LEADERSHIP AND CULTURE
IN NEW ZEALAND

J.C. Kennedy

June 2000

Commerce Division
PO Box 84
Lincoln University
CANTERBURY

Telephone No: (64) (3) 325 2811
Fax No: (64) (3) 325 3847
E-mail: kennedj@lincoln.ac.nz

Acknowledgement

Contents

List of Tables

1.   Introduction

The Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE) was initiated by Professor Bob House (Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania) in 1991 as a means by which links between culture and leadership could be comprehensively researched. Approval of a research grant in 1993 enabled the project to expand, with the recruitment of Country Co-Investigators (CCIs) from around the world. The GLOBE community now comprises around 170 researchers in over 60 countries.

This discussion paper comprises a draft chapter completed for inclusion in an anthology of GLOBE country reports to be published late in 2001. As the anthology will include a chapter covering the GLOBE methodology and the meanings of the various scales, this material has not been included in the body of this report. Appendix One provides an overview of the project, while more detail can be obtained from published sources (den Hartog et al., 1999; House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997; House et al., 1999).

This chapter begins with an overview of New Zealand's historical development, and the cultural themes that have emerged since European settlement in the 1800s. This provides the context for subsequent discussion of the GLOBE cultural scales in New Zealand, and their links with the style of leadership preferred in our business organisations.

2.   New Zealand Culture

The core hypotheses of the GLOBE project revolve around the influence of culture on leadership. It is therefore appropriate to begin each chapter in this anthology with an overview of important aspects of culture within each of the sample countries. This is a difficult task. It must be daunting to encapsulate in a page or two the culture of a country as old as India, as geographically dispersed as China, or as attractive to immigrants as the United States has been over the last two centuries.

At the other extreme, New Zealand is a country consisting of two main islands, two-thirds the size of California, on the hindquarters of the earth's largest ocean. With a population of almost four million, we have fewer people than cities such as Bangkok, London, New York, Moscow or Sydney. We were the last islands of any size to be reached by human beings. It almost seems pretentious to suggest that we have a unique culture.

The original inhabitants, the Maori, came from Polynesia around one thousand years ago. Just over two hundred years ago, Britain colonised New Zealand, and waves of immigrants from Britain subsequently established settlements. Discovery of gold in 1861 led to an influx of miners from the declining gold fields in Australia and China, followed in 1870 by another wave of assisted immigration from Germany, Scandinavia and France, as well as the British isles. The period between the two World Wars saw an increase in immigration from Central Europe, while the period after the Second World War was characterised by a significant inflow from the Netherlands and from Poland. More recently, immigration from Pacific nations (such as Samoa, Tonga and Fiji) has increased, and our Asian population has been boosted by new arrivals from Indo-China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, Korea and other neighbours to the north. At present, 71.7% of the population identify themselves as being European or of European descent with 14.5% in the New Zealand Maori ethnic group. Pacific Islanders and Asian ethnic groups comprise 4.8% and 4.4% respectively of the overall population (Statistics New Zealand, 1999).

While these figures suggest that it makes little sense to talk of one culture for New Zealand, New Zealanders (self-styled 'Kiwis') will argue strongly for the existence of a unique identity, for the existence of something that sets them apart from others, a 'Kiwi culture'. While the components making up this identity may be found in other cultures and nations, the particular combination and emphasis, the shared experiences and history illuminating and illustrating our beliefs and values, creates a distinctive pattern. The components of this pattern will vary according to who is describing it, and the purpose for which it is put forward (Novitz, 1989). This chapter describes leadership in New Zealand business organisations, and we will therefore select elements of culture most relevant to this purpose. By necessity, other (important) elements will be left out, and in order to put this selective view in context, the following paragraphs provide an overview of the historical setting for our description.

The earliest inhabitants of New Zealand migrated here from Polynesia around 1000AD. The Maori retained aspects of their Polynesian culture, while adapting to the challenges of a less tropical and more rugged physical environment. Maori social organisation is largely communal, with social groupings being based on extended families, hapu (subtribes) and iwi (tribes), usually based on descent from a common ancestor. Communities were ruled by chiefs (*rangatira*) who generally held their position subject to the community remaining satisfied with their continued good performance. The literal meaning of *rangatira* is 'to weave people together' - a definition of leadership that neatly encapsulates the interdependent and communal nature of Maori society.

In 1642 a Dutch East India Company expedition under Abel Tasman became the first European voyagers to discover New Zealand. Detailed European exploration took place during the 1770s, with several expeditions by the British explorer James Cook. In 1788 a prison colony was established in Australia, facilitating greater access to New Zealand. American and British whalers and sealers began to establish bases on the New Zealand coast, and several of these expanded into larger settlements involved in farming and trade.

A British governor was appointed in 1840, and in February he began gaining Maori signatories to the 'Treaty of Waitangi'. This document provided for Maori to cede aspects of sovereignty to Queen Victoria, gaining the rights and privileges of British subjects, while retaining ownership of their land, forests and fisheries. Originally an extension of the Australian colony in New South Wales, New Zealand became a British colony in its own right in 1841.

Increasing numbers of settlers arrived, principally from Britain, and a number of planned settlements began to take shape. In a structure akin to the American federal system, six provincial governments were established in 1852, but these were abolished in favour of a central government in 1876. A centralised approach was needed in order to fund and coordinate the expensive business of developing the new nation's transport and communications infrastructure.

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, the central government began to take a much broader and socially progressive role in running the country. In 1877 it provided for a system of free, compulsory education. In 1879 it introduced universal male suffrage, and in 1893 became the first country in the world to extend the vote to women. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1894 has been described as "one of the most dramatic

contributions New Zealand has made to conceptions of humanitarian democracy" (Hansen, 1968, p. 58). It provided a compulsory system of state arbitration "aimed at preventing class conflict by ensuring the workers an adequate share of the national wealth even as it assured adequate incentive to the employer" (Ibid).

The passing of this Act provides a number of insights into aspects of New Zealand societal values that are still relevant today. The changes introduced by this Act (and by earlier widening of the electoral franchise) reflect a degree of willingness by the well-off to give up some privilege, wealth and power. Hansen (1968) argues that this illustrates a gap between the values of the settlers and those dominant in their countries of origin. In particular, the settlers placed greater emphasis on equality, freedom and individual dignity: "…in comparison with England and the United States, and even Australia, New Zealand has most actively and consistently emphasised equalitarianism" (p. 58).

The New Zealand concept of egalitarianism is not restricted to the sense of equal opportunity; it extends to the idea that people should be considered as equal in all aspects of life: "Not only should one person not inherit greater life chances than another; none should be allowed to accumulate a great deal more than another through his own efforts or luck. Exceptional performances or capacities are deprecated by both individuals in a relationship" (Hansen, 1968, p. 60). The phrase "tall poppy syndrome" refers to a tendency in New Zealand to find fault with high achievers, to "cut them down to size" if they pretend they are better than anyone else.

Hansen noted an undesirable side-effect of this in the educational system, where "academic excellence is suspect, and children seem to aim for "a high standard of mediocrity". Today some commentators are concerned that government educational agencies, in their drive to replace competitive examinations with standards-based assessment, are institutionalising this attitude. This move has been described as clipping "the wings of academic high fliers … in order to ensure fail-free education for everyone" (Chamberlain, 2000, p. 88).

There was a feeling among many working people that they could work their way out of wage-dependency and into property ownership on the basis of their individual effort (Fairburn, 1989). Class barriers to upward mobility did not exist to the same extent as in Victorian Britain, and there was little requirement for social or family connections, patronage of the wealthy, intellectual accomplishments, or attendance at the 'right' schools. Deeks et al

(1994) comment on the structures imported into New Zealand from English common law (eg the master-servant relationship), but note their comparative weakness. Few households had servants, and there was not the same expectation of deference and servility in such relationships.

Egalitarianism is also apparent in New Zealand labour law which, until 1991, enforced a strict system of Awards that acted to ensure uniform minimum pay rates and conditions for the same jobs across all employers. Differentials between skill levels were based on negotiation rather than market considerations, and pay for seniority was far more prevalent than pay for performance.

Economically, New Zealand was dependent almost entirely on agricultural exports. Early trade in flax and seafood (primarily with Australia) gave way to exports of meat, wool and dairy products to Britain. Throughout the period from 1875 until World War II, around 80% of our exports were sold to the United Kingdom, and we obtained over half our imports from that country (Department of Statistics, 1990). Coupled with this economic dependence, many of our political and social institutions and customs had English origins, and settlers continued to refer to Britain as Home with a capital 'H'.

New Zealand participation in the South African War (1899-1902) and World War I (where 103,000 served abroad, from a total population of around one million) led to a greater sense of national identity. New Zealanders compared themselves favourably with their British regular force counterparts. In particular, heroic actions of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZACs) at Gallipoli in 1915 are still recalled in annual ceremonies marked by a glorification of Australasian exploits, and a diminution of British (and other Allied) contributions. The dominant and enduring cultural theme portrays New Zealanders as self-reliant pioneers, brave and heroic, demonstrating initiative under pressure. These characteristics were said to engender leadership based on example rather than insistence on 'red tape', by officers who were "'democratic' and modest - one of the boys" (Phillips, 1989, p. 96).

The pioneering settler history, combined with the dependence on farming, gave rise to a strong self-image of New Zealand as a country of rugged individualists in a dramatic rural landscape. The literary incarnation of this theme has a dark side, with an underlying sense of alienation and of distance. This imagery has been used metaphorically in describing

interpersonal relationships, and conveys "uncertainties about the influence of the past as well as a lack of confidence in the future" (Lealand, 1988, pp. 29-30). At a more popular level the rural theme is the setting for much New Zealand humour, is used in locally made television dramas, and is portrayed in many different ways in commercial advertisements (Carter & Perry, 1987).

Another important element of this cultural archetype is a practical, problem-solving approach to life. It involves the willingness to tackle problems and take on responsibilities outside one's normal role. Innovative solutions using tools or material at hand are valued. Kiwis take pride in being able to fix anything with "a piece of No. 8 fencing wire". We celebrate Richard Pearse, a farmer who took to the air nine months before the Wright brothers, in an aeroplane and engine he constructed with home-made tools from scrap metal and other oddments (Ogilvie, 1973). Edmund Hillary was the first person to drive a motorised vehicle overland to the South Pole, and he used converted farm tractors for the expedition (Booth, 1993). As Holm has noted (1994), this celebrated trait of "Kiwi ingenuity", of devising innovative, practical, cost-effective solutions, is now no longer confined to the use of such prosaic materials as fencing wire.

The lasting strength of this rural image, of the practical man in tune with the elements, belies the level of urbanisation in New Zealand. A peak of 75% of the population lived in rural areas in 1871, but this figure has steadily declined. At the most recent census, 85% of New Zealanders lived in urban areas (Statistics New Zealand, 1999).

Following World War II, New Zealand's identification with Britain as the 'Mother Country' declined further. The United States protected New Zealand in the Pacific, while most of our troops were fighting in the Mediterranean theatre. Over 100,000 Americans were stationed in New Zealand during latter stages of the War, and in the following decades our foreign policy became more aligned with that of America. We signed the ANZUS security treaty with Australia and the United States in 1952, and fought with both countries in Korea and Viet Nam.

Following a period of prosperity during the 1950s and 1960s, New Zealand entered a period of uncertainty during the 1970s. External factors, such as the oil price shocks, negatively affected our terms of trade. Britain, who had hitherto been the main market for our exports, entered the European Economic Community, and by 1975 was only taking one-fifth of our total exports. In subsequent decades New Zealand has actively diversified its markets

(looking particularly to Asia) and has sought to expand beyond the role of commodity agricultural exporter into a range of service and technological industries.

On the foreign policy front, New Zealand has been more prepared to take an individual stand on issues rather than uncritically adopt the views of Britain or America. A high-profile example was our nuclear-free policy, which led to banning nuclear warships from our ports. We have increasingly seen our sphere of influence as lying in the South West Pacific, and this has led to new themes for our cultural identity.

The European linkage is weaker, and a renaissance in Maori culture and traditions coupled with an increasing acceptance of our geographic location, has led to greater acceptance of New Zealand as a "self-confident, multicultural Pacific nation" (Lealand, 1988). Kevin Roberts, New Zealand born CEO Worldwide of Saatchi & Saatchi plc, uses the image of 'the edge' - New Zealand on the edge of the world, one of "the most physically remote countries on the planet with few economies of scale, nothing except our land, our brains and our innate competitiveness… one of the great experimental cultures. We try things first. Whether it's votes for women, the welfare state or the market economy, powered flight, nuclear physics, anti-nuclearism, biculturalism" (Roberts, 1999). The importance of people, rather than cultural artifacts, is being emphasised, with New Zealanders being seen as having qualities of "openness, honesty, informality, a sense of adventure, an ability to improvise, and a youthfulness born of the new world" (Laidlaw, 1999, p. 237).

It is clear from this brief overview that dramatic shifts have taken place in our self-concept. We have moved from dependence to independence, from a Euro-focused world view towards one centred more on the Pacific. It should also be apparent that our dominant cultural themes are not truly representative. Many of the themes are masculine in origin, with pioneering, rural and military provenances. The perspectives of women and Maori are underrepresented. Similarly, women and Maori are underrepresented in management within New Zealand organisations. In common with the cultural themes presented in this section, the GLOBE research discussed below reflects a primarily male (and New Zealand European) perspective. This does not make the perspective any less important, but it serves to delimit it.

3.   The GLOBE Study - Societal Culture

The GLOBE study included a quantitative assessment of societal cultural values, seeking information on the current emphasis given to values ("As Is") and the emphasis that respondents felt should be given to each value ("Should Be"). Brief descriptions of these scales can be found in Appendix One. Table 1 presents the results for New Zealand in terms of absolute scores (on a seven-point Likert-type scale) and comparative ranking with other countries on the GLOBE cultural dimensions.

Table 1
Results for New Zealand on the Nine GLOBE Cultural Dimensions, Society Level

Cultural Dimension	"Is Now" Ratings		"Should Be" Ratings		Difference
	Score[b]	Rank[c]	Score[b]	Rank[c]	
Power Distance	4.89	B[e] (50)	3.53	B[e] (4)	-1.36
Uncertainty Avoidance	4.75	A[f] (8)	4.10	C[e] (48)	-0.65
Humane Orientation	4.32	B[e] (15)	4.49	C[d] (61)	0.17
Collectivism I - Societal Emphasis	4.81	B[e] (15)	4.20	C[d] (51)	-0.61
Collectivism II - Family Collectivism	3.67	C[e] (59)	6.21	A[e] (3)	2.54
Assertiveness	3.42	C[d] (61)	3.54	B[d] (41)	0.12
Gender Egalitarianism[a]	3.22	B[e] (23)	4.23	B[d] (47)	1.01
Future Orientation	3.47	C[e] (43)	5.54	A[d] (31)	2.07
Performance Orientation	4.72	A[d] (1)	5.90	B[d] (34)	1.18

Notes:
[a] Low = male oriented, medium equal, high = female oriented
[b] Country mean on a seven point Likert scale
[c] Represents band of countries New Zealand falls into (from a high of A to a low of C, D or E); bands identify meaningful differences between groups of countries. The number in parentheses is New Zealand's rank order out of the 62 countries.
[d] Group span ranges from A-C
[e] Group span ranges from A-D
[f] Group span ranges from A-E

In considering the current situation ("Is Now"), New Zealand ranks highly on the dimensions of Performance Orientation (1/62) and Uncertainty Avoidance (8/62). In contrast, we ranked at the low end of the sample in regard to Power Distance (50/62), Family Collectivism (59/62) and Assertiveness (61/62).

In comparing "As Is" with "Should Be" responses, there are some significant shifts apparent. In part this appears to result from the New Zealand managers not seeking to change their ratings for a number of the scales. Accordingly, changes in the ratings of other countries' managers led to large shifts in the relative position of New Zealand.

The managers in the sample expressed a strong desire to place much more emphasis on values consistent with Family Collectivism, increasing the rating given to this dimension by 2.54 (on a seven-point scale), producing the third-highest "Should Be" ranking of all countries. They also wanted to see a much greater emphasis on Future Orientation, lifting the rating given to this dimension by 2.07, and changing the "Is Now" ranking of 43/62 to a "Should Be" ranking of 31/62. Although there was a desire for further emphasis on Performance Orientation, other countries sought to increase more, and New Zealand's "Should Be" ranking comes back to 34/62.

Although one of the countries with lowest emphasis on Power Distance, the New Zealand managers wanted to further reduce this dimension. It appears that this reduction was not as large as that desired by most other countries, and the resulting "Should Be" score placed New Zealand 4/62 on the "Should Be" ranking.

The discussion of the dominant cultural themes in New Zealand indicates the emphasis placed on male views of society. The respondents in this sample were predominantly male; they acknowledged that New Zealand society is male oriented, and expressed a desire to see a greater shift towards female orientation.

In regard to the Humane scale, the managers saw New Zealand as being around the midpoint of the scale, and expressed little desire to shift from this position. Most other countries felt they needed to emphasise this dimension more, and as a result the New Zealand ranking shifted from 15/62 ("As Is") to 61/62 ("Should Be").

The following paragraphs discuss these dimensions further.

3.1   Performance Orientation

In comparison with other countries, New Zealand managers reported a high level of Performance Orientation. The average rating of 4.72, while not much above the scale midpoint, is the highest out of the 62 countries in the sample.

New Zealanders have always taken pride in the world-beating achievements of people from such a small (in population terms) country. New Zealanders have been the first to split the atom, to climb Mt Everest, to fly direct from England to New Zealand. Twenty years ago, V.S. Naipaul wrote of the contribution New Zealand has made to the world, proclaiming that "more gifted men and women have come from its population of three million than from the twenty-three millions of Argentines" (Naipaul, 1980, p.153).

Expectations and encouragement for high performance are evident particularly in the sporting arena. Despite the small size of our country, we have performed creditably on the international stage in athletics, yachting, rugby, rowing, swimming, and other events. Our athletes have very high expectations placed on them by the public, and are severely criticised when their performance drops.

In the business arena, rapid deregulation of the economy from the mid-1980s has opened our firms to international competition, and removed almost all governmental subsidies and protection. New Zealand was recently ranked first out of 47 countries on the criteria of lack of protectionism, lack of price controls, and accessibility to foreign financial institutions (IMD International, 2000). These factors, together with geographical isolation from most of our trading partners, have put pressure on companies to lift their performance to (or above) international standards.

A comprehensive survey of New Zealanders' values (Gold & Webster, 1990) suggests an age split in the attitudes towards performance. Younger people were less likely to agree that success was a function of hard work, or that "competition brings out the best in people". In the absence of longitudinal studies, however, it is not possible to ascertain whether this represents the beginning of a shift in societal attitudes.

3.2   Uncertainty Avoidance

New Zealand respondents also rated our society as comparatively high on Uncertainty Avoidance (ranking 8th highest in the sample). The scale includes items such as the extent to which laws or rules exist to cover most situations, the tendency for people to lead structured lives, and the relative emphasis on orderliness and consistency.

Many commentators have argued that government has been far too involved in the detailed regulation of business activities (Easton, 2000). Employers need to deal with a wide range of legislation covering issues such as safety and health, minimum requirements in employment contracts, compensation for workplace accidents, and discrimination. A comprehensive state-funded accident insurance and rehabilitation scheme largely removes the right to sue for personal injury, in return for providing universal coverage for injuries.

Hofstede's earlier work (1980) indicated that New Zealanders were more tolerant of uncertainty than suggested by the GLOBE findings, and common cultural stereotype themes of independence support this. However, the New Zealand Survey of Values found that of a list of six important life qualities (comfort and prosperity, excitement, security and stability, accomplishing things, being respected, salvation) security was ranked first, accomplishing things second, and comfort/prosperity third. In regard to important job characteristics, job-security and good pay were ranked at the top of the list. (Gold et al., 1990).

Writers have often attacked the pressure for conformity in New Zealand. Charles Brasch (quoted in Geraets (1984, p. 81)) writes of New Zealanders trying to "seek escape from a life which the pressure of conformity has helped to make intolerably drab and empty". Author Dan Davin vividly captures elements of the emphasis on structured lives and consistency (1984, p.105):

"In New Zealand everyone knows everyone more or less: those you don't know personally you might just as well because they're bound to be very like the people you know already; or think you know, because of course everyone's different deep down but in New Zealand the stereotype that controls what you can say or be seen to do is very strong".

The dramatic changes in the economy over the past fifteen years have left few households unaffected. People's confidence in the prospects for employment security, access to affordable housing, health care and education, and provision of social security benefits has been undermined (Ansley, 2000). Weariness with change is setting in, and this may be reflected in a desire for greater stability, certainty, and predictability. However, the existence of a 'nanny state' creating security for its people 'from cradle to grave' appears to be congruent with underlying values in New Zealand, and with the comparatively high ranking on Uncertainty Avoidance.

3.3 Assertiveness

At the other end of the scale, New Zealand scored lowest of all countries on the Assertiveness dimension. Respondents clearly believe that assertion, dominance and aggression are not normal aspects of social relationships in New Zealand. The Survey of Values, in looking at the values emphasised in child-training, found a high level of national consensus regarding the importance of pleasantness, politeness and good manners. Qualities such as independence were rated as less important (Gold et al., 1990).

New Zealanders often use pejorative adjectives such as 'pushy' or 'aggressive' to describe assertive behaviours by others (such as sales people, Americans and Australians), and the idea of standing up for one's own rights can go against the social norm of conformity.

Psychiatrist Fraser McDonald has argued that the vaunted tolerance and good nature of (particularly male) New Zealanders is actually a withdrawal from confrontation, something which is seen as unpleasant and threatening - they "just avoid aggressive confrontation like the plague" (quoted in McLauchlan & Morgan, 1976, pp. 38-39).

Values of aggressiveness, competitiveness and domination are commonly portrayed and encouraged by 'male' sports in New Zealand (Gidlow, Perkins, Cushman, & Simpson, 1994). The dominant sporting code in New Zealand (in terms of media coverage, international reputation and money) is rugby, a physically aggressive variety of football played by teams of fifteen, without the benefit of helmets or padding. The aggression and confrontation is real,

but is structured within the rules of the game. Perhaps its popularity is partly due to the outlet it provides for socially acceptable aggression, whether by participants or (vicariously) by spectators.

3.4   Collectivism II: Family Collectivism

The middle manager sample also considered New Zealand to be comparatively low on Family Collectivism. While the average score of 3.67 is only just below the scale mid-point, it is the third-lowest rating of all countries in the sample.

There is a theme of independence running through some of the dominant New Zealand European cultural archetypes, and this can carry over into attitudes towards the family. Young New Zealanders are keen to leave the family, to make their own way, often starting with a period of 'OE' (overseas experience). It is uncommon for adults (whether single or married) to share their home with older generations. Around 70% of households consist of 'one family', defined as "a husband and/or wife with or without unmarried children of any age who are living at home" (Department of Statistics, 1990, p. 163). One-person households are the next largest group, comprising almost 20% of households.

State support (in the form of universal superannuation, unemployment benefits, payments to single mothers, study allowances, sickness benefits and the like) reduces the financial obligation on other family members to support relatives. There may also be a historical pattern, with those immigrants willing to come to New Zealand being the ones who were more prepared to sever family ties with relatives left behind.

In a critical commentary on the insular nature of many New Zealand families, Gordon McLauchlan commented: "The family is a fragment, and ephemeral. There are few secure traditional extensions to the nuclear group, either sideways to brothers, sisters, cousins or through marriage to in-laws; and there are no extensions vertically to those who have gone before and who will come after; so that we have no identity in place or time" (1976, p.40).

The marked increase in emphasis on Family Collectivism reflected in the "Should Be" scores seems to reflect a strong desire to gain a sense of family connectedness. This desire may also be underlying the trend towards greater acceptance and introduction of 'family friendly' workplace policies (Rotherham, 1998).

3.5   Power Distance

New Zealand is a low Power Distance country. Hofstede's original work placed us in the
lower group of countries, and the GLOBE results rank us 50th out of participating countries.

The small size of most work organisations in New Zealand – over 80% employ fewer than
ten staff - makes senior managers visible and accessible to most staff. Use of first names is
common between all levels, and in Universities it is not unusual for students to call lecturers
by their first name.

The low Power Distance finding is also highly consistent with the key theme of
egalitarianism emerging from the discussion of New Zealand culture in the introduction to
this chapter. It would be wrong to categorise New Zealand as classless, but there is an
inherent dislike of elitism. Historian Keith Sinclair talks of the 'common colonist's' "distaste
for privilege" and how this "distinguished the New Zealanders even among the peoples of
America and Australia". While acknowledging that New Zealand is not a classless society, he
claims that it "must be more nearly classless…than any advanced society in the world. Some
people are richer than others, but wealth carries no great prestige and no prerogative of
leadership" (Sinclair, 1969, p. 285).

In the years since those words were written, the gap between rich and poor has increased
significantly (Ansley, 2000). As we would expect in a country with low tolerance for power
distance, 80% of New Zealanders consider the increasing differences in wealth to be
'unacceptable' (Gold et al., 1990), and a majority would like to see the gaps reduced (Calcott,
2000).

3.6   Future Orientation

New Zealand's rating on this dimension ranks 43rd among the surveyed countries. The
average of 3.47 suggests that we place a comparatively low emphasis on future-oriented
behaviours such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification.
At the time of the GLOBE data gathering, New Zealand was debating proposals for a
compulsory superannuation savings scheme. Savings can act as a safety net, a form of
insurance in times of ill health, unemployment or old age. They require a person or household

to forego the pleasure of current expenditure in order to provide for some possible event in the future, and savings decisions are therefore partly a reflection of future orientation. New Zealand household saving is low by OECD standards, and has been falling in recent years (Savage, 1999).

Historically New Zealand has had a comprehensive social welfare scheme. Unlike most other countries, the New Zealand scheme is non-contributory; benefits are financed from general taxation, and wage and salary earners are not required to pay regular contributions to a social security fund. This reduces the risks associated with non-saving, and may encourage a 'live for the day' mentality.

In an organisational context, recent surveys suggest that New Zealand companies are not paying sufficient attention to long-term planning. A study of manufacturing companies found evidence of a short-term orientation among many of the sampled firms (Knuckey, Leung-Wai, & Meskill, 1999). A more comprehensive survey of all sectors concluded that managers were excessively focused on short-term goals and need to take a longer-term strategic view in order to achieve sustainable adaptation (Wevers International Ltd/Centre for Corporate Strategy, 1996).

These examples are consistent with the relatively low rating given to Future Orientation by the managers in our sample. They also suggest the reasons for such a high emphasis being given to the "Should Be" rating. Over recent years, increasing public attention has been paid to the inadequacy of most households' preparations for the future. Demographic trends and government reductions in social security provision have highlighted the need for individuals to adopt a longer time horizon for their planning, while economic deregulation and removal of subsidies have created similar pressures on businesses.

3.7   Humane Orientation

New Zealand's low "Should Be" ranking on the Humane Orientation scale may be a reflection of complacency with its past reputation as a welfare state. The country introduced its first state-funded welfare assistance (an old age pension) in 1898, extending into additional programs that culminated in the 1938 Social Security Act, "a bold and daring experiment that deeply influenced the course of legislation in other countries" (Briggs, 1965,

p. 67). Such initiatives gave New Zealand a deserved reputation as one of the leading welfare states in the immediate post-war period.

Contrasting with this early emphasis on social security is the cultural theme of independence. This stems from a pioneering background, and the history of people coming to a strange land and achieving success through their own efforts. This perspective has resulted in people on welfare payments being criticised as lazy, and labelled as 'dole bludgers'. Gold and Perry's survey (1990) asked for perceptions of who or what is responsible for poverty and deprivation in New Zealand. While most respondents attributed it to external causes (unfairness, injustice, bad luck), the single most popular explanation was laziness. The authors concluded that "sympathy for the poor and deprived in New Zealand is not as deeply rooted as it might be" (p. 19).

New Zealand's position as a leading welfare state has declined since the 1960s. In the mid-1980s the Government reformed the welfare system, shifting from one of universal assistance to one which provided a 'safety net' for those in greatest need, and which encouraged self-sufficiency (Statistics New Zealand, 1995). In the period since completion of the GLOBE data gathering, New Zealanders have become increasingly concerned about the evidence of increasing social disadvantage, and there is increased support for more government spending on core welfare state activities. However, this humane attitude is kept in check by concern regarding possible negative effects of welfare on self-reliance, and on the willingness of people to help each other (Calcott, 2000).

3.8   Themes

These results on the GLOBE societal culture scales reveal similarities with some of the underlying cultural themes in New Zealand. The importance of egalitarianism is reflected in our aversion to Power Distance. When coupled with Performance Orientation, it appears that people are likely to be judged more by their accomplishments than by their background. The cultural emphasis on performance also makes it clear that we like winners, but we like our winners to be humble. Assertiveness, especially if it shades into aggressiveness in pursuit of personal goals, is unwelcome. There is a sense of dislocation, of being unhappy at a perceived lack of family collectiveness, which echoes some of the literary cultural themes of 'man alone'. Finally, the independence of the pioneer, the expectation of having to make your own way, lives on in the responses to the Humane Orientation scale.

Several of these themes will be seen to underpin the culturally implicit theory of leadership held by New Zealanders. Before discussing leadership, however, the following section will provide background on the industries from which the GLOBE sample was drawn.

4. Food Processing, Finance and Telecommunications Industries

In order to improve comparability among the various countries of the GLOBE study, the research was carried out in three selected industries - food processing, financial services, and telecommunications. This section provides brief background material on each sector in New Zealand, in order to provide a context for later discussion of survey results.

4.1 Food Processing Industry

New Zealand, as a temperate country with low population density, has a long history as an agricultural producer and exporter. Our ability to attain comparatively high levels of self-sufficiency in food products (Lattimore, 1994) led to an early emphasis on exporting. As a British colony in the late nineteenth century, our export activities were oriented largely towards supplying the British market, and many of our food processing companies (especially in the meat sector) were established with British capital (Lattimore, 1997). Today, New Zealand exports of sheepmeat account for 54% of the world export trade, and we are one of the top five dairy exporters in the world (Statistics New Zealand, 1999). Our export industries are dominated by companies in the food and beverage sector (Crocombe, Enright, & Porter, 1991) and, in 1996, food products made up 38.5% of the total value of New Zealand's exports (Statistics New Zealand, 1997).

Acting in the role of "Britain's Farm", we supplied bulk commodities (such as sheepmeat and butter), with little in the way of added-value processing. The guaranteed market (and good returns) meant there was little pressure to develop greater sophistication in our food processing, or to enter more competitive markets. At the same time, domestically oriented food processing industries (such as wheat, bakery and cereal products) were given protection from competition with imports by a system of state import monopolies, consumer restrictions and phytosanitary restrictions (Lattimore, 1997).

During the late 1960s it became increasingly clear that Britain would join the European Union (EU), and this led to a search for more diverse products and markets. EU agricultural policy meant the loss of Britain as our largest market for agricultural products, and there has been a consequent increase in export activity to non-traditional trading partners. Exports to Asia (including Japan) now account for over 39% of all New Zealand's exports (Statistics New Zealand, 1997). Managers of firms in the sector have had to rapidly broaden their horizons. They have been required to develop greater awareness of diverse customer requirements, and the technological innovations necessary in order to serve them effectively, while meeting increasing levels of international competition.

During the decade following Britain's entry to the EU, government policies continued to provide a degree of protection for parts of the agricultural sector. Moves to remove this protection accelerated from 1984, as the new Labour government began a large-scale process of economic liberalisation and deregulation. New Zealand is now unique among developed countries in that our farmers receive no subsidies from government and have to compete with subsidised production from other producing countries (Statistics New Zealand, 1999).

In most of the agricultural and horticultural sectors, producer boards have been established in order to provide a level of coordination in the processing, marketing and distribution of products. Some of these boards are able to compulsorily purchase product from farmers, and have the sole right to export them; in other industries they have less power. This cooperative approach acts to reduce the variability in returns to producers.

4.2   Financial Services Industry

The banking and financial services sector in New Zealand today is highly competitive but it hasn't always been that way. Until the mid-1980s, only four commercial banks operated in the country, and these were subject to governmental controls over their interest rates, investments, and lending portfolios. Other organisations (such as savings banks, building societies and finance companies) offered a more limited range of banking service, and were also subject to tight government control.

Strong restrictions on foreign exchange transactions effectively protected New Zealand banks from overseas competition, and the lack of any effective competition in the sector meant that

little innovation occurred. Ledingham (1995 p. 163) has characterised the sector at this time as being "boringly stable".

The large commercial banks developed multi-levelled hierarchies and mechanistic cultures appropriate for the stable and predictable environment. They were also dominated by male managers at higher levels in the hierarchy, despite having a majority of female employees (see, for example, Bank of New Zealand, 1984). Large overseas banks or the government owned the commercial banks and their savings bank subsidiaries, and other savings banks were either owned by government or had explicit government guarantees. Probably in common with many other countries, commercial banks were considered to be cautious and conservative, with cultures ill-suited to rapid or radical change (Harris, 1996).

During the 1970s and 1980s, competition developed outside the banking sector, with finance companies, building societies and other organisations beginning to capture an increasing share of the deposits and lending markets. These institutions exerted pressure to be allowed entry to other activities (such as foreign exchange dealing) which government regulations excluded them from. The distinction between banks and non-banks began to diminish and, in 1984-85, government carried out major reform of the financial sector.

These reforms included the removal of foreign exchange and interest rate controls, and had the effect of drastically increasing the level of competition in the sector. Domestic banks also became exposed to international competition. In 1986, new banks were allowed to set up in New Zealand, and a total of 21 new banks were approved. Some of these were building societies or finance companies already operating in New Zealand, but 10 were effectively new participants. In further moves, the government sold the banks which it controlled (1989-1992) and withdrew its explicit guarantee of deposits at trustee savings banks (1988).

At the same time these regulatory changes were occurring, banks had to cope with major changes in technology. The extensive introduction of electronic payments systems, development of new products, and exposure to international innovations placed pressure on managers whose past experience was in a more stable and predictable world.

During the 1990s, the financial sector has continued to evolve as a result of pressures to increase cost efficiencies and improve customer service. Large mergers have resulted in closure of branches, and staff redundancies, while accelerating uptake of telephone banking, ATMs and other technology increases the pressure to reduce staffing. More than one third of

New Zealand's bank branches were closed between 1993 and 1998, with staffing being reduced by 11%. The number of ATMs increased by over 30% in the same period (1999; Harris, 1996; Love, 1996).

4.3   Telecommunications Industry

Prior to 1 April 1987, all telecommunications services, both domestic and international, were provided by the state-controlled New Zealand Post Office. The Post Office's statutory monopoly also extended to the provision of telecommunications equipment, such as domestic telephones and commercial switchboards.

In the mid-1980s New Zealand experienced rapid growth in the demand for telecommunication services. An explosion in the use of computers by both the private and public sectors increased the use of communication networks. The increasing use of information technology was creating a demand for new services, and the national network was severely overloaded. At times it was impossible to get a call through from New Zealand's largest city, Auckland, to the capital, Wellington. Long delays in the provision of telephone services were common, with customers having to wait 6-8 weeks for a telephone to be installed (Telecom Corporation of New Zealand, 1993).

Over the years, the government had been influenced by social and political objectives when setting prices for telecommunications services. Significant cross subsidisation meant that prices bore little relation to the cost of supplying services. In addition, all prices had to be approved by the Postmaster General.

In 1986, the Fourth Labour Government, as part of a programme to free the New Zealand economy from rising public debt and to make State Service delivery organisations more efficient and accountable, passed the State Owned Enterprise Act. New corporate state trading companies were formed to operate as commercially accountable enterprises. Telecom Corporation of New Zealand Limited, one of those companies, began operating on 1 April 1987 (Wagner, 1994).

When Telecom was corporatised, its first priority was to restructure the company in preparation for deregulation and eventual competition. The old centralised bureaucracy was dismantled and a new decentralised organisation structure was put in place. In addition,

Telecom embarked upon a number of programmes to increase service quality, network reliability, personnel productivity, and profitability. Vigorous cost-cutting programmes were put into place, a substantial number of jobs were made redundant, and outdated systems were replaced with computerised alternatives. The whole telecommunication network was substantially upgraded, and a progressive programme to remove cross-subsidies through tariff re-balancing was begun. (Telecom Corporation of New Zealand, 1993).

In 1990 Telecom Corporation was privatised through sale to a consortium headed by two American telecommunications companies, Ameritech and Bell Atlantic for $NZ 4.35 billion. This was the sixth biggest deal in the world in 1990 and, until recently, the biggest deal in New Zealand history (Hyde, 1991).

As part of the deregulation process, new competitors entered the market. Clear Communications introduced competition in the tolls and local call market, and is now competing as an internet service provider. BellSouth (now owned by Vodafone) is catching Telecom in the mobile phone market, and Australian firm Telstra is targeting the international toll call business of commercial organisations. International companies (including Motorola, Nokia and Ericsson) are selling telecommunications equipment, and New Zealand companies (such as Ben Rumble) have entered the retail equipment sales and servicing sector.

Despite the huge increase in competition over the past fifteen years, Telecom still has a natural monopoly in regard to the 'local loop', the wires connecting individual households to the exchange. Several competitors have taken Telecom to court claiming anticompetitive practices, and the present government has promised an enquiry to review the current 'light handed' regulatory regime. The Telecommunications Users Association of New Zealand believes there is insufficient competition in some value-added services (eg ISDN lines), and the Ministry of Commerce has estimated "deadweight losses arising from monopoly rents in telecommunications" to be between $50 million and $250 million each year (Gordon, 1997).

In summary, all three of the industries surveyed in this part of the GLOBE project have experienced significant pressures to increase effectiveness and efficiency as they operate in an environment characterised by increasing competition, greater demands for technology investment, and reduced governmental support and protection.

5. Organisational Culture Results

The GLOBE survey incorporated a measure of dimensions of organisational culture that parallel the societal culture scales. Approximately half of the survey sample completed the societal items, with the remaining managers completing the organisational items. The results for the three industries are summarised in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4.

Table 2
Organisational Culture Dimensions for the Finance Industry

Organisational Culture	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Power Distance Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	2.00 2.40	5.33 5.40	4.01 3.99	.79 .81
Uncertainty Avoidance Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	2.00 2.00	5.67 5.50	4.32 3.98	.94 .80
Humane Orientation Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	3.50 3.00	5.50 5.50	4.50 4.03	.61 .70
Collectivism I - I-C Continuum Is Now: Should Be:	31 32	2.00 3.00	5.67 4.80	4.16 4.04	.71 .46
Collectivism II - Org/Group Pride Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	3.00 4.67	6.50 6.83	5.25 6.11	.78 .51
Assertiveness Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	2.50 3.00	5.50 7.00	4.30 4.32	.71 .52
Gender Egalitarianism Is Now: Should Be: Low = male oriented, medium equal, high = female oriented	32 32	1.67 2.00	5.00 5.88	3.01 4.62	.70 .92
Future Orientation Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	2.67 4.75	6.50 7.00	4.73 5.56	.92 .53
Performance Orientation Is Now: Should Be:	32 32	4.00 4.25	6.50 7.00	4.97 5.77	.65 .83

Table 3
Organisational Culture Dimensions for the Food Industry

Organisational Culture	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Power Distance					
Is Now:	30	1.33	5.00	3.76	.97
Should Be:	30	2.00	5.20	4.01	.88
Uncertainty Avoidance					
Is Now:	30	1.67	6.00	4.38	1.32
Should Be:	30	2.25	5.50	4.38	.88
Humane Orientation					
Is Now:	30	3.25	5.25	4.50	.57
Should Be:	30	3.25	5.25	4.00	.63
Collectivism I - I-C Continuum					
Is Now:	30	3.33	5.67	4.81	.68
Should Be:	30	3.20	6.00	4.41	.63
Collectivism II - Org/Group Pride					
Is Now:	30	4.00	6.40	5.03	.71
Should Be:	30	3.83	6.83	5.96	.64
Assertiveness					
Is Now:	30	2.00	5.25	4.08	.78
Should Be:	30	2.00	5.33	4.03	.86
Gender Egalitarianism					
Is Now:	30	1.00	4.33	2.26	.73
Should Be:	30	2.00	6.00	4.37	1.09
Low = male oriented, medium equal, high = female oriented					
Future Orientation					
Is Now:	30	3.00	6.33	4.90	.83
Should Be:	30	3.75	6.50	5.35	.67
Performance Orientation					
Is Now:	30	3.25	6.00	4.59	.74
Should Be:	30	4.25	7.00	5.80	.67

Table 4
Organisational Culture Dimensions for the Telecommunications Industry

Organisational Culture	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Power Distance					
Is Now:	29	2.67	5.67	4.21	.82
Should Be:	29	2.60	5.20	3.95	.70
Uncertainty Avoidance					
Is Now:	29	2.00	6.67	4.49	1.25
Should Be:	29	2.50	6.00	3.81	.94
Humane Orientation					
Is Now:	29	3.25	5.50	4.47	.62
Should Be:	29	3.25	6.25	4.19	.84
Collectivism I - I-C Continuum					
Is Now:	29	3.33	6.00	4.47	.70
Should Be:	29	3.20	5.60	4.31	.63
Collectivism II - Org/Group Pride					
Is Now:	29	3.20	6.40	4.95	.74
Should Be:	29	5.17	6.67	6.06	.46
Assertiveness					
Is Now:	29	3.50	5.50	4.31	.52
Should Be:	29	2.67	5.00	4.25	.60
Gender Egalitarianism					
Is Now:	29	1.33	4.67	2.85	1.05
Should Be:	29	2.50	5.75	4.40	.91
Low = male oriented, medium equal, high = female oriented					
Future Orientation					
Is Now:	29	2.67	6.00	4.33	.95
Should Be:	29	3.00	6.25	5.51	.67
Performance Orientation					
Is Now:	29	3.00	6.33	4.56	.79
Should Be:	29	4.50	6.50	5.91	.59

All three industries rated Organisation and Group Pride and Loyalty highest (4.95 - 5.25) indicating that managers and employees take pride in each other's accomplishments. At the societal level, managers rated the corresponding scale, Family Collectivism, much lower (3.67). It appears that New Zealanders are more comfortable expressing pride in others' achievements and developing loyalty in the work setting than in the family arena.

The lowest rating scale for all firms was Gender Egalitarianism (2.26 - 3.01). These low scores indicate a strong male orientation, particularly in the food industry. The scores are lower than the societal level rating for this dimension (3.22).

The telecommunications managers rated Uncertainty Avoidance slightly higher than the food and finance managers (4.49 compared with 4.38 and 4.32). They also sought a larger reduction in Uncertainty Avoidance than the other two industries ("Should Be" score of 3.81,

compared with 4.38 and 3.98 for Food and Finance). The telecommunications sample included managers from Telecom New Zealand, the largest listed company in New Zealand and the privatised descendant of the old New Zealand Post Office. This firm is actively seeking to become more responsive and less bureaucratic. The sample also included a number of smaller entrepreneurial companies, new to the New Zealand market. The standard deviation for this scale (1.25) was the highest of all the organisational culture scales, and this may be a function of this spread of companies. Some managers (perhaps from the smaller companies) saw themselves as operating in a relatively unstructured context, tolerating very high levels of uncertainty, while others considered the degree of structure, control and rules to be quite high.

All three industries sought significant increases (in excess of one standard deviation) in Performance Orientation, with telecommunications managers wanting the biggest shift (from 4.56 to 5.91). Similarly, all three industries wanted to increase their level of Future Orientation, with telecommunications managers again wanting the biggest change (from 4.33 to 5.51). These desired changes are coupled with a desire to reduce Humane Orientation. In terms of cultural shift, all three industries are looking to extend their planning horizon, and seek greater performance improvements while reducing the level of friendliness, sensitivity to others, and tolerance for mistakes.

All three industries want to markedly increase the level of Organisational/Group Pride and Loyalty (by more than one standard deviation). For all three industries, this "Should Be" scale was rated highest out of all the cultural scales (with means ranging from 5.96 to 6.11). The low standard deviations suggest a high level of agreement among the respondents. In light of the desired reduction in Humane Orientation, this suggests a shift towards recognising and valuing people more on the basis of their ability to contribute to the group, than for their essential humanity.

The ratings of organisational Assertiveness are somewhat higher than for societal Assertiveness, although food industry managers gave it a slightly lower rating than the other two industries. There is almost no difference between the "As Is" and the "Should Be" scores. In contrast, the male orientation evident in all industries was seen as unacceptable, and all three expressed a desire to shift this towards a more balanced position. The "Should Be" scores on Gender Egalitarianism are 1.5 - 2.8 standard deviations higher than the "As Is" scores.

6.   Previous Research on Leadership

Leadership is a popular topic in magazines aimed at practising managers, and some of this material will be described later in this chapter. Academic research into leadership behaviours is more difficult to find. The leadership chapters in two recent New Zealand management and organisational behaviour textbooks (Inkson & Kolb, 1997; McLennan, 1995) include only five citations to indigenous leadership research, of which three are unpublished discussion papers.

Some recent studies are beginning to consider the cultural influences of increasing ethnic diversity on New Zealand leadership. Ah Chong and Thomas (1995) discuss research into aspects of cross-cultural leadership in New Zealand, referring to a number of studies (see, for example, Love, 1993; Nedd & Marsh, 1983; Pringle & Henry, 1993) illustrating differences in style between New Zealand European, Maori and Polynesian leaders. With Treaty of Waitangi settlements leading to greater Maori investment in property, tourism and fishing industries, there is an increased interest in Maori management styles (Tapsell, 1997). As noted in the introduction to the culture section, however, the focus of the GLOBE study was on the dominant (New Zealand European) pattern of leadership. The following review of leadership research in New Zealand will therefore leave aside material on Maori and Pacific Island leadership styles.

Just over twenty-five years ago, George Hines, a psychologist at Victoria University of Wellington, wrote a book called The New Zealand Manager (Hines, 1973). The work is based on survey research into the background, attitudes, business practices, motivation and psychological characteristics of over 2,400 New Zealand managers. This work, and others by the same author, has been viewed by some as marking the beginning of organisation behaviour as a research-based discipline in New Zealand (Inkson, 1987)

Hines identified a number of characteristics of the business environment that he considered vital to an understanding of the nature of New Zealand management. Two in particular are the relative classlessness of New Zealand society, and the small size of New Zealand firms.

He argued that management style in New Zealand was influenced by the lack of a formal class structure. Individuality and independence were valued, together with an emphasis on

performance rather than social status. New Zealand (at that time) also lacked the large salary differentials that, in some countries, create a divide between labour and management.

In a similar vein, he pointed to the small size of the average New Zealand company. Managers can't hide from their employees. Personal relationships develop, decisions are generally conveyed face-to-face, and there is nowhere to hide when problems arise. Sir James Wattie, founder of Wattie's Foods (now part of the Heinz group) is a good example of these attributes. As Chief Executive, he used to eat in the staff cafeteria, and placed a high value on the information he gained from informal interaction with staff at all levels in his factory (Irving & Inkson, 1998).

In evaluating the role of Herzberg's 'hygiene' and 'motivator' factors, Hines reported that New Zealand managers placed a significantly greater weight on interpersonal relationships than did North American and European managers. He suggested that this finding related to the small size of New Zealand companies, the opportunities for frequent interactions between people at all levels, and the lack of arbitrary class differences.

Hines' survey was consistent with other research that had found New Zealand managers to be conservative in outlook (Wilson & Patterson, 1968). He commented on the association between conservatism and other factors, including adherence to rules and regulations, resistance to change, compliance with existing norms, and a preference for stability, predictability and security. This links closely with the GLOBE dimension of Uncertainty Avoidance, and is consistent with the high 'Is Now' rating given to this dimension in the GLOBE study.

Hines' respondents felt they needed to expend considerable effort to meet the demands of their jobs, and most of them felt that they usually accomplished more than they set out to achieve. There was a desire, particularly among those who liked their work the most, to work hard in order to achieve success and exceed the minimum requirements of the job. Inkson (1974) found managers disliked having their concerns to improve work performance being frustrated or obstructed by others in the organisation. Over half of his sample felt they were contributing less to their organisation than they were capable of as a result of insufficient delegation from their manager, and a tendency for top management to spend too much time on "trivial office routine and decision-making" (p. 25). Inkson concluded that New Zealand managers were not meeting their basic responsibilities towards staff – they were not

involving them, delegating effectively, stretching them, or giving appropriate feedback and recognition.

Independence is often cited as a characteristic of the New Zealand psyche, and Hines' sample responded in a manner consistent with this stereotype. Most of the sample (55%) wanted to work without any supervision at all, and another quarter preferred being given the freedom to act within a set of suggested priorities. Coupled with this attitude was a strong preference for being given work that required high levels of responsibility. Most of the managers considered themselves ambitious, with the more extreme respondents being keen to work autonomously, taking personal responsibility for their actions.

Hines noted the adherence to codes of ethical standards in traditional professions such as medicine and law, and referred to the view of some that management is "a second-class profession for second-class people" (Rossel, 1972, cited in Hines, 1973). The managers in Hines' study, however, were almost unanimous in describing the New Zealand manager as being ethical in business practice, and only 21% believed that formal ethical standards should be adopted. This view is supported by Inkson's interviews of managers. He noted that "where ethics were referred to [bosses] were seen totally by subordinates in favourable terms" (1974, p. 25).

Hines based his findings on a large scientific survey; a review of articles in <u>Management,</u> the official journal of the New Zealand Institute of Management during the year he published his book provides additional insight into the preferred leadership style and methods of managers in 1973.

There are some immediately obvious differences between the 1973 and the 1998 volumes of the magazine, with the issue of gender roles being particularly prominent. The male pronoun is intrusive in almost every 1973 article. Beyond mere grammatical convenience, most articles assume the manager really is male (eg by claiming, (as Clapcott, 1973, p. 13 does), that we all know of "the executive's wife who has gone, tearfully, to the managing director begging him to prevent long, late-night working in the office"). Perhaps this assumption was valid at the time – all of the 100 photographs of managers in the 'Appointments' section during 1973 were of men. By contrast, around 25% of the photographs during 1998 were of women managers.

In reviewing the 1973 volume for insights into leadership, one of the most revealing findings is the paucity of information. Not one of the feature articles included the word 'leadership' in its title. The articles coming closest to addressing leadership were a series on Management by Objectives by an American consultant, recently settled in New Zealand (Mordka, 1973a, b), and an article on delegation principles (Harris, 1973). Articles on productivity improvement, safety, marketing and other functional topics were most prevalent, perhaps reflecting the comparative strength of the manufacturing sector at the time. This is consistent with the finding of Place (1971) cited by Hines (1973) that New Zealand business magazines in the early 1970s gave very little emphasis to 'industrial psychology' topics.

Ransom (1973) decried the "abysmal lack of knowledge about management of New Zealand companies". Hume, (1973) studied the recruitment and selection practices of Auckland employers. The interviewees in her sample appeared unable to articulate the set of personal qualities (over and above more objective requirements of experience and qualifications) necessary for success in management roles. During 1973 the University of Auckland appointed a new staff member tasked with creating courses in organisational behaviour (1973, p. 37).

Kaiser (1973) commented on the part played by authoritarian management styles in creating or prolonging industrial disputes. He noted the frequent use of hierarchical, authoritarian styles of management, and suggested that the "consultative way of communicating is receiving a lot more attention" (p.19). The state of industrial relations at the time forms an undercurrent to many articles, with reference to the 'us versus them' mentality and the confrontational nature of labour/management relationships.

In an editorial, Niblock (1973) refers to a speech by a young (37 year old) general manager, who, proclaiming the 1970s to be the 'age of youth', welcomes the trend towards "young people taking over the traditional bastion of conservatism itself; the world of industry, commerce and finance." (p. 3). Ten years later, the fourth Labour government initiated a dramatic and significant restructuring of the New Zealand economy. The scale of this change can be gauged by the description in the previous section of its effects on the food, financial services and telecommunications industries.

Conservatism was no longer an option for managers. The qualities reflected by leadership research and practice during the 1970s would not suffice for the 1990s or beyond. The sense of sharp transition, of a watershed in the demands on leaders, is clear:

> "If our past existence had created an environment where the basic parameters for leadership were set, where the solid virtues, sound administration, transactional leadership, and strong control were sufficient for success, then the new environment has changed things irrevocably. Qualities previously unnecessary in New Zealand management suddenly became critical not for spectacular success, but for mere survival: innovation, lateral thinking, vision, entrepreneurship (and its organisation corollary, 'intrapreneurship'), networking ability, international orientation." (Inkson & Henshall, 1990, p.164).

Transformational leaders became more visible at the helm of many New Zealand companies (Inkson, Henshall, Marsh, & Ellis, 1986), the prevalence of 'high commitment' management practices increased (Hamilton, Dakin, & Loney, 1992) and research began to indicate the increased value subordinates placed on transformational behaviours (Singer, 1985).

In 1993 and 1996 the New Zealand Institute for Economic Research published studies that examined the ways in which New Zealand private sector management had adjusted to the structural changes and deregulation of the preceding decade (Campbell-Hunt & Corbett, 1996; Campbell-Hunt, Harper, & Hamilton, 1993). These reports found evidence of increasing emphasis on teamwork, training and performance rewards (with a dramatic increase in the use of performance-linked pay systems since introduction of the Employment Contracts Act in 1991). On the other hand, longer-term issues such as career development, labour planning, and the link between training policy and strategic planning received insufficient attention. This pattern is consistent with the high Performance Orientation and low Future Orientation scores reported in the culture section above.

The studies report that leaders showed increasing awareness of the need to create more flexible organisation structures, improve the communication of their vision to staff, and involve people more effectively in the development of strategy. Evidence suggested, however, that many managers did not know how to transform this awareness into action (Frater, Stuart, Rose, & Andrews, 1995; Wevers & Company, 1994). Campbell-Hunt and Corbett concluded that, in 1996, New Zealand managers were "only part-way through a change in style from a hierarchical, 'command and control' mentality to an empowering, 'delegate and coach' style" (Campbell-Hunt et al., 1996, p.98).

At the same time the GLOBE data were being collected in New Zealand, Sharon Rippin was carrying out a significant study into the criteria used by Chief Executives and senior managers to assess the effectiveness of senior managers (Rippin, 1995). She summarised (1994) the five skills that best differentiated ineffective from effective managers as:

Gives open and honest feedback to staff
Sticks to decisions
Is accountable for the outcome of their own work and their staff's work
Is enthusiastic and passionate about work
Is committed to a team approach.

Several of these attributes come through strongly in the GLOBE findings. The following section presents the findings from the focus group discussions, media analysis and quantitative surveys comprising the GLOBE data collection in New Zealand.

7. The GLOBE Study

7.1 Focus Groups and Interviews

As one of the first steps in the GLOBE study, a focus group of Chief Executives and board directors was convened, in order to elicit information regarding perceptions of leadership in New Zealand (Fearing, Heyward, Kennedy, & O'Sullivan, 1995). The focus group was asked to consider management and leadership, and to identify characteristics distinguishing outstanding leaders from effective managers (See Table 5). The group viewed average managers primarily in the context of maintaining the status quo through control and enforcement of existing policies and procedures. They were considered better managers of things than of people, and some members of the focus group felt this characteristic was often associated with a weakness in regard to understanding human nature. They did not have an innate understanding of how to motivate people, and could be ineffective delegators.

More effective managers shared some of these characteristics, but were regarded as more willing to question goals, procedures and processes in order to explore opportunities, and seek lateral alternatives. They typically had greater people skills, and were able to lead effectively by example. They were more willing to take risks than were average managers, and could marshal resources to achieve results over and above routine expectations.

Average managers were viewed as controllers, whereas leaders were more democratic and team-oriented. The focus group was convened shortly after the death of one of New Zealand's celebrated war heroes, double-Victoria Cross winner Charles Upham. One of the group participants noted that Upham always claimed his team was "very hard to control, but a lot easier to lead". This nicely captures the ambivalent feeling many New Zealanders have in regard to formal restraint and control

In distinguishing leadership from management, the group also emphasised the importance of developing a clear vision, and a set of beliefs that are passed on to peers and subordinates. Leaders were seen as high achievers, with their success leavened by humility. New Zealanders like 'humble winners'.

A cluster of traits emerging from the discussion concerned the personal characteristics of modesty, humility, and recognition of one's own weaknesses, balanced with a healthy respect for self and others. Outstanding leaders in New Zealand are not self-absorbed, "cocky", or bent on Machiavellian control of others. They see their leadership role as being based in the team, not outside it. They evidence a strong commitment to the value of teamwork, a willingness to be a "team player" themselves, and to actively contribute their own efforts and ideas, rather than try to lead from a distance. As one participant noted:

> They get around their troops a lot, they make sure they talk to everybody; they make people really feel part of a team, as though they're important. It's their people skills; they understand the strengths and weaknesses of the team.

Table 5
Manager and Leader Characteristics Identified by Focus Group

Characteristics Reported by Focus Group Participants		
Average Manager	**Above-Average Manager**	**Outstanding Leader**
Concerned with maintenance	Has flair for growth and opportunity	Total commitment ("love") for people
Better at managing *things*	Uses lateral thinking	Articulate and persuasive
Policies and procedures	Good with people and involves them as a team	Possess high degree of integrity
Controller, not expander	Communicates well	High achiever, both in and outside of work
Maintains status quo	Growth-oriented: Sets some goals	Charismatic – has the "X" factor
Regular (eg works 9.00 – 5.00)	Uncertain about projecting visions and beliefs throughout the organisation	Consistent
Not completely focused	Not visionary: Works on a day-to-day or yearly basis	Democratic
Compromises	More focused than average manager	Trusting of others
Doesn't fully understand human nature	Prepared to take risks to some extent	Team player
Problems with delegation	Leads by example	Have strong communication and people skills
Patterned	Not afraid of making important decisions	Customer-oriented
Controlled outcome, standard requirement	Has better understanding of people and the business than average manager	Humble
	Aims to achieve a result beyond given expectations	Imperfect, but know own weaknesses
	Uses resources effectively	Have respect for self
		Experienced and well-rounded
		Pragmatic

7.2   Media Analysis

An additional qualitative insight into New Zealand leaders was gained from completion of a survey of leadership references in print media during a one-week period at the end of 1997 (Godfrey & Kennedy, 1998). The sample media comprised two business magazines (Management and New Zealand Business), two business weekly newspapers (The Independent and National Business Review) and three daily newspapers (Auckland's New Zealand Herald, Wellington's Dominion, and Christchurch's Press). All references to New Zealand leaders (in political, commercial and community spheres) were identified and coded. A total of 557 data elements (from 320 separate text extracts) were categorised iteratively,

starting with fine-grained categories containing only a few items. These were combined progressively into broader categories in successive rounds.

The final number of categories was 26, clustered into five main facets of leadership; these consisted of two behavioural categories (organisation management and people management), personality, ability and image. The categories are listed in Table 6, with the most frequently represented categories listed first in each column. Categories containing less than six data elements (equivalent to 1% of the total set) are printed in italics; categories including elements referring only to political leaders are labelled (P).

Table 6
Categories Emerging from Media Analysis

Organisation Management	People Management	Personality	Ability	Image
Taking action	Motivator	Traits	Abilities	Impression management
Strategic management	Communicator	Leader style	Knowledge and understanding	Conduct
Development	Relationship builder	*Realism (P)*	Worthiness	*Public image*
Change management	Team player		*Information management*	*Consistency*
Setting ethical standards	*Director*		*Cultural awareness*	*Political expediency (P)*
	Information provider (P)		*Conceptual thinking*	

The largest category, representing 30% of the data elements, was that of personality traits. Within this cluster, the largest subcategory referred to determination, resolve, 'stickability' and perseverance towards accomplishment of goals. Confidence was the second-largest subcategory, encompassing belief in oneself, and an optimistic outlook. Passion, energy and commitment comprised the next cluster of attributes. Attributes that were consistently presented as being undesirable included arrogance, emotionality, panic and weakness.

The second largest category referred to aspects of taking action. Being active, responsive and proactive were viewed positively, while negative connotations applied to behaviours such as delaying, reneging on commitments, and becoming complacent.
The next most common category was that of strategic management. This included data elements relating to vision, planning, policy, strategy and purpose.

The importance of personality traits in describing leaders is consistent with some of Rippin's work. In her study of the effectiveness of New Zealand senior managers she found that "the effectiveness of managers is largely assessed on personality dimensions" (1995, p.190).

7.3   The Leadership Scales

The GLOBE leadership questionnaire asked respondents to rate various leadership behaviours and traits on a seven-point scale according to the extent they contributed to 'outstanding leadership' in New Zealand. Table 7 presents the mean score for each of the 21 first-order leadership factors and the six second-order factors (in bold). The numbers in parentheses are New Zealand's rankings in comparison with the other 61 countries. As with the cultural scales, countries have been grouped into a number of bands according to their scale score, and the standard error of difference. The table represents this graphically, with the number of cells in each row representing the number of distinct bands for that scale.

Table 7
New Zealand Leadership Styles

Leadership Dimension	Average Scores, Relative to Other Countries in Sample			
	High End	Above Average	Below Average	Low End
Charismatic/Value Based	5.87 (35) Band C (A-I)			
Charismatic I: Visionary	6.23 (16)			
Charismatic II: Inspirational	6.50 (3)			
Charismatic III: Self Sacrificial[a]		4.88 (41)		
Integrity[b]			5.49 (58)	
Decisive[c]	5.69 (45)			
Performance Orientation	6.31 (13)			
Team Oriented	5.44 (56) Band D (A-G)			
Team I: Collaborative Team Orientation[a]		5.21 (51)		
Team II: Team Integrator[a]		5.71 (43)		
Diplomatic			5.22 (54)	
Malevolent (Reverse scored)			1.83 (21)	
Administratively Competent				4.79 (60)
Self-Protective	3.19 (45) Band F (A-I)			
Self-Centred[a]			2.23 (22)	
Status Consciousness[a]			3.56 (56)	
Conflict Inducer		3.74 (43)		
Face-saver			2.39 (53)	
Procedural		3.86 (33)		
Participative	5.50 (24) Band B (A-F)			
Autocratic (Reverse)			2.63 (31)	
Non-participative (Reverse)		2.38 (47)		
Humane	4.78 (36) Band B (A-E)			
Modest		4.57 (52)		
Humane Orientation[a]	5.09 (18)			
Autonomous	3.77 (35) Band B (A-D)			
Autonomous[d]		3.77 (37)		

[a] Only one country was categorised in Band D.
[b] Only one country was categorised in Band E.
[c] 60 of the 62 countries fell into the two top bands, with one each in Bands C and D.
[d] Only one country was categorised in Band C.

In terms of absolute scale values, New Zealand managers gave three scales average ratings in excess of 6.0 on the seven point scale: Charismatic II Inspirational, Performance Orientation, and Charismatic I Visionary. A further two scales (Team Integrator and Decisive) were rated 5.5 or higher.

At the low end Malevolent, Self-Centred, Non-Participative, and Face-Saver all had average ratings lower than 2.4 and were thus seen as seriously inhibiting effective leadership.

At a simple level then, an outstanding leader in New Zealand is seen as a positive, optimistic person who is able to generate confidence, enthusiasm and excitement among followers, challenging them to exceed expectations in pursuit of future goals. He or she is a good communicator, sharing information to ensure common understanding among followers, and encouraging them to work as an integrated team. The leader must be prepared to make decisions firmly and resolutely, whether based on logic or intuition. This decisiveness needs to be balanced, however, by recognition of the individual abilities of team members (without regard to their status); the leader must not be a micro-manager, and must be willing to share the decision-making with capable team members. Personal qualities such as irritability, cynicism, conceitedness or lack of sincerity undermine leadership effectiveness.

While the Team Integrator dimension was ranked fourth highest, the other team scale (Collaborative Team Orientation) was ranked eighth. This second team scale places more emphasis on behaviours such as mediation (solving conflicts between team members), group welfare, friendliness with subordinates, and support for people experiencing problems.

The overall pattern emerging from this summary of extreme ratings in the New Zealand data closely matches the set of universally endorsed positive and negative leadership characteristics reported by Den Hartog et al (1999).

The leadership qualities valued by New Zealanders will now be compared with other countries in the sample. At the high end, New Zealanders placed more emphasis on the Inspirational dimension than almost every other country. This scale picks up items relevant to the leader's optimism, energy, confidence and motivation, and his or her ability to inspire these characteristics in followers.

New Zealand is also in the highest band for the Visionary, Decisive, Performance Orientation and Humane Orientation scales. The first three of these scales have already been discussed. The importance of Humane Orientation is consistent with the finding by Toulson (1990) that New Zealanders in work organisations strongly endorse humanistic work beliefs.

In contrast, New Zealand managers' ratings on six of the leadership scales were among the lowest ten countries. The rating of 4.79 given to Administratively Competent ranks 60th among all the countries, and falls into the lowest band. The scale reflects an organised, methodical approach to work, underpinned by skills in coordinating and managing complex administrative systems. The mean is just above the midpoint, suggesting that most managers view this scale positively, but we value it much less as a contributor to effective leadership than do other countries. This may be a function of the comparatively small size of many of our companies, but it also echoes the comments made by the focus group. Administrative competence is considered to be something required by an average manager, and is not a distinguishing characteristic of an outstanding leader.

The New Zealand sample also gave lower ratings to Integrity than most other countries – an average of 5.49 giving a country ranking of 58th. This scale had the highest standard deviation for the New Zealand leadership scales, suggesting a wide spread of opinion about its relevance to leadership. It may be the case that New Zealand managers see honesty and trustworthiness as being the norm in New Zealand, rather than a special quality useful for distinguishing effective leaders. The Inkson research cited earlier (1974, p. 25) lends support to this view. New Zealand also ranks very highly as a corruption-free country in the annual surveys carried out by Transparency International (1999).

Status-Consciousness is the next lowest dimension in the inter-country comparisons, with a rating of 3.56 and a ranking of 56th. This is below the mid-point of the scale, indicating that most managers take a somewhat negative view of leaders who are conscious of class or status boundaries, and who allow these to influence their actions.

The final three scales on which New Zealand ranks low compared with other countries are Diplomatic (54th), Face-Saver (53rd) and Modest (52nd). The Face-Saver characteristics (eg being indirect in communication to avoid giving offence) are seen as inhibiting effective leadership more by New Zealanders than by respondents in other countries. The other two

dimensions are rated as contributing to effective leadership, but are seen as less important contributors than in other countries.

7.4 Factor Analysis of Leadership Scales

The GLOBE factors assist us in identifying the dimensions that are useful for distinguishing the various countries in the study. Within each country, however, a separate factor analysis is useful in identifying the clusters of leadership scales used to distinguish leader characteristics within that country. This section summarises the results of a principal components factor analysis of the New Zealand questionnaire responses. Five factors emerged (eigenvalue > 1, varimax rotation) and the scale loadings are summarised in Table 8.

Table 8
Leadership Factor Loadings

Scale	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Decisive	.81				
Team II Team Integrator	.75				
Charismatic I: Visionary	.73				
Malevolent	-.65				
Integrity	.64				
Performance Oriented	.62				
Admin Competent	.62				
Team I: Collaborative Team Orientation	.55				
Diplomatic	.52				
Conflict Inducer		.79			
Autocratic		.66			
Modesty		-.61			
Self-Centred		.59			
Autonomous		.51			
Non-Participative		.47			
Charismatic II: Inspirational			-.71		
Face Saver			.68		
Status Conscious			.53		
Humane			-.49		
Procedural				.87	
Charismatic III: Self-Sacrificial					.82

Factor One includes most of the scales loading on the first factor emerging from the GLOBE second-order factor analysis, captured by the Charismatic/Value Based and Team Oriented CLT dimensions. In New Zealand, however, the Inspirational and Self-Sacrificial subscales do not load on this factor. The Self-Sacrificial scale forms a factor of its own, and the Inspirational scale loads on Factor Three (see below). Factor One is very much a 'team-leader' factor, capturing a style of leading which encompasses personal managerial skills focused on creating and maintaining a working group. The Team I, Team II and Diplomatic scale items emphasise the importance of working together, resolving individual and intra-group conflict, giving time and energy to help others, being skilled and tactful in interpersonal relations, and being loyal to the group even in times of trouble.

The high negative loading of Malevolent indicates the undesirability of attributes such as irritability, dishonesty, egotistical behaviours, cynicism, slowness to learn, and uncooperativeness.

While Autocratic and Self-Centred have their highest loadings on Factor Two, they also have sizable negative loadings on Factor One, and this ties in nicely — the factor captures the importance of the group, rather than the individual. The Autocratic scale includes items such as the tendency to make decisions in a dictatorial way, the belief that some people are entitled to special privileges, and the inclination to dominate others. These are all inimical to the creation of good teams. Similarly, the Self-Centred scale consists of items reflecting a person's disinterest in being part of a group at all.

In addition to these team-oriented scales, the Factor has loadings from the Decisive and Performance Oriented subscales. These capture elements of effective behaviours - the ability to make decisions firmly and logically, to be determined and persistent, and to strive for increasingly high levels of performance. The team has to be an efficient and effective one, a winning team, not an unstructured or directionless group.

Factor Two includes elements of both the Self-Protective and Participative (negatively loaded) CLT dimensions. It captures a self-centred, directive leadership style. A strong loading from Autocratic captures both leadership style (bossy, domineering, dictatorial, intolerant of questioning) and belief in elitism. The other four scales loading positively on this factor are Conflict Inducer, Non-Participative, Self-Centred and Autonomous. These reflect attributes such as an emphasis on one's own interests rather than the group's, an insistence on making decisions personally, a tendency to conceal information from the group and a preference for independence.

Finally, the high negative loading on Modesty clearly links into New Zealanders' abhorrence of the 'self-promoter', indicating the importance of modesty (does not boast, presents self in a modest way) and a self-effacing manner.

The highest loading (negative) scale on Factor Three is the Charismatic II: Inspirational scale, which received the highest average rating of all scales, and is thus seen as contributing most strongly to effective leadership. Scale content addresses the extent to which leaders display (or generate in their followers) positivity, encouragement, enthusiasm, high morale, confidence and energy. The Humane subscale reflects a sense of compassion and generosity in assisting others.

As evidenced by the strong loading of the Face-Saving and Status-Conscious subscales, an egalitarian approach coupled with clear and direct communication is an important part of the leadership perspective captured by this factor.

Only one scale has its highest loading on Factor 4 - Procedural - although Status-Conscious also has a loading >0.4. The Procedural subscale taps items relating to formality, caution, maintaining a habitual routine, and a preference for following established rules. The Status subscale indicates a leader who is aware of class and status boundaries and acts accordingly.

The only scale to load significantly on the fifth factor is Charismatic III: Self Sacrificial. This illustrates a leader who is willing to invest major resources in endeavours that do not have a high probability of success, someone who is willing to forego self-interest and make personal sacrifices in the interest of a goal or vision, and who is unusually able to persuade others of his/her viewpoint. Many of the people honoured by being featured on New Zealand banknotes epitomise these qualities. Sir Edmund Hillary (first person to climb Mt Everest, and first to drive overland to the South Pole); Kate Sheppard, the most prominent leader of the campaign for universal suffrage in New Zealand at the end of the nineteenth century; Sir Apirana Ngata, who led the revival of Maori people and culture in the early twentieth century; and Ernest Rutherford, internationally recognised as 'father of the atom'.

The contribution of these factors to effective leadership can be assessed. The leadership scales are based on variables rated from 1 ('greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader') to 7 ('contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader'). By taking the average score of each of the leadership scales loading on each factor, we can assess the extent to which a high factor score is positively or negatively associated with leadership. The arithmetic mean of scale averages is calculated; where a scale loads negatively on a factor, the corresponding mean is transformed by subtracting it from 8.

On this basis, the cluster of leadership scales represented by Factor One are the ones most highly valued in New Zealand leaders, with an average rating of 5.65. The presence of characteristics captured by Factor Three is seen as seriously inhibiting effective leadership (average = 2.59). Factors Two (especially the autocratic, self-centred and non-participative components) and Four are also seen as undesirable leadership styles with average ratings of 3.03 and 3.86 respectively. Finally, Factor Five (self-sacrificial) is seen as a style contributing to effective leadership (average = 4.88).

A recent sporting example illustrates aspects of the team and self-sacrifical qualities forming this pattern of leadership. In February 2000, New Zealand became the first country outside America to successfully defend the America's Cup yachting trophy in its 149-year history. At the press conference after the first race in the seven-race final series, the world's sporting media expected to talk to the captain, Russell Coutts. Three Team New Zealand sailors appeared, but Coutts was accused of arrogance and lack of consideration for staying away. He later explained that he was only part of the team, and any other team member knew enough to discuss the race with the media. It was not a deliberate snub, but true teamwork in action.

This belief in teamwork combined with a willingness to forego self-interest was illustrated even more dramatically in the final race of the series. Coutts chose to step aside from the helm of Team New Zealand's boat in the deciding race of the series. He allowed his understudy the glory of sailing to victory in this prestigious international trophy.

8.   Conclusions

Over the last fifteen years, New Zealand has been navigating the transition from a centralised and highly regulated economy to one characterised by open markets, rapid change and minimal government intervention. By contrasting the GLOBE study findings with earlier research into New Zealand management behaviours we find that the culturally implicit theory of leadership in New Zealand has followed a similar pattern. We have shifted from a hierarchical "command and control" mentality, to one characterised by a preference for teamwork, empowerment and inspirational leadership.

New Zealand is not alone in making this shift, and we share many attributes of preferred leadership styles with other countries. Beneath this surface similarity, however, can be detected important variations related to deeply ingrained and enduring cultural themes.

The emphasis placed on group/team loyalty in organisations contrasts markedly with the lack of a similar sense of pride and loyalty within families. Managers report a desire to increase the emphasis on both, but their view of workgroup pride is strongly based on utilitarian

considerations rather than on an innate need for affiliation. Performance is paramount. According to the pioneering cultural strand, we make our own fortune. We stand or fall on our ability to achieve, whether as individuals or as contributors to a wider group enterprise. We are a small country, we hardly feature in anyone else's worldview, and it's important for our self-esteem to show that we can match or beat the best the world can present, even if hardly anyone else notices. There is a sense of insecurity that needs to be assuaged by regular doses of international success.

We don't like rules, administrative procedures, being controlled by micro-managing bureaucrats. On the other hand, we seem to have a high need to reduce uncertainty, to increase the level of stability and predictability in our lives. The cultural themes indicate this comes about through conformity, through a desire to avoid being different, rather than by any desire to subordinate ourselves to a set of externally imposed or class-based 'rules'. The most effective leaders will adopt a 'clan control' rather than 'bureaucratic control' approach to controlling people and channelling their efforts (Bartol & Martin, 1998).

We don't like leaders who are autocratic, but we also spurn leaders who pull their punches, who aren't prepared to 'call a spade a spade'. There is a potential dissonance between our avoidance of the autocrat, and our desire for a leader who can reduce our uncertainty, give us a sense of security and confidence regarding our place in the world. We value performance highly and give accolades to those who achieve at the highest level (as long as they don't suggest that their achievements make them any different from the rest of us). We want to follow a leader who can succeed, who can perform at an exceptional level, and who gives us hope that we can share in this success. We want to be told what to do by a successful leader, not by a bureaucrat with a policy manual.

A strong leader can reduce our uncertainty - make us feel we are on the winning team. Perhaps this accounts for what Pearson has called our "lurking respect for the dictator" (Pearson, 1974), our willingness to allow a leader to be dictatorial if he or she achieves results, and if those results benefit the dominant group. Dictators usually have a passion, they are driven to control people to an end, they are enthusiastic about their goals. At various times in the past New Zealand has willingly endorsed authoritarian Prime Ministers (such as Seddon, Massey, Fraser and Muldoon). The media study identified emotionality, panic and weakness as negative characteristics – our pioneering background makes a strong autocrat preferable to a sensitive facilitator.

Traditional attributes are still valued, such as strength of character, resolve, determination, and commitment. Increasing importance is being placed on the ability to inspire and enthuse staff, on future orientation, and on development and communication of a compelling vision. The high importance placed on having a leader with vision reflects the overall concern at the low level of future orientation in society. We want a leader who is able to demonstrate foresight, to plan ahead, and to take actions in consideration of future goals, because as a society we don't do this well.

There is an important aspect of our cultural identity that is not adequately captured by the GLOBE findings. The rural archetype encompasses a practical, down-to-earth approach to problem solving, coloured by 'Kiwi ingenuity'. The GLOBE items, by focusing on generic leadership behaviours, do not address technical skills, yet this seems to be an area that may further distinguish New Zealand leaders from their international counterparts. Rippin (1995) found that technical skills were an important contributor to judgements about senior managers' perceived levels of overall effectiveness. Her finding contrasts with similar overseas studies, and she speculates that the value placed on technical skills may be a function of the New Zealand 'colonial spirit' (p.133), requiring managers to demonstrate greater versatility than is the case in other countries.

This chapter began with a quotation from John Mulgan, a New Zealand writer and diplomat who studied and worked in England during the 1930s. He described the qualities that characterised New Zealand soldiers he met during the desert campaign of World War II. We have seen how some of these attributes closely fit the culturally endorsed model of outstanding leadership in New Zealand. This implicit model combines inspirational enthusiasm ('sunshine'), low assertiveness, pragmatism and perseverance. Low power distance and the strength of egalitarian beliefs mandate a style of leadership that is participative, grounded in the team, and which provides the opportunity for shared success.

To the extent that leadership is "the process of being perceived by others as a leader" (Lord & Maher, 1991, p.11) then New Zealand leaders must conform to the cultural expectations of their followers. New Zealand's cultural identity, however, has been determined in part by the actions of leaders (in military, sporting, political and commercial spheres). Culture can therefore be viewed as both a constraint on what is acceptable, and as a supporting structure

amenable to further development as we build and extend our concept of effective leadership. Another New Zealand writer, Katherine Mansfield (1960, p. 127), described New Zealand as

> a little land with no history
> (Making its own history, slowly and clumsily
> Piecing together this and that, finding the pattern, solving the problem
> Like a child with a box of bricks).

New Zealand leaders have found patterns and solved problems in ways that both reflect and help to define 'Kiwi culture'. While many of the 'building blocks' for New Zealand's leadership style can be found in other countries, the overall pattern is unique. The problems to be solved will continue to change, and leaders will need to continue finding new bricks to extend the pattern. The GLOBE study provides a snapshot of existing cultural themes and leadership styles, and a basis from which to explore future evolution of Kiwi leadership as New Zealand continues to develop and refine its sense of identity and place in the world.

Appendix One

PROJECT GLOBE

The Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE) was initiated by Professor Bob House (Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania) in 1991 as a means by which links between culture and leadership could be comprehensively researched. Approval of a research grant in 1993 enabled the project to expand, with the recruitment of Country Co-Investigators (CCIs) from around the world. The GLOBE community now comprises around 170 researchers in over 60 countries.

Following a comprehensive review of leadership and cross-cultural research literature, questionnaires to measure cultural values and leadership practices were developed and refined. The items included in these survey instruments were based on input from scholars in Asian as well as western countries, in order to provide instruments that could be used in all cultures. CCIs in each country managed the process of translating questionnaires, and obtaining qualitative material with which to supplement the questionnaire-based measures of societal and organisational culture and leader attributes.

During the initial phase of the project, the questionnaires were psychometrically analysed to identify the underlying factor structure, and to determine the properties (eg reliabilities) of the scales. On the basis of this work, it was possible to establish eight dimensions of societal culture (matched with corresponding measures of organisational culture dimensions). Similarly, the analysis identified six global dimensions of leader behaviour, based on 22 underlying specific leader attributes or behaviours.

The GLOBE project is a major study, extending over many years. It aims to develop an empirically-based theory to describe, understand and predict the influence of cultural variables on leadership and organisational processes. The study hopes to be able to answer questions such as the following (House et al., 1999):

1. Are there leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices that are universally accepted and effective across cultures?

2. Are there leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices that are accepted and effective in only some cultures?

3. How do attributes of societal and organisational cultures affect the kinds of leader behaviours and organisational practices that are accepted and effective?

4. What is the effect of violating cultural norms relevant to leadership and organisational practices?

5. What is the relative standing of each of the nations studied on each of eight core dimensions of culture?

6. Can the universal and culturally-specific aspects of leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices be explained in terms of an underlying theory that accounts for systematic differences across cultures?

Conceptual Model

The GLOBE study uses implicit leadership theory (Lord et al., 1991) as a conceptual basis for its analysis of leadership. This approach argues that individuals make assumptions or develop beliefs (ie hold implicit theories) about the attributes consistent with effective leadership. When others act in ways that are consistent with these implicit theories, then individuals are more likely to accept them as leaders. With greater acceptance, such leaders will gain greater stature, and increased ability to get the organisational resources needed in order to accomplish goals. Considerable research supports the notion that implicit leadership theories constrain the exercise of leadership, the acceptance of leaders, and the extent to which they are viewed as effective.

The GLOBE study defines culture as the "shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives and are transmitted across age generations" (House et al., 1999). It is likely that the attributes, norms and practices that distinguish one culture from another will also influence the implicit leadership theories held by members of that culture. Leaders are therefore likely to enact the behaviours expected and valued in the particular culture. Variations in implicit leadership theories across different cultures will be reflected in the different value placed on various leader behaviours and attributes.

Societal culture is not the only variable that will influence leadership style. For example, the size and nature of the company, its competitive environment, ownership structure and

organisational culture will all moderate or compete with the effect of societal culture in determining leader attributes. A more complete model of such relationships can be found in House, Wright and Aditya (House et al., 1997).

Cultural Dimensions

The eight cultural dimensions used in the GLOBE study are based on extensive previous research. The first five dimensions stem from Hofstede's work (1980), with his original Masculinity-Femininity dimension divided (on the basis of factor analysis) into two dimensions (Gender Egalitarianism and Assertiveness). The Collectivism scale was also supplemented by items based on the work of Triandis (1995). Performance orientation is derived from McClelland's (1985) work on need for achievement, and is similar to Hofstede and Bond's (1988) Confucian Dynamism dimension. Future Orientation and Humane Orientation stem mainly from work by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961).

Brief definitions of each of the eight cultural dimensions follow:

> *Uncertainty avoidance* is the extent to which a society strives to avoid uncertainty by reliance on social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices to alleviate the unpredictability of future events.
>
> *Power distance* is defined as the degree to which members of a society expect and agree that power should be unequally shared.
>
> *Collectivism* reflects the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups within a society.
>
> *Gender egalitarianism* is the extent to which a society minimises gender role differences.
>
> *Assertiveness* is the degree to which individuals in a society are assertive, dominant, and aggressive in social relationships.
>
> *Future orientation* is the degree to which a society encourages and rewards future-oriented behaviours such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification.
>
> *Performance orientation* refers to the extent to which a society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.
>
> *Humane orientation* is the degree to which a society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring and kind to others.

Leadership Dimensions

The final set of leadership dimensions used in the GLOBE study were derived from factor analysis of responses to approximately 16,000 questionnaires from middle managers of

approximately 825 organisations in 64 countries. A total of 21 leadership scales (first-order factors) were identified, and these are listed in the Table 1-1, together with sample items.

Table 1-1
Leadership Prototype Scales: First Order Factors and Leader Attribute ITEMS
(House et al., 1999).

Administratively Competent	Decisive	Non-participative
- orderly - administratively skilled - organised - good administrator	- wilful - decisive - logical - intuitive	- non-delegator - micro-manager - non-egalitarian - individually-oriented
Autocratic - autocratic - dictatorial - bossy - elitist	**Diplomatic** - diplomatic - worldly - win/win problem-solver - effective bargainer	**Performance oriented** - improvement-oriented - excellence-oriented - performance-oriented
Autonomous - individualistic - independent - autonomous - unique	**Face Saver** - indirect - avoids negatives - evasive	**Procedural** - ritualistic - formal - habitual - procedural
Charismatic I: visionary - foresight - prepared - anticipatory - plans ahead	**Humane orientation** - generous - compassionate	**Self-centred** - self-interested - non-participative - loner - asocial
Charismatic II: inspirational - enthusiastic - positive - morale booster - motive arouser	**Integrity** - honest - sincere - just - trustworthy	**Status consciousness** - status-conscious - class conscious
Charismatic III: self-sacrificial - risk taker - self-sacrificial - convincing	**Malevolent** - hostile - dishonest - vindictive - irritable	**Team 1: Collaborative Team Orientation** - group-oriented - collaborative - loyal - consultative
Conflict Inducer - normative - secretive - intra-group competitor	**Modesty** - modest - self-effacing - patient	**Team II: Team Integrator** - communicative - team-builder - informed - integrator

While each of the leadership scales resulting from the first-order factor analysis are psychometrically sound, there is considerable inter-relationship between the factors. A second-order factor analysis was therefore used to reduce the number of scales to a more manageable set of less inter-related scales. A combination of statistical and theory-based

considerations led to the development of six higher order leadership scales. These scales represent relatively broad leadership styles, encompassing the 21 more detailed leadership subscales. The second-order factors (marked in bold) are summarised in Table 1-2. The Autonomous factor is based on individual questionnaire items, while the rest comprise the subscales listed under each factor heading.

Table 1-2
Global Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership (CLT) Dimensions (House et al., 1999)

1. **Charismatic/Value Based**, 4.5 - 6.4 • Charismatic 1: Visionary • Charismatic 2: Inspirational • Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice • Integrity • Decisive • Performance oriented	2. **Team Oriented**, 4.8 - 6.3 • Team 1: Collaborative Team Orientation • Team 2: Team Integrator • Diplomatic • Malevolent (reverse scored) • Administratively competent
3. **Narcissistic**, 2.1 - 4.5 • Self-centred • Status conscious • Conflict inducer • Face saver • Procedural	4. **Participative**, 2.0 - 4.6 • Autocratic (reverse scored) • Non-participative (reverse scored)
5. **Humane**, 3.6 - 5.5 • Modesty • Humane orientation	6. **Autonomous**, 2.3 - 4.7 • Individualistic • Independent • Autonomous • Unique

Samples of managers in each culture rated individual leader behaviours on a scale from 1 (greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader) to 7 (greatly contributes to a person being an outstanding leader). The average score for each culture, for each of the second-order scales, was calculated and the range of scores is shown beside each of the six second-order factors in Table 2. Thus, for example, the Charismatic/Value-Based leadership style (with a range of culture scores between 4.5 and 6.4) is positively endorsed by all cultures. In contrast, the Humane style (3.6 to 5.5) is endorsed by some cultures, and seen as an ineffective leadership style by others.

References

1973. People & companies, *Management*, Vol. 19(12):: 37.

1999. One-third of bank branches closed, *The Press*: 5 May 1999: 29. Christchurch.

Ah Chong, L. M., & Thomas, D. 1995. Cross-cultural research in New Zealand organisations. *Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management*, 1(2): 14-32.

Ansley, B. 2000. Human Values, *Listener*: March 25: 16-19.

Bank of New Zealand. 1984. Equal Employment Opportunity Management Plan. Wellington: Bank of New Zealand.

Bartol, K. M., & Martin, D. C. 1998. *Management* (3rd ed.): Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Booth, P. 1993. *Edmund Hillary: The Life of a Legend*. Auckland, NZ: Hodder Moa Beckett.

Briggs, A. 1965. The welfare state in historical perspective. In M. Zald (Ed.), *Social Welfare Institutions*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Calcott, D. 2000. Kiwis want income gap reduced, *The Press*: May 12: 9. Christchurch, NZ.

Campbell-Hunt, C., & Corbett, L. 1996. A Season of Excellence? An Overview of New Zealand Enterprise in the Nineties. Wellington: New Zealand Institute of Economic Research.

Campbell-Hunt, C., Harper, D., & Hamilton, R. 1993. Islands of Excellence? A study of Management in New Zealand. Wellington: New Zealand Institute of Economic Research.

Carter, I., & Perry, N. 1987. Rembrandt in gumboots: Rural imagery in New Zealand television advertisements. In J. Phillips (Ed.), *Te Whenua Te Iwi - The Land and the People*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Chamberlain, J. 2000. Standard debasement, *North & South*(167): February: 86-94.

Clapcott, B. H. 1973. Controlling executive stress and tension. *Management*, 19(12): 13.

Crocombe, G., Enright, M., & Porter, M. 1991. *Upgrading New Zealand's Competitive Advantage*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Davin, D. 1984. Cassino Casualty, *Islands*, Vol. 1 New Series(2): November.

Deeks, J., Parker, J., & Ryan, R. 1994. *Labour and Employment Relations in New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Longman Paul.

den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Dorfman, P. W., Ruiz-Quintanella, A., Kennedy, J. C., & et al. 1999. Culture-specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? In J. A. Conger, & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Leadership Quarterly Special Issue - Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I)*: 219-256.

Department of Statistics. 1990. *New Zealand Official Yearbook* (94th ed.). Wellington: Department of Statistics.

Easton, B. 2000. Value added, *Listener*: March 25: 20-21.

Fairburn, M. 1989. *The Ideal Society and its Enemies: the Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850-1900*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Fearing, M., Heyward, J., Kennedy, J. C., & O'Sullivan, D. 1995. The GLOBE Study of Management and Leadership in New Zealand. Christchurch: Commerce Division, Lincoln University.

Frater, P., Stuart, G., Rose, D., & Andrews, G. 1995. The New Zealand Innovation Environment. Wellington, NZ: Business and Economic Research Ltd.

Geraets, J. 1984. An interior landscape: Charles Brasch's 'Indirections' and 'The Universal Dance'. *Islands*, 1 New Series(1): 71-84.

Gidlow, R., Perkins, H., Cushman, G., & Simpson, C. 1994. Leisure and recreation. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson, & I. Shirley (Eds.), *New Zealand Society: A Sociological Introduction*, 2nd ed. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.

Godfrey, K., & Kennedy, J. C. 1998. Media Portrayal of Leadership in New Zealand: A GLOBE Study. Christchurch, NZ: Commerce Division, Lincoln University.

Gold, H., & Webster, A. 1990. *New Zealand Values Today*. Palmerston North: Alpha Publications.

Gordon, R. 1997. Tuanz worried competition too far off as bureaucrats procrastinate, *National Business Review*: 11 July: 47. Auckland.

Hamilton, R. T., Dakin, S. R., & Loney, R. P. 1992. Economic deregulation and general managers: New Zealand's experience. *Personnel Review*, 21(7): 14-23.

Hansen, D. 1968. Social Institutions. In A. McLeod (Ed.), *The Pattern of New Zealand Culture*: 49-67. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Harris, P. 1996. The Changes Banks Face. Wellington: The Finance Sector Union (FinSec).

Harris, T. E. 1973. Principles of delegation. *Management*, 19(12): 15.

Hines, G. 1973. *The New Zealand Manager*. Wellington: Hicks, Smith & Sons Ltd.

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. London: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. 1988. The confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organzational Dynamics*, 16: 4-21.

Holm, M. 1994. Secrets for success, *Listener*: November 5: 16-24.

House, R., Wright, N., & Aditya, R. 1997. Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley, & M. Erez (Eds.), *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, 1st ed.: 535-639. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M. W., Gupta, V., Kennedy, J. C., & et al. 1999. Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances In Global Leadership*: 171-233. Stamford, CN: JAI Press.

Hume, A. L. 1973. How Auckland managers select their staff. *Management*, 20(2): 15, 17, 22.

Hyde, T. 1991. How They Sold Telecom, Why they Sold Telecom, *Metro*(123): September: 54-69.

IMD International. 2000. *The World Competitiveness Yearbook*. Lausanne: International Institute for Management Development.

Inkson, J. H. K. 1974. New Zealand managers - their problems and their needs, *Management*, Vol. 21(7): October: 23-25, 43.

Inkson, J. H. K., Henshall, B., Marsh, N., & Ellis, G. 1986. *Theory K: The Key to Excellence in New Zealand Management*. Auckland: David Bateman Ltd.

Inkson, K. 1987. Organisational behaviour: A review of New Zealand research. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 16: 9-27.

Inkson, K., & Henshall, B. 1990. Transformational leadership and management development. In P. Boxall (Ed.), *Function in Search of a Future: Perspectives on Contemporary Human Resource Management in New Zealand*: 157-171. Auckland: Longman Paul.

Inkson, K., & Kolb, D. 1997. *Management Perspectives for New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Addison Wesley Longman.

Irving, D., & Inkson, K. 1998. *It Must be Wattie's: From Kiwi Icon to Global Player*. Auckland: David Bateman.

Kaiser, B. 1973. Increasing national productivity Part 5: Communications, Human and industrial relations. *Management*, 20(7): 19-21.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. 1961. *Variations in Value Orientations*. New York: Harper Collins.

Knuckey, S., Leung-Wai, J., & Meskill, M. 1999. Gearing Up: A Study of Best Manufacturing Practice in New Zealand. Wellington: Ministry of Commerce.

Laidlaw, C. 1999. *Rights of Passage: Beyond the New Zealand Identity Crisis*. Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.

Lattimore, R. 1994. Assessing the international competitiveness of the New Zealand food sector. In M. Bredahl, P. Abbott, & M. Reed (Eds.), *Competitiveness in International Food Markets*. Boulder: Westview.

Lattimore, R. 1997. Deregulation: The New Zealand food industry. In T. Wallace, & W. Schroder (Eds.), *Government and the Food Industry: Economic and Political Effects of Conflict and Cooperation*. Boston: Kluwer Publishers.

Lealand, G. 1988. *A Foreign Egg in our Nest? American Popular Culture in New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Ledingham, P. 1995. The review of bank supervision arrangements in New Zealand: The main elements of the debate. *Reserve Bank Bulletin (RBNZ)*, 58(3): 163-171.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. 1991. *Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Love, M. 1993. *Maori management: The way of the future?* Paper presented at the ANZAME Conference, Deakin University, Melbourne.

Love, P. 1996. Changing times bring upheaval for financiers, *The Evening Post*: 14 September 1996: 15. Wellington.

Mansfield, K. 1960. To Stanslaw Wyspianski. In A. Curnow (Ed.), *The Penguin Book of New Zealand Verse*: 127-128. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

McClelland, D. 1985. *Human Motivation*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.

McLauchlan, G., & Morgan, J. 1976. *The Passionless People*. Auckland: Cassell New Zealand.

McLennan, R. (Ed.). 1995. *People and Enterprises* (2nd ed.). Sydney: Harcourt Brace.

Mordka, I. 1973a. The concepts underlying management-by-objectives. *Management*, 20(1): 21, 23, 47.

Mordka, I. 1973b. A review of the concepts underlying management-by-objectives. *Management*, 19(12): 20-21, 23.

Mulgan, J. 1984. *Report on Experience*. Auckland, NZ: Oxford University Press.

Naipaul, V. 1980. *The Return of Eva Peron with The Killings in Trinidad*. London: Andre Deutsch.

Nedd, A. N. B., & Marsh, N. R. 1983. Social-traditionalism and supervisory style: An empirical investigation of the relationships between social values and the compliance-gaining strategies of supervisors. In N. R. Marsh, & W. F. McDonald (Eds.), *The Multicultural Workforce in New Zealand and Australia*, Vol. Occasional Paper. Auckland: Department of Management Studies, University of Auckland.

Niblock, S. C. 1973. Publisher's Letter, *Management*, Vol. 20(3): June: 3.

Novitz, D. 1989. On culture and cultural identity. In D. Novitz, & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and Identity in New Zealand*: 277-291. Wellington, NZ: GP Books.

Ogilvie, G. 1973. *The Riddle of Richard Pearse*. Wellington, NZ: AH & AW Reed.

Pearson, B. 1974. *Fretful Sleepers and Other Essays*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Phillips, J. 1989. War and national identity. In D. Novitz, & B. Willmott (Eds.), *Culture and Identity in New Zealand*. Wellington: GP Books.

Place, H. I. 1971. The status and scope of industrial psychology in New Zealand. Hamilton: Department of Psychology, Waikato University.

Pringle, J. K., & Henry, E. Y. 1993. *Diversity in women's organisations: Maori and Pakeha*. Paper presented at the Fifth International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, Costa Rica.

Ransom, S. W. 1973. Research - Lip service or action? *Management*, 19(10): 19.

Rippin, S. 1994. *New Zealand managerial effectiveness study*. Paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management, Wellington, NZ.

Rippin, S. 1995. *The Competencies Used to Assess the Effectiveness of New Zealand Managers*. Unpublished PhD, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington:NZ.

Roberts, K. 1999. The New Zealand Edge, http://www.nzedge.com/speeches/edge2.html, Accessed 29 April 2000.

Rossel, P. E. 1972. Need to upgrade profession, *Dominion*: 3 March. Wellington.

Rotherham, F. 1998. Is the Kiwi corporate culture wrecking our family life?, *The Independent*: 2 September.

Savage, J. 1999. Savings in New Zealand. Wellington, New Zealand: Office of the Retirement Commissioner.

Sinclair, K. 1969. *A History of New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Singer, M. 1985. Transformational vs transactional leadership: A study of New Zealand company managers. *Psychological Reports*, 56: 816-818.

Statistics New Zealand. 1995. *Facts NZ* (2nd ed.). Wellington, NZ: Statistics New Zealand.

Statistics New Zealand. 1997. *New Zealand Official Year Book 1997*. Wellington: GP Print.

Statistics New Zealand. 1999. New Zealand Official Yearbook on the Web 1999, http://www.stats.govt.nz, Accessed 26 April, 2000.

Tapsell, S. 1997. Is Maori management different?, *Management*, Vol. 44(9): October: 46-50.

Telecom Corporation of New Zealand. 1993. *The Telecom Turnaround: The Deregulation of the Telecommunications Industry*. Wellington: Telecom Corporation of New Zealand.

Toulson, P. K. 1990. *Perceptions, Practices, and Productivity: An Assessment of Personnel Management in New Zealand*. Unpublished Ph D, Massey University, Palmerston North.

Transparency International. 1999. 1999 Corruptions Perceptions Index, http://www.transparency.de/documents/cpi/index.html, Accessed 30 March 2000.

Triandis, H. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wagner, G. 1994. *The Deregulation and Privatisation of New Zealand Telecommunications: An Economic, Political and Ideological Analysis*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy, University of Oregon.

Wevers & Company. 1994. The Index of Human Resource Management Performance. Wellington, NZ.

Wevers International Ltd/Centre for Corporate Strategy. 1996. New Zealand Index of Human Resource Management & Organisational Effectiveness. Wellingon, NZ: New Zealand Institute of Management.

Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. 1968. A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 7: 264-269.