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Chapter 6: Survey Results

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the survey, beginning with the survey participants’ demographic information. While demographic information was not deemed critical for this research, it was important to capture these data to analyse the different groups’ responses against the average to ensure there were no major differences or anomalies. It was also important to be able to compare the survey respondents’ demographics against what was found in the purposive sample selection used in this research. Once the demographic information has been adequately addressed, the chapter will progress to present the data and results for each question, in ascending order, in both graphical and table form.

After the results of each question are displayed accurately, the top five responses will be summarised and discussed in some detail through initial analysis. Other responses that may have an effect or have a similar weighted average will also be discussed. Each of the questions will have the associated findings and data presented individually, with an initial discussion and analysis completed and summarised. The findings will then be discussed in terms of how they address the research questions—particularly the primary research question.

As discussed in detail in the research methods and research proposal, this research used a mixed-methods approach, with a literature review, a case study (detailed in Chapter 4) and 10 semi-structured interviews all used to inform the development of the survey instrument. While this research was predominantly qualitative, the survey allowed for the qualitative information gained during the first phases of the research to be validated and weighted quantitatively. SurveyMonkey was used as both the survey platform and analysis tool and software, as described previously. Upon completion of the detailed discussion and summary of all the information, the initial research model will be reviewed and revised, and conclusions will be drawn regarding the research findings.
6.2 Demographic Information

The survey participants were drawn from a purposive sample selection consisting of current and former staff—predominantly managers and leaders—involved in projects in security and logistical organisations in the PNG resource industry. The sample would cause an anomaly in the demographic information because this industry has traditionally been a middle-aged and male-dominated environment. Over one-third of the female respondents were aged younger than 39, and over 90% of responses were from male participants. Over 70% of respondents were over 40 years of age, which is expected in leadership and management positions in the resource industry; thus, this finding fairly reflects the population.

As the results below demonstrate, over 70% of respondents were expatriates or non-PNG nationals, which proportionately reflects the resource industry leadership and management population. The case study in Chapter 4 already established the traditional breakdown of staffing and the workforce composition for a resource industry project in PNG. It was impossible to obtain exact verified data from the national statistics office in PNG to support these demographic data in comparison to the national standard or an averaged demographic figure because of the lack of records and no sharing of government data. In addition, the national statistics office has recently been implicated in a fraud investigation that led to its leadership being imprisoned for fraud. The investigation found that leadership was involved in questionable practices for at least four years that seriously affected the reliability and accuracy of any records the office produced. As a result, the case study approach was used to gain an overview of the HR breakdown of a project in PNG (Post Courier, 2016).

It was also found that over 67% of respondents had a tertiary education, with a further 11% having an unfinished tertiary education. Twelve per cent had vocational education up to and including advanced diplomas and diplomas, while the rest (7%) had finished high school.
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Table 6.1 Education of Respondent’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Undergrad Incomplete</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Post Grad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: PNG National (A)</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Non-PNG National (B)</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>72.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Experience of Respondent’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>2 years or less</th>
<th>2 to 5 years</th>
<th>6 to 10 years</th>
<th>Over 11 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: PNG National (A)</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>22.14%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Non-PNG National (B)</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>14.86%</td>
<td>39.19%</td>
<td>29.73%</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
<td>72.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3 Results

Question 6: Based on your observations, do you think resource organisations build dependence on expatriate staff?

![Figure 6.6 Question 6 Response](image)

Figure 6.6 Question 6 Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>2. AGREE</th>
<th>3. NEUTRAL</th>
<th>4. DISAGREE</th>
<th>5. STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Question 6 Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>2. AGREE</th>
<th>3. NEUTRAL</th>
<th>4. DISAGREE</th>
<th>5. STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: PNG National (A)</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Non-PNG National (B)</td>
<td>35.14%</td>
<td>51.36%</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>72.56%</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Question 6 Response by Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>2. AGREE</th>
<th>3. NEUTRAL</th>
<th>4. DISAGREE</th>
<th>5. STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5: None (A)</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 2 years or less (B)</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 2 to 5 years (C)</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 6 to 10 years (D)</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>30.39%</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Over 11 years (E)</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Question 6 Response by Experience
With 35.29% of the responses stating they very strongly agreed and a further 49.02% agreeing, as well as a weighted response of 1.88, the data provided from the responses to this question indicated that it was strongly supported. A neutral response accounted for 8.82% of responses, while 5.88% disagreed, and 0.98% (a single respondent) strongly disagreed. It is worth noting that, when the responses compared nationals to non-nationals, the nationals were less supportive of the statement at 1.93, compared with the non-nationals (expatriates) at 1.86. The data clearly indicate that the majority of the respondents—84.31% or 86 responses—supported the view that resource organisations in PNG build dependence on expatriate staff. An overall weighting of 1.88 confirmed that this statement was accurate, which was supported by the semi-structured interviews and literature covered previously.

Q7: Rate the following factors and their effect on building dependence on expatriate staff in resource organisations.
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After identifying initial factors through the semi-structured interviews, the survey respondents weighted the potential effect of these factors in terms of their influence on building dependence on expatriate staff. The most strongly supported factor was ‘issues with education and training of the national workforce’, with 66% of all respondents stating that this was very important and 30% stating it was important, and a weighted average of 1.39. When PNG national and expatriate responses were compared, they were very close: 1.36 and 1.40, respectively. This was followed by the ‘technical expertise of expatriates’, for which 62.75% stated that it was very important and 30.39%
stated it was important, and the weighted average was 1.47. PNG nationals gave this factor less weight (1.34) than did the national respondents (1.82). None of the respondents reported thinking that these factors were unimportant. However, the third factor—‘limited pool of educated, experienced nationals’—elicited a greater variety of responses. Fifty per cent claimed that it was very important, 37.25% said it was important, 6.86% stated neither, 4.90% stated that it was unimportant, and a single response (0.98%) indicated that it was very unimportant. This led to a weighted average of 1.70. The fourth factor—‘expatriates are easier to use’—had a weighted average of 1.88. The fifth factor—‘poor recruitment structure that limits placing experienced nationals’—had a weighted average of 1.89. The rest of the factors, with significantly higher weighted averages, are covered in Table 6.6. Of those, only ‘faster with expatriates’, with a weighted average of 1.99, was close to the previous five responses, which were well under 2.

**Q8: Is it possible to develop a national workforce in the early phase of the project, so they are better skilled for start-up?**
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**Table 6.7 Question 8 Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>39.22%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The respondents strongly supported the question about whether it is possible to develop a national workforce in the early phase of the project, so they will be better prepared and better skilled for start-up and operations. Of the respondents, 29.41% strongly agreed with the statement, 39.22% agreed, 13.73% were neutral, and 17.65% disagreed with the statement. No respondent strongly disagreed with the statement. This gave the statement a weighted average of 2.20.

When investigating variances from different respondents, the most positive support for the statement came from those with either very little experience or over 10 years of experience, with respondents in the ‘over 11 years’ bracket having a weighted average of 1.85, which showed very strong support. PNG nationals supported this statement more strongly than did non-nationals, with a weighted average of 1.43. In comparison, non-PNG nationals, or expatriate respondents, had a weighted average of 2.49, which showed support for the statement, but not as strongly as the PNG respondents. Over 67% of PNG nationals strongly agreed with the statement, compared with only 14.86% of non-PNG nationals strongly agreeing. This statement received similarly varied support during the semi-structured interviews conducted prior to the survey. This question was designed to gain a better understanding of the respondents’ perceptions of PNG nationals being trained earlier in the project. It was based more on the perceptions of individuals who had experience in this area, rather than on statistics and hard science. As a result of the lack of accurate statistics at the governmental level in PNG, it is very challenging to gain an accurate picture and data to support this statement. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile trying to understand the perceptions of the individuals surveyed in terms of their professional opinion, which, at this stage, is the most accurate data.

Table 6.8 Question 8 Response by Respondent Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>2. AGREE</th>
<th>3. NEUTRAL</th>
<th>4. DISAGREE</th>
<th>5. STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5: None (A)</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 2 years or less (B)</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 2 to 5 years (C)</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>37.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: 6 to 10 years (D)</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Over 11 years (E)</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9 Question 8 Response by Respondent Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>2. AGREE</th>
<th>3. NEUTRAL</th>
<th>4. DISAGREE</th>
<th>5. STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: PNG National (A)</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Non-PNG National (B)</td>
<td>14.86%</td>
<td>44.59%</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
<td>22.97%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
available to support this statement. With a weighted average of 2.20—meaning that 70 of 102 respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed—the data suggest that this statement is well supported. Further, though relatively sparse, support for this statement was also found in the literature and the semi-structured interviews.

**Q9:** If workforce nationalisation was to occur earlier in projects, would there be cost benefits for the company?
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**Table 6.11 Question 9 Response by Nationality**

This question asked whether, if workforce nationalisation was to occur earlier in projects, as discussed in a previous question, there would be cost benefits for the company. This statement was strongly supported, with 33.33% strongly agreeing, 34.31% agreeing, 15.69% remaining neutral or undecided, 14.71% disagreeing, and
only 1.96% (two respondents) strongly disagreeing. With a weighted average of 1.64, PNG nationals more strongly supported this statement than did non-PNG nationals, who had a weighted average of 2.38. In regard to the effect of experience on the responses, respondents with limited experience and respondents with between six and 10 years of experience had lower weighted averages, whereas respondents with two years of experience had the highest weighted average at 2.36. This question, as with the previous question, was based on the respondents’ opinions and subject to our hypothetical propositions. However, the concepts in the statement were still strongly supported.

**Q10: If workforce nationalisation were to occur earlier in a project, would there be a positive time difference for the project delivery?**
As with the previous statement, the potential effect of early workforce nationalisation was met with mixed results. Only 10.78% respondents strongly agreed, 26.47% agreed, 16.67% remained neutral, 39.22% disagreed and 6.86% strongly disagreed. In terms of the actual numbers of respondents, a total of 38 respondents supported this statement, while 47 did not support the statement, and 17 were neutral. Given that the majority of respondents did not agree, the statement was not supported. However, the potential effect remains hypothetical and based on opinion until the statement can truly be measured, which can only occur after accurate data are collected regarding the different variables during a project or multiple projects. Given that the collection of such data may be many years away, this research provides the most accurate data available. Additionally, it is worth noting that, when the survey results are viewed in conjunction with the case study and semi-structured interviews, the overall view of the statement shifted more towards neutral. Nevertheless, statistically speaking, it is difficult to argue with the results of the survey, which show a weighted average of 3.05.
Q11: If workforce nationalisation were to occur earlier, would there be significant reputational benefits for the company?

There was strong support for the idea that companies would reap reputational benefits from early nationalisation. The respondents were very supportive of this statement, with
30.39% strongly agreeing and a further 46.08% agreeing. Only 13 respondents, or 12.75%, remained neutral, and 10.78% disagreed, while no respondent strongly disagreed. This produced a weighted average of 2.04, which indicated strong support for the statement. In terms of different demographic groups, PNG nationals were more positive (with a weighted average of 1.71) than were non-PNG nationals (with a weighted average of 2.16).

While all experience groups had strong weighted averages, the least experienced group and the group with six to 10 years of experience had 1.67 and 1.81, respectively, while the highest weighted average (2.37) came from the group with two to five years of experience. This aligns closely with the results from the semi-structured interviews and case study. The data gleaned from this statement clearly support the idea that there would be significant reputational benefits for any company that nationalises its workforce earlier. With a weighted average of 2.04 and only 11 respondents disagreeing with the statement, the research results from the survey overwhelmingly supported the statement.

Q12: In your experience, which are the key factors that limit the workforce nationalisation of security and logistical workforces?
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The information gathered during the semi-structured interviews suggested that, in terms of the key factors that limit workforce naturalisation in security and logistics, all the possible responses contained in the survey had merit. Thus, the purpose of the survey was to provide weight and clarity to the most commonly perceived limitations to workforce naturalisation. The limitation found to have the most effect, with a weighted average of 1.48, was the lack of skills, knowledge and experience of staff, with 56.86% of respondents stating that this was very important and a further 39.22% indicating that it was important, while only 2.94% said it was neither important nor unimportant, and only one respondent (0.98%) stating that it was unimportant. This limitation factor was by far the most supported, and received almost universal support from the respondents,
with 98 respondents stating that it was either important or very important. The next two factors—‘experience and suitability of managers’ and ‘not having the right people in roles, both nationals and expatriates’—were equal, with weighted factors of 1.51. Both these answers were also very closely related to the first factor, as they ultimately involve having the right people in the right positions, with skills and experience suitable for the role.

The motivation and cultural expectations of staff came in fourth, with a weighted average of 1.53. Other responses that were strongly supported were lack of training and development (with a weighted average of 1.56) and wantok issues (1.62), which are cultural, family-related effects, as explained in the literature review. Responses to the rest of the factors are detailed in the above table and graph. These include lack of qualifications, even among semi-skilled staff; cultural issues; motivation and engagement of staff; and companies’ minimum wage mentality. While all these were strongly supported as factors that limit workforce nationalisation, the first five were shown to have the most support.
Q13: Which factors would enable the early nationalisation of staff? Please rate the effects of the following.

![Bar chart showing the effects of various factors on early nationalisation of staff.](Figure 6.13 Question 13 Response)
Figure 6.13 and Table 6.18 display the factors that enable the early nationalisation of staff, in ascending order. Looking at the top five responses, selection of staff was clearly viewed as the most important factor, with 72.28% of respondents stating it was very important, and 25.74% stating it was important, giving it a weighted average of 1.30. None of the respondents stated that this factor was unimportant or very unimportant, and only two respondents were neutral. This indicated that the selection of national staff was the leading factor. Mentoring programs were a close second, with a weighted average of 1.32. Again, no respondents stated that this factor was unimportant or very unimportant. The third-most important factor was ‘identify key national staff early for supervisory and management positions’. This was also strongly supported, with a weighted average of 1.37, and no respondents in the negative. The selection of expatriate staff was fourth, with a weighted average of 1.42. Apprenticeships and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>VERY UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of staff (National)</td>
<td>72.28%</td>
<td>25.74%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring programs</td>
<td>70.53%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying key national staff early for supervisory and management</td>
<td>63.73%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of staff (Expatriate)</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>25.49%</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships or traineeships pre-company employment</td>
<td>62.75%</td>
<td>31.37%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs to be nationally recognised and ongoing</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer term industry focus rather than immediate focus</td>
<td>63.73%</td>
<td>28.43%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Experts learning language)</td>
<td>30.22%</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traineeships were fifth, with a weighted average of 1.43. The responses to this question were all very strongly supported, as all had weighted averages well under two, with the highest—communication with expatriates learning the local language—being 1.83, which was still a very strong response.

14: Which factors have you seen be successful in the past? Please rate the following.

![Figure 6.14 Question 14 Response](image)
While similar to the previous question, this question was intended to specifically address which factors the respondents had seen to be successful in the past, as opposed to any judgemental or theoretically-based opinions. According to the results, 77.45% of respondents stated that the selection of mentors was very important, while a further 19.61% stated that it was important. This was by far the most supported statement, with a weighted average of 1.25. This response was also strongly supported during the semi-structured interviews and anecdotally throughout the research process. Training and development of staff was in second position, with a weighted average of 1.30, while mentoring was third, with a weighted average of 1.31. Building relationships with staff based on mutual respect received equal weighting to mentoring at 1.31, while the selection of expat managers to mentor local staff followed, with a weighted average of
Again, the other responses were all strongly supported, as demonstrated in Table 6.19 above.

We can see a pattern beginning to form around mentoring, training, selection of staff to support these activities, and development of national staff by the right people. The selection of mentors, training and development, mentoring programs, and the importance of selecting expatriates who can mentor were all factors with a weighted average under 1.40, which indicated very strong support. The context of this question asked the respondents—predominantly from supervisory or management positions—to report what they had observed while working on previous projects; thus, this was potentially a source of one of the most accurate summaries of which activities have succeeded previously. The conclusive support given to these factors by both the semi-structured interviews and survey respondents constitutes one of the most comprehensive analyses undertaken in this area, according to the information found in the literature. In the context of this research, this is potentially one of the most supportive and informative responses because it underpins our understanding of which approaches have succeeded in the past.

15: In your experience, which key activities promote a successful mentoring program in a resource company operating in PNG?

![Figure 6.15 Question 15 Response](image-url)
With regard to mentoring programs in resource companies, the following key activities were found to promote successful mentoring programs. The quality of mentors and managers was found to be most the important factor, with 81.37% stating it was very important and 16.67% stating that it was important, giving it a weighted average of 1.21. However, this factor was followed closely by mentoring programs needing full commitment from management and the company, which had a weighted average of 1.24. Engagement with staff had a weighted average of 1.26, while building trust in the team had a weighted average of 1.27, and understanding culture and country had a weighted average of 1.28. The top five results all had a weighted average of better than 1.28, with no respondents, out of 102, stating that any of these factors were unimportant or very unimportant. Just outside of the top five, but still very important, was identifying strengths and weaknesses of staff and implementing personal development plans, with a weighted average of 1.33. Table 6.20 above demonstrates conclusive
results regarding the importance of these activities, as all results were well under a weighted average of 1.59.

It is important to note that a large amount of responses and data from the semi-structured interviews were summarised into similar responses, and then the top nine were used in the survey. As discussed in detail previously, the purpose of the survey was to provide further depth to the qualitative data, while allowing responses to be measured quantitatively. This allowed for the research results to be demonstrated accurately and enabled analysis of the top five responses.

The survey further assisted in removing any ambiguity or potential emotive responses or waiting, and presented the data drawn from 102 responses in a numerical, statistically accurate, quantitative figure. In summary, for Question 15, it was clear that the quality of managers, mentors and mentoring programs, combined with staff engagement, were the most prominent factors, which was supported by these factors receiving the top three responses. This continues with the ongoing theme supporting like responses, which will be discussed and analysed in detail at the completion of the findings section from the survey.
Q16: In your opinion, what makes a good mentor in PNG?

Figure 6.16 Question 16 Response
Table 6.21 Question 16 Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builds trust in the team</td>
<td>80.39%</td>
<td>18.63%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the country and culture</td>
<td>75.49%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and transparent dealing with staff</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff engagement</td>
<td>73.27%</td>
<td>26.73%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing support to national staff and positive performance management</td>
<td>72.55%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has training and teaching skills</td>
<td>60.78%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not trying to enforce western values on everything</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications skills (speaks Tok Pisin)</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>40.20%</td>
<td>15.69%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Military or Police background</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>32.67%</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing from the previous question regarding mentoring, this question considered the respondents’ opinions regarding the attributes of good mentors in the resource industry’s security and logistical workforce in PNG. Building trust in the team was the factor that elicited the strongest response, with 80.39% stating that it was very important and an additional 18.63% stating that it was important. Only one person (or 0.98%) responded that it was neither important nor unimportant, and no respondent stated that it was unimportant. With a weighted average of 1.21, this was clearly the strongest response in a top five that were all under 1.30.
The factor with the second strongest response was understanding the country and culture, at 1.25, again with no unimportant or very unimportant responses. Interestingly, no participant responded neutrally to this factor. Transparent dealings had a weighted average of 1.25 and no negative responses, while staff engagement also had no negative responses and a weighted average of 1.27. The final response of the top five, with a weighted average of 1.30, was the ongoing support to national staff and positive performance management. The rest of the responses—including teaching and training skills, not trying to enforce Western values and communication skills—also had strong results, rounding to an average of 2.00. Mentors or managers being ex-military or having a police background had a weighted average of 2.58, which indicated support for this being an influential factor; however, this did not indicate the level of importance that was initially discussed during the semi-structured interviews. It could be anecdotal or coincidental that so many mentors working in PNG come from this kind of environment. The survey data indicated that, while this is potentially a positive factor, it has nowhere near the significance of the eight proceeding factors.

Q17: Which other factors do you think affect workforce nationalisation in a resource company operating in PNG?

![Figure 6.17 Question 17 Response](image-url)
Table 6.22 Question 17 Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NEITHER</th>
<th>UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>VERY UNIMPORTANT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair and transparent dealing with staff</td>
<td>74.51%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing support to national staff and positive performance management</td>
<td>74.51%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing and supported training</td>
<td>70.30%</td>
<td>28.71%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of mentoring</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>36.27%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of PNG culture</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of expat managers to mentor staff</td>
<td>60.76%</td>
<td>36.27%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of the process</td>
<td>60.40%</td>
<td>37.62%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting realistic expectations</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
<td>43.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to mentor by managers</td>
<td>42.16%</td>
<td>43.14%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was derived to cover all the other factors raised during the semi-structured interviews and literature review that were not articulated through any of the other questions. Specifically, these were factors raised during the interviews when participants were asked if they wished to emphasise any particular points. Although many of the points covered by Question 17 were covered previously or in a different context, it was important to allow the interviewees a final opportunity to reinforce previous statements or provide information they felt needed to be discussed. The responses to this prompt from the semi-structured interviews were summarised previously. All responses with more than three similar answers during the interviews were included in the list of possible responses to Question 17 of the survey. The rates to the different responses were very similar to like responses from previous questions. Fair and transparent dealing with staff came first, with a weighted average of 1.26, while ongoing support for national staff and positive performance management came in a close second, with a weighted average of 1.27. Ongoing and supported training was also strongly supported, with a weighted average of 1.31, which indicated how closely weighted the top three were. Consistency of mentoring and understanding the PNG culture made up the top five, with weighted averages of 1.40 and 1.41, respectively. Again, the selection of expatriate managers to mentor staff was quite strong, with a
weighted average of 1.42, while both leadership of the process and setting realistic expectations had weighted averages of 1.43. The final response, with a weighted average of 1.78, was reluctance to mentor by managers. This final point—although last in the list of responses to Question 17—was an important issue raised during the semi-structured interviews, and also appeared in the literature review. Although it stands alone as its own point in this question, in previous questions, it would potentially be closely aligned with selection of correct staff and selection of skilled mentors or managers. It may have been strongly represented during the semi-structured interviews because of its anecdotal support, and, with 87 responses agreeing or strongly agreeing, there could be some truth to this statement. However, it was the last and least supported response in this section. The way in which staff are managed and supported, in conjunction with training and performance management, are clearly the central factors that can be drawn from this final section.

6.4 Summary of Findings

When interpreting data gathered from research, it is important to return to the research questions. After all, the research questions drove the development of the semi-structured interview questions and, with those, the survey questions. First, the minor research questions need to be addressed, which will underpin the summary of findings and the information required to answer the primary research question.

6.4.1 Minor Research Questions

Why do resource organisations build dependence on expatriate staff?

To answer this question, it must first be determined that there is actually dependence on expatriate staff. This was the basis of Question 6, which conclusively demonstrated that the perception of 96 of 102 respondents was that there is dependence on expatriate staff. With a weighted average of 1.88, the responses clearly demonstrated that resource organisations do build dependence on expatriate staff in PNG. Having demonstrated that this dependence exists, we analysed the findings from Question 7 regarding what may influence this dependence. As discussed in the results of Question 7, issues with education and training in the national workforce was considered the most influential factor, with a weighted average of 1.39. Both the semi-structured interviews and previous literature on the subject support this as one of the top factors causing this
dependence. The previous literature suggested that issues with education, including availability, lack of transparency, authenticity of educational documents, education levels and the availability of training positions, all affect the skills and training qualifications of the national workforce. The technical expertise of expatriates, with a weighted average of 1.47, was the second most influential factor. This finding was also supported by the literature and interviews, which suggested that workforce nationalisation is influenced by the ability to hire technical experts from overseas and then release them as soon as they are no longer needed.

The survey responses further demonstrated that this practice is especially prevalent in the resource industry during the project and construction phase. The final three factors from the top five included a limited pool of educated and experienced nationals (which was closely related to the first response and had a weighted average of 1.70), expatriates being easier to use (with a weighted factor of 1.88), and a recruitment structure that limits placing nationals (with a weighted average of 1.89). These results were fairly conclusive in demonstrating that the three main factors that cause resource organisations to depend on expatriates are the speed and ease of use with expatriates; issues with finding and recruiting the right national staff; and the perceived and real issues surrounding the education, training and experience of national staff. As indicated by the semi-structured interviews, this issue includes both national staff who cannot provide accurate documentation to support their education and training, and multiple cases of fraudulent and questionable documentation. The lack of transparency and the corruption in the country’s educational and governmental organisations creates ambiguity and uncertainty when hiring staff. These reasons, while not exhaustive, were the top five responses from the 102 respondents demonstrating the most plausible reasons for the reliance on expatriate professionals in the resource industry in PNG.

*How does the role of expatriate staff affect national staff?*

In support of the information found in the literature and the answers from the semi-structured interviews, the information gathered through the survey demonstrated that numerous factors were deemed important, ranging from the suitability of managers and how they mentor national staff (with a weighted average of 1.51 in Question 12) to the need for ongoing support for national staff and positive performance management (with a weighted factor of 1.27 in Question 17). Both the consistency and quality of mentors
received very high responses of 1.21 and 1.40, respectively, while fair and transparent dealing with staff had a weighted average of 1.25, staff engagement was 1.27, and one-on-one feedback with staff was 1.48. When viewing these responses and considering how they factor into answering this question, the predominant responses all involved mentoring and the way mentors interface with national staff. For example, in Question 14, selection of mentors had a weighted average of 1.25, followed closely by mentoring and training of development staff at 1.30. While other factors could be considered important—such as understanding the culture—a variety of responses across multiple questions all suggested that the most important factors are transparency when dealing with staff and staff engagement.

*If nationalisation were to occur earlier through advanced activity in the case study, what would be the approximate difference from a cost perspective between the use of expatriates and nationals?*

While this minor research question was designed with the purpose of using the case study to identify an approximate delta (difference in numerical figures) for what would happen if nationalisation were to occur earlier, it could not be estimated with any real degree of accuracy. However, in the survey, 33.33% of the respondents strongly agreed that there would be a positive cost benefit, and an additional 34.31% agreed that there would be a positive cost benefit. Nevertheless, 15.69% of the responses were neutral, 14.71% disagreed, and 1.96 strongly disagreed that there would be a positive cost benefit to the company. This yielded a weighted average of 2.18 in support of the potential of cost benefits to a company undertaking early workforce nationalisation. This indicates that the majority of respondents agreed that there would be positive cost benefits; however, any dollar amount would be proportionate to the rate of nationalisation and the size and complexity of the project.

Anecdotal evidence drawn from discussions with project finance specialists supports the idea that, in the example from the case study, developing and supporting the organisation’s logistics team with a more aggressive and early nationalisation program could have potentially saved over five years of work and somewhere in the vicinity of US$5 million. However, this information is anecdotal and based on assumptions from the case study and the numbers of staff, which cannot be verified; thus, it is purely speculative.
Which key factors limit early nationalisation of security and logistical workforces?

According to the responses to Question 12, the top five factors were a lack of skills and experience among staff (which had a weighted average of 1.48), not having the right people in both national and expatriate roles (which had a weighted average of 1.51), the experience and suitability of managers (which had a weighted average of 1.51), the motivation and cultural expectations of staff (which had a weighted average of 1.53) and the lack of training and development (which had a weighted average of 1.56). When considering these responses in the context of the relevant literature and interviews, it seems that a number of these factors existing concurrently causes the largest limitations. When staff lack skills, knowledge and experience, it directly affects the second response, which is not having the right people in both national and expatriate roles.

When considered in relation to response three—the experience and suitability of managers—these factors are all similar, in that they suggest that having the wrong people in support roles and other potential mismatched personnel has a significant negative effect. Inexperienced managers with little knowledge or interest in mentoring, who are leading staff with minimal training and experience, affects the workforce significantly, as demonstrated through the fourth response—motivation and cultural expectations of staff. The way in which staff are led and treated and the support they receive from managers and supervisors are all key factors that, if not handled properly, would limit the success of a nationalisation program.

Which factors would enable the early nationalisation of staff?

The final of the minor questions dealt with the factors that help enable the early nationalisation of staff, which was covered in Question 13 of the survey findings above. The selection of national staff, with a weighted average of 1.30, was the top response, closely followed by mentoring programs, with a weighted average of 1.32. Identifying key national staff early for supervisory and management positions also scored very high, with a weighted average of 1.37. Selection of staff (expatriates) and apprenticeships or traineeships came in at positions four and five, with weighted averages of 1.42 and 1.43, respectively.

These results support the evidence from the literature and interviews that it is important to select the correct staff (both expatriate and national) early in the process and to focus
On finding national staff suitable for supervisory and manager positions who can be mentored and developed early. Based on the similarities between the first four responses, it is clear that the quantitative data support the qualitative findings regarding this minor research question.

6.4.2 Major Research Question

Which key activities promote a successful program to enable early nationalisation in a resource company operating in PNG?

With the minor research questions summarised in the findings above, the major research question needs to be addressed. In doing so, this section will include a summary analysis of all the information from Question 14, while also comparing and contrasting all the key findings from the rest of the research results. The findings from Question 14 were presented in ascending order and sorted into similar responses. These similar responses were then matched with the top five responses from the other questions to develop similar factors. This resulted in five distinct groups of responses, categorised as follows: mentoring, training and development, staff engagement, culture and HR factors. Figure 6.18 below illustrates the findings for the mentoring category, with each similar factor mapped in relation to the broader category.
Figure 6.18 Initial Mentoring Factors

Mentoring

- 1.25 Selection of mentors
- 1.31 Mentoring
- 1.21 Quality of mentors and managers
- 1.24 Mentoring program needs full commitment by management and company
- 1.27 Ongoing support for national staff and positive performance management
- 1.32 Mentoring programs
- 1.40 Selection of managers to mentor staff
- 1.40 Consistency of mentors
- 1.51 Experience and suitability of managers.
Figure 6.19 Initial Training and Development Factors

Training and development

- 1.30 Training and development of staff
- 1.31 Ongoing supported training
- 1.39 Issues with education and training
- 1.43 Apprenticeships and traineeships
- 1.48 Skills, knowledge and experience of staff
- 1.56 Lack of training and development opportunities.
Figure 6.20 Initial Engagement Factors

Engagement

- 1.31 Building relationships with staff based on mutual respect
- 1.21 Building trust in the team
- 1.25 Fair and transparent dealing with staff
- 1.26 Fair and transparent dealing with staff
- 1.27 Staff engagement
- 1.26 Engagement with staff
- 1.27 Building trust in the team
- 1.30 Ongoing support for national staff and positive performance management
- 1.58 Incremental responsibility to build capacity
- 1.48 One-on-one feedback with staff.
Cultural understanding

- 1.47 Language and cultural understanding
- 1.25 Understanding the country and culture
- 1.28 Understanding the country and culture
- 1.41 Understanding PNG culture.
Figure 6.22 Initial Human Resource Factors

HR factors

- 1.30 Selection of staff—nationals
- 1.37 Identifying key national staff early for supervisory and management positions
- 1.42 Selection of staff—expatriates
- 1.47 Technical expertise of expatriates
- 1.5 Not having the right people in roles, both nationals and expatriates
- 1.53 Motivation and cultural expectations of staff
- 1.70 Limited pool of nationals
- 1.88 Expatriates easier to use
- 1.89 Poor recruitment structure limits placing experienced nationals.
These findings provide a strong understanding of the key activities that promote successful nationalisation programs in resource organisations operating in PNG. As discussed, the purpose of Question 14 was to provide the basis to answer the major research question, with support from the rest of the research question responses. When looking at the table above and the strong weighting of each of the responses from Question 14, the five themes were clearly identified.

### 6.4.3 Grouping the Responses

Now that the findings have been broken into the key five categories above, each will be discussed to further develop the summary. As shown, the responses that comprised each of the five categories often included multiple variations of the same response or similar responses. These were further broken down to create a single ‘action item’ for each to be used in developing the final model.
6.4.3.1 Mentoring

Figure 6.24 Mentoring

While the previous version of the mentoring model showed every response that could be grouped under mentoring, it has now been refined further. The first step was to identify the key responses that linked directly with the grouping, which were mentoring (1.31) and mentoring programs (1.32). Both of these factors demonstrated the importance of mentoring as both a primary function in workforce nationalisation and a sub-function to be considered and used. This left two distinct mentoring sub-groups: selection of mentors and conduct of mentors. Under selection of mentors, the following sub-responses were grouped: selection of mentors (1.25), quality of mentors and managers (1.21), experience and suitability of managers (1.51) and selection of managers to mentor staff (1.40). All these responses were related to the importance of selecting the right managers to mentor national staff, including their experience; suitability; and other qualities that make a good mentor, such as cultural understanding, communication skills, ability to transfer knowledge and teaching skills.

The second sub-group of mentoring—the conduct of mentors—including the following: the mentoring program needs full commitment by management and company (1.24), ongoing support for national staff and positive performance management (1.27) and consistency of mentors (1.40). All these responses involved what happens after staff
selection has occurred and mentoring programs are potentially underway. Integral to the success of any program is demonstration that senior management supports and is fully committed to their mentoring program, as discussed in detail in the literature, the semi-structured interviews and now the survey results.

It has been well demonstrated throughout the research findings, case study, literature and interviews that mentoring is one of the key factors supporting workforce nationalisation. Further, it has been shown that, in addition to having mentoring or a mentoring program, there needs to be full commitment by management, as well as a well-designed and well-operated program. This needs to be driven by the right people, as indicated through the importance of selecting managers and mentors. Without trained and experienced mentors, the program will have a reduced chance of success. The final summary draws all the groups together into a single model to discuss the findings holistically and demonstrate the optimum workforce nationalisation model.

6.4.3.2 Training and Development

Training and development of staff (1.30) mirrored the group label and was the key factor within which the others were grouped. These included issues with education and training (1.39); the skills, knowledge and experience of staff (1.48); and a lack of training and development opportunities (1.56). These were all potentially limiting factors that must be addressed when seeking to drive workforce nationalisation. They
should be fully considered and understood before the development of a program. The skills and experience of staff feed directly into issues with available opportunities for education and training because, in some parts of PNG—especially in remote resource project areas—there are limited opportunities for potential staff. These issues need to be considered in relation to the second sub-grouping, which included ongoing, supported training and the use of apprenticeships and traineeships.

While the key factor here is the training and development of national staff, the two sub-groups indicated how this should occur and what the limiting factors may be. With a weighted average of 1.30, the importance of training and developing national staff was clearly demonstrated through the data. The ways to respond to this factor were also made clear, as ongoing, supported training had a weighted average of 1.31 and apprenticeships or traineeships had a weighted average of 1.43. The survey results conclusively confirmed the findings from the literature and interviews that both traineeships and apprenticeships, coupled with ongoing, supported training, are crucial to successful workforce nationalisation.

6.4.3.3 Engagement

![Figure 6.26 Engagement](image)

The primary grouping of engagement was further broken into two sub-groupings: performance management and mutual respect. Engagement with staff (1.26) and 1.27 staff engagement (1.27) were absorbed by the primary grouping of engagement. The performance management sub-grouping consisted of one-on-one feedback with staff
ongoing support to national staff and positive performance management (1.30) and incremental responsibility to build capacity (1.58). These responses were all related to how to best manage the performance of national staff, and clearly demonstrated that one-on-one feedback, coupled with ongoing supportive management, are the best methods for managing staff. As covered in some detail previously, these averages show strong statistical support for what was covered thoroughly during the interviews.

The other key component to this sub-grouping is the incremental responsibility to build capacity, which both Interviewees B and E discussed in detail, and was confirmed by the survey as being a key factor in enabling staff. The mutual respect sub-group included building relationships with staff based on mutual respect (1.31), building trust in the team (1.21), fair and transparent dealing with staff (1.25), fair and transparent dealing with staff (1.26) and building trust in the team (1.27). Looking at these results, as well as the two results that were replicated (building trust in the team and fair and transparent dealing with staff), it is clear how highly regarded these factors were in terms of their importance for the workforce nationalisation process. During the interviews, many of the interviewees considered these two points to be critical to the process, and particularly stated that if staff do not respect you and there is no trust, you will have a very low chance of success. Mentoring is built on common respect and trust in one another, and a key aspect of this trust is being open and transparent. This was clearly shown through the findings.
6.4.3.4 Cultural Understanding

The process of further grouping cultural understanding was not required because all responses were so closely aligned that they could be considered the same factor. Thus, they will be now discussed as such. When looking at the individual responses—language and cultural understanding (1.47), understanding the country and culture (1.25), understanding the country and culture (1.28) and understanding PNG culture (1.41)—the findings clearly demonstrated that the ability of the expatriate manager and mentor to understand the culture and attain even a rudimentary understanding of the language greatly assists in the mentoring process. Being able to communicate effectively is central to passing on knowledge. It was also suggested in the interviews (Interview C) that the fastest way to develop a common ground is through social-based conversation with workers. Something as basic as exchanging greetings in the local language can greatly improve the previous factor’s (engagement) success. As discussed in some detail in the literature, PNG is a very complex country with hundreds of different cultures and languages. Managers and mentors must understand the effect of culture so that it can be employed as an enabler, instead of a limitation. If certain factors are understood and become part of the plan, they can greatly assist managers’ ability to communicate with and engage staff, which has a positive effect on the workforce.
nationalisation process. The importance of this is clearly demonstrated by this factor’s 1.25 weighted average obtained from the survey.

6.4.3.5 Human Resource Factors

Breaking down the HR factors into sub-groups was undertaken differently than with the other four factors, as shown in the diagram above. The sub-groups were broken down to have the two enabling sub-groups (identifying key national staff early for supervisory and management positions [1.37] and selection of staff—nationals and expatriates [1.30]) on the right and the two limiting sub-groups on the left. The technical expertise of expatriates (1.47) and expatriates being easier to use (1.88) were grouped together to form the primary information regarding why companies prefer to employ expatriates, rather than promoting nationalisation. The other limitations grouped together were as follows.

The factor of not having the right people and roles, both nationals and expatriates (1.50), has been discussed in some detail and was covered from a different perspective—the need to find and hire the right people—in the mentoring grouping above. The motivation and cultural expectations of staff (1.53) was discussed as a potential limitation. Once the moral in the organisation begins to collapse and a focus on mentoring dissipates, as discussed during the interviews and supported by the surveys, this has a major effect on the workforce nationalisation process.
The response regarding the limited pool of nationals (1.70) was drawn from the interviews and refers to the inability of companies to find and hire experienced national staff during project start-up. This limitation was supported by the survey data. The limited pool of nationals problem is also related to the response that poor recruitment structures limit the placement of experienced nationals (1.89). This problem has been observed and was discussed in the interviews, and the survey confirmed that the PNG recruitment framework has limitations. These problems are connected to the lack of transparency and integrity in some of the educational and training records for potential staff, as well as the fact that PNG has a high ranking on the country corruption index. All these factors combined are responsible for the lack of trust in the recruitment process, which has a negative effect on workforce nationalisation.

6.5 Conclusion

The below figure displays the final grouping of the five factors most critical to workforce nationalisation in PNG, and demonstrates their relationship to mentoring. The final summary and conclusion chapter will focus predominantly on the enabling factors for workforce nationalisation, and how to move forwards towards nationalisation. Moreover, importantly, this chapter will summarise the potential limitations of this study.
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**Figure 6.29 Proposed Mentoring Model**