state and federal levels in a single setting contributed to the findings from the predictor model, once it was developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yin 2009

3.6.1 Research question

For the past several decades, both State and Commonwealth governments have endeavored to development and implement strategies and policies to improve the economic development of Australia’s Indigenous people only to consistently fail. The
strategies and policies have seen vast amounts of financial assistance, land transfers and investment in education and training.

The research question therefore was: *What are the theoretical bases of Aboriginal economic development failures and the impact of homo-social reproductive activities on the management, governance and policy development processes within Australia’s Aboriginal economic development framework?*

The research aim was to look at how these Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship systems and homo-social reproductive activities are developed and sustained through self-interest and lateral violence activities such as the use or misuse of power relationships, intimidation and threats of violence and/or threats of withdrawing financial assistance for projects and programs. More specifically, the research looks at how these activities develop, why they develop, and how are they sustained, and the resulting affects and possible strategies to overcome them, as reflected in the 2011 Australian Social Justice Commission Report.

As a result, the research aim was to build a management model for Aboriginal managers, Boards of governors and policy makers to integrate into their management, governance and policy-making practices. It will provide a possible solution to the question: *How can Aboriginal organizations and policy makers develop better management, governance and policies to improve Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples’ economic development opportunities and outcomes via changing the ‘organizational culture’ of Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship and homo-social reproductive activities?*

The lack of a practical solution to this question, and the lack of relevant and available literature contributed to a research problem that: *There is no practitioner model for changing the Aboriginal bureaucratic system and homo-social reproductive ‘culture’ of Aboriginal organizations and government agencies.*

### 3.6.2 Research proposition

As Yin (2009) points out, the research proposition(s) direct the researcher’s attention to what should be examined within the scope of the case study research method and in this case, mixed-methods multiple case studies. Three research propositions and a counter-proposition was developed to address both the research question and the research problem represented in Figure 3.2.
A counter proposition has been introduced. The concept of incorporating a counter proposition to the research proposition will be discussed in Section 3.7.2 Credibility.
3.6.3 Unit of analysis

In this case, the researcher focused on individual Aboriginal Australians at three levels of ‘Local Aboriginal organizations’, along with ‘State’ and ‘Commonwealth’ government agencies involved in Aboriginal economic development activities including management, governance and policy development. These agencies constituted the units of analysis.

3.6.4 Linking data to research proposition

The techniques to link data to research propositions can be one or a combination of ‘pattern-matching’, ‘explanation building’, ‘time-series analysis’, ‘logic models’ and ‘cross-case synthesis’ (Yin, 2009). In this case replication logic, based on ‘visually notable differences,’ was used to synthesize quantitative reports from the survey data. Participants were invited, at the followed up qualitative structured interview, to express their reflections of the quantitative survey results, which should indicate their level of understanding of the homo-social reproductive activities within the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’, and their readiness to implement change within their organization and/or work and/or policy development processes.

Participants were also asked questions relating to the three research propositions, as well as inviting those who were studied to review the findings of the research which should offer another approach to analytical triangulation (Patton, 2002). This is also a commonly accepted practice/protocol among the researcher’s community.

3.6.5 The criteria for interpreting findings

According to Yin, case study analysis, to a large extent, does not use statistical analysis to demonstrate an observed social phenomenon to be ‘statistically significant’ when its $p$ level is less than .05. Instead, case study researchers rely more on ‘analytic generalization’ than ‘statistic generalization’ as the criterion for interpreting the research.

In this case, the researcher used ‘analytic generalization’ incorporating a ‘counter-proposition’ strategy. The researcher developed the research description from the findings along the line of:
The case studies will reveal how homo-social reproductive activities and lateral violence developed, and was maintained, within Australia’s Aboriginal Peoples’ economic development ‘framework’ and its effect on the management, governance and policy outcomes over the past several decades. The case studies will also show why Aboriginal managers, Boards of Governors and policy makers need to understand what Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship systems and homo-social reproductive theory is and what effects Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship systems and homo-social reproductive activities are having on their organizations and agency outcomes.

Aboriginal organizations and government agencies also need to examine their level of readiness in using a management model that will endeavour to change the existing organizational culture within the ‘framework’ of Aboriginal socio-economic development as a mechanism to improve Aboriginal socio-economic development outcomes.

With the five components of case study research design addressed, the next emphasis is quality criteria.

### 3.7 Case study quality criteria

Yin (2009) and Kidder & Judd (1986) specify a set of logical tests to gauge the quality of any research designs. As described in Table 3.10, they are:
Table 3.10: Four common quality tests for empirical social research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Case Study Quality Tactic</th>
<th>Phase of Research</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct viability</td>
<td>Use multiple sources of evidence Establish chain of evidence Have key informants review draft case study report</td>
<td>Data collection Data collection Composition</td>
<td>To identify correct operational measure for the concepts being studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity or building credibility</td>
<td>Do pattern-matching Do explanation building Address rival explanations Use logic models</td>
<td>Data analysis Data analysis Data analysis Data analysis</td>
<td>To establish a causal relationship whereby certain conditions are believed to lead to other conditions as distinguished from spurious relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>Use theory in single case study Use replication logic in multiple case study</td>
<td>Research design Research design</td>
<td>To define the domain to which findings of the case under study can be generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Use case study protocol Develop study database</td>
<td>Data collection Data collection</td>
<td>To demonstrate that the operations of a study such as the data collection procedure can be repeated with the same result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yin 2009 and Kidder & Judd 1986

Following Yin’s suggestion, relevant quality tactics presented in Table 3.9 above were used to establish construct validity, credibility, external validity and reliability. On account of the nature of this study being defined as descriptive rather than experimental, internal validity does not apply. As an alternative measure, credibility emphasis (Gummesson 1991) discussed in 3.7.2 was followed.

3.7.1 Construct validity

Apart from adhering to the four quality tactics, to further ensure construct validity, mixed-method multiple case studies approach of quantitative survey questionnaire followed by structured interviews helped converge multiple sources of evidence of the same fact. Moreover, owing to the resulting chain of evidence, this research was logically presented to allow interviewees to follow the derivation of any evidence from initial research questions to ultimate case study findings. The research included optional expert discussion activities for the case participants to review the outcome of the research findings in terms of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship and Kanter’s homo-social reproductive activities, and the proposed ‘new’ management model to change Aboriginal organizational ‘culture’.
3.7.2 Credibility

To ensure that the research findings reflect the phenomenon under investigation, credibility testing tactics such as pattern matching, triangulation, cross-case synthesis and checking the findings with interviewees can all be used. For this study, two tactics were engaged. First was pattern matching to identify the level of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship systems and homo-social reproductive activities within the management, governance and policy making framework of Aboriginal socio-economic development. This was carried out across the three levels of Aboriginal economic development activity at the local community based level, State Government Agency level and the Commonwealth Government Agency level based on the responses to the self-administered questionnaire survey. Second, both the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and homo-social reproductive activity level report generated from descriptive statistics were then triangulated with participants at structured interviews.

Case study research, to a large extent, does not use statistical analysis to demonstrate an observed social phenomenon to be statistically significant when its p level is less than .05 (Yin 2009). Instead, case study researchers rely more on analytic generalization rather than statistic generalization as the criterion to interpret research findings (Yin 2009). As such, the researcher had engaged a concept termed “counter proposition” in the study to demonstrate how analytic generalization incorporating a “counter proposition” rather than ‘statistical analysis’ with a ‘null/alternative hypothesis’ approach, to enhance the credibility of qualitative research (Wong & Neck 2014).

The practice of using “null hypothesis, “H₀” is well documented and practiced in the quantitative research community. However, for qualitative research, the use of “counter proposition/alternative proposition” is not well practiced. The null hypothesis is the opposite of the “alternative hypothesis, H₁.” When significance tests indicate p=95 or p=99%, there is a likelihood that the results do not fit the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis is then rejected, in favour of the alternative hypothesis, H₁. Using the null hypothesis logic is good research practice and is an essential part of any quantitative research design. The null hypothesis is always tested directly or indirectly. An example of a null hypothesis, H₀, is, for example, stating that, ‘smoking does not cause cancer’ whilst the ‘alternative hypothesis H₁’ is “smoking does causes cancer. Whilst it is not possible to totally validate the alternative hypothesis that ‘smoking causes cancer’, there is
overwhelming evidence to indicate smoking is highly likely to cause cancer. The overwhelming support for the ‘alternative hypothesis’ indirectly nullifies (falsifies) the ‘null hypothesis’, in this case, ‘smoking does not cause cancer’. Nullifying a ‘null hypothesis’ supports the investigation of the “alternative hypothesis.” The same logic behind the ‘null/alternative hypothesis’ could be applied to qualitative research in the form of ‘counter proposition/alternative proposition’.

To illustrate the need to include a counter proposition in a qualitative argument, the researcher found it necessary to illustrate with an example from Stone Sweet’s (2007) ‘counter proposition’ strategy to bring a debate on whether the issue ‘juridical coup d’etat’ was worth pursuing. This had been an issue that Stone Sweet found intriguing and he decided to seek support from the legal community whether the issue is worth pursuing. The counter proposition was ‘juridical coup d’etat is an impossibility’, to start his debate. The responses from the legal community nullified the ‘counter proposition’. Stone Sweet then moved on to investigate the alternative proposition on ‘juridical coup d’etat – is theoretically appropriate’ and focus on the process of transformation (constitution-building).

The idea of ‘counter proposition’ is often practiced in business consultancy. Practitioners often challenge their clients especially when the clients are complacent in terms of their achievements. For example, in a merger and acquisition (M&A) situation when the M&A executive team is complacent about their achievements and their M&A plans, a simple question like ‘What if your whole M&A team is dissolved, would that change your situation?’. This ‘counter proposition’ approach always put the clients back to the drawing board to plan for a ‘counter’ scenario without their engagement. Such is the credibility and power of incorporating a ‘counter proposition’ in the design of data collection and indeed in the design of a qualitative or mixed method research that is not too different to the ‘null/alternative hypothesis’ strategy practiced by quantitative researchers.

For this study, the researcher used actual data findings to generate survey reports, in which ‘analytic generalization’ incorporating a ‘counter proposition’ strategy can be used to interpret the findings from the participants. The researcher aimed to develop the research description from the findings along the lines that: The case studies will reveal the degree of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship and homo-social reproductive activities that occur with the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’. Also, that the reasons
why persons involved in the management, governance and policy development ‘framework’ should evaluate their understanding of these activities and their level of willingness to implement organizational change that will improve Aboriginal economic development.

The findings from both the quantitative survey data and qualitative interview questions either supported or rejected the propositions, which in turn, answer the research question. Adding a counter proposition to the argument will add additional insights into the research during data collection. Researchers would then have to include steps to collect data reflecting on the counter proposition (Patton 2002; Wong & Neck 2014; Yin 2009). If the original proposition is supported and the counter proposition is rejected (falsified), the credibility of the argument is further enhanced. This approach should enhance the credibility of qualitative and mixed method case study research of an exploratory nature when testing of internal validity is not a viable option.

3.7.3   External validity
To ensure generalizability, external validity was ascertained through replication logic applied to multiple case studies of Aboriginal organizations and Government agencies across the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’, namely the local, State and Commonwealth jurisdictions. This research also relied on the case study protocol and a separate case study database to minimize errors and biases to improve the reliability of the study and indeed data collected, to support the three propositions (to be discussed in Chapter 4: Data Analysis) generated by the same results over the three levels of the Aboriginal socio-economic development ‘framework’.

3.7.4   Reliability
Reliability is a test to see ‘if a later investigator followed the same procedures as described by an earlier investigator and I conducted the same case study all over again, the later investigator should arrive at the same findings and conclusions’ (Yin, 2009, p. 45). A reliability test is different from an external validity test. A reliability test relies on doing the same case over again, and not on “replicating” the results generated from one case through the study of another case (Gabriel 1990; Gummesson 1991; Yin 2009). Case study protocol, guides researchers to minimize errors and biases by making as
many steps as operational as possible with the goal that an auditor could in principle repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results (Yin 2014).

Like other research methods, it is considered good practice for this research to provide separately the case study database and the case study reports. The availability of a separate case study report can then be the subject of separate, secondary analysis, independent of any reports generated by this research. The case study database will also enable critical readers to inspect the raw data that lead to the case study’s conclusions (Yin 2014). A case study database should markedly increase the reliability of the entire case study and, at the same time, overcome a major shortcoming of case study research that needs to be address – the reliability issue (Yin 2009).

Summing up, the four quality tests relevant to this research study, were included at the planning stage. The tactics required to apply the quality tests were also considered. The tactics to be employed for the quality tests were followed during the data collection and the data analysis stages of this research.

### 3.8 Case study selection criteria

Yin suggests two approaches in planning a case study design: single case or multi-case research. The advantages and disadvantages of both approaches are discussed in the next two sections.

#### 3.8.1 Single case study

The objective of single case research is to build theory and refine concepts or to test a theory (Markus, 1989). Single case study research provides researchers with rich descriptions and understandings when investigating phenomena in depth (Walsham 1995). The five situations appropriate for a single case study are shown in Table 3.1:

Table 3.1: Single case research

| 1. Critical case to test a well-formulated theory; |
| 2. Extreme or unique case to draw inferences and to generalize for lesser extreme cases; |
| 3. Representative or typical case to capture the circumstances and conditions of an everyday or commonplace situation; |
| 4. Revelatory case when an investigator has an opportunity to observe and analyse a phenomenon previously inaccessible to social science inquiry; or |
| 5. Longitudinal case where the same case is studied at two or more different points in time. |

Source: Adapted from Yin 2014

3.8.2 Multiple case studies

Whenever possible, Yin (2014) recommends planning for at least two or more cases because multiple case studies have unique characteristics as compared with a single case study, as listed in Table 3.12:

Table 3.12: Advantages of multiple case studies research

| 1. Can avoid blunt criticisms and scepticisms about the uniqueness or ‘artefactual’ conditions surrounding a single case research; |
| 2. Can follow replication logic (literal and theoretical replication) rather than relying solely on sampling logic; |
| 3. Are often considered to produce more compelling and more robust evidence but at the same time the rationale for single case research cannot usually be satisfied by multiple case-studies research; and |
| 4. Require more resources and time than single case research |

Source: Adapted from Yin 2014

After weighing the pros and cons of multiple-case studies and single-case study approaches, multiple-case studies research was adopted.

The organizations chosen were from across the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’, which included Aboriginal community-based organizations and State and Commonwealth Government agencies and the individuals employed and/or
involved in the management, governance and policy development processes across the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development framework.

Table 3.13: Multiple-case studies research and multiple units of analysis (UoA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 1</th>
<th>Case Study 2</th>
<th>Case Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoA</td>
<td>UoA</td>
<td>UoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp;</td>
<td>Governance &amp;</td>
<td>Governance &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-making employees</td>
<td>Policymaking employees</td>
<td>Policymaking employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research

3.8.3 Multiple case studies selection process

Employees involved in the management, governance and policy-making activities in organizations and/or agencies within the Aboriginal economic development ‘framework’ were selected. These organizations included local community-based organizations, State Government agencies and Commonwealth Government agencies involved in managing, governing and/or policy making relating to Aboriginal socio-economic development as the multiple units of analysis (UoA). They were surveyed concerning their level of understanding of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship systems and Kanter’s homo-social reproductive mechanisms and their level of participation in Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship and homo-social reproductive activities within the ‘framework’ and their level of interest in implementing changes within their organization’s culture. The survey was studied at management, government and policy-making staff levels.
Figure 3.3: Case study selection process
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Source: Developed for this research

Organizations and/or agencies short-listed were:

- Aboriginal Land Councils;
- Aboriginal Native Title Organizations;
- Aboriginal Community Centres;
- State Departments of Aboriginal Affairs;
- State Departments of Employment, Education and Training;
- Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs;
- Commonwealth Department of Employment & Workplace Relations;
- Commonwealth Department of Education & Training

The organizations and agencies were selected because they are involved in:

- representing the three levels of Management, Governance and Policy-intensive operations within the Aboriginal Economic Development Framework
- facing challenges in today’s Aboriginal Economic Development Framework
- within the limited resources and time-frame of this research
- Community/State/Commonwealth based; and
- Reasonably easy to access
Once the multiple cases were decided, the next phase was data collection.

3.9 Case study data collection

To reiterate, data collection in this study followed Yin’s quality guidelines for ensuring construct validity, internal validity (in this case, credibility), external validity and reliability. Two quality tactics were deployed: case study protocol and case study database.

3.9.1 Case study protocol

In general, Yin (2014) specifies that there are four components for case study protocol: an overview of the case study project; the field procedures; the case study questions, and the report outline. For this study, the case study protocol had fourteen (14) steps, which address the reliability issue for other investigators/business consultants to follow when this study becomes a commercially viable application (Table 3.12). The fourteen (14) steps case study protocol index, provides instructions as to how this research was carried out as well as how it could be replicated by others.

3.9.2 Case study database

Following Yin’s (2014) suggestions, a second technique for the reliability test was developed with two case study databases created: one data-base to maintain the data collected from the mixed method techniques and the case study pilot, and a separate data-base to maintain the case study reports.

3.9.3 Self-administered questionnaire and structured interview

Three of Yin’s (2014) tactics for ensuring construct validity, were adopted for this research:

- multiple sources of evidence;
- chain of evidence; and
- review of draft case study report by key informants (to be discussed in Chapter Four: Data Analysis)
Table 3.14: Case study protocol index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>1. Executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Supervisor note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Research Question, Research Objective, Research Propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Candidate note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Procedures</td>
<td>5. Contact details (see Appendix 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Invitation letter (see Appendix 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Ethics clearance (Appendix 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Researcher’s letter (see Appendix 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Self-administered questionnaire survey instruction (Appendix 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>10. Self-administered quantitative questionnaire survey (Appendix 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>11. Structured qualitative interview questions (see Appendix 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research

Neuman (2006) and Veal (2005) both suggest that multiple sources of evidence implicitly add strength to case study research. For this study, multiple sources of evidence came from a self-administered quantitative questionnaire survey. This was followed by structured qualitative interviews with key participants/Aboriginal commentators to initiate an analysis and report on the degree (or otherwise) of homosocial reproductive activities with the management, governance and policy framework of Aboriginal public policies relating to economic development generated statistically from the quantitative survey data collected.

Eisenhardt (1989, p. 538) further suggests, as a process for triangulation and corroborate, that:

“Quantitative data could point out the relationships which may not be salient to the researcher, and qualitative data is important for understanding the rationale or theory underlying the relationships revealed in the quantitative data, or may directly suggest theory which can then be strengthened by quantitative analysis.”
Following Eisenhardt’s suggestion, quantitative data from a self-administered questionnaire survey was used to generate alignment reports from the three levels of homo-social reproductive activities within the Aboriginal/Indigenous public policy economic development framework. Included in the survey were community-based organizations, State Government departments/agencies and Commonwealth Government departments or agencies, which otherwise were not “salient” to the researcher and the participation organizations.

Qualitative data from the follow-up structured interviews of key participants and/or Aboriginal commentators within the Aboriginal/Indigenous economic development framework was gathered. Respondents gave their perspectives when interpreting the quantitative alignment reports and how the reports could be used to investigate their level of homo-social reproductive activities within the framework. Respondents discussed any issues that integrated their management, governance and policy processes with Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory and the mechanisms used to implement and maintain these activities.

Qualitative analysis of data from the follow-up structured interviews of key participants and/or key commentators within the Aboriginal economic development public policy framework was carried out. This gave additional insights into the rationales underlying the relationships between analysis reports relating to the homo-social reproductive activities identified within the three areas of management, governance and policy development that is occurring within the three levels authority within the Aboriginal/Indigenous public policy framework. This framework includes community-based organizations, State Government departments/agencies and Commonwealth Government departments/agencies revealed in the self-administered quantitative questionnaire survey.

3.9.3.1 The self-administered questionnaire design

Consent was sought from the Director(s)/Heads of the relevant Government Departments, the management of community-based organizations and individuals to seek their support and participation in the research project. To obtain their consent, four supporting documents were sent to or attached to the surveys of all the participants in each of the three levels of the Aboriginal framework.
These documents included:

1. Mailed invitations to participate in the Research (see Appendix: 2);
2. Researcher letter outlining the purpose of the Research (see Appendix 4);
3. Copy of Research Survey (see Appendices 5 & 6).

For professional, commercial and ethical practice, it is critical that senior executives participate in both survey and review sessions (Conner 1992). Additional formalities included consultations with the executive and management teams of the organizations and departments/agencies to select suitable participants within the management, governance and policy areas of the Aboriginal framework.

To understand the degree to which an organization possesses and/or practices these bureaucratic ‘kinship’ and homo-social reproductive activities, the research project’s goal was to measure these activities within all three levels the Aboriginal framework. To do this, the researcher analysed such activities at the management, governance and policy making levels. Thomas and Baron (1994) and Rittenhouse (1992) suggest that one way to understand why a business is performing the way it does is to observe the behaviour of the individuals within it. Bloom (1956) specifies that individual units or indeed individuals sometimes participate in certain activities governed by their attitudes, knowledge and skills.

Therefore, the research project was designed to investigate the level of behaviour and/or activities identified in Chapter Two. The research project was also designed to investigate whether this behaviour and/or activities are repeated through homo-social reproductive activities. To achieve this, the research survey questions were developed from Kanter’s HSR Theory, summarized as follows:

**Factors of Kanter’s HSR Theory**

1. Similarity - social background or characteristics
   - organizational experiences
2. Ease of communication;
3. Social control;
4. Uncertainty in job evaluation;
5. Loyalty value over performance;
6. The more ‘closed’ the management structure is, the easier it is to keep others outside the circle/structure
7. Issue of ‘human capital’ vs. ‘social capital’

In addition, Homo-social Reproductive Theory/Activities are actively pursued by or through the Selection and Recruitment Processes by:

1. Recruitment panels – dominated by ‘similarities’
2. “Confidentiality” of the process &/or who applies & who we ‘similar’ favour;
3. How it is advertised and the language used;
4. Attitude/opposition towards dominant ‘similar’ re: panel make up or acceptance of applicants;
5. Description of the organization & organizational culture; & applicant ‘fit’;
6. Where to advertise – widely or restricted etc.;
7. Selected &/or direct recruitment by both dominant ‘similar’ on the panel & others;
8. Elimination of ‘good’ or ‘better’ qualified applicants;
9. Dominant argument of ‘we need someone who come up through the ranks’ or ‘internal applicants only’;
10. ‘Perfect’ or ‘good’ applicants – dominant argument is ‘candidate’s background or qualifications too specialized’;
11. ‘Suspect’ references’
12. Personal support for a certain candidate by the dominant group (conflict of interest etc.);
13. Dismissal of negative comment by the dominant group; e.g., that the candidate preferred by the dominant group is less qualified);
14. The role of the dominant ideology in the decision-making process; and
15. ‘Different’ treatment of committee members; e.g., ‘outsider’ status – less knowledge of needs of the organization, etc., i.e., ‘boundary heightening’

guidelines for substantive questions with Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 questions as the main focus:

- Level 1 questions: for specific interviewees, in this case, concerning homo-social reproductive activities within the management, governance and policy “framework” of Aboriginal economic development;
- Level 2 questions: for an individual case, such as questions built to the case study protocol, to be asked by the investigator about a single case even when the single case is part of a larger, multiple-case study, in this case. These questions were based on the factors of Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory and the factors of how homo-social reproductive theory and/or activities are pursued, which were identified by Dressel et al. (1994).
- Level 3 questions: for pattern-matching and repetition logic across multiple cases, in this case, questions were directed at organizations and/or Government Department/Agencies across the three levels of Aboriginal “framework”.
- Level 4 questions: for an entire study such as calling on information beyond the case study evidence and including other literature or published data that may have been reviewed. In this case, to highlight the extent of the problems associated with the practices of homo-social reproduction/activities, an integration solution for practical implementation is considered but beyond the scope of this study; and
- Level 5 normative questions: for policy recommendations and conclusions. Such questions were considered.

The self-administered questionnaire survey was designed with five sections:

- Part A consisted of set of nine questions set at the individual and organizational level, to enquire into a participants’ general responses relevant gender, age, nationality and employment status;
- Part B consisted of another set of seven questions to determine how each participant ranks the seven most important factors of economic development;
- Part C contained 20 questions set at individual level to enquire participants’ responses relevant to the management practices within Aboriginal/Indigenous organizations or agencies within the Aboriginal
economic development framework;
- Part D contained another 20 questions set at individual level to enquire participants’ responses relevant to the policy development processes/practices within Aboriginal organizations or agencies within the Aboriginal economic development “framework”; and
- Part E contained another 12 questions set at individual level to enquire participants’ responses relevant to the governance of Aboriginal organizations or agencies within the Aboriginal economic development framework.

For the questions a seven-point Likert Scale was engaged. Possible responses were: strongly disagree (1), moderately disagree (2), slightly disagree (3), neither agree nor disagree (4), slightly agree (5), moderately agree (6) and strongly agree (7). The participants were asked to assess the survey questions, directed at the management, governance and policy activities within the Aboriginal economic development framework, based on their assessment of their importance to achieving the goals and objectives of the Aboriginal economic development framework.

The five-part questionnaire survey was taken to several academic advisors/peers and my doctorate supervisors at Southern Cross University and several executives employed within organizations/agencies within the Aboriginal framework for their comments. In addition to the comments and advice provided by my academic advisors/peers, doctorate supervisors and Aboriginal participants at a focus group, identified earlier. They suggested that the survey questions be confined to a manageable format that could be completed in around 30 minutes.

The full questionnaire survey is presented in Appendix 5.

3.9.4 Structured-interview questions
Further, to provide multiple sources of evidence, the researcher engaged follow-up structured interviews to ask the participants to form their own opinions when interpreting the quantitative data analysis reports. At the structured interviews key commentators/participants within the Aboriginal framework were asked to reflect on the results of the quantitative analysis reports. Their comments were used to gauge their
support or objections to the key research propositions. To reiterate, the three research propositions were as follows:

- There is a system to why Aboriginal economic development policies and programs repeatedly fail
- This system has a theoretical basis to it
- To develop an Aboriginal Management Model to overcome these failures within the Aboriginal economic development framework

At the structured interviews, the interviewees were briefed on the quantitative reports generated from the questionnaire survey and asked for their interpretation of the results.

### 3.9.5 Establishing a chain of evidence

Yin (2009) suggests that a chain of evidence would allow thesis examiners to see how evidence is derived from initial research questions to the ultimate case study findings and conclusions. In this case, the researcher’s tactics to maintain the chain of evidence outlined in the case study protocol as follow (Figure 3.13):

![Figure 3.4: Establishing a chain of evidence](image)

Source: Adapted from Yin 2009, p. 123

Yin (2014) suggests that, when the chain of evidence is followed, original evidence will not be lost and factual evidence of a case will therefore receive its appropriate attention for consideration. In this case, the researcher followed all the steps to address any
methodological problems in determining construct validity. This way, the overall quality of the study was also improved.

### 3.10 Case study data analysis

Case study data analysis is about examining, categorizing, tabulating, testing, and recombining evidence, to draw empirically based conclusions, and as Yin (2009) states, it can be especially difficult because analytical techniques are still not sufficiently specific. Yin (2014) further suggests four analytical strategies to form the five tactics when adapted, as illustrated in Table 3.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Analytical Strategies</th>
<th>Case Study Analytical Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relying on theoretical propositions;</td>
<td>1. Pattern matching;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing case description</td>
<td>2. Explanation building;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Using both quantitative and qualitative data; and</td>
<td>3. Time-series analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examining rival explanations.</td>
<td>4. Logic models; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cross case synthesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yin 2014

In this study, the research goal was to develop an “Aboriginal management, governance and policy development improvement model” for Aboriginal organizations/agencies within the Aboriginal economic development “framework”, by assessing the level of bureaucratic kinship system activities and the level(s) of homo-social reproductive activities within these organizations/agencies. The development of a theoretical system was identified along with a theoretical model (homo-social reproduction) that explained how this system was consistently repeated over the past several decades in Chapter Two: “Literature review” (refer to “Section 2).

The lack of knowledge and understanding of the identified theoretical “system” and homo-social reproductive mechanisms of Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory which has leads to the identified problem backed up by the gap identified in the literature review for this research to investigate, resolve and fill. As a result, the first strategy identified in Table 3.12 – of relying on theoretical propositions, was deployed to guide data analysis to focus on areas critical to the theoretical propositions. In addition, special attention
A theoretical analysis of why Aboriginal socio-economic development policy fail.

(Table 3.17) was given when collecting both quantitative and qualitative data for this mixed-method case study.

Table 3.16: Comparison of quantitative and qualitative data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Both methods infer from the empirical details of social life;</td>
<td>1. Quantitative researchers choose from a specialized, standardized set of data analysis techniques which are highly developed and build on applied mathematics. Qualitative researchers rarely know the specifics of data analysis to begin with. It is less standardized;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Both methods involve a public method or process such as systematically record or gather data, and making their actions accessible to others;</td>
<td>2. Quantitative researchers do not begin data analysis until they have collected all of the data and condensed them into numbers in order to see patterns or relationships. Qualitative researchers look for patterns or relationships while data are being collected;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Researchers of both methods compare the evidence gathered as the central process to data analysis; and</td>
<td>3. Quantitative researchers manipulate numbers that represent empirical facts in order to test an abstract hypothesis with variable constructs. Qualitative researchers may illustrate or colour in evidence showing that a theory, generalization, or interpretation is plausible; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Researchers of both methods strive to avoid errors, false conclusions, and misleading inferences.</td>
<td>4. Quantitative researchers assume that social life can be measured by using numbers, then manipulate the numbers with statistics to reveal features of social life. Qualitative researchers do not draw on a large, well-established body of formal knowledge from mathematics and statistics. The data are relatively imprecise, diffuse, and context-based.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Neuman 2006

In this case study, the researcher adopted pattern-matching and explanation building with ‘opposing proposition’ as the two main analytical tactics for mixed data analysis. Eight hundred (800) quantitative surveys were sent out to encompass the three levels of Aboriginal socio-economic development “framework” which included community-based organizations, State Government Departments or Agencies and Commonwealth Government Departments or Agencies. Two hundred (200) surveys were returned and formed the basis of descriptive statistics to generate alignment reports for pattern
matching, between the three levels of the ‘framework’, specifically looking at the management, governance and policy development activities and practices operating at each of the levels.

All survey questions were asked of all participants across the three levels of the ‘framework’. Again, the aim was to identify patterns to generate different level of ‘bureaucratic kinship system’ and homo-social reproductive activities and alignment reports with Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory and Dressel’s list of major factors/mechanisms of how homo-social reproductive theory and activities are constantly repeated over time.

The quantitative analysis reports were used to formulate the questions for the structured interviews to triangulate with the quantitative data as well as to develop explanations of the three research propositions and to address the rival explanation. The researcher adopted a quantitative self-administered questionnaire survey followed by a qualitative structured interview for his Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) study in the field of Kanter’s homo-social reproductive theory.

In summary, this research was a multiple case study in design where the cases were at three levels of the Aboriginal socio-economic development ‘framework’: Community-based organizations, State Departments/Agencies involved in Aboriginal socio-economic development, and Commonwealth Government Departments/Agencies involved in Aboriginal socio-economic development. Literal (replication) logic will be discussed in Chapter Four.

### 3.11 Case study limitations

Yin describes four limitations for the case study research method:

1. Lack of rigour: in this case, the four quality tests of construct validity, credibility (internal validity), external validity and reliability were built into the design phase, the data collection phase, data analysis phase and composition as previously discussed. This, together with the case study protocol should further reduce its limitation;
2. Limited basis for scientific generalization: in this case, the goal was to generalize the developed theoretical propositions only. It was not intended to generalize to populations or universe;

3. Time-wise too long leading to massive, unreadable documents: in this case, the development of prior theories from the pilot study, together with the focus on descriptive statistics of the quantitative reports simplified the research process;

4. Incapable of directly addressing randomized field trials or ‘true experiments’ to establish causal relationships: in this case, this limitation does not apply as this research is descriptive rather than explanatory. However, in the research design phase, an explanation of the research propositions and ‘opposing proposition’ were addressed.

In addition to the four limitations, there could be concern that the findings of this study are limited to one or two specific levels within the framework of Aboriginal economic development. Future studies could be undertaken to study the effect if specific concentration level(s) within the framework were bureaucratic kinship systems were operating and if homo-social reproductive activities were active.

### 3.12 Ethical considerations

Neuman (2006) suggests research ethics should maintain a balance between the values of advancing knowledge against the value of non-interference in the lives of the researched subjects. Ethical issues include concerns, dilemmas, and conflicts about the proper way to conduct social research. Qualitative researchers often investigate the researched subjects’ private spaces. Emery and Cooper (1991) stress the point that without a careful research design, any research methods have the potential to cause physical harm, discomfort, pain, embarrassment, or loss of privacy to the researched subjects.

In this case, prior consent was obtained from the management teams. In addition, all survey participants were provided with the following documents:

1. Contact details (see Appendix 1);
2. Letter of Invitation to participate in the Research project (see Appendix 2);
3. Ethics Clearance (see Appendix 3)
4. Researcher’s Note (see Appendix 4);
5. Self-administrated research questionnaire survey instructions (see Appendix 5);
6. Quantitative Research Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix 5);
7. Qualitative Research Survey Questionnaire (see Appendix 6);

The participation in the research was voluntary and participant identification was optional. Data were kept confidentially and were only accessible only to the researcher and the supervisors. At the follow-up structured interviews, the same precautions were followed. The interviews were recorded and the interviewees could withdraw at any time during their interviews.

Prior to the actual fieldwork, an Ethics clearance application was lodged to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the Southern Cross University. Subsequently, the ethic application was approved and an ethic clearance number of, ECN-13-154 was allocated on 24 June 2013.

3.13 Chapter summary
This chapter presented the justification for mixed-methods multi-case studies research over 11 steps:

1. Justification for a descriptive study
2. Justification for a realism paradigm
3. Justification for mixed-methods multiple case studies
4. Four quality tests to ensure rigour of case study research
5. Establishment of a case study protocol
6. Maintenance of two separate case study databases
7. Mixed-methods data collection triangulation tactics
8. Use of theoretical propositions in the data analysis strategy
9. Pattern matching and theory explanation as prime data analysis tactics;
10. Limitations of case study research and
11. Ethical considerations.

These steps were necessary to ensure rigour of case study fieldwork at the data collection phase. In the next chapter, the focus will be on the findings and data analysis
of the collected data in line with the procedures included in the case study protocol.
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter presents the results from analysis of data collected by means of a detailed survey, in-depth interviews, a focus group and observations during the research project. The preparation of the data for analysis by means of appropriate coding procedures, and the identification of themes relevant to each research question is then discussed. Results from analysis of quantitative data and qualitative data in turn are presented, and the chapter ends with concluding remarks, and recommendations arising from the research. The structure of Chapter 5 is given in Figure 5.1.

Figure 4.1: Structure of Chapter Four

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Data collection and preparation

4.3 Analysis of quantitative data

4.4 Analysis of qualitative data

4.5 Conclusion
4.2 Data collection and preparation

The data collection methods used by the researcher included a self-administered questionnaire for generating quantitative data (see Appendix 5). The results obtained from this survey were then used to formulate a questionnaire to generate qualitative data, which were then used by the researcher as the basis for conducting structured interviews to determine the validity of the results gained from the initial quantitative survey. The results of these two processes were then considered against information gained from conducting a forum at which the research project was discuss, and the researcher’s long term observations of the mechanisms and processes that operated within the Aboriginal economic development framework.

4.2.1 Data collection
The research included the collection of quantitative and qualitative data as part of the researcher’s mixed methods approach. The collection of quantitative data was collected using a quantitative survey (see Appendix 5) and involved the collection of primary data and re-examination of existing statistical information (secondary data) gathered by government agencies and organizations involved in Aboriginal socio-economic development that is relevant to the research topic.

The collection of qualitative data took the form of either incorporating qualitative research questionnaire material into the quantitative questionnaire format and/or historical-comparative research. In addition to the incorporation of both quantitative and qualitative information into a suitable questionnaire for quantitative analysis, field research also involves participant/researcher observations and focus group discussion. Historical comparative research included examining existing data relating to the research topic including books, articles, existing statistics, newspaper articles, observation and interviews.

4.2.2 Data preparation

After data were collected, categorized and coded, the SPSS computer software program was used to transform the data, and to identify thematic responses and rankings in participants’ responses (Basto & Pereira 2012). Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3, demonstrates the research hypotheses, expressed in quantitative terms as follows:

Figure 4.2: Research hypotheses 1:

Hypothesis 1:

\[ H_0 = \text{Control over (ISED+MgtP +IPDP) DOES NOT influence PNPP and therefore lead to ABKB+HSRB} \]

\[ H_1 = \text{Control over (ISED+MgtP +IPDP) DOES influence PNPP and therefore lead to ABKB+HSRB} \]

\[ H_0 = \text{The Null Hypothesis} \]
\[ H_1 = \text{Alternative Hypothesis (Positive Influence)} \]
ISED = Indigenous Socio-economic Development Factors
MgtP = Management Practices
IPDP = Indigenous Policy Development Processes
PNPP = Policy and Program Performance
HSRB = Homosocial Reproductive Behaviour
ABKSB = Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship Behaviour
Figure 4.3: Research hypotheses 2:

Hypothesis:

\[ H_0 = \text{Control over (PnPP + ISED + MgtP + IPDP) DOES NOT influence ABKB and therefore lead to ABKB+HSRB} \]

Alternatively;

\[ H_1 = \text{Control over (PnPP + ISED + MgtP + IPDP) DOES influence ABKB and therefore lead to ABKB+HSRB} \]

\( H_0 = \) The Null Hypothesis
\( H_1 = \) Alternative Hypothesis (Positive Influence)
ISED = Indigenous socio-economic development
MgtP = Management Practices
IPDP = Indigenous Policy Development Processes
PnPP = Policy and Program Performance
HSRB = Homo-social Reproductive Behaviour
ABKB = Aboriginal Bureaucratic Kinship Behaviour

4.3 Analysis of quantitative data

Demographic statistics

The objective of the research project was to secure two hundred questionnaire respondents across the three levels of Aboriginal socio-economic development activities: the commonwealth, state and local levels of activity within the Aboriginal socio-economic development framework. These levels of activities encompassed commonwealth government departments and agencies, state government departments and agencies, and community-based organization.
The demographic profiles of respondents were as follows:

**Table 4.1: Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that approximately equal numbers of males and females completed the questionnaire. From an Aboriginal cultural perspective, this represented a significant result, indicating that both Aboriginal males and females are concerned with the current status of Aboriginal economic development.

**Table 4.2: Nationality of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aboriginal</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicates that the majority (81%) of respondents identified as Aboriginal, with only six percent identifying as Torres Strait Islander and 26 percent of respondents being of Australian heritage or non-Aboriginal.

Table 4.3 indicates that that the majority (41%) of respondents who participated in the quantitative research component of the study were between the ages of 35-40 years of age, 18.5 percent were aged between 45-54 years, 17.5 percent were aged between 25-34 years, nine percent were aged between 18-24 years, and eight and half percent were aged between 55-64 years.

Table 4.3: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 60 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two thirds of the respondents were aged between 25-54 years, which indicates that these respondents have been exposed to the workings of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system, implying that its effects on Aboriginal economic development performance(s) is a higher degree of concern.

Table 4.4: Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school leaving certificate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher school certificate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary certificate/diploma</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher degree (Master, PhD, etc.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 indicates that approximately one third (36%) of the respondents had a tertiary education either at certificate or diploma level, 28.5 percent of respondents had school leaving certificates and that 11 percent had a higher school certificate, 16 percent had a bachelors’ degree, and 6 percent had higher degree qualifications. Overall, the majority of respondents had an education level sufficient to understand the nature of the research and/or the issues being investigated.

Table 4.5: Study field of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study field</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no tertiary qualifications</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social welfare</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 indicates that 25 percent of the respondents had no tertiary education, 18.5 percent had a tertiary qualification in business, 16.5 percent had a tertiary qualification in the social welfare field, 5.5 percent had tertiary qualification in the field of education, and one third (33.5%) indicated that they had a qualification not listed in the survey, or no qualifications at all. Overall, three quarters of the respondents to the quantitative survey indicated that they had a tertiary qualification.

Table 4.6 identifies the employment areas in which the respondents are employed. The results show that 80.5% of respondents are employed in organizations within the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development framework, which has been identified previously as local community-based Aboriginal organizations, state government agencies and commonwealth government agencies.

Table 4.6: Employment area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid indigenous organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. C'th Department</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. State Department</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. Local Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 also indicates that 38 percent of respondents were employed within community-based organizations, 27 percent are employed with state government agencies and 12 percent of respondents are employed within commonwealth agencies. The results also imply that the 80.5 percent of respondents working within the Aboriginal economic development framework are well positioned to comment on the workings of the framework.

Table 4.7: Employment position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid chairman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chief executive officer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior manager</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project officer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin. officer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 indicates that approximately one third (31%) of respondents have identified as being employed at a senior management level within the Aboriginal framework, and that approximately one quarter (26%) of respondents have identified that they are employed as project officers within the framework.

The table also indicates that only six percent of respondents were in the position of chairperson, that only one respondent (0.5%) identified as being employed as a managing director position and only eleven respondents (5.5%) identified as being employed in a position of chief executive officer in an organization within the Aboriginal economic development framework. This indicates that there was a reluctance to participate in the research and/or a reluctance to expose the inner workings of the framework.

Table 4.8: Employment period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment period</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid less than 3 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 indicates that the majority of respondents to the survey were employed for periods between three and twenty years, with approximately one third of respondents being employed within the Aboriginal economic development framework for five to ten years (33%). A further one fifth (22.5%) of respondents indicated that they have been employed within the framework for ten to fifteen years, and are well placed in terms of knowledge and experience with how the Aboriginal economic development framework operates, to provide appropriate responses relating to the workings of the system.
It can be seen from the results shown in Table 4.8 that approximately one quarter (23%) of respondents indicated that they had been employed within organizations and agencies within the Aboriginal economic development framework for five years or less, and by participating in the research, were already expressing concern with the poor level of outcomes being achieved.

Table 4.9: Previous workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous workplace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid indigenous organization</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonwealth department</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state department</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private sector</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 indicates that approximately forty percent of respondents (38.5%) were employed at the local government or within local community-based Aboriginal organization within the Aboriginal economic development framework. Seven and a half percent of respondents were employed within commonwealth departments/agencies involved in the Aboriginal economic development framework, and 21.5 percent of respondents were employed within state government departments/agencies involved in the framework.

Overall, 70 percent of respondents were employed within the three levels of the Aboriginal economic development framework identified in Figure 1.2 of the research and are well placed to provide information on the working of the organizations and/or agencies involved in the development and delivery of Aboriginal policies and programs.

Table 4.10 indicates that the majority (87%) of respondents were either a general member, board member, or a member of multiple Indigenous/Aboriginal organizations.
and/or government or agency committee. This also indicates that the respondents were well placed within the Aboriginal economic development framework to contribute responses to the research study.

**Table 4.10: Board and/or committee member**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board and/or committee member</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not on any committees or boards</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Indigenous Organization</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member Indig. Org.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. C'th Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. State C'tee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indig. Local C'tee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiples Indigenous. C'tees</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composite Variables:**

After collection, coding and entering of the data into the SPSS, several new Composite Variables (ISED, MgtP, IPDP and PnPP), were developed in relation to the hypotheses and the research questions outlined above. The composite variables developed were then tested for their reliability by determining the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The composite variables relating to each of the proposed hypotheses, included the following:

Composite Variable for Indigenous (or Aboriginal) socio-economic development (ISED):

Tables 4.11 through to Table 4.27 explain the process of assessment using the software program SPSS to determine the reliability of the composite variable for Indigenous/
Aboriginal socio-economic development. For each of the respondents, the mean across items two, four, five and six was calculated to form a new variable ISED, which represents Indigenous/Aboriginal socio-economic development factors. Item-to-total correlations and inter-item correlations were calculated. Using the criteria presented by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 118), all items were found to display item-to-total correlations greater than the criterion of 0.05. All items were also found to display inter-item correlations greater than the criterion of 0.3.

A univariate analysis was carried out to determine whether any outliers existed that may distort the results of the analysis. Outliers were identified by calculating the standard Z Scores. In a normal distribution, nearly all cases lie within ± 3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores with scores in exceeding ± 3.29 (p< .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practice this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers. The analysis found that three potential outliers existed.

A multivariate analysis was carried out to test for potential outliers. Using multivariate analysis to determine outliers, this created a new variable in the dataset by calculating mahalanobis scores (MAH_1). These scores, for each respondent, was then used to calculate which respondents’ responses to each of the survey questions were too extreme or presented an unusual pattern that would distort the research results.

After entering the four variable (ISED, MgtP, IPDP & PnPP), that made up the four variables developed to assess the hypothesis, into the SPSS computer program, the analysis recommended that all values above a MAH_1 value of 18.467 should be considered as outliers across the four variable and should be removed so that the results would not be distorted.

In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable ISED, the analysis identified three variables which were removed. Their removal resulted in a negative skewing of the remaining dataset, which required a further “normality” test. The dataset had a ‘ceiling’ effect that indicated that the composite variable ISED has the extreme response and it is not appropriate for these types of responses to be normalized by any method because no matter what method used responses will possess ‘skewness’. A principal component analysis was performed for the composite variable ISED, to
examine whether the items making up the composite variable could be considered to measure a single underlying construct. Only one component was extracted with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and so unidimensionality was assumed. All items displayed loadings greater than the minimum criterion 0.05 as specified by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 111).

A test for reliability was carried out which produced a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha which was found to be good ($\alpha = .826$).

**Table 4.11: Composite variable analysis for ISED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ised2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Figure 4.13 above indicates the four of the seven variables used to compile the composite variable ISED, (ised2, ised4, ised5 & ised7), were found to have greater communalities than the other three and were subsequently used to form the composite variable ISED for the research. The seven variables used to determine the composite variable ISED included;
ISED 1 = quantitative research survey question 10
ISED 2 = quantitative research survey question 11
ISED 3 = quantitative research survey question 12
ISED 4 = quantitative research survey question 13
ISED 5 = quantitative research survey question 14
ISED 6 = quantitative research survey question 15
ISED 7 = quantitative research survey question 16
(See Appendix 5)
Table 4.12: Total variance for composite variable ISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>74.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>16.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>6.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.12 indicates that the four variables used to compile the composite variable ISED, only one of the variable returned an eigenvalue greater than one. Therefore, the variables are said to be homogenous. This is also indicated in Table 4.15, which also indicates that only one component has been extracted from those used to compile the composite variable ISED.

Table 4.13: Component matrix for composite variable ISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrixa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ised7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.

Table 4.14 and Table 4.15 show the composite variable ISED reliability tests results, which return a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.826 which represents a good level of reliability.
Table 4.14: Reliability test for composite variable ISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Valid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Excluded*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.15: Reliability statistic (Cronbach Alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following analysis was carried out to determine the existence of potential outliers within the research data, so that they could be removed to prevent a distortion of the results.

Identifying univariate outliers ISED:

It can be concluded that the data have the ceiling effect that the ISED has the extreme responses, and it is not appropriate to normalize these responses by using any method because no matter what method is used, the responses will have skewness (SPSS cookbook, p. 64).
Figure 4.4: Graph /histogram for composite variable ISED

The multivariate outlier analysis created the new variable in the dataset MAH_1. Alternatively, we could have used chi square values to identify these responses. Because we entered 4 variables, which are our CVs, the spss cookbook recommends that values greater than 18.467 are outliers (p. 58). So MAH_1 values greater than 18.467 should be considered as outliers across all variables because we calculated the Mahalanobis distance scores (MAH_1), for the following composite variable ISED, Mgt Practice, IDPD and PnPP.
Figure 4.5  Boxplot to determine outliers for composite variable ISED

Normality ISED:

Table 4.16:  Descriptive statistics for composite variable ISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISED</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.9800</td>
<td>.13347</td>
<td>-8.682</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution is negatively skewed with the value of -8.682. In order to decide this skewness is significant, we calculate statistic/ std. error, which gives the answer -50.4767 to create a Z score. For samples less than 300, if the value exceeds an absolute value of 2.58, then the skew is significant. Therefore, the data have significant skewness.
Therefore, the variables 32, 45 and 51 were removed from the dataset, then descriptive statistical analysis was run. Results are shown in Figure 4.4 and Table 4.17.

**Table 4.17: Descriptive statistics for composite variable ISED after removal of outliers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISED</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.9949</td>
<td>.03535</td>
<td>-6.855</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite variable for Management practices (MgtP):

For each of the management practices (mp) grouped respondents, the mean across items 1-20 was calculated to form a new variable MgtP, which represents factors of Aboriginal management practices. Item-to-total correlations and inter-item correlations were calculated. Using the criteria presented by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 118), Six of the twenty items were found to display item-to-total correlations greater than the criterion of 0.05. Twelve items were found to display inter-item correlations greater than the criterion of 0.3.

A univariate analysis was then carried out to determine whether any outliers existed that may distort the results of the analysis. Outliers were identified by calculating the standard Z Scores. For a normal distribution nearly all cases lie within ±3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores greater than ±3.29 (p< .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practice this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers. The analysis found that the same three potential outliers that existed in the ISED analysis, existed within the composite variable MgtP.

A multivariate analysis was carried out to test for potential outliers. Using multivariate analysis to determine outliers, a new variable was created in the dataset by calculating the mahalanobis scores (MAH_1). After entering the four variable (MgtP, ISED, IPDP & PnPP), the analysis recommended that all values above a MAH_1 value of 18.467 should be considered as outliers across the four variables.
In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable MgtP, the analysis identified the same three variables as outliers found in composite variable MgtP, which were removed. Their removal resulted in a negative skewing of the remaining dataset, which required a further “normality” test, the same as that carried out for the composite variable ISED, to correct the “skewness” of the data.

A principal component analysis was then performed for the composite variable MgtP, to examine whether the items making up the composite variable could be considered to measure a single underlying construct. Six components were extracted with an eigenvalue greater than one and therefore multi-dimensionality was assumed. Twelve items displayed loadings greater than the minimum criterion 0.05 as specified by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 111). A test for reliability of the composite variable was carried out which produced a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of (\(\alpha=.717\)), which was found to be acceptable for the research project.

Note: In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable MgtP, the analysis identified six components that were influencing the composite variable. Even though the reliability test was found to be acceptable, further research beyond this project will need to be carried out to determine the level of their individual effects.

Tables 4.17 through to Table 4.27, identify the process followed to determine the factors that contributed to the formation of the composite variable management practices (mp) and the test to determine the composite variable reliability or Cronbach Alpha score.
Table 4.18: Management variables used to create composite variable management practices (mgtP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mp1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp11</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp12</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp13</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp14</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp15</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp16</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp17</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp18</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp19</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp20</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

mp1-mp20 = quantitative research survey questions 17-36 (See: Appendix 5)
### Table 4.19: Total variance of management variable (mp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.072</td>
<td>30.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>8.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>7.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>6.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>5.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>4.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>4.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>3.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>2.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>2.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>2.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>2.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>1.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Table 4.20: Component matrix for composite variable (mgtp)

Component Matrix\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrix for composite variable (mgtp)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mp1</td>
<td>-.428</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp2</td>
<td>-.428</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp3</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp4</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp5</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp6</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp7</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.526</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp8</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp9</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.423</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp10</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp11</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp12</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp13</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-.564</td>
<td>-.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp14</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp15</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp16</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp17</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp18</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp19</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp20</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

\(^a\) 6 components extracted.
Table 4.21: Reliability Test for composite variable (mgtp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded⁹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.22: Reliability statistic for composite variable (mgtp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha = .717 is acceptable
Identifying univariate outliers Management Practice (MgtP):

**Figure 4.6:**  Graph /histogram(normal)= Mgt Practice.

![Graph showing frequency distribution of Mgt Practice](image)

Figure 4.6 indicates that the variables used to create the composite variable (MgtP), the analysis resulted in a negative skewing of the data and required a further normality transformation process to be carried out using the SPSS computer program to correct the “skewing” of the data.

**Table 4.23:**  Boxplot for composite variable MgtP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt_Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.7: Boxplot to determine outliers for composite variable mgtP

Table 4.23 and Figure 4.7 provide a graphical interpretation of the data in the form of a boxplot to determine the outliers associated with the variables used to create the composite variable management practices (MgtP). The variable are those that lie outside the boxplot in Figure 4.5 above and were removed from the relevant data.

Table 4.24: Descriptive statistics Management Practice
(in column ZMgt Practice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgt_Practice</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.9655</td>
<td>.46070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SPSS Cookbook (p. 55) recommended that outliers be identified by their standardized Z scores. In a normal distribution, nearly all cases lie within +3.29 and –3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores exceeding 3.29 (p < .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practice, this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers.

The Z scores, in column ZMgt Practice, highlight that case 40 has value higher than 3.29.
Table 4.25: Identifying multivariate outliers for management practice (MgtP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mgt_Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.9655</td>
<td>.46070</td>
<td>-1.479</td>
<td>4.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outliers are identified through multivariate analysis, which creates a new variable in the data MAH_1 or use chi square value to identify those responses. Four variables were entered, for the composite variables (CVs), the cookbook therefore recommends that values greater than 18.467 are outliers (p. 58). Therefore MAH_1 values greater than 18.467 should be regarded as outliers across all variables because MAH_1 was calculated using the following variables ISED, Mgt_Practice, IDPD and PnPP.

Normality Management Practice (mgtP) process:

The distribution was negatively skewed, with the value of -1.479. To find out the significance of the skewness, the statistic/std. error was calculated. This resulted in a score of 8.5988. For samples less than 300, if the Z-score value exceeds an absolute value of 2.58, then the skew is significant. Therefore, the data has a significant skewness. Cases with a score greater than 18.467 were removed from the analysis that is the following rows were deleted from the dataset 9, 32, 40, 45, 51, 56 and the descriptive statistics analysis was then carried out. It further shows consistency that 32, 45 & 51 remain outliers for another variable as well.

Table 4.26: Descriptive statistic for composite variable MgtP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mgt_Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.9902</td>
<td>.40497</td>
<td>-.978</td>
<td>1.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution is negatively skewed with the value of -.978. To decide this skewness is significant, we calculate statistic/std. error, which gives the answer 5.588 to create a Z score. For samples less than 300, if the value exceeds an absolute value of 2.58, then the
skew is significant. Therefore, the data still have significant skewness. A ‘normality’ correction analysis was then undertaken to correct the ‘skewness’ of the data.

**Figure 4.8:** Boxplot outliers graph for composite variable mgtP

Figure 4.8 above shows that the variables used to create the composite variable management practices was negatively skewed to the right and therefore a normality data transformation procedure was carried out to correct the skewness.

**Table 4.27:** Case processing summary for composite variable mgtP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.
Composite variable (CV) for Indigenous policy development processes (IPDP):

For each of the (ipdp) grouped respondents, the mean across items 1-20 was calculated to form a new variable IDPD, which represents factors of Indigenous/Aboriginal policy development processes. Item-to-total correlations and inter-item correlations were calculated. Using the criteria presented by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 118), eleven items of the twenty items were all found to display item-to-total correlations greater than the criterion of 0.05. Eleven items were found to display inter-item correlations greater than the criterion of 0.3.

A univariate analysis was carried out to determine whether any outliers existed that may distort the results of the analysis. Outliers were identified by calculating the standard Z Scores. In a normal distribution, nearly all cases lie within ± 3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores exceeding ± 3.29 (p< .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practice this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers. The analysis found that there were no potential outliers within the composite variable IPDP.

Before making a final decision regarding outliers, a multivariate analysis was carried out to test for potential outliers. Using multivariate analysis to determine outliers creates a new variable in the dataset by calculating mahalanobis scores (MAH_1). Alternatively, we can also use chi square values to identify potential outliers as well. After entering the four variable (MgtP, ISED, IPDP & PnPP), a composite variable IDPD was developed to assess hypothesis one, the analysis recommended that all values above a MAH_1 value of 18.467 should be considered as outliers across the four variable.

In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable IPDP/IPD, the analysis identified six variables as outliers in composite variable IPDP as compared to ISED and MgtP composite variables, which were removed. Their removal resulted in a positive ‘skewing’ of the remaining dataset, which required a further “normality” test to be carried out for the composite variable ISED and MgtP, to correct the “skewness” of the data.
A principal component analysis was then performed for the composite variable IPDP/IDPD, to examine whether the items making up the composite variable could be considered to measure a single underlying construct. Seven components were extracted with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and therefore multi-dimensionality was assumed. Eleven items displayed loadings greater than the minimum criterion 0.05 as specified by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 111)

A test for reliability of the composite variable was carried out which produced a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of ($\alpha=.700$), which was found to be acceptable for the research project.

Note: In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable IPDP/IDPD, the analysis identified seven components that were influencing the composite variable. Even though the reliability test was found to be acceptable, further research beyond this project will need to be carried out to determine their individual effects on the composite variable IPDP/IDPD data:
For the composite variable IPDP/IDPD, the complete data file containing all 200 cases was used.

**Table 4.28: Composite variable analysis (CV) for IPDP/IDPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ipdp1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp11</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp12</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp13</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp14</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp15</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp16</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp17</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp18</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp19</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp20</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.28 identifies the variable used to create the composite variable Indigenous policy development processes (ipdp) and represent questions 37-56 of the quantitative research survey (see: Appendix 6).
Table 4.29  Total variance of variables used to create composite variable (ipdp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>24.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>12.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>9.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>8.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>6.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>5.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>5.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>4.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>4.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>3.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>2.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>2.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>2.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>1.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>1.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>1.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>1.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.29 has analysed the variables used to create the composite variable ipdp, and indicates that there are seven dominant variables with eigenvalues greater that one within the data that contribute to the composite variable ipdp.
Table 4.30: Component matrix for composite variable (ipdp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrixa</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ipdp1</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp2</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp3</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp4</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp5</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp6</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp7</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp8</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp9</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>-.533</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp10</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.684</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp11</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp12</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp13</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp14</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp15</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp16</td>
<td>-.422</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp17</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp18</td>
<td>-.311</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp19</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ipdp20</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 7 components extracted.

Table 4.30 above shows the matrix data for the composite variable ipdp and further identifies the seven variables with eigenvalues greater than one, meaning that seven components were extracted requiring further research beyond this study to determine their individual impacts on the data.
Table 4.31: Reliability tests for composite variable ipdp

**RELIABILITY**

**Case Processing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\). Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.32: Reliability statistic for composite variable ipdp

**Reliability Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.700</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha is at the acceptable level

Table 4.31 and Table 4.32 above show the data results relating to the reliability testing of the composite variable ipdp. The results indicate a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.7 which is considered acceptable to use as a reliability test for the data.
Figure 4.9: Identifying univariate outliers for composite variable ipdp/idpd
Graph /histogram(normal)= idpd/idpd.

Figure 4.9 shows that the variables used to create the composite variable Indigenous policy development processes (ipdp) was positively skewed to the left and therefore a normality data transformation procedure was carried out to correct the skewness.

Table 4.33: Composite variable IPDP case processing summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.10: Boxplot to determine outliers for composite variable ipdp

Table 4.35 and Figure 4.10 show the graphical interpretation of the data in the form of a boxplot to determine the outliers associated with the variables used to create the composite variable Indigenous policy development processes (ipdp/idpd). These variable are those that lie outside the boxplot in Figure 4.8 above and were removed from the relevant data.

Table 4.34: Descriptive statistics IPDP (Zipdp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPDP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.6717</td>
<td>.56182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SPSS Cookbook, p. 55) Identify outliers using their standardized Z scores. In a normal distribution analysis, nearly all cases lie within +3.29 and – 3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores with an absolute score exceeding 3.29 (p < .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practices this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers.

The Z scores, in column ZIPDP, highlight that no cases have value higher than 3.29.
Multivariate outlier analysis was used to identify outliers. This created a new variable in the data MAH_1. Alternatively, we can also use chi square value analysis to identify those responses also. Because we entered four variables, which is our CVs, the cookbook recommends that values greater than 18.467 are outliers (SPSS Cookbook, p. 58). So MAH_1 values greater than 18.467 should be considered as outliers across all variables because we calculated MAH_1 by entering the variables ISED, Mgt_Practice, IPDP/IPDP and PnPP.

Normality testing for composite variable IPDP/IPDP:

The distribution is positively skewed with the value of 1.159. In order to decide this skewness is significant, we calculate statistic/std. error, which gives the answer 6.738 to create a Z score. For samples less than 300, if the value exceeds an absolute value of 2.58, then the skew is significant. Therefore, the data have significant skewness. Cases with a score greater than 18.467 were removed from our analysis that is rows 9, 32, 40, 45, 51, 56 were deleted and then the descriptive statistics process was carried out.

It further shows consistency that 32, 45 & 51 remain outliers for another variable as well, ISED and MgtP.

Table 4.35:  Identifying multivariate outliers IPDP

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum Statistic</th>
<th>Maximum Statistic</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPDP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.6717</td>
<td>.56182</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum Statistic</th>
<th>Maximum Statistic</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPDP</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.6776</td>
<td>.56681</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normality testing for composite variable IPDP/IPDP:
Figure 4.11: Identifying outliers form composite variable ipdp

Graph /histogram(normal)= idpd.

Figure 4.11 above shows that the variables used to create the composite variable Indigenous policy development processes (ipdp) was positively skewed to the left and therefore a normality data transformation procedure was carried out to correct the skewness of the data.
Composite variable (CV) for Indigenous policy development processes (PnPP):

For each of the policy program (pp) grouped respondents, the mean across items 1-12 was calculated to form a new variable PnPP, which represents factors of Indigenous/Aboriginal policy development processes. Item-to-total correlations and inter-item correlations were calculated. Using the criteria presented by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998, p. 118), Five of the twelve items were found to display item-to-total correlations greater than the criterion of 0.05. Nine items were found to display inter-item correlations greater than the criterion of 0.3.

A univariate analysis was carried out to determine whether any outliers existed that may distort the results of the analysis by calculating the standard Z Scores. In a normal distribution, nearly all cases lie within ± 3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores exceeding ± 3.29 (p< .001) are identified as potential outliers. In practice this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers.

The analysis found that there were no potential outliers within the composite variable PnPP. Before making a final decision regarding outliers, a multivariate analysis was carried out to test for potential outliers. Using multivariate analysis to determine outliers, creates a new variable in the dataset by calculating mahalanobis scores (MAH_1). The SPSS analysis recommended that all values above a MAH_1 value of 18.467 be considered as outliers across the four variables of (MgtP, ISED, IPDP & PnPP).

In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable PnPP, the analysis identified six variables as outliers in composite variable PnPP. These variables were then removed from the dataset. Their removal resulted in a positive ‘skewing’ of the remaining dataset, which required a further “normality” test to that carried out for the composite variable ISED, MgtP and IPDP, to correct the “skewness” of the data. A principal component analysis was then performed for the composite variable PnPP, to examine whether the items making up the composite variable could be considered to measure a single underlying construct. Three components were extracted with an eigenvalue greater than 1 and therefore multi-dimensionality was assumed. Five items displayed loadings greater than the minimum criterion 0.05 as specified by Hair,


A test for overall reliability of the composite variable was carried out which produced a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of ($\alpha = .825$), which was found to be acceptable.

Note: In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable PnPP, the analysis identified seven components that were influencing the composite variable and even though the reliability test was found to be acceptable, further research beyond this project would need to be carried out to determine the level of their individual effects on the overall composite variable.

Composite variable analysis (CV) data for composite variable policy and program performance (PnPP):

In this analysis, I used the data file with all the 200 cases.

\[
\text{COMPUTE PnPP} = \frac{(pp1 + pp2 + pp3 + pp4 + pp5 + pp6 + pp7 + pp8 + pp9 + pp10 + pp11 + pp12)}{12}.
\]

Table 4.37: Total variance of variables used to create composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>47.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>10.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>9.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>7.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>5.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>4.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>3.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>2.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>2.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>2.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>1.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.38: Component matrix for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Matrix(^a)</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp1</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp2</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp3</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>-.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp4</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp5</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp6</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp7</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp8</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp9</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp10</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp11</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp12</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-.406</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 3 components extracted.

Reliability:

Table 4.39: Reliability tests for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 4.40: Reliability statistic for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha is considered, to be at a good level
Figure 4.12: Identifying univariate outliers PnPP

Graph/histogram(normal)=PnPP.

Figure 4.12 above shows that the variables used to create the composite variable policy and program performance (PnPP) was positively skewed to the left and therefore a normality data transformation procedure was carried out to correct the skewness of the data.

Table 4.41: Case Processing Summary for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnPP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.13: Boxplot to determine outliers for composite variable PnP

![Boxplot](image)

Tables 4.41 and Figure 4.13 above show the graphical interpretation of the data in the form of a boxplot to determine the outliers associated with the variables used to create the composite variable policy and program performance (PnP). These variables are those that lie outside the boxplot in Figure 4.12 above and were removed from the relevant data.

Table 4.42: Descriptive statistics Z-scores for PnP (ZPnP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PnP</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.6904</td>
<td>1.03351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SPSS Cookbook, p. 55): identify outliers using their standardized Z scores. In a normal distribution, nearly all cases lie within +3.29 and – 3.29 standard deviations of the mean. Cases with standard scores with an absolute score exceeding 3.29 (p < .001) are
identified as potential outliers. In practices this is a commonly used criterion to identify univariate outliers.

The Z scores, in column ZPnPP, highlight that none cases have value higher than 3.29.

Table 4.4: Identifying multivariate outliers for PnP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We identify through multivariate outlier analysis, which creates a new variable in the data MAH_1 and we can also use chi square value to identify those responses. Because we entered 4 variables, that is our CVs, the cookbook recommends that values greater than 18.467 are outliers (SPSS Cookbook, p. 58). So MAH_1 values greater than 18.467 should be regarded as outliers across all variables because we calculated MAH_1 on the basis of ISED, Mgt_Practice, IDPD and PnPP.

Normality PnPP:

The distribution is positively skewed with the value of 0.738. In order to decide this skewness is significant, we calculate statistic/std. error, which gives the answer 4.290 to create a Z score. For samples less than 300, if the value exceeds an absolute value of 2.58, then the skew is significant. Therefore, the data have significant skewness and ‘normality’ skewness correction tests were carried out.

Cases with a score more than 18.467 from our analysis were deleted and a descriptive statistics analysis was run. It further shows consistency that 32, 45 and 51 remain outliers for another composite variable previously identified as well.
Table 4.44: Descriptive statistic for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnPP</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.6628</td>
<td>0.01068</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.14: Identifying univariate outliers PnPP

Figure 4.14 above shows that the variables used to create the composite variable policy and program performance (PnPP) was positively skewed to the left and therefore a normality data transformation procedure was carried out to correct the skewness of the data.

A similar analysis was carried out to determine the composite variable for Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system (ABKS) behaviour. This was followed by a principal component analysis, to establish whether there was a single underlying construct. The analysis extracted three components with an eigenvalue greater than one with the assumption that multidimensionality existed. The remaining eight components
displayed loadings greater than the minimum criterion of 0.05 as specified by Hair et.al (1998). A test for overall reliability was then carried out resulting in a Crombach alpha coefficient of (0.821) which is considered acceptable.

Note: In the case of the principal component analysis for composite variable ABKS, the analysis identified eleven components that were influencing the composite variable and even though the reliability test was found to be acceptable, further research beyond this project would need to be carried out to determine the level of their individual effects on the overall composite variable.

The data for the new Composite Variable Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system (ABKS) is set out below.

```
COMPUTE ABKS=mp3+mp4+mp5+mp6+mp7+mp8+mp9+mp10+mp11+mp16+mp17/11.
EXECUTE.

correlations
    /variables=ABKS mp3 mp4 mp5 mp6 mp7 mp8 mp9 mp10 mp11 mp16 mp17
    /print=twotail nosig
    /missing=pairwise.
```

### Table 4.45: Correlation notes for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Created</td>
<td>08-AUG-2016 19:18:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Dataset</td>
<td>DataSet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Syntax | CORRELATIONS
    /VARIABLES=ABKS mp3 mp4 mp5 mp6 mp7 mp8 mp9 mp10 mp11 mp16 mp17
    /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
    /MISSING=PAIRWISE. |

[DataSet1] /Users/trevorgmaher/Desktop/CHAPTER 4 SPSS Files/SPSS 9-10-15 outliers removed Data.sav
Table 4.46: Correlations for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABKS</th>
<th>mp3</th>
<th>mp4</th>
<th>mp5</th>
<th>mp6</th>
<th>mp7</th>
<th>mp8</th>
<th>mp9</th>
<th>mp10</th>
<th>mp11</th>
<th>mp16</th>
<th>mp17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

```
FACTOR
/VARIABLES mp3 mp4 mp5 mp6 mp7 mp8 mp9 mp10 mp11 mp16 mp17
/MISSING LISTWISE
/ANALYSIS mp3 mp4 mp5 mp6 mp7 mp8 mp9 mp10 mp11 mp16 mp17
/PRINT INITIAL EXTRACTION
/CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25)
/EXTRACTION PC
/ROTATION NOROTATE
/METHOD=CORRELATION.
```

## Factor Analysis

### Table 4.47: Factor analysis notes for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>08-AUG-2016 19:23:29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Active Dataset</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Filter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Split File</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value Handling</td>
<td><strong>Definition of Missing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cases Used</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td><strong>FACTOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td><strong>Processor Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Elapsed Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Maximum Memory Required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.48: Factor communalities for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mp3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp11</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp16</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp17</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.49: ABKS factor variances explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Variance Explained</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>36.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.433</td>
<td>13.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>11.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>8.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>6.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>6.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>4.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>4.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>3.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>2.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.50: Component Matrix for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mp3</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp4</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp5</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp7</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp8</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp9</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp10</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
<td>.341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp11</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td></td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp16</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mp17</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
<td>.312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 3 components extracted.
Reliability analysis

Table 4.51: Reliability analysis notes for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Created</th>
<th>08-AUG-2016 19:25:58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Dataset</td>
<td>DataSet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split File</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Rows in Working Data File</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value Handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Missing</td>
<td>User-defined missing values are treated as missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Used</td>
<td>Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor Time</td>
<td>00:00:00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elapsed Time</td>
<td>00:00:00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Table 4.52: Reliability analysis case processing summary for ABKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.
4.3.1 Tests for variable association:

A Multiple linear regression (MLR) was carried out for PnPP:

To test the association/relationship of the independent variables (ISED+MgtP+IPDP) to the dependent variable (PnPP) and therefore the performance outcomes of policies and programs within the Aboriginal framework, the following test was carried out. A Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) analysis test was carried out in accordance with the recommendations outlined for research questions which propose associations between variables (SPSS Cookbook, 81-115). The regression analysis was carried out to determine whether any such association between the variables satisfied the null hypotheses (H₀) or whether the association satisfied the alternative hypothesis (H₁).

\[ H₀ = \text{Control over (ISED+MgtP+IPDP) DOES NOT influence PNPP as a result of HSRB} \]

Alternatively:

\[ H₁ = \text{Control over (ISED+MgtP+IPDP) DOES influence PNPP as a result of HRB} \]

**Dataset for Hypothesis one: Test of association between the variables**

**Regression-MLR (PnPP/ISED+MgtP+IPDP)**

**Table 4.54:** Variables Entered/Removed for composite variable PnPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entered/Removed(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a. \text{Dependent Variable: PnPP} \)

\( b. \text{All requested variables entered.} \)
Table 4.55: Composite variable PnPP model summary

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646*</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.77726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IDPD, ISED, Mgt_Practice

Table 4.56: Composite variable PnPP ANOVA

ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>82.356</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.452</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>114.787</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197.143</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PnPP

b. Predictors: (Constant), IDPD, ISED, Mgt_Practice

Table 4.57: Composite variable PnPP coefficients

Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Zero-order</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-26.282</td>
<td>12.691</td>
<td>-2.071</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISED</td>
<td>3.916</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt_Practice</td>
<td>-.643</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>-4.213</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPD</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>11.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PnPP

A standard multiple regression was performed between Policy and Program Performance as the dependent variable and Indigenous Socio-economic Development factors (ISED), Management Practices (MgtP) and Indigenous Policy Development Processes (IPDP) as independent variables. The multiple correlation coefficient (R = .65) was significantly different from zero, F = 45.44, p < 0.05, and 40.9% of the variation in the dependent variable was explained by the set of independent variables (R² = .418, and the Adjusted R² = .409)
Coefficients for ISED were $r^2 = 0.014$, $t = 2.18$, $p < .05$
Coefficients for IPDP were $r^2 = .405$, $t = 11.29$, $p < .05$
Coefficients for MgtP were $r^2 = -0.05$, $t = -4.21$, $p > .05$

The test of association shows that control of the resources of Aboriginal/Indigenous socio-economic development (ISED) and control over the policy development processes (IPDP) by utilizing homosocial reproductive mechanisms and behaviour, significantly and uniquely contribute to the poor policy and program performance (PnPP). The regression analysis also shows that management practices (MgtP) was found not to provide any significant contribution to the same prediction ($t = -4.21$, $p > .05$).

Further research, beyond the scope of this study, needs to be undertaken to determine why management practices within the framework has had, when taken in isolation, a negative impact on the performance of Aboriginal policies and programs. Further research, also needs to investigate whether management practices and their influences diminish as control over the resources of Aboriginal economic development and policy development processes shift to persons outside the management structures of the Aboriginal framework and the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system.

Overall, the research shows that the variables in combination, support the proposition that the long term continuous control, by the same and/or similar persons implementing homosocial reproductive behaviour, structures and activities (HSR) significantly effects the policy and program outcomes within the Aboriginal framework. Therefore, the quantitative research analysis indicates that the Null hypothesis ($H_0$) should be rejected and that the alternative hypothesis ($H_1$) be supported.

An additional Multiple linear regression (MLR) analysis was also carried out to test the relationship between the variable and the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system (ABKS):

The test was carried out to test the association of the independent variables (ISED+MgtP+IPDP+PnPP) to the dependent variable (ABKS) and therefore Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour within the Aboriginal framework. The analysis was carried out in accordance with that recommended for research questions which propose associations between variables (SPSS Cookbook, 81-115). Therefore, a Multiple Linear
Regression Analysis (MLR) was carried out to determine whether the association between the variable were associated or not associated with the outcomes of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour within the Aboriginal framework. The multiple linear regression analysis was carried out to determine whether the null hypotheses (H₀) existed or whether the alternative hypothesis (H₁) existed.

\[ H₀ = \text{Control over (ISED} + \text{MgtP} + \text{IPDP} + \text{PnPP) DOES NOT influence ABKS behaviour as a result of homosocial reproductive behaviour}\]

Alternatively:

\[ H₁ = \text{Control over (ISED} + \text{MgtP} + \text{IPDP} + \text{PnPP) DOES influence ABKS behaviour as a result of homosocial reproductive behaviour.}\]
Dataset for Hypothesis two: Test of association between the variables

Regression-MLR (ABKS/ISED + MgtP + IPDP + PnPP)

REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA ZPP /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT ABKS /METHOD=ENTER ISED Mgt_P Practice IDPD PnPP.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis - ABKS (all variables)

Table 4.58: Multiple linear regression analysis for ABKS notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Created</th>
<th>08-AUG-2016 19:29:41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Dataset</td>
<td>DataSet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split File</td>
<td>&lt;none&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Rows in Working Data File</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value Handling Definition of Missing Cases Used</td>
<td>User-defined missing values are treated as missing. Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA ZPP /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT ABKS /METHOD=ENTER ISED Mgt_Practice IDPD PnPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor Time</td>
<td>00:00:00.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elapsed Time</td>
<td>00:00:00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Required</td>
<td>7072 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Memory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for Residual Plots</td>
<td>0 bytes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.59: Variable entered/removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PnPP, Mgt_Practice, ISED, IDPD</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ABKS
b. All requested variables entered.

Table 4.60: ABKS model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.899*</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>2.84369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), PnPP, Mgt_Practice, ISED, IDPD

Table 4.61: ANOVA analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>6471.375</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1617.844</td>
<td>200.066</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1528.360</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7999.735</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ABKS
b. Predictors: (Constant), PnPP, Mgt_Practice, ISED, IDPD

Table 4.62: ABKS coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-214.674</td>
<td>46.951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISED</td>
<td>31.450</td>
<td>6.753</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt_Practice</td>
<td>13.645</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPD</td>
<td>-1.793</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PnPP</td>
<td>-1.977</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ABKS
A standard multiple regression analysis was performed between Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system (ABKS) as the dependent variable and Indigenous Socio-economic Development factors (ISED), Management Practices (MgtP), Indigenous Policy Development Processes (IPDP/IDPD) and Policy and Program Performance as independent variables. The multiple correlation coefficient ($R = 0.899$) was significantly different from zero, $F = 200.066$, $p< 0.05$, and 80.5% of the variation in the dependent variable was explained by the set of independent variables ($R^2 = .809$, and the Adjusted $R^2 = .0.805$)

Coefficients for ISED were $r^2_i = 0.022$, $t = 4.657$, $p< .05$
Coefficients for IPDP were $r^2_i = -0.012$, $t = -3.478$, $p > .05$
Coefficients for MgtP were $r^2_i = -0.551$, $t = 23.351$, $p < .05$
Coefficient for PnPP were $r^2_i = -0.056$, $t = -7.449$, $p > .05$

Both ISED and MgtP were found to significantly and uniquely contribute to the prediction of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour (ABKS). Alternatively, IPDP (IDPD) and PnPP were both found to not provide any significant unique contribution to the prediction with t values ($t= -3.478$, $p > .05$) and ($t= -7.449$, $p > .05$) respectively.

Therefore, the research shows that eighty percent of the problems encountered in relation to the performance of policies and programs within the Aboriginal framework can be attributed to the continuous control of the Aboriginal bureaucratic system by the same and/or similar persons. In addition to this, the research shows that these ‘similar’ people implement homosocial reproductive mechanisms and behaviour to create and maintain an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system (ABKSB) throughout the framework.

The quantitative research analysis indicates that the Null hypothesis ($H_0$) should be rejected and that the alternative hypothesis ($H_1$) be supported.
4.4 Qualitative data analysis results

The research results provided by the quantitative data analysis were tested using a qualitative research approach, whereby the qualitative research data collection and analysis approach involved the following processes:

**Figure 4.15: Qualitative data collection and analysis process**

![Diagram showing qualitative data collection and analysis process]

Source: Adapted from Neuman 2011, p. 518

Data 1 = Collection of raw data, experiences of the researcher
Data 2 = Codification of data
Data 3 = Reporting of selected processed data

Even though the qualitative research component of the overall data collected was represented by a much lower number of participants than those who participated in the quantitative data collection and analysis, a concerted effort was made to collect qualitative data from a similar geographic group of participants. Stage one of the qualitative research approach was to formulate a qualitative research questionnaire. This was then used as the basis for a series of structured interviews, involving a sample of participants/cases (20) involved in the Aboriginal economic development framework? The qualitative research questions asked during the structured interview stage of the research project are set out in Table 4.49.
In addition to developing the questionnaire for the structured interviews, notes were taken from listening to and observing participants in several Aboriginal socio-economic development forums, and coupled with the longstanding observations of the researcher. All notes and observations were then recorded and coded.

Table 4.63: Qualitative research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Research Question (RQ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ1  | Does control over the factors/resources of Aboriginal socio-economic development by the same people within organizations and agencies, over long periods of time affect the policy and program outcomes of organization(s) and Aboriginal people?  
Do you Agree/Disagree? Why?  |
| RQ2  | Does control over the management of organization(s) involved in the Aboriginal socio-economic development of Aboriginal Peoples, by the same people over long periods of time affect the outcomes of policies and programs of those organizations and Aboriginal People?  
Do you Agree/Disagree? Why?  |
| RQ3  | Does control over the Aboriginal policy, program development and program implementation processes, by the same people over long periods of time affect the socio-economic development outcomes of Aboriginal people?  
Do you Agree/Disagree? Why?  |
| RQ4  | Is the control over the management and operation of organizations, involved in the development and implementation of policies and programs relating to Aboriginal socio-economic development caused by: Networks/factions within organizations, created between similar people and their bureaucratic kinship behaviour?  
Why?  |

Source: Developed for the research project
The participants’ responses are set out in Table 4.50:

### Table 4.64: Participant responses – Agree/Disagree with quantitative findings/qualitative questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>No. of Participants that Agree</th>
<th>No. of Participants that Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants (%) that Agree</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants that Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research project

The qualitative research data obtained from the observations, listening to conversations and the structured interviews and subsequent surveys, was then reviewed and coded to identify the major statements being made by the participants. These statements were analysed to identify the major themes of the data that were relevant to each of the qualitative research questions. These themes were then thematically coded and presented in Figure 4.51.

To conclude, the analysis of the qualitative research data, overwhelmingly confirms the results of the quantitative data analysis. The outcome is that a strong association exists between the theories and theoretical elements identified in the research project, and moreover control over the three independent quantitative variables of:

1. Indigenous (or Aboriginal) socio-economic development factors (ISED);
2. Management practices (MgtP); and
3. Indigenous policy development process (IPDP)

By organizations and/or agencies operating at all three levels of the Aboriginal economic development “framework”, display Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship and homo-social reproductive behaviour, which affects the performance and outcomes of policies and programs (PnPP).
Table 4.65: Qualitative research question themes: WHY respondents
Agreed/Disagreed with each research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme(s) Relating to WHY respondents Agreed/Disagreed with each research question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ1-T1 | • Control over the factors/resources of Aboriginal economic develop leads to repetition of poor outcomes; and  
• Stagnant organization/agency policies and programs based on low skills levels |
| RQ2-T2 | • Existence of low management, governance and policy and program skills lead to poor outcomes; and  
• Leads to nepotism and self-interest resulting in poor policies and program outcomes |
| RQ3-T3 | • Control of the policy and program development by the same people over the long term leads to networks of self-interest and poor outcomes; based on low levels of skills and knowledge; and  
• Need to improve the skills and knowledge of management, governors and policy-making along with wider consultation and accountability to force improvements in policy and program outcomes |
| RQ4-T4 | • The poor outcomes of Aboriginal economic development policies and programs are caused by self-interest networks that become the “norm” over the long term; and  
• The poor outcomes associated with Aboriginal economic development policies and programs are caused by promotion of government’s self-interest network “model” |

Source: Developed for the research project

4.5 Chapter summary

The chapter also identified how the proposed research data was collected and analysed using both quantitative and qualitative research methods and employed computer-based programs to assist in analysing both primary and secondary sources.

The next chapter will reflect on the data that has been collected and analysed and provide a conclusion as to what the research results show. In addition, Chapter 5 will recommend future research in this area.
5.1 Chapter introduction

This research set out to investigate the issues surrounding the underlying theoretical causes of why Aboriginal socio-economic development policies and programs continue to fail. To achieve this, the research study undertook a mixed methods research approach and in doing so collected and analysed both quantitative and qualitative data.

To satisfying the academic requirements of the Doctor of Business Administration, the research is aimed at providing a resource that will fill the gap in the existing research area. In addition to this, the research aims to influence the behaviour of groups involved in the management and delivery of policies and programs within the Aboriginal framework. Finally, the overall objective of the research is to prescribe its application to facilitate a better understanding to why Aboriginal economic development progress continues to be slow.

Figure 5.1: Structure of Chapter 5
5.2 Conclusions from findings

The research concludes that homosocial reproductive activities such as those identified by Kanter (1977 and Dressel (1993) in combination with the elements of bureaucratic, network and social capital theories has created an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. The research has also shown that the structures established from Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship behaviour were protected by implementing homosocial reproductive mechanisms. In addition, these mechanisms were further strengthened by networking and social capital activities within the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and its framework.

The research has shown that the management practices within the Aboriginal kinship system was first established in the early 1900s under the Aboriginal Protection Board era of Australia’s socio-economic history. That the legislative controls established by the various forms of government and the physical and institutional controls exerted by ‘similar’ individuals and groups, over access to the major factors of economic development, including land, labour, capital investment, education and entrepreneurship has resulted in failed policies and poor outcomes.

The research has also shown that the historical creation of this Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and its homo-social reproductive behaviour, had set the groundwork for similar structures and behaviour to be established well into the future under the varying policies of the governments of the day. In addition to this, the research has shown, that this type of system and its behaviour was reproduced by Aboriginal organizations across Australia, under the self-determination and self-management policies of the 1970’s and are still being established and maintained today.

The research also shows that the overall impact of the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system and its homosocial reproductive activities in controlling the major factors of Aboriginal economic development, has been a significantly negative one. The impact of this system and its behaviour has had a significantly negative influence on the performance of policies and programs across the Aboriginal framework. As the research shows, management and management practices within the system accounted for forty percent of the negative impact on policy and program performance.
It could be argued that as the policies and programs moved away from the control of management and into the implementation phases, the influence of managers and management declined. This decline in control by management can be attributed to the influence of less skilled grass-roots employees employed throughout the system. The research also showed that these less skilled individuals and their behaviour were still significantly influenced by middle and senior management who controlled the funding and funding allocations. That the Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship attitude of managers, boards of directors, policy makers and politicians still affected the way policies and programs were delivered across the three levels of the Aboriginal framework. The data analysis indicates that this shift in management control to less skilled grass-roots employees contributes to sixty percent of the problems associated with the performance and outcomes of policies and programs.

More specifically, the research has shown that, in terms of how the Aboriginal framework was controlled and operated, eighty percent of the problems associated with Aboriginal policy and program failure can be attributed to the existence of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system. Also, it shows that this system is dominated by homosocial reproductive activities practiced by management, boards of directors, and policy makers within the various organizations across all three levels of the Aboriginal framework.

The research concludes that, there is a theoretical basis to explain the poor policy and program outcomes associated with Aboriginal economic development in Australia. Secondly, that these poor outcomes are the result of an Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system that has its roots embedded within the Aboriginal framework since 1900 and the Aboriginal Protection Board era. Finally, that the mechanisms established and behaviour practiced within this system can be attributed to the mechanisms and behavioural factors identified by Kanter (1977) and Dressel (1993) relating to homosocial reproductive theory. That this system and its controlling mechanisms, does have a significant impact on the overall performance of Aboriginal management, governance, policy practices and leadership across all levels of the Aboriginal economic development framework.
5.3 Recommendations

However, the research can be used as a tool to argue that the management, governance, policy development, and policy implementation strategies within the Aboriginal framework need to change. That Aboriginal participation, Aboriginal productivity and the overall economic performance of Aboriginal organizations and agencies within the framework need to understand the underlying theoretical causes of why Aboriginal economic progress remains slow before it can move forward.

The issues identified by the research need to be promoted and addressed throughout the entire framework, so that individuals, groups and organizations/agencies tasked with improving this area of public policy can better understand the underlying issues and causes of the problems. To achieve these objectives, as a first step, greater emphasis needs to be applied to designing and conduct more culturally appropriate business and management programs for organizations and individuals working within the Aboriginal framework that incorporate and deal with the issues raised by the research.

In addition to the provision of more appropriate business and economic development education and training programs, a new approach is needed to develop and/or implement new management and legal structures, for the framework to operate. These new management and legal structures must place greater emphasis on breaking down the dominant mechanisms and structures that maintain the ‘closed shop’ Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system approach.

The researcher also recommends that a long-term strategy needs to be developed to increase Aboriginal control over the necessary drivers of economic development including land, labour, capital investment, investment in education, entrepreneurship and political stability. In addition, it is recommended that the homosocial reproductive barriers identified by this research, along with the legal and political barriers that exist within and/or are impacting upon the Aboriginal framework be removed, or at least modified to facilitate change.

The researcher’s recommendation, that the development of a long-term strategy to increase Aboriginal control over the necessary drivers of economic development, will eventually result in a shift away from the controlling influences of the Aboriginal
bureaucratic kinship system. To facilitate this strategy, politicians and policy makers need to investigate the utilization of existing regional and national structures that have been created to improve regional development across Australia in general.

These outcomes and recommendations emerge in response to the (foregoing) underlying theoretical issues and/or mechanisms to the extent that the Aboriginal economic development framework has become a closed system that hinders or restricts the economic development of Aboriginal Peoples as shown in Figure 5.8.

To achieve the final objectives of improving the economic development policy and program outcomes for Aboriginal Peoples, the research recommends carrying out further research in this area if significant positive improvements are to be made. For example, changes may include restructuring the Aboriginal economic development framework so that it no longer remains a closed system as indicated in Figure 5.2.

Figure 5.2: Drivers of Aboriginal bureaucratic kinship system(s)

Source: Developed for the research project
Increased effort is required to improve the management, governance and policy development and implementation capabilities within the local levels of the framework. Particularly necessary are the capabilities and skills of those employed at the coalface within local community-based organizations that are tasked with the implementation of policies and programs at the regional level as indicated in Figure 5.3. Has the level of skills and knowledge increases at the local and regional levels, the levels of control currently exerted by central organizations and individuals will be reduced.

Figure 5.3: ‘New’ Drivers of Aboriginal economic development

Source: Developed for the research project
Finally, to strengthen the endeavour to increase the capabilities of management, boards of governors and the implementation and outcomes of policies and programs, within the local levels of the framework, greater effort is required to provide a better understanding of the underlying causes of the problems. To achieve this goal, improved business and entrepreneurial education and control over the factors of economic development is a fundamental requirement. The ‘road ahead’ must incorporate education and training programs that include those indicated in Figure 5.8 below. These new business and entrepreneurial education programs must incorporate an understanding of both corporate as well as cultural responsibility, including how these two factors/systems of accountability are integrated with each other and change over time.

**Figure 5.4: ‘New’ focus on ‘real’ business education and training**
Recommendations for future policies and practices to enhance Aboriginal socio-economic development, be achieved by moving from traditional drivers of Aboriginal socio-economic development as shown in Figure 5.2, to the new drives of Aboriginal economic development as shown in Figure 5.3. In addition, it is recommended that a new focus on real business education and training be adopted as shown in Figure 5.4.

5.4 Suggested for further research

The researcher recommends that further research be carried out in this field of study in an endeavour to change the behaviour of managers and policy makers working within the Aboriginal economic development framework and to continually build upon the knowledge in this area. It is also recommended that further research be carried out to investigate other factors that interact and/or impact on the independent and dependent variables identified in the research hypothesis. Finally, further research should be carried out to investigate the human resource management implications associated with Kanter’s theory of homo-social reproduction and their effect on organizations and agencies operating within the Aboriginal economic development framework.
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No ☐

If I have concerns about the ethical conduct of this research, I understand that I can contact the SCU Ethics Complaints Officer Yes ☐
No ☐

Participants name:
Participant’s signature:
Date:

☐ Please tick this box and provide your email address or mail address (confidential) below if you wish to receive a summary of the results:
Email:

Mailing address:

Contact Details for the researcher and research supervisor:
Researcher: Trevor Maher
Locked Mail Bag 4,
COOLANGATTA Q’LD 4225
Email: t.maher.12@student.scu.edu.au
Mobile: 0423 803881

Research Supervisor: Adjunct Professor Philip A. Neck
Southern Cross University Business School
Email: paneck@bigpond.com
Telephone: 07 5599 3125

Contact details for the ethics offices are:
HREC Administration
Lismore HRESC Administration
Sue Kelly
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Invitation letter:

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE and CONSENT FORM
Reminder: the invitation and consent form is RETURNED to the researcher


Name of researcher: Trevor Maher
Name of Research Supervisor: Adjunct Professor Philip Neck
(Contact details of the researcher and the supervisor are contained in the information sheet about this research)

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the Southern Cross University researcher for their records.

Tick the box that applies, sign and date and give to the researcher

I agree to take part in the Southern Cross University research project specified above. Yes ☐ No ☐

I have been provided with information at my level of comprehension about the purpose, methods, demands, risks, inconveniences and possible outcomes of this research, including any likelihood and form of publication of results. Yes ☐ No ☐

*I agree to be interviewed by the researcher Yes ☐ No ☐

*I agree to allow the interview to be *audio-taped and/or *video-taped Yes ☐ No ☐

*I agree to make myself available for further interview if required Yes ☐ No ☐

*I agree to complete questionnaires asking me about ???(insert general topic) Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that my participation is voluntary Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I can choose not to participate in part or all of this research at any time, without negative consequence to me Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that any information that may identify me, will be de-identified at the time of analysis of any data. Therefore, any information that I have provided cannot be linked to me (Privacy Act 1988 Cth) Yes ☐ No ☐

*I understand that neither my name nor any identifying information will be disclosed or published (**delete this statement if the study is completely anonymous) Yes ☐ No ☐
I understand that all information gathered in this research is confidential. It will be kept securely and confidentially for 7 years at the University. Yes ☐ No ☐

I am aware that I can contact the supervisor or researcher at any time with any queries. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that the ethical aspects of this research have been approved by the SCU Human Research Ethics Committee. Yes ☐ No ☐

If I have concerns about the ethical conduct of this research, I understand that I can contact the SCU Ethics Complaints Officer. Yes ☐ No ☐

Participants name: ____________________________
Participant’s signature: _______________________
Date: ____________________________

☐ Please tick this box and provide your email address or mail address (confidential) below if you wish to receive a summary of the results:
Email: _______________________________________

Mailing address: _______________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Researcher: Trevor Maher

Locked Mail Bag 4,

COOLANGATTA Q’LD 4225

Email: t.maher.12@student.scu.edu.au

Mobile: 0423 803881

Research Supervisor: Adjunct Professor Philip A. Neck

Southern Cross University Business School

Email: paneck@bigpond.com

Telephone: 07 5599 3125

Contact details for the ethics offices are:

HREC Administration
Lismore HRESC Administration
Sue Kelly
Tel: (02) 6626 9139
Fax: (02) 6626 9145
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Ethics Clearance:

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (HREC)
HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE (HRESC)

NOTIFICATION

To: Adjunct Prof Philip Neck/Trevor Maher
Southern Cross Business School
t.maher.12@student.scu.edu.au;paneck@bigpond.com

From: Secretary, Human Research Ethics Committee
Division of Research, R. Block

Date: 24 June 2013


Approval Number ECN-13-154

*The Southern Cross University Human Research Ethics Committee has established, in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research – Section 5/Processes of Research Governance and Ethical Review, a procedure for expedited review and ratification by a delegated authority of the HREC.*

Thank you for your expedited ethics application dated the 14 June. This was considered by the HRESC, Gold Coast Campus and has been approved.

All ethics approvals are subject to standard conditions of approval.

These should be noted by researchers as there is compliance and monitoring advice included in these conditions.

Ms Sue Kelly
HREC Administration
T: (02) 6626 9139
E: ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au

Dr David Lloyd
Acting Chair, HREC
E. david.lloyd@scu.edu.au
HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (HREC)
HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS SUB-COMMITTEE (HRESC)

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR ALL ETHICALLY APPROVED RESEARCH PROJECTS

The following standard conditions of approval are mandatory for all research projects which have been approved by the HREC or a HRESC and have received an ethics approval number.

All reporting is to be submitted through the Human Research Ethics Office, either at Lismore, Coffs Harbour or GC/Tweed. The email addresses are:
ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au
ethics.tweed@scu.edu.au

Forms for annual reports, renewals, completions and changes of protocol are available at the website:

Standard Conditions in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (National Statement) (NS).
1. Monitoring
   NS 5.5.1 – 5.5.10
   Responsibility for ensuring that research is reliably monitored lies with the institution under which the research is conducted. Mechanisms for monitoring can include:
   (a) reports from researchers;
   (b) reports from independent agencies (such as a data and safety monitoring board);
   (c) review of adverse event reports;
   (d) random inspections of research sites, data, or consent documentation; and
   (e) interviews with research participants or other forms of feedback from them.

2. Approvals
   (a) All ethics approvals are valid for 12 months unless specified otherwise. If research is continuing after 12 months, then the ethics approval MUST be renewed. Complete the Annual Report/Renewal form and send to the ethics office.

   (b) NS 5.5.5
      The researcher/s will provide a report every 12 months on the progress to date or outcome in the case of completed research including detail about:
      Maintenance and security of the records.
      Compliance with the approved proposal.
      Compliance with any conditions of approval.
      Changes of protocol to the research.

3. Reporting to the HREC
   (c) The researchers will immediately notify the ethics office, on the appropriate form, any change in protocol. NS 5.5.3
   (d) A completion report, on the appropriate form, must be forwarded to the ethics office.
   (e) The researchers will immediately notify the ethics office about any circumstance that might affect ethical acceptance of the research protocol. NS 5.5.3
   (f) The researchers will immediately notify the ethics office about any adverse events/incidences which have occurred to participants in their research. NS 5.5.3

2. Research conducted overseas
   NS 4.8.1 – 4.8.21
   Researchers conducting a study in a country other than Australia, need to be aware of any protocols for
that country and ensure that they are followed ethically and with appropriate cultural sensitivity.

3. **Participant Complaints**

*NS 5.6.1 – 5.6.7*

**General information**

Institutions may receive complaints about researchers or the conduct of research, or about the conduct of a Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) or other review body.

Complaints may be made by participants, researchers, staff of institutions, or others. All complaints should be handled promptly and sensitively. All participants in research conducted by Southern Cross University should be advised of the above procedure and be given a copy of the contact details for the Complaints Officer. They should also be aware of the ethics approval number issued by the Human Research Ethics Committee.

The following paragraph is to be included in any plain language statements for participants in research.

*Complaints about the ethical conduct of this research should be addressed in writing to the following:*

*Ethics Complaints Officer*

*HREC*

*Southern Cross University*

*PO Box 157*

*Lismore, NSW, 2480*

*Email: ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au*

*All complaints are investigated fully and according to due process under the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and this University. Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and you will be informed of the outcome.*
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Researcher’s letter

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH

Dear Mr/Ms xxxxxxxxx

My name is Trevor Maher. I am conducting research as part of my Doctorate in Business Administration (DBA) at Southern Cross University. Title of my research project is: An analysis of Australian Indigenous socio-economic development policies: A study of management practices within Indigenous organizations and government agencies. The research objective is to analyse the management, governance and policy development issues underlying the performance of Australian Indigenous Economic Development.

This research involves the completion of an anonymous survey, questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will be extremely valuable in determining the underlying problems associated within the management of Indigenous organizations and the development and implementation of Indigenous policies.

My responsibilities to you are to guarantee that your privacy, anonymity and confidentiality will be protected. To the broader community, Indigenous organizations and policy makers the aim is to produce a management and policy development and implementation model, that can be used to improve the socio-economic development of Indigenous people over time.

As part of this survey, you will be required to complete a questionnaire. It is estimated that this survey should take less than 30 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. It is alright for you not to participate. It will be quite in order for you wish to discontinue or withdraw from this survey if you so wish.

The results of this study may be published in a peer-reviewed journal and presented at a conference, but only group data will be reported. For security and storage, Southern Cross University has strict rules regarding security and storage of research data. Research material is in retention for a period of 7 years.

As a participant, you are entitled to feedback from this research study. The doctoral thesis stemming from this research will be available at a later stage in the SCU Library. However, as a participant, if you choose to receive a summary of the results by email or mail, please email a request to the researcher for a copy.

Southern Cross University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has reviewed the ethical issues associated with the research project and has issued approval for the study to proceed. The approval number is XXXXXX. If you

have concerns about the ethical conduct of this research or the researcher, please write to the following:

The Ethics Complaints Officer
Southern Cross University
PO Box 157
Lismore NSW 2480
Email: ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au

All information is confidential and will be handled as soon as possible.

Should you require further information, or wish to discuss issues raised by this survey, please contact the researcher at:

Trevor Maher
Email: t.maher.12@student.scu.edu.au
Mobile: 0423 803881

We thank you for providing your time and assistance in participating in the research and the completion of this survey, which will contribute greatly towards my research study.

Yours sincerely

Trevor Maher (Doctoral Candidate)
Locked Mail Bag 4,
COOLANGATTA Q’LD 425
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Quantitative survey questionnaire and instructions

A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF AUSTRALIAN INDIGENOUS SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICIES: A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WITHIN INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

DOCTORAL RESEARCH 2013

Trevor Maher
Doctoral Researcher
Southern Cross Business School
Gold Coast Campus, Australia
Email: t.maher.12@student.scu.edu.au
Mobile: 0423 803881

Please return to:
Adjunct Professor Philip Neck
Southern Cross University
Riverside Campus,
Locked Mail Bag 4
COOLANGATTA Q’LD 4225

SOUTHERN CROSS UNIVERSITY
Dear Participant;

I would like to take the opportunity to thank you for participating in this research project that examines the management practices within Australian Indigenous organizations. The research forms part of the requirements of the Doctorate Business Administration (DBA) Degree from the Southern Cross University Business School.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT:
Over the past several years, there has been several Government reports that have indicated the failure of past and more recent policy failures in achieving that goals of improving the socio-economic development of Australia’s Indigenous people.

The purpose of the proposed research project is to determine whether there is an underlying theoretical basis to these failures and assist in improving Aboriginal Management Process to overcome these failures.

INSTRUCTIONS:
The research project involves the completion of an anonymous survey questionnaire about the various aspects of management and governance practices within Australia’s Indigenous organizations as they apply or appear to you and/or your organization.
You are asked to answer all questions and wherever possible and appropriate provide examples to support your response.
The questions are preceded with instructions on how to answer them. Please read the instructions and make your selections as requested.
The survey questionnaire should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.
The completed survey questionnaire can be returned in the self-addressed envelope provided or the researcher will collect the completed survey questionnaire in person after one week.

DEFINITION OF TERMS:
The term Indigenous organization refers to any Indigenous community-controlled organization, Indigenous or non-Indigenous Government department providing services to Australian Indigenous people as a result of specific Indigenous government policies and/or independent Indigenous statutory authorities.
(The term Indigenous is also synonymous with using the term Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander)

ETHICAL CONCERNS:
This research project involves the completion of an anonymous survey questionnaire and has been given a Southern Cross University Human Research Ethics Committee number, which is: Approval Number ECN-13-154

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:
If you would like to receive a summary of the results, please include your information below;
Address: _____________________________________________________________
E-mail: ______________________________________________________________

I thank you for your participation and cooperation in the research project. Please remember that this research project is for academic purpose only. The information and results will be handled anonymously and will NOT be provided to a third party.

Thank you once again for participation in advance.

Trevor Maher
Doctoral Researcher
The following questions are for analytical purposes ONLY and will NOT be used for individual identification.

1) What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2) What is your Nationality?
   - Australian
   - Aboriginal
   - Torres Strait Islander
   - Other

3) What is your age?
   - 18 to 24 years
   - 25 to 34 years
   - 35 to 44 years
   - 45 to 54 years
   - 55 to 64 years
   - More than 65 years

4) What is your education level?
   - School Leaving Certificate
   - Higher School Certificate
   - Tertiary Certificate/Diploma
   - Bachelor’s Degree
   - Higher Degree (Masters, PhD etc.)
   - Main Field of Study
     - Business
     - Social Welfare
     - Education
     - Law
     - Other (specify)_________

5) Are you employed within an;
   - Indigenous Organization
   - Department?
     - Commonwealth
     - State
     - Local
   - Other (specify)

6) If you answered Yes. What is your position?
   - Chairman
   - Managing Director
   - Chief Executive Officer
   - Senior Manager
   - Project Officer
   - Admin. Officer
   - Other (please specify)

7) Are you a member of;
   - An Indigenous Organization(s)
   - On the Board of an Indigenous Organization(s)
   - An Indigenous Departmental Committee(s)
     - Commonwealth
     - State
     - Local

8) How long have you been employed within the organization?
   - Less than 3 years
   - 3 to 5 years
   - 5 to 10 years
   - 10 to 15 years
   - 15 to 20 years
   - More than 20 years

9) Where did you work before your current position?
   - Government Department
     - Commonwealth
     - State
     - Local
   - Indigenous Organization
   - Private Sector Company
   - Other (specify)
PART B: INDIGENOUS SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FACTORS

The following questions are for analytical purposes ONLY and will NOT be used for individual identification.

The follow questions relate to the factors that are important for Australian Indigenous social and economic development. You are asked to rate each one on their level of importance. Indicate your level of agreement/importance by using the scale below and by circling the appropriate number.

Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>RANK the importance of each factor of Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Access and ownership of land is important for Indigenous social and economic development?  
11) The employment of Indigenous people in the delivery of social and economic development of services is necessary.  
12) Government and Private sector investment in capital and appropriate infrastructure is necessary for the social and economic development of Indigenous people  
13) Investment in Business and Entrepreneurial education is necessary for improving Indigenous social and economic development  
14) Skilled Leadership is necessary for improving the social and economic development of Indigenous people  
15) A stable Political Environment is necessary for better social and economic development of Indigenous people  
16) Indigenous people need to take the lead role in developing, implementing and managing policies that impact upon their social and economic development

(PLEASE RANK IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE WHEN ANSWERING THIS SECTION: Range of Importance: 1= Not Important to 7= Vitally Important)  
**Please note: You can only use a Ranking Number ONCE.**  
For example: In Question 1, if you think ownership of land is Vitally Important your Ranking will be 7. OR If you think it’s not important your Ranking will be 1.  
**You CANNOT use the same Ranking twice for questions 10-16.**
PART C: MANAGEMENT, GOVERNANCE AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES WITHIN INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

The following questions relate to the management, governance and policy development practices within Indigenous organizations and Public Sector organizations involved in the development and delivery of Indigenous socio-economic development policies and programs. The information provided will be used for analytical purposes ONLY and will NOT be used for individual organization identification.

You are asked to rate each question on your level of agreement. Indicate your level of agreement by using the scale below and by circling the appropriate number.

(Indigenous organization also refers to Government Department of Independent Authority)

Please note that the scale (1-7) also indicates degree to which the incidents occur. Example: A ranking of 1 indicates the incident does not occur. A ranking of 6 indicates that the incident(s) occur quiet often. A ranking of 7 indicates the incident occurs all the time.

Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) Your organization’s Board of Directors is properly balanced to represent all Indigenous aspects and groups in the community.

18) The Chief Executive Officer (CEO), General Manager and other members of the organization’s senior management team are selected on merit (on the basis of their academic and professional qualifications).

19) The C.E.O., General Manager and other members of the organization’s senior management team appear to be selected on the basis of their current or previous working or social relationships with the organization’s Board members or management team.

20) The Board of Directors is dominated by one specific faction and hinders the social and economic development of the organization and the community.

21) The Board of Directors is split along factional lines and hinders the social and economic development of organizations and the community.

22) Management within the organization constantly employ and/or surround themselves with people of similar characteristics as themselves.
23) Executive and other senior management positions are filled by people with the same or similar views as the Board or other senior managers  
24) Indigenous organizations have “closed” management structures. That is, decisions and policies are made by the top senior executives and dominant members of the Board and exclude other employees and Board members  
25) Due to the political volatility of Indigenous organizations the senior management team and Board of Directors tend to create an environment that rewards loyalty rather than performance  
26) When employing senior staff, management tends to establish selection panels that are dominated by panelists that have similar views as their own.  
27) When recruiting senior staff, management tends to restrict the selection process to only those with similar backgrounds and characteristics as their own  
28) When recruiting senior staff, management tends to determine where to advertise the positions and to determine the suitability of all candidates.  
29) When recruiting senior staff, does management look for persons that “fit” within the organization’s culture?  
30) When recruiting senior staff, the management tends to decide to advertise the positions internally to exclude applicants with different characteristics as those within the senior management ranks of the organization  
31) “Ideal” or “Good” candidates are excluded from senior positions within the organization on the basis that their skills and qualifications are too “specialized”  
32) Support for a particular candidate by the dominant group on the selection panel tends to take precedence over better candidates  
33) Recruitment of senior staff within Indigenous organizations tends to be in accordance with the views and politics of the dominant groups within the organization  
34) The views and recommendations from external recruitment panelists are given less “weight” or “status” by the dominant “internal” panelists in determining who should be given the position.  
35) The organizational Culture within your organization encourages employees to contribute to or question the decision-making processes of management?  
36) The organizational Culture within your organization discourages employees to contribute to or question the decision-making processes of management?  
37) Indigenous social and economic development policies are currently well developed within your organization?
<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38) Indigenous social and economic development policies are currently well developed by government agencies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) The level of consultation undertaken by your organization when developing Indigenous social and economic development policies is widespread and inclusive of all groups and individuals?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) The level of consultation undertaken by government agencies when developing Indigenous social and economic development policies is widespread and inclusive of all groups and individuals?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Indigenous policy development is restricted to senior management within organizations and government agencies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) The policy development processes used are repeated whenever organizations and governments develop policies that affect Indigenous people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) The policy development process used by the government is widely accepted by Indigenous people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) The views and information provided by Indigenous people during government policy development consultations is adequately reflected in the final policy document?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) The views and information provided by Indigenous people during government policy development consultations is interpreted and reflected correctly in the government’s final policy document?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) The government’s Indigenous policies, in spite of the consultation process, reflect the views and position of government and or government agencies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) The government’s Indigenous policies are primarily influenced by select groups of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people within community?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) Governments place too much emphasis on the views expressed by a select group of Indigenous leaders who do not represent the collective views of the wider Indigenous community?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) The government’s Indigenous policies are strongly influenced by government bureaucrats rather than Indigenous community members or elected members of parliament?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) The current methods used by organizations and government agencies to manage and implement Indigenous policies are the most appropriate?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51) There is a greater need for Indigenous people to take a lead role in managing and implementing Indigenous policies?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) Federal State and Local Governments need to provide Indigenous organizations with greater resources to take a leading role in policy develop, manage and implement policies that affect them?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53) Governments need to provide better business (management and governance) education programs to Indigenous groups and individuals so that they can better develop, manage and implement policies that affect them?

54) Indigenous people are disillusioned with the restrictive policy development process and are reluctant to participate and contribute to the development of policies that affect them?

55) The organizational Culture within your organization encourages employees to contribute and/or question the policy development processes or outcomes of your organization of government?

56) The organizational Culture within your organization discourages employees to contribute to or question the policy development processes or outcomes of your organization or government?

57) The Board of Directors are always selected on merit and their capabilities to understand the tasks of governing an organization?

58) The Chief Executive Officer and other senior staff members employed by the organization are selected on merit for their skills and understanding of the tasks of managing the organization?

59) The focus of the Board within your organization is always on providing the best services to the community rather than maintaining their own position or agendas within the organization?

60) Board members of your organization are not always selected on merit and for their skills but their connections with Board members and senior management?

61) The Board and senior management staff of your organization, provide the necessary leadership and direction to achieve the social and economic goals of your organization?

62) The Board of Directors and senior staff members of your organization creates an organizational culture that treats its staff as assets and rewards performance?

63) The Board and senior management staff within your organization encourage individuals and the organization to continuously improve and increase your performance and the performance of the organization?

64) The focus of senior management within your organization is always on providing the best outcomes for the community (the customer)?

Please provide any further comments and suggestions you may have regarding the management, policy development process and the performance of Indigenous organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65) The Board and senior management within your organization encourage participation in the running of the organization and or the development of policies that affect its members and or the community?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66) The Board and senior management of your organization constantly measure the performance of its staff and the organization and provide constructive advance on how to improve staff performance and or the performance of the organization?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67) The Board and the senior management within your organization consistently build strong relationships with its staff and the community to improve the performance of the organization?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68) The Board and senior management within your organization constantly hold strategic planning workshops to align the organization’s policies with the goals and aspirations of its members and or the communities’ needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL COMMENTS and SUGGESTIONS

Please provide any further comments and suggestions you may have regarding the management, policy development process and the performance of Indigenous organizations.

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION AND REMEMBER THAT THIS RESEARCH IS FOR AN ACADEMIC PURPOSE ONLY.
Appendix 6

**Structured interview questions:**

**Research Question 1:**

Does control over the factors/resources of Aboriginal socio-economic development by the same people within organisations and agencies, over long periods of time affect the policy and program outcomes of organisation(s) and Aboriginal people?

Do you Agree/Disagree?

Why?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

**Research Question 2:**

Does control over the management of organisation(s) involved in the Aboriginal socio-economic development of Aboriginal Peoples, by the same people over long periods of time affect the outcomes of policies and programs of those organisations and Aboriginal People?

Do you Agree/Disagree?

Why?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

**Research Question 3:**

Does control over the Aboriginal policy, program development and program implementation processes, by the same people over long periods of time affect the socio-economic development outcomes of Aboriginal people?

Do you Agree/Disagree?

Why?

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

**Research Question 4:**

Is the control over the management and operation of organisations, involved in the development and implementation of policies and programs relating to Aboriginal socio-economic development caused by?

Networks/factions within organisations, created between similar people and their bureaucratic kinship behaviour?

Why?

_________________________________________________________________________________