



'We're not a white fella organization': Hybridity and friction in the contact zone between local kinship relations and audit culture in an Indigenous organization.

Journal:	<i>Organization Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	OS-20-0820.R4
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	hybridity, Indigenous, audit, kinship, friction, decolonization, contact zone
Abstract:	Our paper contributes to studies of Indigenous organizing and organizations. We draw on Indigenous knowledge which recognises that everything is connected within networks of relationships (Yunkaporta,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	<p>2019; Kwaymullina, 2016) to extend post-colonial theory on hybridity (Bhabha, 1994). Our case study research with Australia's only Indigenous-owned credit union identifies how hybridity is co-constituted through 'friction' (Tsing, 2005) in the 'contact zone' (Pratt, 2007) where local kinship relations and audit practices meet and grapple. Focusing on the 'contact zone' allows us to better understand the everyday organizing that produces hybridity. We build on existing work on hybridities in organizations which predominately focus on issues of language and knowledge by focusing on the organizational interactions themselves, especially the embedded interactions between humans and objects. Seeing these interactions as 'friction' means not trying to solve or dissolve them – but to acknowledge them as lived realities of an Indigenous organization.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
‘We’re not a white fella organization’: Hybridity and friction in the contact zone between local kinship relations and audit culture in an Indigenous organization

10
11
12
13
14
Leanne Cutcher

University of Sydney Business School

Corresponding author: leanne.cutcher@sydney.edu.au

15
16
17
18
19
Karen Dale

University of Lancaster Business School

20
21
22
Abstract

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Our paper contributes to studies of Indigenous organizing and organizations. We draw on Indigenous knowledge which recognises that everything is connected within networks of relationships (Yunkaporta, 2019; Kwaymullina, 2016) to extend post-colonial theory on hybridity (Bhabha, 1994). Our case study research with Australia’s only Indigenous-owned credit union identifies how hybridity is co-constituted through ‘friction’ (Tsing, 2005) in the ‘contact zone’ (Pratt, 2007) where local kinship relations and audit practices meet and grapple. Focusing on the ‘contact zone’ allows us to better understand the everyday organizing that produces hybridity. We build on existing work on hybridities in organizations which predominately focus on issues of language and knowledge by focusing on the organizational interactions themselves, especially the embedded interactions between humans and objects. Seeing these interactions as ‘friction’ means not trying to solve or dissolve them – but to acknowledge them as lived realities of an Indigenous organization.

Keywords: Indigenous, audit, kinship, friction, hybridity, decolonization, contact zone

Introduction

There is growing recognition that studying Indigenous organizations matters (Love, 2020, 2019; Tedmanson, Verduyn, Essers, & Garner, 2012; Banerjee & Tedmanson, 2010; Peredo & McLean, 2010; Foley, 2003a). It matters because studying Indigenous organizing can shed light on the ongoing, diverse effects of colonialism. Studying the ongoing effects of colonialism is important because this continues to be a living process in many parts of the world (Moreton-Robinson, 2007). In Australia, where our research was conducted, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are still subjected to settler colonialism with the main objective of ‘transforming Indigenous land and the Indigenous citizens into productive participants in the market economy’ (Howard-Wagner, 2012, p. 224). Settler colonial practices of domesticating Indigenous sovereignty have been buoyed by neo-liberal policies that have limited the possibility of Indigenous intervention, denying Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples their rights, and ignoring the effects of discriminatory treatment (Howard-Wagner, Bargh, & Altamirano-Jimenez, 2018; Howard-Wagner, 2012). As a result, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continue to experience restricted access to Country and resources (Banerjee & Tedmanson, 2010). Country is the term used by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to describe the lands, waterways, and seas to which they are ancestrally connected (Flood, 2006). The term encompasses complex ideas about law, place, custom, belief, culture, family and identity (AIATSIS.gov.au). Dispossession from Country disrupts kinship relations which guide, ‘cultural ways of knowing, being and doing (Dudgeon & Bray, 2019, p. 4). For Indigenous Australians, Country, culture and kinship are inseparable.

Moreover, studying processes of colonisation helps to bring into sharp relief key assumptions which underpin organization studies as a disciplinary field. As Meyer & Quattrone (2021, p. 1377) urge it means going beyond ‘the colonialist impetus that made the discipline emerge’ and learning from Indigenous communities. It requires us to acknowledge that

1
2
3 dominant ways of studying organizations are sustained by ‘white privilege – of the knowledge
4 disciplines and institutions of the west’ (Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 440). Studying Indigenous
5 organizations means acknowledging that they are grounded in their own constitution of
6 meaning which can neither simply be ‘read’ through dominant management concepts nor
7 appropriated for the use of generalized management studies (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004; Jaya,
8 2001). It is imperative that we reject the tendency to unquestioningly apply western knowledge
9 systems to the study of Indigenous peoples (Love, 2020; Tedmanson et al., 2012; Banerjee &
10 Tedmanson, 2010; Foley, 2003b), listen to Indigenous voices and highlight Indigenous
11 knowledges (Kwaymullina, 2016). In this way, Indigenous organization research might inspire
12 novel ideas about organizations and challenge prevailing notions, making way for alternative
13 theories of organizations (Love, 2020, 2019).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Our research focuses on Traditional Credit Union (TCU), very much an Indigenous organization, specifically described by the CEO as ‘not a white fella organization’. It is an initiative of Aboriginal elders and the Arnhem Land Progress Association. A raft of branch closures across Australia in the 1990s saw many remote and rural communities without a banking service, leaving these communities financially excluded. Financial exclusion means not having access to low cost, fair and safe financial products which leads people into greater poverty and over-indebtedness (Jones, 2007, p. 2144). East Arnhem Land Elders understood that financial exclusion would exacerbate the socio-economic disadvantage already experienced by their communities, with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples having lower levels of education and employment (PM&C, 2020)ⁱ and shorter life expectancy (ABS, 2018)ⁱⁱ compared to the rest of Australia’s population.

As a credit union, TCU is a not-for-profit financial co-operative that provides savings, loans and other financial services to their members. The ideals of mutualism which has been described as a sort of communitarianism or collectivism, in which individuals are tied to others

1
2
3 through a variety of economic and social links, underpin the operations of credit unions (Parker,
4 Fournier & Reedy, 2007). TCU is held up as an exemplar by the industry body representing
5 credit unions because of the strong bonds of association it has with its members. However,
6 despite these local connections, TCU necessarily extends the international financial system and
7 its assumptions of individual rights and responsibility into local communities with long-
8 standing cultural traditions of shared resources and communal ownership.
9

10
11
12 We explore the complexities and contradictions which come from TCU's navigation
13 between being an Indigenous organization and the demands of the globalised financial services
14 industry by focusing on the 'contact zone' where kinship relations and audit culture meet. Pratt,
15 (2007, p. 7) describes the contact zone as the 'social spaces where disparate cultures, meet,
16 clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and
17 subordination'. We highlight how organizational sites in settler colonial contexts can be
18 understood as 'contact zones' where specific aspects of audit culture and kinship relations
19 interact and creates tensions. We draw upon post-colonial (Bhabha, 1994) and Indigenous
20 (Yunkaporta, 2019) notions of hybridity to look more closely at how hybridity is co-constituted
21 in the 'contact zone'. To analyse the co-constitution of hybridity we build on Tsing's (2005, p.
22 4) concept of 'friction': the 'awkward, unequal, unstable and creative qualities of
23 interconnection across difference' through which 'cultures are continually co-produced'.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Much of the existing work on hybridity in organization studies focuses predominantly on
46 issues of language, culture, and knowledge (Dar, 2018, 2014; Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006;
47 Yousfi, 2014). In this paper we focus on organizational interactions themselves, especially the
48 interactions between humans and objects. Tsing describes these interactions as the 'sticky
49 materiality of practical encounters' (Tsing, 2005, p. 7), that can enact relations which elude
50 straightforward expression in language. Our focus on human and non-human elements was also
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 influenced by Indigenous knowledges which sees everything as connected within networks of
4 relationships (Yunkaporta, 2019; Kwaymullina, 2016).
5
6

7
8 We adopt an ethnographic approach that focuses on the interaction of the discursive and
9 material, observing the ‘friction’ (Tsing, 2005) between kinship systems and audit culture but
10 also the ways in which a set of hybrid relations are constituted in an Indigenous organization.
11 Exploring these interactions enables us to make a theoretical contribution by extending our
12 understanding of hybridity as co-constituted through ‘friction’ generated in a ‘contact zone’
13 which is an entanglement of the social and the material (Yunkaporta, 2019; Tsing, 2005). The
14 paper also contributes empirically to developing an understanding of Indigenous organizations
15 and organizing with the aim of showing what organizations might look like if ‘organizing
16 principles are based on Indigenous knowledges and ways of doing things’ (Love, 2020, p. 8).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Indigenous Organizing**

29
30 Love (2019, p. 2) points out that ‘the formation of organizations has ... been an important part
31 of Indigenous peoples’ collective efforts in the struggle for the recognition of rights’ with the
32 objectives of bringing change, empowerment, and emancipation. There have been studies of
33 Indigenous organization and organizing from several perspectives. The area of Indigenous
34 entrepreneurship has a rich tradition, stemming from the recognition that entrepreneurial
35 activity allows Indigenous peoples opportunities to develop economic independence, be self-
36 determining, and to do this in ways which value their own cultural and community histories
37 (Anderson & Giberson, 2003). Indigenous organizing is often based upon a different
38 relationship between people and land and tends towards more consensual decision-making and
39 collective ownership (Peredo & McLean, 2010; Spiller, Erakovic, Henare, & Pio, 2011). As a
40 result, Indigenous economic activity very often has a different understanding and approach
41 from mainstream economic assumptions (Schaper, 2007) with Indigenous organizing often
42 taking place within complex networks of mutual obligation (Peredo & McLean, 2010). As a
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 result, an individual's status, well-being and social inclusion are the result of reciprocated
4 contributions (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006, p. 313). In this way, community entitlement can
5
6 override individual property rights (Peredo & McLean, 2010). For example, Cahn (2008, p. 5)
7
8 writes about how reciprocal gift giving which is part of Samoan kinship obligations has both a
9
10 social and economic function for the wider community. Curry (2005, p. 8) writing about village
11
12 trade stores in Papua New Guinea shows how they were established and managed through the
13
14 same kinship networks that govern other aspects of community life. As Curry (2005) found,
15
16 the distribution of investment returns was influenced more by Indigenous moral obligations
17
18 associated with the type of kinship relationship between investor and store proprietor than by
19
20 the initial investment level.
21
22
23
24
25

26 The emphasis on relationships and social networks in the management of finance does
27
28 not fit neatly into the dominant system of economic value and as a result it is denigrated and,
29
30 as a result, ignored or separated out as 'cultural' rather than 'economic' activity (Altman, 2004;
31
32 Altman, Biddle, & Buchanan, 2012). Altman et al. (2012) discuss how categories in
33
34 government statistics embody mainstream western assumptions that value the individual over
35
36 the collective, for example the way 'real' jobs were viewed as individual and economic and
37
38 customary work as collective and cultural. TCU embodies tensions between communal ways
39
40 of organizing resources and the focus on individual ownership that underpins Western financial
41
42 systems.
43
44
45

46 **Audit Culture**

47
48 Auditing techniques and assumptions have been used as part of the colonial relations of
49
50 subordination of Indigenous peoples (Neu, 1999, 2000; Willmott, 2020). Neu (1999) describes
51
52 techniques such as accounting as a technique of governance: 'colonialism at-a-distance'.
53
54 Willmott (2020) has shown how the use of auditing procedures by the Canadian State towards
55
56 First Nations people through the *First Nations Financial Transparency Act (FNFTA)* in 2013,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 became a tool to shape how First Nation governments must create political subjects and
4 citizenship in ways which fit with the norms of the dominant Canadian culture.
5
6

7
8 At one level 'audit' refers to inspection of accounts or other organizational activities,
9 often by an external body, using 'mundane practices' such as checking accounts and records,
10 tallying figures as money moves around, allocating resources, and measuring performance.
11
12 However, the effects of audit are much more extensive than this, having been extended beyond
13 financial systems or financial institutions (Power, 1999, 2000; Shore & Wright, 2015;
14 Strathern, 2000). Beyond its techniques, Swan notes, is 'the importance of audit as an idea, a
15 mindset which replicates certain values and images of control' (2010, p. 486). At the same
16 time, audit techniques carry legitimacy and a certain form of moral power: 'the cultural stamp
17 of accountability' (Strathern, 2000, p. 53). The proliferation of audit marks a move from direct
18 control to the 'control of control' (Power, 1999, p. 66): part of a regime of self-control and self-
19 regulation that also influences self-formation and subjectivity. It is in this broader sense that
20 Power (1999) refers to an 'audit culture'.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The application of a 'robust' audit culture is deemed to demonstrate individual and
36 collective responsibility. Practices and relations which do not fit within these western cultural
37 norms are deemed illegitimate and suspect: a failure to demonstrate trustworthiness and good
38 management. Strathern (2000, p. 2) has argued that 'by themselves audit practices often seem
39 mundane, inevitable parts of a bureaucratic process. It is when one starts putting together a
40 larger picture that they take on the contours of a distinct cultural artefact', which she recognises
41 as a specific Western phenomenon. Further, audit practices can operate as a form of cultural
42 performance through which certain organizational members are made visible to one another
43 and are able to assert just who is in control (Munro, 1999). This takes on a particular
44 complexion within the relations of settler colonialism in Australia where struggles around
45 several organizations for the self-determination and development of Indigenous communities
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in Australia have centred on the presentation of financial and administrative ‘problems’
4
5 (Ivanitz, 2000; Pratt & Bennett, 2004). Both media and political attention have channeled
6
7 hostility to Indigenous self-determination through expressions of concern about the
8
9 administration and transparency of Indigenous affairs. In other words, the supposed objective,
10
11 neutral and moral categories of accounting and accountability are drawn upon as a tool to cast
12
13 doubt upon the fitness of Indigenous peoples and organizations to have access to and control
14
15 of resources. In this paper we are concerned with what happens to norms around the audit
16
17 culture when Indigenous peoples take up these techniques themselves, for their own benefit.
18
19 To do this, we consider the importance of the in-between spaces of colonialism.
20
21
22

23 24 **Hybridity in the Contact Zone**

25
26 Here we turn to the work of post-colonial scholar, Homi Bhabha who has theorised the in-
27
28 between spaces produced by colonialism as hybrid spaces where ‘translations’ of texts,
29
30 practices, and identities take place (Bhabha, 1996, 1994). As Frenkel and Shenhav explain:
31
32

33 Bhabha’s notion of hybridity does not nullify the asymmetrical power relations between
34
35 the colonizer and the colonized and should not be equated with the simple mixing of
36
37 cocktails as in syncretism (Gilroy 1993). On the contrary, hybridity is embedded in power
38
39 (2006, p. 4).
40
41

42 In settler colonial states like Australia, Yunkaporta (2019, p. 233) warns that the power
43
44 relations are so skewed that ‘there is not much opportunity for the brackish waters of hybridity
45
46 to stew up something exciting’. However, he is hopeful that encounters between Indigenous
47
48 and non-Indigenous knowledges can ‘harness the power of hybridity’ (p. 235).
49
50

51 We contend that to understand how hybridity is co-produced, we need to focus the
52
53 ‘contact zone’ where the disparate and asymmetrical cultures of local kinship relations and
54
55 audit practices meet and grapple (Pratt, 2007, p. 7). To understand hybridizing processes that
56
57 occur in the ‘contact zone’ we turn to the work of Tsing (2005) who explores the complexities
58
59
60

1
2
3 of colonial encounters in her study of Indonesian rainforests, specifically the knotty
4 relationship between the universal and the local. The idea of the ‘universal’ is important
5 because it assumes that processes such as regulations and procedures can be disembedded from
6 the specific conditions which produced them and are able to transcend cultural differences
7 (Tsing, 2005, p. 7). However, Tsing points out there is a need to recognise that not only does
8 that which presents itself as universal have its own historical and cultural specificity, but it is
9 also itself produced and transformed within the colonial encounter. For this paper, this is an
10 important point to make in relation to audit culture. Audit may be presented as a universal set
11 of techniques and goals, but it incorporates its own historical and cultural assumptions, and as
12 it is brought into contact with Indigenous organization, it will also be ‘charged and enacted in
13 the sticky materiality of practical encounters (Tsing, 2005, p. 7). These are inevitably
14 ‘encounters across difference’, encounters which are contingent, messy, and surprising (Tsing,
15 2005, p. 3). As Pratt (2007, p. 8) argues we need to pay attention to and write into our accounts
16 these ‘interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters’.

17
18
19 This is the case especially when what we encounter challenges the limits of our
20 knowledge, requiring us to embrace the conditions of possibility (Cutcher, Hardy, Riach, &
21 Thomas, 2020). In our case it meant seeking to understand Indigenous knowledges which
22 emphasize that everything is ‘connected within networks of relationships and is in a constant
23 state of movement’ (Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 441) As Yunkaporta (2019, p. 169) explains, ‘in
24 Aboriginal worldviews, nothing exists outside of a relationship to something else’. These
25 connections are at the heart of Indigenous knowledge systems which are underpinned by norms
26 of responsibility and reciprocity towards human and more-than-human kin (Dudgeon & Bray,
27 2019). It is kinship that connects humans, other species and Country. This means that ‘the
28 process of knowing inevitably involves locating the self within the networks of relationships
29 that comprise the world, that also comprise the self’ (Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 441). Aboriginal
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Torres Strait Islander peoples ‘exist to form these relationships, which make up the energy
4 that holds creation together’ (Yunkaporta, 2019, p. 169). Hybridization is a force that
5 incorporates and influences all of this creation (Yunkaporta, 2019).
6
7

8
9
10 Exploring these connections allows us to identify the translations that take place in the
11 ‘contact zone’ and the hybrid practices co-produced (Yunkaporta, 2019; Pratt, 2007; Bhabha,
12 1994). Before discussing the nature and effects of these encounters and connections and the
13 hybridity they co-produce we provide more information on the context of our research.
14
15
16
17
18

19 20 **Banking on Country: Case Study and Research Sites**

21
22 A decade-long relationship between the first author and the Credit Union Foundation of
23 Australia (CUFA) that supports the provision of services to financially excluded communities
24 facilitated access to TCU. A long-time contact from CUFA introduced the researcher to TCU’s
25 Training Manager via email who then facilitated access to the organization. TCU’s head office
26 is in Darwin, and they have 14 branches across the Northern Territory of Australia with 9,000
27 members. Our fieldwork was undertaken on Larrakia land, at the head office in Darwin, and
28 on Yolungu land, at the Ramingining branch located 560kms east of Darwin on the edge of the
29 Arafura Swamp. Darwin is the capital city of the Northern Territory and has a population of
30 around 162,000. Ramingining is an Aboriginal community with a population of approximately
31 800 but this fluctuates as people from many of the outstations situated on the banks of lagoons
32 and rivers come and go from the community. Given the remoteness of the research site, the
33 fieldwork was undertaken in two blocks of time (one week and three weeks in length).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 For the Larrakia and Yolungu peoples, Country is ‘communal and personal’: the
51 connection to Country binds them to the land and they are connected to each other and to all
52 other beings through a kinship system (King, 2011, p. 115). Moiety is the first level of kinship
53 and represents the two halves of the universe (see Riley, 2015). People who share a moiety are
54 obliged to support one another through a system of reciprocal rights. King, a Larrakia woman,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 writes that ‘living our lives within the boundaries of the kinship system we help to maintain
4 balance, harmony and relatedness of all things, including our lives and our relationships with
5 each other’ (2011, p. 252). Sharing the same moiety sets up a system of responsibilities and
6 obligations to other people who if they give something to you can expect to be paid back. The
7 meeting of the obligation to reciprocate does not have to come from that same individual but
8 may come from someone else in the kinship system. Sylvia, TCU’s Accounts Manager
9 explains: ‘I’m adopted into the kinship system. So, if I see anyone who is a significant family
10 person, they are very unlikely not to ask me for something. Sharing is a really significant thing’.
11 Within the moiety system the value of many items, including money, is mediated by sharing,
12 which strengthens the bonds of relationality. This concept of relational sharing sits in stark
13 contrast to a financial services audit culture that emphasizes individual ownership and
14 confidentiality. While TCU’s Board has a majority of Indigenous Directors (five out of nine)
15 and 75% of its total workforce of 50 employees is Indigenous and 100% of staff employed in
16 branches are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders (TCU Annual Report, 2019-2020) it is
17 governed by the laws of the financial system and this system is governed by a very different
18 set of relations towards resources and modes of valuation than the culture and law of the
19 Yolungu and Larrakia peoples.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 Many of the practices that TCU undertakes are set down by external government
43 reporting and regulatory authorities, most notably the Australian Prudential Regulatory
44 Authority (APRA), the body responsible for regulation of the financial services sector. TCU is
45 subjected to the same reporting requirements as any other ‘deposit taking institution’ yet it
46 operates in very different spaces. The logistics and administrative costs associated with training
47 staff in APRA’s regulations and requirements was identified as a major challenge by TCU
48 management. Training is costly and time-consuming because its staff in the communities have
49 very low levels of numeracy and literacy, with all employees (and potential employees from
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the community) only having completed the early years of school education. TCU devotes
4
5 considerable resources into training and development: a commitment that has seen them win
6
7 several diversity and training awards, including Northern Territory Trainee and Trainer of the
8
9 Year and the *Deadly Award for Employment*ⁱⁱⁱ
10
11

12 The second major challenge identified by TCU management is how to manage
13
14 compliance across a widespread branch network. TCU's head office staff regularly travel to
15
16 these remote locations to ensure that procedures are followed, restocking safes, and providing
17
18 support and training to staff. As Diane, the Senior Training Officer explained:
19
20

21 Out there, just to get equipment, travel, accommodation costs, to go out. Some places,
22
23 some of our branches, we can – there's no regular flights in and out so we actually have
24
25 to charter flights. Some of those charters are two grand one way. You get picked up in
26
27 Darwin and I'm going to Minyerri, that's two grand to drop me off on Monday and then
28
29 you pay another two grand to bring me back home on Friday. So, expenses are really
30
31 huge (Interview, Senior Training Officer).
32
33
34

35 We also observed that TCU's presence in the remote communities is made more complex by
36
37 the fact that these communities are not only widely geographically dispersed, but they are also
38
39 populated by very different cultural and language groups. The similarities they do share relate
40
41 to the ways in which successive governments have subjected them to special measures that do
42
43 not apply to other Australian citizens, such as income management regimes that quarantine
44
45 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's money so that a proportion of a person's welfare
46
47 payment is compulsorily directed towards meeting basic needs such as housing and utilities
48
49 (see Bielefeld, 2012 for an overview of colonial approaches to limiting access to money for
50
51 Indigenous Australians). These interventionist policies are part of a 'much longer story of
52
53 settler colonialism in Australia' (Howard-Wagner, 2012, p. 224).
54
55
56

57 **Methodology**

58
59
60

Observing and Yarning

We deploy an ethnographic approach which means that in our fieldwork we sought to learn the culture of a particular setting through observation, participation, interviews, and documentary evidence. As O’Doherty & Neyland (2019, p. 435) write, an ethnographic approach promises to ‘provide insights into complexity, paradox and ambiguity in organizations.’ During the research processes we were acutely aware of being ‘outsiders.’ The first author might describe herself as an ‘inside-outsider’ because she is an Australian who has Indigenous ancestry^{iv} but sits outside the culture and lived experience of the Larrakia and Yolngu peoples, while the British author is a ‘real outsider’. We became increasingly aware that the ‘assumptions, motivations, narratives, and relations which are part of [our] backstage’ had shaped the original structure and substance of our research project (McCorkel & Myers, 2003, p. 200). This was never more apparent than when undertaking the fieldwork. While Indigenous staff were ‘encouraged’ by management to make themselves available for interview, they never did. Through their refusal, we were confronted by ‘the fraught position of holding privilege that emerged from, and to some degree is sustained by, the marginalization of the people [we] write about’ (Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 442). A different way of engaging was needed, and opportunities were taken to chat informally with the tellers about their work while they were in the ‘tearoom’ or while they were serving customers at the front counter. This approach was much more in line with Indigenous ways of sharing knowledge through ‘yarning’. Bessarab & Ng’andu (2010) have identified a range of types of yarning, including ‘research topic yarning’ which unlike formal interviewing allows the participants to lead the conversation, shape the direction of the discussion without interruption in a known and culturally safe environment (Walker, Fredericks, Mills, & Anderson, 2014). The first author also conducted a half day strategy workshop with the senior management team as a way of giving back to the organization and gaining insights into the aspirations of and challenges faced by the

1
2
3 organization. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with the five non-Indigenous
4
5 managers who made up the senior management team and four operations officers, including
6
7 two training officers, the business development officer, and the accounts manager (see Table 1
8
9 for details of the interviews). There have been some staff changes since we conducted our
10
11 research and we have given our research participants pseudonyms to protect their
12
13 confidentiality.
14
15

16
17 Table 1 about here
18
19

20
21 An interview guide was sent to TCU prior to the research to gain permission to undertake the
22
23 research. This guide was used to orientate the interviews and supplemented with questions that
24
25 allowed for exploration and confirmation of viewpoints that arose from observations made
26
27 during the fieldwork (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001). The interviews were tape recorded with the
28
29 consent of the interviewees and transcribed as close to the interview time as practical so that it
30
31 was possible to recall and reflect on the meaning constructed at the time. The first author also
32
33 had regular contact with the organization, via email and social media following the fieldwork,
34
35 when she received updates about new developments in the organization.
36
37

38 39 *A Storied Approach to Analysis* 40

41
42 In the same way that our assumed approach to data collection had to change so did the way
43
44 we approached our data analysis. In previous research projects we had focused on our interview
45
46 data but in this research project it was important not to privilege the interview data as it was
47
48 primarily with the non-Indigenous managers. We turned our attention to the observational data,
49
50 with the first author sharing excerpts and stories from the fieldwork. In these exchanges we
51
52 began to note what O'Doherty & Neyland (2019, p. 458) call 'objects of concern' that highlight
53
54 the 'mutual and inextricable entanglement between subject and object'. This socio-material
55
56 entanglement has been the subject of many perspectives and debates, with which we do not
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have space in this paper to engage (Carlile, Nicolini, Langley, & Tsoukas, 2013; Dale &
4
5 Latham, 2015; Dale, 2005). However, the perspective that we take is that:
6
7

8
9 Materiality is imbued with culture, language, imagination, memory; it cannot be reduced
10
11 to mere object or objectivity. And, even further, it is not just that materiality has taken
12
13 on social meanings, but that humans enact social agency through a materiality which
14
15 simultaneously shapes the nature of that social agency (Dale, 2005, p. 652).
16
17

18 Our analysis proceeded with this understanding as we focused on not only what was said but
19
20 also on the relational spaces in between the discourse (talk) and materiality (objects).
21
22

23 In what follows we tell stories about what happened in TCU around narrative objects. In
24
25 this we are inspired by Yunkaporta's (2019) emphasis on the importance of 'yarning', and how
26
27 much this fits with the significance in indigenous cultures on storytelling, along with
28
29 recognition that *materiality* matters: that the objects we discuss below are themselves active
30
31 and vibrant (Bennett, 2010) in the co-construction of hybridity. Indigenous scholars looking to
32
33 develop Indigenous research methodologies have also incorporated sentient non-human
34
35 elements through storied approaches to analysis (Yunkaporta & Moodie, 2021; Wright et al.,
36
37 2012). As Love notes (2020, p. 19) 'the truth of a narrative/story lies in its meaning, not its
38
39 accuracy' and further, that narrative theorizing can be helpful in analysing social processes and
40
41 relations. But, as we show below, the narratives are intimately bound up with what *matters* –
42
43 and this includes the matter or objects which enact the friction of the cultures of kinship and
44
45 audit in TCU. In this we follow Humphries and Smith (2014, p. 478) in seeing that objects are
46
47 not just there to tell stories about, or to find meaning in, but they themselves 'produce and
48
49 participate in narrative production'.
50
51
52
53

54 **Smoke: Circulating Cultural Practices**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *When our founder passed away, we had to have every branch closed and smoked. Closed and*
4 *smoked out. You know, and to find someone in town to be able to smoke out each branch. That*
5 *took ages (CEO Interview).*
6
7
8
9

10 The smoke of selected leaves travels through the air of the branches of TCU. As it circulates it
11 takes with it meanings and connections which go back tens of thousands of years, into offices,
12 its particles and scent touching desks and counters and papers. Its clouds obscure the everyday
13 materials and associations of a financial organization.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 As Yunkaporta (2019, p. 107) explains:
21

22
23 Smoke is made by the leaves; light from sky camp and nutrients from the underground,
24 connecting the two worlds and moving between them visible but intangible. You have
25 to feel it going through you, through our body and particularly through the big spirit at
26 the centre of your belly. The smoke is liminal – neither earth nor air but part of both –
27 so it moves across the same spaces in-between as shadow spirits do, sending them on
28 their way.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The flow of the smoke into the nooks and crannies of every part of TCU makes connections as
39 it diffuses, not only between sky and earth, but between the cultures, communities and land of
40 the peoples of TCU and the organization's financial, business and audit practices and culture.
41 'Sorry business' – the processes and ceremonies of bereavement and grief – are brought into
42 the heart of TCU's ways of organizing, and as they do so, they disrupt 'business as usual', as
43 the Business Development Manager explained:
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 I've just opened three new business accounts out at Galiwinku and they've got all this
52 money to bank and we can't bank it because one of the teller's mums passed away. But
53 they're good, as long as I ring them and let them know they totally get it. We also close
54 for smoking.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Smoke is central to who TCU are as an Indigenous organization. This diffuse particulate matter
4 matters. TCU's honouring of the Elder spreads throughout the organization like the wreaths of
5
6
7 smoke:
8
9

10 All our staff went to the funeral. We just chartered planes and yeah, all the staff came
11
12 from other communities. It was huge. It was a really sad day, and it still is sad, he was
13
14 such an influential fellow, just a really good man (Business Development Manager).
15
16
17

18 TCU's branches are separated by huge distances. To give you a sense of this, the Milingimbi
19
20 community, where the funeral was held, is 450 kilometres east of Darwin and 650 kms from
21
22 TCU's most western branch at Wadeye. Chartering planes for their staff to attend the Elder's
23
24 funeral was a huge cost to this small, co-operative organization but the consequences of not
25
26 doing this could have been more significant. As the Australian FairWork Ombudsman
27
28 acknowledges 'if an individual doesn't attend the funeral or the funeral isn't done according to
29
30 culture, the spirit may cause the individual problems' (see Fairwork Ombudsman 2021). The
31
32 whole of TCU, regardless of geographical distance or financial cost, becomes as one in its
33
34 connection through the smoke. The movement of smoke appears to be frictionless, to drift, but
35
36 in its contact zone within the organization, it touches objects and people that are also related to
37
38 a very different set of rituals and ceremonies: the audit culture. It reminds us that the places in
39
40 which TCU operates are shaped by tens of thousands of years of cultural practices and
41
42 knowledge. But they are also shaped by the last two hundred years of colonisation, as
43
44 represented by our next narrative object – blood on the counter.
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **Blood on the Counter – Friction Between Kinship Relations and Audit Practices**

52
53

54 *One morning as soon as the branch opened, two men came in with head injuries and bleed*
55
56 *over a teller's work counter. They apologised, explaining they had had a big night and had*
57
58 *both fallen over and hit their heads. They needed to withdraw money to get home to their*
59
60

1
2
3 *community. After they left the teller explained that this wasn't unusual and that is why tellers*
4 *had bacterial wipes and sanitiser at hand. There were a lot of people in the branch that*
5 *morning, but the men and their bloody heads drew no special attention.*
6
7
8
9

10 The counter is the classic material instantiation of a banking institution. Transactions take place
11 across the boundary it creates between 'organization' and 'community', 'employee' and
12 'customer'. Those transactions are often paper – the documents which matter to the audit
13 culture, demonstrating identity, providing a record of monies in and out, itemising value and
14 putting it into abstract numbers. At the counter, the complex interpersonal relations between
15 people in the community are translated into the standardised, regulated relations required by
16 financial practices. The counter is the place where you can have access to your individualised
17 account, if you can prove that your documented identity tallies with the records of the
18 institution. It is also the place where there are disagreements over access to accounts, and you
19 will be turned away if this account, this money, does not 'belong' to you, *individually*. As Jane,
20 an Aboriginal head office teller, explained in an informal conversation:
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Out there because they all live together, they all know that's such and such's husband;
38 it's alright, he's allowed to ask for her balance because that's his wife. We're still trying
39 to emphasise that he's not allowed to ask because that's not his account and it's really
40 hard. I don't live there; maybe she is sick, and all the local tellers know that she's sick
41 so it's okay for him to come ask. But still, it breaks our *Privacy Act*.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The counter is both a barrier and a bridge between cultures. The blood on the counter means
50 that TCU has taken up a place, materially and socially, in the community – the men come there
51 to obtain money to return home, their bleeding 'drew no special attention'. The blood is
52 indicative of the colonial encounter in Australia which involved violent clashes over land and
53 the massacre of thousands of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. It speaks
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 wordlessly of the intergenerational trauma experienced by Indigenous Australians as a direct
4 result of colonisation and its legacy of ‘overt physical violence (invasion, disease, death, and
5 destruction), covert structural violence (enforced dependency, legislation, reserves and
6 removals) and psycho-social domination (cultural and spiritual genocide)’ (Atkinson, 2002,
7 cited by Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 440). Within the context of TCU these legacies of colonisation
8 and the ongoing settler colonizing practices seek to transform Aboriginal and Torres Strait
9 Islander peoples into full participants in the market economy (cf. Howard-Wagner et al., 2018)
10 are evident in the way in which audit practices demand accountability and emphasise individual
11 responsibility.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Thus, the counter becomes an expression of this friction between kinship relations and
26 audit culture. Most of the encounters we observed between the tellers and TCU customers at
27 the counter involved checking identities, verifying signatures and explaining that ‘there are
28 rules and we have to do things the right way, or we get into trouble’ (teller comment to customer
29 at front counter). The checking was by no means straight-forward and we observed how
30 difficult it was for the tellers to mediate the emphasis on connectedness, sharing and
31 communality from the kinship system with the requirements of the audit culture. Sometimes
32 this meant a need to get away from the counter, as shown by a request from one remote branch
33 teller if she could be granted leave not to work on pay days so that she could avoid the conflict
34 she faced when family members came to the branch asking for money from her pay. A sign at
35 the counter reads: ‘Please don’t ask for other people’s balances or money. I could lose my job
36 if I break the rules’. TCU needs to demonstrate that Indigenous organizations can be
37 ‘accountable’ in the terms of the audit culture. At the counter this plays out through tellers on
38 minimum wage having to repay any discrepancies in the accounting records with their own
39 pay, which in our observations of suspected shortfalls created an atmosphere of anxiety.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These tensions remind us of the need to move beyond universal explanations (Tsing,
4 2005), and to look more closely at the ‘contact zone’, to understand how specific aspects of
5 audit culture come into friction with local conditions as captured in the interactions around a
6 clock.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **The Clock in the Drawer – Boundaries of Practice and Knowledge**

14
15

16 *Shortly after arriving at the Ramingining office, Sandra, the Training Manager, asks ‘where is*
17 *the clock I brought on my last visit?’ One of the Ramingining tellers pulls out a drawer, looks*
18 *down at the clock sitting in the drawer, smiles and quietly closes the drawer. No more words*
19 *are exchanged. A short time later noisy children arrive at the branch calling to their mothers*
20 *and the branch is closed for lunch.*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 We noted how in this guileless and friendly exchange the clock is not a passive and inanimate
29 object but enacts friction between the audit culture and local kinship relations. For us (as
30 researchers), the clock in the drawer has been and continues to be a source of fascination. The
31 incongruity, for us, of a clock in a drawer tells a story to which we are only privy to one side.
32 As an object in an unexpected space (for us) it speaks volumes – and yet, no more words are
33 spoken. There are no questions, no explanations, no conflict, no demand to do anything
34 differently, no vocalised emotions, no discussion.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 As researchers – as with the white manager who gave the clock – we can only turn to
46 other accounts to try to understand. Love (2019, p. 53) writes that ‘one of the most salient
47 cultural differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples lies in their temporalities
48 or the ways they make sense of time’. In western societies time is ‘denatured, linear, episodic
49 and event oriented’ and this way of conceiving time has had a major influence on ‘what
50 organizational life should look like’ (Cunliffe, Luhman, & Boje, 2004, p. 266). Yet, the ‘clock
51 in the drawer’ speaks to other ways of conceptualising time and organizing. The arrival of the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 children signals it is time to stop work and eat lunch. Janca & Bullen (2003, p. 41) write that
4
5 for most Aboriginal people time cannot be extracted from the environmental system as a whole
6
7 and it is not important *when* things happen, it is important *that* they happen. Yunkaporta (2019,
8
9 p. 66) shares that in Aboriginal languages, ‘time and place are usually the same word – they
10
11 are indivisible’. These different ways of conceptualising time highlight the ‘friction’ between
12
13 organizing around clock time and organizing in relation to events that are placed in time
14
15 according to their relative importance for the community. Appreciating this concept of ‘placed
16
17 time’ can generate ways of organizing that are ‘oriented around human intentionality and
18
19 experience’ (Love, 2019, p. 55).
20
21
22
23
24

25 Earlier we discussed the importance of smoke and kinship, which leads TCU to close
26
27 branches at a moment’s notice because of a death in the community, and this speaks powerfully
28
29 to the way in which time must be conceptualised differently in Indigenous organizations, as
30
31 well as how the different geographical spaces of TCU are also made one place through the
32
33 shared understanding and rituals of community. But the clock in the drawer also tells
34
35 powerfully of the boundaries of knowledge, the incommensurability of the expectations, norms
36
37 and the lived experiences within TCU – between Sandra, the Training Manager, and Joanie,
38
39 the head teller at Ramingining – and also outside TCU, with our own inability to fit this incident
40
41 into our existing understandings of organizational life. Yet, in TCU understandings need to be
42
43 translated and relations mediated, we explore these translation and mediation practices through
44
45 our next object, talking posters.
46
47
48
49

50 **Talking Posters – Translation and Mediation Practices**

51
52
53 *In the Ramingining branch, we noted ‘talking posters’ displayed near the front counter. When*
54
55 *touched the posters talk in a local language giving customers step-by-step instructions about*
56
57 *the correct procedures in relation to deposits and withdrawals. Sandra, the training manager,*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *explained, 'we've done three types of posters so far. One on cash withdrawals, one on cash*
4 *deposits and one on privacy and security. We've taken photographs of hands that point to step-*
5 *by-step procedures. Staff and members press a button, and it talks to you. We've done it in*
6 *language. We plan to do seven languages.*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 The development of the talking posters by TCU is a very physical, technological form of
14 putting mediation into practice. The very idea of the posters recognises the need to
15 communicate key aspects of the audit culture to people in the Indigenous communities. They
16 are objects which literally 'translate' not only from English into Indigenous languages but also
17 translate between the two cultures. They create connection: in material form through the
18 pressing of a button, the sharing of a language. In some ways they can be seen as expressing
19 the desire to foster relations between TCU and its staff and members. TCU and the training
20 managers are proud of the innovation: they have put care and attention into thinking about the
21 needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff and members. They have shown through
22 their work that the community languages *matter*, and that they want to recognise the
23 community and to signal that the community matters to them.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The talking posters enact the ways in which TCU management have come to mediate the
40 impact of compliance with an audit culture on their staff's kinship relations, including making
41 informal work adjustments (as we see in the example above of a teller taking leave on pay
42 days), adapting training methods, and mentoring by Indigenous elders. For example, Diane,
43 the senior training manager, has spent time and effort adapting standard training materials, as
44 well as developing her own, based on visuals and techniques of storytelling, to teach TCU's
45 systems and procedures as well as to educate tellers in financial regulation. Through pictures
46 and story-telling she recognises and values the local cultures and traditions. The mentoring by
47 Elders both supports the tellers in 'working in the white man's world' (Ruth, CEO), as well as
48 educating the non-Indigenous managers about the primacy of cultural practices. The mentors
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 share knowledge about the kinship systems that exist in each community and advise TCU
4
5 management on how best to help the staff navigate working in the ‘contact zone’, allowing the
6
7 tellers to continue working for the credit union and maintain their kinship practices.
8
9

10
11 The talking posters are a mediating technology, and one that illustrates the hybridity of
12
13 kinship and audit cultures in the contact zone in TCU. But at the same time as they mediate,
14
15 they also express the friction between the cultures: the audit culture seems to demand that its
16
17 needs are met, that people in the remote communities understand what the rules and regulations
18
19 are, how to correctly do withdrawals and deposits, how to fit themselves into the audit culture.
20
21 Whilst the talking posters speak the languages of the communities, they are one-way
22
23 communication devices: they speak but they do not listen. Yet this is also a practical response
24
25 to one of the key challenges for TCU: its wide geographical dispersal. It spends a lot on training
26
27 and development, and a high proportion of that has to be on travel costs for trainers. The posters
28
29 can be continuously present in remote branches when more experienced colleagues from the
30
31 headquarters cannot be.
32
33
34
35

36
37 In summary, the successes of TCU, once it is looked at through the ‘sticky encounters’
38
39 of friction and patterns of hybridity, is composed of multiple, different relations. Existing
40
41 relations in TCU are changed, but *not* through the simple either/or of the imposition of audit
42
43 *or* resistance to it. Audit culture ‘comes to ground’ in hybrid processes which weave Aboriginal
44
45 and Torres Strait Islander languages, pictures and stories into the abstract rules and numbers.
46
47 It makes a space for financial inclusion and thus enlarges the possibilities for self-determination
48
49 for the communities it serves. It facilitates community across its counters, with the men who
50
51 gather there after their heavy night and the children who arrive for lunch. It honors and
52
53 continues tradition and history through the smoking ceremonies. Yet audit culture is also
54
55 enforced through practices which do not and indeed cannot always recognize and value
56
57 different norms and cultures: every discrepancy in the records has to be closely examined and
58
59
60

1
2
3 any shortfall falls on the lowest paid, the tellers, who have to pay it from their own individual
4 wages or are dismissed from their job. In observations of checking practices, the anxiety of
5 staff was palpable. Audit culture is not about the use of supposedly neutral techniques but based
6 on individualized responsibility and the inculcation of the ‘governable’ and ‘calculable’ person:
7 one ‘increasingly used to assess performance and encourage people to think of themselves as
8 calculating, responsible, self-managing subjects’ (Shore & Wright, 2015, p. 421). The
9 challenges and difficulties their Indigenous staff face in trying to ‘walk the line’ between audit
10 practices and kinship relations is the main reason given by TCU’s CEO for the high rates of
11 turnover in their branches. Yet in putting responsibility and accountability via audit controls
12 onto individual employees, it is these individuals who are shouldering the friction of collective
13 relations, of the different expectations around ownership and sharing that is the basis of long-
14 standing kinship relations. Thus, we can see that there are competing and different interests
15 and effects at the point of friction where TCU is both changed by, and appropriates, aspects of
16 the audit culture in this hybrid space. We discuss the implications of this for theory and studies
17 of Indigenous organizations below.

38 Discussion

39
40
41 We have spun our ‘yarns’ around the different narrative objects that tell stories of the ‘contact
42 zone’: ones which are not apparent in the classical analytical terms of organization studies: we
43 are not looking at structures, at processes, hierarchies, leadership and so on. Instances like the
44 clock in the drawer or the talking posters would not attract attention in classical analysis, they
45 are mundane, they are material. On the other hand, our other objects, blood on the counter and
46 smoke, would be seen as ‘exotic’ and unusual in studies of organizations. Yet for those
47 involved in the ‘contact zone’ they are ‘normal’ – the men bleeding on the counter doesn’t
48 draw comment from the many others at the branch that morning; smoking out the offices are
49 an integral part of kinship relations. The point of the stories is to show how in studying
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interactions in the ‘contact zone’ it is possible to see how the friction of kinship and audit
4 cultures co-produces hybridity. Whereas others have argued that techniques of governance of
5
6 Indigenous peoples can become internalized and subject to either resistance or failure (Neu,
7
8 1999, 2000; Willmott, 2020), we found that TCU staff were able to combine aspects of an audit
9
10 culture and kinship practices. We found that there are competing and different interests and
11
12 effects in the ‘contact zone’ of kinship systems and audit cultures where Indigenous
13
14 organizations are both changed by, and appropriate, audit culture. We did not observe binaries
15
16 playing out between the two cultures but the co-production of new sets of relations and hybrid
17
18 practices.
19
20
21
22
23

24 The importance of researching the ‘contact zone’ is that it is embedded within its own
25
26 lived context and culture. It is therefore dynamic and situated. The idea of the contact zone
27
28 being sited is important as it brings in the lived interactions between the social and the material
29
30 and enables us to see how existing relations are changed. As Haraway says: ‘the point is that
31
32 the contact zones are where the action is, and current interactions change interactions to follow’
33
34 (2008, p. 219). The emphasis on situated understanding facilitated a deeper understanding of
35
36 Indigenous organizing from the interactions within TCU of human and objects.
37
38
39

40 As Yunkaporta (2019, p. 13) warns, we must avoid the ‘illusion of parochial isolation’
41
42 which seeks to locate Indigenous knowledge independent of ‘historical contexts of
43
44 interrelatedness’ and where ‘upheavals are sidelined’. This is because ignoring the context in
45
46 which Indigenous organizations are embedded extends processes of colonisation which has
47
48 sought to disembed Indigenous peoples (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004). Instead, we have focused
49
50 on the translation process, specifically how cultural practice is developed within affiliations
51
52 with community (Yunkaporta, 2019). Failing to do so would have meant ignoring the
53
54 complexity of kinship relations and how they connect peoples and place through networks of
55
56 reciprocity and responsibility (Dudgeon & Bray, 2019; Yunkaporta, 2019; Kwaymullina, 2016;
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Peredo & McLean, 2010; Peredo & Chrisman, 2006). However, in acknowledging the crucial
4 importance of kinship relations in our case we also acknowledge the boundaries of our knowing
5 and the limitations of our subject position because we are located outside these kinship systems
6 (Kwaymullina, 2016; Applebaum, 2010).
7
8
9
10

11
12 We have sought to bring the idea of the connectedness of the social and the material to
13 our research and this has helped us to observe how translation practices of accommodation,
14 and compromise enabled the potential for new ways of doing things to grow out of the ‘brackish
15 waters’ of hybridity (Yunkaporta, 2019, p. 233). Encounters across differences do not produce
16 straightforward compromise, integration or resistance but something more complex, a
17 hybridity which is not simply a combination. Tsing (2005, p. 5) describes encounters such as
18 those we analyse in TCU as ‘friction’ because, as she says, friction is productive: it does not
19 stop things happening, or even slow them down, rather ‘a wheel turns because of its encounter
20 with the surface of the road...Rubbing two sticks together produces heat and light’. These
21 encounters are characterised by ‘the awkward, unequal, unstable, and creative qualities of
22 interconnection across difference’ and ‘the effects of encounters across difference can be
23 compromising or empowering. Friction is not a synonym for resistance. Hegemony is made as
24 well as unmade by friction’ (Tsing 2005, p. 4).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 It is this recognition of the painfulness and the unequal power relations inherent in these
43 encounters that prevents the idea of hybridity from implying some middle ground or mutuality,
44 as has sometimes been argued (During, 1998; Parry, 2004). We bring together the idea of
45 ‘contact’ (Pratt, 2007) with the theorizing of hybridity (Bhabha, 1994, 1996) because it
46 ‘foreground[s] the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily
47 ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination’ and recognizes
48 relations between colonizers and colonized in terms of ‘co-presence, interaction, interlocking
49 understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power’ (Pratt
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2007, p. 7). In this way, the lens of friction enables us to extend the analysis of hybridity within
4 organization studies (Frenkel, 2008; Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006; Dar, 2018, 2014) to show as
5
6 both Bhabha (1996, 1994) and Yunkaporta (2019) have argued that hybridity does not mean
7
8 that power asymmetries are done away with, they cannot be, as they will always shape colonial
9
10 and post-colonial relations. Rather, understanding hybridity and its relationship to power
11
12 means focusing on the spaces of ‘negotiation where power is unequal, but its articulation may
13
14 be equivocal’ (Bhabha, 1996, p. 58). Hybridity can create space for resistance and autonomy
15
16 (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006), and sustainable innovations or new patterns of doing (Yunkaporta,
17
18 2019), but also the stickiness of colonial norms and dominations.
19
20
21
22
23

24 Our engagement with Indigenous knowledge that everything is ‘connected within
25 networks of relationships and is in a constant state of movement’ (Kwaymullina, 2016, p. 441)
26
27 and that hybridization incorporates all of this ‘creation’ (Yunkaporta, 2019, p. 233) has helped
28
29 us extend postcolonial understandings of hybridity, seen as functioning primarily as discursive
30
31 (Bhabha, 1994, 1996; Dar, 2014; Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006; Yousfi, 2014)), by identifying how
32
33 they are also shaped by interactions with *matter* and that *matter*. By focusing on the ‘sticky
34
35 materiality’ (Tsing, 2005) of encounters between humans and objects that enact friction in the
36
37 ‘contact zone we show that hybridity is co-produced at the point of contact between the material
38
39 and the social, the ‘universal’ and the ‘local’. In seeking to better understand the specific
40
41 conditions under which an Indigenous organization operates, we have made a beginning in
42
43 taking seriously the material entanglements which make up, reproduce, and transform settler
44
45 colonial relations. Interactions through objects enact and embody the friction in the meeting of
46
47 audit culture and Indigenous culture, its tensions, ambiguities and mediations. Seeing these
48
49 interactions as ‘friction’ means not trying to solve or dissolve them – but acknowledging them
50
51 as lived realities of an Indigenous organization.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Conclusion**

59
60

1
2
3 Love (2019, p. 2) insists that Indigenous organization theory ‘should encourage us to see
4 organizations and organizing in ways which take into account Indigenous people’s aspirations’.
5
6 We have highlighted the East Arnhem Land elders’ aspirations to facilitate the financial
7 inclusion of their communities through a financial services organization with organizing
8 principles that are shaped, in part, by Indigenous knowledges and ways of doing things (Love,
9 2020). Realizing this aspiration has produced ‘friction’ and involved contingent, messy and
10 surprising encounters across difference (Tsing, 2005) but it has also co-produced hybrid
11 relations and practices needed for TCU to serve its remote communities.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 As researchers we have also been subject to the productive effects of friction, and we
22 find ourselves inhabiting a different space. We have engaged in hybrid theorizing,
23 incorporating Indigenous knowledges and ways of seeing the world as we recognized the
24 limitations of traditional management and post-colonial theories. Influenced by Indigenous
25 knowledges that all things are connected, we adopted a methodological approach which
26 focused on the relationship between humans and non-human elements. We have also been
27 conscious of our own embedded context and position of privilege, asking ourselves how is it
28 that we are speaking (Ford, Harding, & Learmonth, 2010; Applebaum, 2010) and in response,
29 have used techniques of storytelling to weave a narrative that does not seek to foreclose further
30 understandings but creates one space, one story, amongst many, for understanding the stories
31 of others.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Acknowledgements**

52 We are grateful for the clear and encouraging guidance of Professor Ignasi Martí throughout
53 the review process and thank the three anonymous reviewers for their critical insights and
54 suggestions.
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- AIATSIS (2022). Welcome to Country – What is Country: <https://aiatsis.gov.au/explore/welcome-country#toc-what-is-country->, accessed 15 March.
- Altman, Jon (2004). Economic development and Indigenous Australia: Contestations over property, institutions, and ideology. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 48, 513–534.
- Altman, Jon, Biddle, Nicholas, & Buchanan, Geoff (2012). The Indigenous hybrid economy: Can the NATSISS adequately recognise difference? In Boyd Hunter & Nicholas Biddle (Eds.), *Survey Analysis for Indigenous Policy in Australia: Social Science Perspectives* (pp. 163–191). Canberra: ANU Press.
- Anderson, Robert B., & Giberson, Robert J. (2003). Aboriginal entrepreneurship and economic development in Canada: thoughts on current theory and practice. In Curt H. Stiles & Craig S. Galbraith (Eds.), *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process (International Research in the Business Disciplines, Vol. 4)* (pp. 141–167). London: Emerald Group.
- Applebaum, Barbara (2010). *Being white, being good: White complicity, white moral responsibility, and social justice pedagogy*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Atkinson, Judy (2002). *Trauma trails, recreating song lines: The transgenerational effects of trauma in Indigenous Australia*. Melbourne: Spinifex Press.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata B., & Linstead, Stephen (2004). Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57, 221–247.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata B., & Tedmanson, Deidre (2010). Grass burning under our feet: Indigenous enterprise development in a political economy of whiteness. *Management Learning*, 41, 147–165.
- Bennett, Jane (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bessarab, Dawn, & Ng'andu, Bridget (2010). Yarning about yarning as a legitimate method in indigenous research. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 3, 37–51.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1996). Cultures in between. In Stuart Hall & Paul du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 53–106). London: Sage.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bielefeld, Shelley (2012). Compulsory income management and Indigenous Australians: Delivering social justice or furthering colonial domination. *UNSW Law Journal*, 35, 522–562.
- Cahn, Miranda (2008). Indigenous entrepreneurship, culture and micro-enterprise in the Pacific Islands: case studies from Samoa. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 20, 1–18.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Carlile, Paul R., Nicolini, Davide, Langley, Ann, & Tsoukas, Haridimos (2013). *How matter matters: Objects, artifacts, and materiality in organization studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cunliffe, Ann, Luhman, John T., & Boje, David M. (2004). Narrative temporality: Implications for Organizational Research. *Organization Studies*, 25, 261–286.

Curry, George N. (2005). Doing ‘Business’ in Papua New Guinea: The social embeddedness of small business enterprise. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 18, 231–246.

Cutcher, Leanne, Hardy, Cynthia, Riach, Kathleen, & Thomas, Robyn (2020). Reflections on reflexive theorizing: The need for a little more conversation. *Organization Theory*, 1, DOI: 10.1177/2631787720944183.

Dale, Karen (2005). Building a Social Materiality: Spatial and Embodied Politics in Organizational Control. *Organization*, 12, 649–678.

Dale, Karen, & Latham, Yvonne (2015). Ethics and entangled embodiment: Bodies–materialities–organization. *Organization*, 22, 166–182.

Dar, Sadhvi (2018). De-Colonizing the Boundary-Object. *Organization Studies*, 39, 565–584.

Dar, Sadhvi (2014). Hybrid accountabilities: When western and non-western accountabilities collide. *Human Relations*, 67, 131–151.

Dudgeon, Patricia, & Bray, Abigail (2019). Indigenous Relationality: Women, Kinship and Law. *Genealogy*, 3, 1–11.

During, Simon (1998). Postcolonialism and globalisation: A dialectical relation after all? *Postcolonial Studies: Culture, Politics, Economy*, 1, 31–47.

Fairwork Ombudsman (2021) Taking Time off for Sorry Business, <https://www.fairwork.gov.au/find-help-for/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-people>, accessed 4 August.

Flood, John (2006). *The original Australians: Story of the Aboriginal people*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Foley, Denis (2003a). An Examination of Indigenous Australian Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 8, 133–152.

Foley, Denis (2003b). Indigenous epistemology and Indigenous standpoint theory. *Social Alternatives*, 22, 44–52.

Ford, Jackie, Harding, Nancy, & Learmonth, Mark (2010). Who is it that would make business schools more critical? Critical reflections on critical management studies. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 71–81.

1
2
3 Frenkel, Michal (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking
4 international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy*
5 *of Management Review*, 33, 924–942.

6
7
8 Frenkel, Michal, & Shenhav, Yehouda (2006). From binarism back to hybridity: A postcolonial
9 reading of management and organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 27, 855–876.

10
11 Gubrium, Jaber F., & Holstein, James (2001). *Handbook of interview research: Context and*
12 *method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

13
14
15 Howard-Wagner, Deidre (2012). Reclaiming the Northern Territory as a Settler-colonial
16 Space. *Arena Journal*, 37/38, 220–240.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Howard-Wagner, Deidre, Bargh, Maria, & Altamirano-Jimenez, Isabel (2018). From new
paternalism to new imaginings of possibilities in Australia, Canada and Aotearoa/New
Zealand: Indigenous rights and recognition and the state of the neoliberal age. In Deidre
Howard-Wagner, Maria Bargh, & Isabel Altamirano-Jimenez (Eds.), *The Neoliberal State,*
Recognition and Indigenous Rights: New paternalism to new imaginings (pp. 1–40).
Canberra: ANU Press.

Humphries, Clare, & Smith, Aaron (2014). Talking objects: Towards a post-social research
framework for exploring object narratives. *Organization*, 21, 477–494.

Ivanitz, Michael (2000). The demise of ATSIC? Accountability and the Coalition government.
Australian Journal of Public Administration, 59, 3–12.

Janca, Aleksandar, & Bullen, Clothilde (2003). The Aboriginal concept of time and its mental
health implications. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 11, 40–44.

Jaya, Peruvemba S. (2001) Do we really ‘know’ and ‘profess’? Decolonizing management
knowledge. *Organization*, 8, 227–233.

Jones, Paul A. (2007). From tackling poverty to achieving financial inclusion: The changing
role of British credit union in low income communities. *The Journal of Social Economics*, 37,
2141–2154.

King, Karen C. (2011). How understanding the Aboriginal Kinship system can inform better
policy and practice: Social work research with the Larrakia and Warumungu Peoples of the
Northern Territory (pp. 1–138). PhD Thesis, Australia Catholic University.

Kwaymullina, Ambelin (2016). Research, ethics and Indigenous peoples: An Australian
Indigenous perspective on three threshold considerations for respectful engagement.
AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 12, 437–449.

Love, Tyron (2020). Indigenous knowledges, priorities and processes in qualitative
organization and management research: State of the Field. *Qualitative Research in*
Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 15, 6–20.

Love, Tyron (2019). *Indigenous Organization Studies: Exploring Management, Business and*
Community. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

1
2
3
4 McCorkel, Jill A., & Myers, Kristen (2003). What Difference Does Difference Make? Position
5 and Privilege in the Field. *Qualitative Sociology*, 26, 199–231.

6
7
8 Meyer, Renate E., & Quattrone, Paolo (2021). Living in a post-truth world? Research, doubt
9 and *Organization Studies*. *Organization Studies*, 42, 1373–1383.

10
11 Moreton-Robinson, Aileen (2007). *Sovereign Subjects: Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*.
12 Sydney: Unwin & Allen.

13
14
15 Neu, Dean (1999). ‘Discovering’ indigenous peoples: Accounting and the machinery of
16 Empire. *Accounting Historians Journal*, 26, 53–82.

17
18 Neu, Dean (2000). ‘Presents’ for the ‘Indians’: Land, colonialism and accounting in Canada.
19 *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 25, 163–184.

20
21
22 Parker, Martin, Fournier, Valerie, & Reedy, Patrick (2007). *The Dictionary of Alternatives:
23 Utopianism and Organization*. London: Zed Books.

24
25 Parry, Benita (2004). *Postcolonial studies: A materialist critique*. London: Routledge.

26
27 Peredo, Ana Maria, & Chrisman, James (2006). Toward a theory of community-based
28 enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 309–328.

29
30
31 Peredo, Ana Maria, & McLean, Murdith (2010). Indigenous Development and the Cultural
32 Captivity of Entrepreneurship. *Business & Society*, 52, 592–620.

33
34 Power, Michael (2000). The audit society—Second thoughts. *International Journal of
35 Auditing*, 4, 111–119.

36
37
38 Power, Michael (1999). *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University
39 Press.

40
41
42 Pratt, Mary Louise (2007). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. New York:
43 Routledge.

44
45
46 Pratt, Angela, & Bennett, Scott (2004). *The end of ATSIC and the future administration of
47 Indigenous affairs*. Canberra: Department of Parliamentary Services.

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Riley, Lynette (2015) Kinship Modules, <https://www.sydney.edu.au/about-us/vision-and-values/our-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-community/kinship-module.html>., accessed 6 August 2021.

Schaper, Michael (2007). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Entrepreneurship in Australia: Looking Forward, Looking Back. In Leo-Paul Dana & Robert B. Anderson (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous Entrepreneurship* (pp. 526–535). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishers.

Shore, Cris, & Wright, Susan (2015). Audit culture revisited: Rankings, ratings, and the reassembling of society. *Current Anthropology*, 56, 421–444.

1
2
3
4 Spiller, Chellie, Erakovic, Ljiljana, Henare, Manuka, & Pio, Edwina (2011). Relational Well-
5 Being and Wealth: Maori Businesses and an Ethic of Care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98,
6 153–169.
7

8
9 Strathern, Marilyn (Ed.) (2000). *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability,*
10 *Ethics and the Academy*. London and New York: Routledge.
11

12 Swan, Elaine (2010). States of white ignorance, and audit masculinity in English higher
13 education. *Social Politics*, 17, 477–506.
14

15
16 Tedmanson, Deidre, Verduyn, Karen, Essers, Caroline, & Garner, William B. (2012). Critical
17 perspectives in entrepreneurship research. *Organization*, 19, 531–541.
18

19 Tsing, Anna (2005). *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. New Jersey: Princeton
20 University Press.
21

22
23 Walker, Melissa, Fredericks, Bronwyn, Mills, Kylie, & Anderson, Debra (2014). ‘Yarning’ as
24 a method for community-based health research with Indigenous women: The Indigenous
25 women’s wellness research program. *Health Care for Women International*, 35, 1216–1226.
26

27 Willmott, Kyle (2020). From self-government to government of the self: Fiscal subjectivity,
28 Indigenous governance and the politics of transparency. *Critical Social Policy*, 40, 471–491.
29

30
31 Wright, Sarah, Lloyd, Kate, Suchet-Pearson, Sandie, Burarrwanga, Laklak, Tofa, Matalena, &
32 Bawaka Country (2012). Telling stories in, through and with Country: Engaging with
33 Indigenous and more-than-human methodologies at Bawaka, NE Australia. *Journal of Cultural*
34 *Geography*, 29, 39–60.
35

36
37 Yousfi, Hela (2014). Rethinking hybridity in postcolonial contexts: What changes and what
38 persists? The Tunisian case of Poulina’s managers. *Organization Studies*, 35, 393–421.
39

40 Yunkaporta, Tyson (2019). *Sand Talk: How Indigenous Thinking Can Save the World*.
41 Melbourne: Text Publishing.
42

43
44 Yunkaporta, Tyson, & Moodie, Donna (2021). Through ritual: An Indigenous data analysis
45 method for research. In Tarquam McKenna, Donna Moodie, & Pat Onesta (Eds.), *Indigenous*
46 *knowledges: privileging our voices* (pp. 87–96). Leiden: Brill Sense Publishers.
47

48 49 Author bios

50
51 **Leanne Cutcher** is Professor of Management and Organization Studies at the University of
52 Sydney Business School. Her research interests revolve around discourse, materiality, and
53 identity. This research has been published in leading, international journals and edited books.
54 She is currently exploring the ethics of commemoration around bushfires; the role of stigma
55 in social entrepreneurship and continues her research into Indigenous organizations and ways
56 of organizing.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Karen Dale** is Professor of Organisation Studies at Lancaster University. Her research on
4 organisational embodiment, spatiality and materiality has been published in leading journals
5 and books including *Anatomising Embodiment and Organisation Theory* (Palgrave); *The*
6 *Spaces of Organisation and the Organisation of Space: Power, Identity and Materiality at*
7 *Work* with Gibson Burrell (Palgrave), and *Organizational Space and Beyond: The Significance*
8 *of Henri Lefebvre for Organization Studies* with Sytze Kingma and Varda Wasserman
9 (Routledge). She is currently researching the productive body in contemporary work; shared
10 embodiment in the fitness industry; and exploring human – more-than-human relations,
11 particularly with plant-life.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 ⁱ The Indigenous employment rate was 46.6 per cent in 2016 compared to a non-Indigenous employment rate
22 of 72 per cent. In the same year, 65.3% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students completed high school
23 compared to 89.1% of non-Indigenous students [https://www.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/reports/closing-](https://www.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/reports/closing-the-gap-2018/executive-summary.html)
24 [the-gap-2018/executive-summary.html](https://www.pmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/reports/closing-the-gap-2018/executive-summary.html); accessed, 26 August, 2020).

25 ⁱⁱ Life expectancy for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men is between 4 and 14 years less than for non-
26 Indigenous Australians and for women it's between 7.6 and 12 years less than for non-Indigenous Australians.
27 The differences depend on which state you live in. WA has the highest gap in life expectancy, following by the
28 Northern Territory (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018).

29 ⁱⁱⁱ The Deadly Awards, commonly known simply as The Deadlys, was an annual celebration of Australian
30 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander achievement in music, sport, entertainment and community. The word
31 'Deadly' is a modern colloquialism used by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders to indicate 'cool, rockin',
32 fantastic'.

33 ^{iv} The first author is a member of the Awabakal Descendants Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation
34 Association and is an ancestor of Mahrahkah who is seen as the mother of the Awabakal nation. The mid north
35 coast area of New South Wales is Awabakal Country.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1
Interviewee Details

Position	Gender	Age	Race	Tenure	Length of Interview
General Manager	Female	40s	Non-Indigenous Australian	5 years	40 minutes
Operations Manager	Female	30s	Non-Indigenous Australian	10 years	40 minutes
Human Resources Manager	Female	30s	Non-Indigenous Australian	18 months	50 minutes
Business Development Manager	Male	40s	Non-Indigenous Australian	8 months	40 minutes
Training Manager	Female	40s	Non-Indigenous Australian	2 years	40 minutes
Business Development Officer	Female	40s	Non-Indigenous Australian	12 years	60 minutes
Senior Training Officer	Female	50s	Non-Indigenous Australian	17	2 interviews - 1 x 60 minutes, 1 x 30 minutes
Training Officer	Female	20s	Larrakia woman	2	45 minutes
Accounts Manager	Female	40s	Non-Indigenous Australian	6 months	55 minutes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Peer Review Version