**Appendix**

Table A1 presents the summary statistics for each of the variables used in the probit regression models. As noted in the text, each variable is constructed as a binary, with 0 indicating a business does not fall into a category and indicating that it does. The mean values presented in Table A1 therefore indicate the percentage of businesses that fall into each category, i.e. the mean value of the Indigenous Manager/s variable is 0.234, indicating that 23.4% of the businesses in the sample indicated that they had one or more Indigenous people in positions of management.

**Table A1: Summary Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Obs.** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev** | **Min** | **Max** |
| Indigenous Retention Rates | 277 | 0.809 | 0.55 | 0 | 2 |
| Indigenous Employment Rate 3.8% | 680 | 0.321 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| Indigenous Manager/s | 680 | 0.234 | 0.42 | 0 | 1 |
| 20-199 Businesses | 680 | 0.329 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| 200+ Businesses | 680 | 0.154 | 0.36 | 0 | 1 |
| Reconciliation Action Plan | 680 | 0.207 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| Cultural Competency Training | 680 | 0.194 | 0.40 | 0 | 1 |
| NAIDOC/Reconciliation Weeks | 680 | 0.322 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| Indigenous Policy Bundle | 680 | 0.100 | 0.30 | 0 | 1 |
| Regional | 680 | 0.316 | 0.47 | 0 | 1 |
| Remote | 680 | 0.046 | 0.21 | 0 | 1 |

Table A2 presents the output from the probit regression model that allowed for the probability estimates presented in Table 4. Table A2 shows that the strongest statistically significant positive correlation with the likelihood of having 3.8% or more Indigenous employment is the presence of Indigenous management in the business ( = 1.65, p < .05). The size of the business is the only other factor that produces statistically significant findings, with businesses of 20-199 employees demonstrating a positive correlation ( = 0.35, p < .05) with the dependent variable. Businesses of 200 or more employees had a weak negative correlation with the likelihood of maintaining 3.8% or more Indigenous employment ( = -0.61, p < .05). This may not be indicative that larger businesses are necessarily poorer employers of Indigenous people than medium and smaller sized businesses, but potentially demonstrative of the limitations of Indigenous labour supply within the local labour market to maintain 3.8% Indigenous employment. Table 1 revealed that Indigenous workplace policies (such as having a RAP, cultural awareness training, and celebrating NAIDOC/Reconciliation Week) may be associated with proportionate or greater Indigenous employment. Testing these policies individually within the regression models is unable to produce significant results, however when they are bundled into a single variable, they are able to demonstrate a significant positive association with the dependent variable.

**Table A2: Probit Regression Model on Indigenous Employment Parity of 3.8%, 2022.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Probit Regression** | |
| Indigenous Employment Rate 3.8% | Coefficient | Std. Err |
| Indigenous Manager/s | 1.71\* | 0.16 |
| 20-199 Businesses | 0.38\* | 0.13 |
| 200+ Businesses | -0.60\* | 0.20 |
| Indigenous Policy Bundle | 0.41\* | 0.19 |
| Regional | 0.10 | 0.12 |
| Remote | 0.40 | 0.26 |
| *Constant* | -1.05\* | 0.10 |
| *No. of Obs. =* |  | 680 |
| *LR chi2(6) =* |  | 215.75 |
| *Prob > chi2 =* |  | 0.00 |

*Table note: \*p< 0.05.*

Table A3 presents the output from the ordered probit regression model, which was used to produce the probability estimates presented in Table 5. Table A3 demonstrates the presence of Indigenous management has a positive correlation with the likelihood of maintaining higher rates of Indigenous employee retention ( = 0.42, p < .05). Large businesses of 200 or more employees again show a negative correlation with the dependent variable ( = -0.53, p < .05). For this model, Indigenous workplace policies were not able to demonstrate any statistically significant association with Indigenous employee retention. In summary, whilst there appears to be some small moderation based on the size of non-Indigenous businesses, the strongest and most consistent positive association with higher rates of Indigenous employment and retention is the presence of Indigenous management within non-Indigenous businesses. This allowed for the methodological decision to make probability estimations based on the two variables with statistical significance, Indigenous management and business size.

**Table A3: Ordered Probit Regression Model of Indigenous Staff Retention Relative to Other Staff, 2022.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Ordered Probit Regression** | |
| Indigenous Retention Rates | Coefficient | Std. Err |
| Indigenous Manager/s | 0.42\* | 0.15 |
| 20-199 Business | -0.19 | 0.18 |
| 200+ Businesses | -0.56\* | 0.21 |
| Indigenous Policy Bundle | 0.27 | 0.18 |
| Regional | -0.06 | 0.16 |
| Remote | -0.43 | 0.36 |
| Cut 1 | -0.64 | 0.18 |
| Cut 2 | 1.49 | 0.20 |
| *No. of Obs. =* |  | 277 |
| *LR chi2(6) =* |  | 16.19 |
| *Prob > chi2 =* |  | 0.01 |

*This table presents an ordered probit regression. The dependent variable is an ordinal variable based on a survey question asked of the 307 businesses with Indigenous employees relating to their perceptions of Indigenous employee retention. This ordinal variable is defined as 0 = Indigenous retention lower than non-Indigenous, 1 = the same, and 2 = Indigenous retention higher than non-Indigenous. N=30 of the sample is excluded as they answered 'don't know' to the retention question. \*p < 0.05.*