Organization, Leadership, and Communications   School of Management

2012

Exploring the Cultural Origins of Differences in Time Orientation between European New Zealanders and Māori

Kevin D. Lo
University of San Francisco, kdlo@usfca.edu

Carla Houkamau

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.usfca.edu/olc

Part of the Anthropology Commons, International Business Commons, and the Sociology Commons

Exploring the Cultural Origins of Differences in Time Orientation Between European New Zealanders and Māori

Kevin D. Lo, School of Management, University of San Francisco
kdlo@usfca.edu and
Carla Houkamau, Department of Management and International Business, University of Auckland[1]
c.houkamau@auckland.ac.nz

Abstract: Previous research suggests that time orientation differs as a function of national culture. National cultures often cluster together by region, thus regional generalizations can provide insights on how cultures in a given cluster perceive time. We consider the unique case of bi-cultural New Zealand with two cultures, the European New Zealanders (Pākehā) and the indigenous Māori from historically contrasting temporal clusters: Anglo-American and South Pacific. To demonstrate the ways in which Pākehā and Māori differ in their perspectives on time orientation we take our analysis beyond the basic generalizations based on regional clusters and consider the cultural roots of Māori time perceptions. Specifically we consider differences between these two cultures along the theoretical dimensions of clock vs. event time, punctuality, and past/present/future orientations. With respect to Māori culture, we argue that sociocentricity, including different conceptualizations of self, and a unique historical perspective form the basis for the discernible differences between Pākehā and Māori in terms of time perspectives. The endurance of these different perceptions of time, despite over 160 years of Māori and Pākehā social and cultural integration, testify to the centrality of time orientation as a fundamental cultural value. Managerial implications of understanding these cross-cultural differences in time orientation for both domestic and international business are discussed.

Keywords: New Zealand, Māori, time orientation, cross-cultural, indigenous perspectives

INTRODUCTION

According to Hall (1959), time is part of a "silent language" that gives meaning to people and their behaviors, but the "informal patterning of time is one of the most consistently overlooked aspects of culture" (p. 152). This paradox holds important implications around our understanding of cross-cultural differences: Time is a fundamental cultural dimension that provides clues about the values and norms in a culture. Therefore, understanding how time is divided, scheduled, and utilized provides valuable insights into a culture. Non-native understandings of temporal patterns can inform outsiders' interactions with a culture. However, these subtle differences are often overlooked or misunderstood, as Hall argues. In management and organizations, Goodman, Lawrence, Ancona, and Tushman, (2001) argue that time is surprisingly under-researched in organizational studies even though it is a prevalent inquiry in other disciplines.

For the present inquiry, bi-cultural New Zealand witnesses cross-cultural misunderstandings between the European New Zealanders (Pākehā) and the indigenous Māori. We argue that one key to improving relationships between these two cultural groups lies in arriving at a level of mutual understanding of their respective conceptualizations and uses of time. Smoother cross-cultural interactions at the interpersonal level can arise from an understanding of a given culture's time orientation and the resulting behaviors that might be accordingly expected.

In recent years, scholars from social science disciplines, especially anthropology and history, have convincingly argued that time is not an absolute concept, but a relative one that is culturally conditioned (Fabian, 1983 cited in Byrnes, 2006), thus it carries cultural specific properties. Several different dimensions have emerged out of research on time as a construct to

---

[1]Both authors contributed equally

capture the multi-dimensionality of these cultural specificities. Some of the more salient dimensions include clock vs. event time, punctuality, and past/present/future orientation (Brislin & Kim, 2003; Hall, 1959; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Schriber & Gutek, 1987). These dimensions surface in cross-cultural interactions most prominently because they help to delineate obvious differences between cultural values and perspectives. While research has revealed other dimensions of time, we believe that these dimensions in particular have significant implications for international business and particularly the unique case of New Zealand.

At the level of national culture, research on time supports the assertion that time perspectives in western, industrialized cultures are significantly different that those of developing, less industrialized cultures (Brislin & Kim, 2003; Hall, 1959; Levine, 1997). Often, it can be generalized that cultures from the same geographic region share the same time orientations. North America, Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand generally cluster together on multiple dimensions of time (Brislin & Kim, 2003). Conversely, the South Pacific Islands constitute another cluster. With the understanding that there are different temporal clusters, we also acknowledge that different clusters often have contrasting time orientations. Understanding the patterns of time orientation between various clusters is a starting point for acquiring broader cross-cultural understanding of time orientations.

In New Zealand, the interplay between Māori and Pākehā create a unique dynamic with respect to time perspectives through the juxtaposition of cultures from two contrasting temporal clusters. Despite decades of social and cultural integration, research indicates time perspectives differ considerably between these two groups, which have created challenges in terms of integration of Western technology and business with the indigenous Māori community and culture (Bigart, 1972, cited in Berwick-Emms, 1995). We examine previous research on dimensions of time and offer research propositions that may offer empirical evidence of differences between these two groups' temporal orientations based on their cultural backgrounds. Rather than pit these cultures at opposite extremes of a continuum as a result of membership in contrasting temporal clusters, we seek to go beyond the negative relationship often imposed by cross-cultural dimensions and understand the cultural roots for Māori time orientations. Ultimately, this understanding should promote increased cross-cultural awareness within New Zealand and promote smoother workplace interactions.

Our paper is structured in four parts. First, we briefly examine New Zealand history especially as it relates to recent events concerning Māori and Pākehā relations. This foundational understanding is crucial to our exploration of the cultural roots of temporal differences between these two groups. Second, we look at the relevant cross-cultural dimensions of time to ascertain a better understanding of what is pertinent to our discussion. Third, we offer theoretical explanations regarding the deep cultural roots of certain Māori temporal perspectives. While these will be discussed in greater detail, we outline them now as sociocentricity, including a strong interdependent construal of self, and a unique construction of history. Finally, we offer propositions to compose a research agenda in this area and suggest managerial and organizational implications for the codification of such knowledge and understanding.

Brief Introduction to New Zealand

To gain an appreciation of the contextual factors that influence how Māori and Pākehā relate to each other on a day-to-day basis, a basic understanding of New Zealand history is necessary. While is not possible here to provide a comprehensive portrait of New Zealand history, the following brief sketch of the major historical events relevant to understanding the Māori/Pākehā relationship offers the necessary context for discussing their different cultural conceptions of time.

Estimates suggest that Māori were present in New Zealand for over a thousand years prior to Pākehā settlement in the early 1800s (Te Puni Kokiri, 1996; 2000; Walker, 1990). In February 1840 Māori and Pākehā signed of the Treaty of Waitangi. Commonly referred to as "the Treaty," it was first signed by a selection of Māori Chiefs and representatives of the British Crown to establish New Zealand as a British colony. There are two versions of this Treaty one written in English and the other in Māori. Most Māori (500) signed the Māori version and only 39 signed the English version. Because the English and Māori versions are not direct translations this has created difficulties in interpretation (Orange, 1992, 2004). Māori argue that the signatories to the Treaty believed the document guaranteed they would retain all of their lands and their political autonomy as a people (Awatere, 1984). However this did not occur after 1840 as the Treaty ultimately empowered the settler (Pākehā) Government to establish a system of laws that both Māori and Pākehā were required to follow (Walker, 1990). To ensure continued Pākehā settlement, the Government established legislation (and a Native Land Court) devised to facilitate settler access to Māori land (Jackson, 1993). These efforts were successful and large scale transfer of Māori land to Pākehā ownership occurred from the 1840s onwards (Walker, 1990). As Māori lost their economic base and became increasingly absorbed into a new emerging primarily capitalist economic system traditional Māori society began to erode over generations. Integration of Māori into Pākehā society and culture via the education system, legal system and various Government institutions has seen the gradually assimilation of Māori into Pākehā society. Many Māori believe the outcomes of this process of colonization have been largely deleterious and Māori have struggled politically for decades to have their Treaty rights honored and their historical losses compensated.

Māori are currently a minority ethnic group at 17% of the total population while Pākehā comprise approximately 70% (Statistics New Zealand, 2007a, 2007b). Despite their minority status and relative marginalization over the last 30 years Māori have driven a cultural and political renaissance that has catapulted Māori rights to the forefront of New Zealand politics (Durie, 1998; 2004). The Treaty, although a source of debate, now plays an influential role in New Zealand politics (Orange, 1992, 2004). Largely due to Treaty legislation introduced in 1982 Māori now have the right to be recognized as partners with the New Zealand Government in matters governing Māori development. Government officials performing public duties are now legally obliged to act consistently with its inherent principles and Māori rights to cultural and social equality with Pākehā are recognized under a state policy of bi-culturalism (Orange, 2004).

While Treaty rights have enabled Māori to make claims for compensation for historical land loss and advance in several key areas (see Houkamau, 2006 for a review) Māori remain disadvantaged in New Zealand, which is evident through their overrepresentation in a wide range of negative social and economic statistics. These statistics include higher levels of unemployment, lower life expectancy, lower median income, and increased rates of incarceration (NZ Ministry of Social Development, 2009).

Recent events New Zealand have hailed in a new era of cultural relations for Māori and Pākehā as an all Māori political party, the Māori Party formed in 2004, signed a coalition government with the traditionally right winged Pākehā supported National Party. These events have served to heighten interest in the relevance of Māori culture for New Zealand society, particularly with respect to understanding how to address historical events and build a shared New Zealand identity (Statistics New Zealand, 2007a; 200b). However, significant challenges still remain. Because of the history of inter-group conflict there remains a political tension between the two groups even though they now live alongside each other in relative harmony (Sibley, Harre, Houkamau and & Hoverd, in press). In testimony to this tension, several studies indicate that

Exploring the Cultural Origins of Differences in Time Orientation

Page | 107

Māori still face considerable intolerance and racism from Pākehā in daily interactions (Selby, 1995; Pearson, 1990; Johnston & Pihama, 1994). In addition several studies indicate that many Pākehā are intolerant of Māori claims to restoration for past grievances and are reluctant to see money spent on Māori progress and development (Taylor & Wetherell, 1995).

Given the closeness of these two groups and the complexities of their historical relationship, research that explores the differences between Māori and Pākehā worldviews and how they manifest in daily workplace interactions is useful to gain deeper insights into the subtle yet important ways that differences in cultural perception shape intercultural interactions. It is within this context that we offer our analysis of cross cultural differences in time perceptions. We see cross-cultural differences in time orientation as a relevant cultural difference that creates a potential barrier to smooth work interactions between these two ethnic groups. To illustrate our argument, we now turn to a discussion of the most salient dimensions of time orientation to frame the differences specific to Māori and Pākehā.

Relevant Theories in Organizational Behavior and Dimensions of Time
Cross-cultural investigations of time took their first roots in the parent disciplines of organizational behavior: anthropology (Hall, 1973; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) and social psychology (Levine, 1997; Schrieber and Gutek, 1987). In organizational studies, time research is relatively young, so a dominant research paradigm has not yet developed (Ancona, Okhuysen, & Perlow, 2001). Although cross-cultural temporal differences are far less researched in organizational behavior, they are no less important because of their important implications for intercultural communication (Brislin and Kim, 2003; Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988), leadership (House *et al*, 2004; Triandis, 2006), and international business (Cushner and Brislin, 1996).

In their survey of organizational research on time Ancona, Okhuysen, and Perlow (2001) found that time can assume different shared meanings for different socio-cultural groups. To understand how cross-cultural perspectives on time might influence each of these constructs, particularly with respect to Māori and Pākehā relations, we must first arrive at a clear understanding of each dimension of time. We reiterate from the outset of our discussion on theories of time dimensions that research in this area is extremely limited. However, we proceed with an examination of the cross-cultural dimensions of time relevant to this inquiry in order to ascertain a clearer understanding of each.

Clock vs. Event Time
The difference between a clock time vs. an event time orientation presents arguably the most pronounced cross-cultural difference with respect to time orientation (Brislin and Kim, 2003). In other words, this theory possesses the most explanatory power when considering cross-cultural differences in time orientation. The principle difference captured by this dimension is as its name suggests: If people make appointments and organize their schedules primarily according to pre-designated times, they operate on clock time. Conversely, if people organize their time around the natural flow of events, they function on event time. Thus, in order to ascertain a given culture's orientation on this temporal dimension, we can ask the following question: Is one's behavior throughout the day governed by scheduled appointments and the time on the clock, or does the natural course of events dictate one's behavior?

Generally, it is argued that more industrialized cultures operate on clock time, while less industrialized cultures move on event time (Brislin & Kim, 2003; Levine, 1999; Levine & Norenzayan, 1999). As an example, the Anglo-American cluster is more clock time oriented. Thus, as part of the Anglo-American cluster, New Zealand is more clock time oriented.

However, we offer the important caution that while this classification reflects New Zealand as a whole, it is more likely reflective of Pākehā time perspectives.

As stated previously, one of the indicators of a clock time orientation is level of industrialization. Historically, industrialization occurred first in Europe, namely the United Kingdom, and then in the United States. While New Zealand did not undergo an industrial revolution in the same way that in the United Kingdom and the United States did, the mentality of an industrialized culture accompanied the earliest waves British settlers to New Zealand in the late 18th century. Thus, we believe it is acceptable to extrapolate that New Zealand, particularly the Pākehā subpopulation, is clock time oriented.

Conversely, Māori culture, as part of the South Pacific cluster is more event time oriented. As a cluster, Polynesia and the rest of the South Pacific are not very industrialized, which orients them closer to the event time extreme of this dimension. These cultures have not cultivated the same need for the clock to govern behavior throughout the day. In addition, their roles in international business have been less prominent, thereby decreasing the influence of schedules that are dependent on international clock standards (Levine and Norenzayan, 1999). We will expand upon the specific cultural roots that lead to this Māori preference for event time in a subsequent9 section. At this point, it will suffice to say that Māori should exhibit stronger event time tendencies, while Pākehā should showcase a stronger clock time orientation.

Punctuality

Notions surrounding punctuality are directly related to difference in clock time vs. event time (Brislin and Kim, 2003). Thus, punctuality is another dimension of time that differs as a function of national culture. By definition, punctuality is the degree of rigidity when adhering to schedules and deadlines (Schriber & Gutek, 1987). As another means of ascertaining this degree of rigidity, we can ask, "How much latitude is allowed to be late for an appointment?" Is this acceptable window of lateness five minutes? Fifteen minutes? One hour? Whatever the temporal increment, this basic unit of time measurement will differ between cultures.

More clock time oriented cultures will generally have a narrower window of acceptable lateness (e.g. five or ten minutes). If a person is late to an appointment by more than five minutes in certain clock time oriented cultures (e.g. the United States, Germany), they would likely need a valid explanation for their tardiness (Brislin and Kim, 2003). On the other hand, cultures with stronger event time orientations will have more elastic notions of punctuality. In such cultures, there may be fewer stated start times for events, and one could legitimately arrive one or two hours after a event's stated start time without the need for an explanation.

Event time cultures do not make the clock obsolete. However, event time "is a product of the larger gestalt; a result of social, economic, and environmental cures, and, of course cultural values (Levine, 1997, pp. 91). Specific to our current cross-cultural investigation, Māori culture is event time oriented and has more elastic definitions of what constitutes appropriate punctuality. This does not mean that Māori do not use the clock. However, the time on the clock takes a subordinate position to social, cultural, and situational contexts.

Past/Present/Future

Humans possess the capacity to live in the present but also to look towards the past as well as towards the future. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) first proposed past, present, and future orientations as a cross-cultural point of differentiation in time orientation. However, it is rare for a culture to have a singular orientation towards the past, present, or future to the exclusion of the other two (Brislin and Kim, 2003). Very rarely do cultures exhibit a singular orientation as such. Rather, it is common for cultures to be oriented towards two of these concurrently. For

example, indigenous people groups such as the Māori are, on one hand, future oriented because of their emphasis on conservation of natural resources and the desire to leave more for tomorrow or for the next generation. At the same time, however, there is also strong evidence of a past time orientation for Māori. Past time orientations emphasize tradition and time-honored approaches (Brislin & Kim, 2003).

In this section, we have defined and explained the cross-cultural dimensions of time most relevant to differences between Māori and Pākehā . On one hand, it is somewhat intuitive that these differences exist because each culture is a member of a different temporal cluster. However, deeper cultural roots exist for these temporal orientations, particularly for Māori. Knowing and understanding these cultural roots will facilitate a clearer understanding of the associated behaviors. Furthermore, such understanding holds important implications for communication, teamwork, and leadership. In the following section, we elaborate on the cultural roots of Māori time perspectives towards event time, elastic notions of punctuality, and a past/future orientation.

Cultural Roots of Māori Time Perspectives
We believe that while Māori time orientations are strongly rooted in their traditional culture and history, it is important to recognize that due to colonization the values and culture of Pākehā have profoundly transformed how Māori live. However we also offer the point that Māori are not culturally homogenous and many have acculturated to Pākehā ways of life to various degrees (Durie, 1994). Durie (1994) has described this within group diversity in his discussion of different groups of Māori. One group of Māori he observed is conservative and traditional. This group is culturally and socially Māori, understand their Māori *whakapapa* (genealogy), speak Māori and are familiar with *tikanga* Māori (Māori customs). Another group he observed is 'bi-cultural.' They identify as Māori yet operate effectively in the company of Pākehā, adhering to Pākehā cultural norms and behaviors when in Pākehā cultural contexts. Bi-cultural Māori evaluate their Māori identity positively and see their Māori culture and heritage as enhancing their lifestyle in a Pākehā dominated country. Williams (2000) described similar sub-groups of Māori as Durie (1994) and included one additional category. The final group he described is socially and culturally indistinguishable from Pākehā. Members of this group are ethnically Māori but define themselves as Kiwi or New Zealander. They are almost culturally indistinguishable from Pākehā (Royal, 2003). With these three categories in mind, we point out that for the purposes of this paper we are discussing traditional Māori perspectives. We also emphasize that a full discussion of Māori cultural values and beliefs is certainly not claimed here, rather we select concepts we believe are relevant to the current paper (for discussions of Māori cultural perspectives see Bishop, 1996; Marsden, 1975; Metge, 1995; Rangihau, 1992; Ritchie, 1992; Salmond, 1975, 1978).

Notable Māori historian and theologian Marsden (1975; 2003) has noted that Māori spirituality is central to Māori culture. He observes that Māori conceive of the universe as comprised of (at least) two-worlds "in which the material proceeds from the spiritual and the spiritual (which is the higher order) interpenetrates the material physical world..." (Marsden, 1975, p.215). Thus, the Māori worldview needs to be seen as rooted in both the spiritual and the material world, as both must be considered when contemplating the various facets of Māori culture and society.
Traditional Māori society (or pre-colonial Māori society which was devoid of Pākehā contact) was communal and tribal based. Biological kin groups *whānau* (extended family based on shared genealogy), *hapū* (sub-tribes comprising several *whānau*) and *iwi* (tribes comprising *hapū*) lived in ancestral tribal areas (Walker, 1990). Similar to other communally oriented cultures each individual member of Māori *whānau* lived a life that was deeply intertwined with the lives of others in their community and the day-to-day activities of other *whānau* members.

In the traditional Māori community *whānau* were primarily concerned with communal work for collective survival (Selby, 1999). Supporting each other and providing for the needs of others was essential in many ways as harsh living conditions meant that daily survival posed a continuous challenge, and the survival of *whānau* unit was dependent upon mutually beneficial relationships within the *whānau* and between other families within the *hapū* (Walker, 1990). Moreover, as inter-tribal warfare was a feature of political life commitment to *whānau* and *hapū* provided more protection and greater chances of survival for families when required to defend themselves from invading tribes (Walker, 1990). Cultural values for Māori, therefore, derived from allegiance to *whānau*, mutual support, and engagement in community activity (Pere, 1982). As a corollary, like other communally oriented cultures Māori social expectations were clearly mapped out through obligations to *whānau* and *hapū* (Best, 1924; Houkamau & Sibley, 2010).

Although many of these traditional tribal structures have changed as a reflection of colonization (Houkamau, 2006) the concept of *whānaungatanga* (family connection, belonging, support and sustenance) remains an enduring and is often cited as one of the most central and pervasive Māori values. Although *whānaungatanga* may be most simply conceived as an extended version of the concept of *whānau*, *whānaungatanga* has a wider meaning and refers to all of the values, processes, protocols and intentions underlying relationships between Māori whānau. Taken together these processes are, according to Ritchie (1992), the "basic cement that holds things Māori together" (p. 67).

One concept particularly relevant to *whānaungatanga* is *aroha*. *Aroha* can be defined simply as compassion and affection and also recognizes the centrality of good-will towards others for *whānau* well-being. *Aroha* has been described by Pere (1997) as "an important concept in regard to the survival and true strength of *whānaungatanga*" (p. 6). Another relevant concept is that of *mana which* Barlow (1991) defined as social standing and integrity in traditional Māori society. *Mana* was earned in traditional Māori society by consolidating and maintaining positive relationships of mutual respect with others and is therefore seen as a favored characteristic of individuals in terms of their commitment to upholding *whānaungatanga.*

Reflecting upon the centrality of *whānau* and *whānaungatanga* to social interactions, the very way in which Māori defined themselves drew from their positions within their social networks (Marsden, 1975). Foremost, Māori identified themselves in relation to their position in their *whanau, hapu,* and *iwi* structure*s* (Barlow, 1991; Best, 1924; Moeke-Pickering, 1996). Today, when Māori introduce themselves to other Māori at in-group gatherings or in culturally Māori contexts, it is appropriate that the individual define their *iwi* and *hapu* name and location (as these larger groups are more likely to be known to Māori from different areas). This interpretation of the traditional basis of self-definition and expression is demonstrated in the following excerpt from an interview with Harata Ria Te Uira Parata (a prominent Māori kuia or female elder of Ngati Raukawa, Ngati Toa, and Te Atiawa descent) conducted by Judith Fyfe in 1990, p.87).

I see myself not as an individual but as part of a group. That is the difference between our culture and Western culture. In Western culture there is the individual first – you go the other way in Māoritanga and I literally mean this. When somebody sees me they don't say 'Harata', they say 'Ngati Toa' or 'Ngati Raukawa' – the last thing they say is my name. And if I'm in a Māori situation to identify myself, I identify my canoe, my iwi, all of that. The last thing I do is say my own name.

Given the importance of *whānaungatanga* to Māori culture, we note that this deference to maintaining positive social connections remains a strong and salient cultural value permeating

Māori society today (Love, 2002). Leading Māori academic Mason Durie (1994) has noted that the ideal of being able to stand alone and be independent is actually an unhealthy position from a Māori perspective where interdependence has been encouraged. This is not to suggest that Māori do not engage in individual pursuits. Rather, Māori activities have traditionally been conducted in such a way as to promote group harmony and collectivism as opposed to individualism (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

In relation to understanding how these values relate to perceptions of time, we introduce the concept of sociocentricity. Sociocentricity has recently been espoused by Love (2004) who suggested that Māori construct their own sense of self in ways consistent with what Sampson (1988) termed "ensembled individualism." In Sampson's (1988) paper "The Debate on Individualism: Indigenous Psychologies of the Individual and their Role in Personal and Societal Functioning," he made a basic distinction between individuals from collectivist/non-Western cultures and those from individualistic Western (Anglo-American cultures). He suggested that while Western cultures, with their emphases on personal rights and independence, equate personal achievement with independence and self-fulfillment, non-Western/indigenous cultures (in this case Māori) see achievement as linked to interconnectedness with kin and community. Accordingly, Love (2004) notes that Māori models of self emphasize sociocentricity, or self-conceptualization, in terms of important relationships. While we seek to focus on the cultural roots of Māori time orientation, we note that these concepts of self according to Love's (2004) sociocentricity are consistent with a distinction that Markus and Kitayama (1991) term the independent vs. interdependent construal of self. Specific to Māori sociocentricity is the interdependent construal of self that emphasizes a connectedness between people as a fundamental, cultural imperative. Maintaining harmony among these relationships is paramount. Furthermore, consistent with our argument, norms for behavior are determined by others in the relationship as contrasted to the self.

The impact upon time perceptions of a strong collective orientation among Māori will be discussed below. However, we argue that sociocentricity can be linked to event time as it requires maintaining social relationships, interpreting sequences of events in terms of how they influence social relationships, and negotiating how long events should take with another party (as opposed to more individualist, clock-driven agenda). The second element relates to the role of the land and nature in time conceptions. Because of tribal connections and localization of tribes, Māori identity was intimately associated with the location of tribal boundaries, and therefore with the land. Māori lived in harmony with the natural environment, therefore, were more likely to follow the natural rhythms of nature. We also believe this tendency would indicate a strong inclination for Māori to move according to event time rather than clock time.

Differences between Māori and Pākehā cultural values

We now turn our attention to selected aspects of Pākehā culture. In doing so we acknowledge that Pākehā, like Māori, are a group with considerable within group diversity in culture and values (see Webster, 2001 for a discussion). In addition we do not purport to provide a comprehensive review of Pākehā culture rather we focus on specific aspects in order to provide a basic foundation for understanding the different approaches to time between the two groups (see Ritchie, 1992; King, 2003 for a fuller discussion).

Describing Pākehā cultural values poses a challenge. As leading New Zealand historian Michael King (1991) notes "while much is known of Māori culture very little is known, written or discussed of the cultural attitudes and values of Pākehā New Zealanders" (p. 7). While it has been proposed that a lack of recognition that Pākehā have a culture reflects ethnocentrism and the tendency the Pākehā majority to perceive their culture as normal or simply 'New Zealand culture' (Awatere, 1989; McCreanor, 2005) others suggest the lack of clarity around Pākehā

culture simply reflect the challenges Pākehā have in terms of positioning themselves as a unique cultural group in New Zealand. For example, Bell (2009), notes that the lack of analyses of the Pākehā culture reflects their position as essentially 'settlers' in that they are migrants to New Zealand, influenced by their cultural (mainly British) roots yet also influenced by Māori. As such their challenge is to claim an identity which is distinctive from their homeland and also distinctive from Māori.

In a series of books focusing on Pākehā identity King (1985, 1991, 2004) has proposed that while Pākehā culture has distinct features that reflect their unique settler experiences and historical relationships with Māori, it is still largely comprised of the values of the early (mainly) British settlers who colonized New Zealand from the nineteenth century.

Others have echoed these views and observed that the cultural legacies and values of early British settlers remain resilient within Pākehā society now. For example Ritchie (1992) has outlined several key cultural differences evident between Pākehā and Māori. In particularly he describes Pākehā culture as being more individualistic than Māori. This individualism manifests in a social outlook or ideology which promotes independence, self-reliance and individual achievement while opposing the role or influence of the group upon one's personal views and experience. Research carried out on Pākehā attitudes in New Zealand by Webster (2001) supports this view and found that New Zealanders who define themselves as Pākehā tend to be strongly individualistic and support the view that individuals should take personal responsibility for their own successes and failures. Pākehā individualism as may be seen as posing a challenge to the Māori priorities of interdependence and the preservation of good relationships based upon *whānaungatanga*. This individualistic tendency has been described by Hook (2007) who sees Pākehā individualism the opposite to the Māori value of *whānaungatanga*. She observes: "The Pākehā/Western concepts of individuality and values of autonomy, freedom, self-interest, entitlement, competition, and so on are inconsistent with the concepts of Māori individuality where individuality is more likely to be constituted on values of relationality, collectivity, reciprocity, and connectivity to prior generations" (p. 4).

In their discussions of Pākehā values both Ritchie (1992) and King (2003) also refer to a very strong tendency for Pākehā to value egalitarianism and the concomitant practice of avoiding 'special treatment' of particular groups or individuals in society. King refers to this as a "fiercely egalitarian instinct" among Pākehā New Zealand and a tendency to prefer to see resources spread equitably throughout the community (King, 2003, pp. 508-509). Pākehā deference to egalitarianism may explain some of the tensions that Pākehā feel in relation to Māori who are, as Treaty partners, perceived as having special treatment relative to other ethnic groups in New Zealand(see Houkamau 2006, 2010 for a discussion).

A final point of difference noted here is the tendency for contemporary Pākehā to be more secular than religious and concomitantly more likely to see spiritual dimension as unimportant and not relevant in the "real" world. This tendency towards secularity can be seen as contradictory to Māori spiritual orientations. Given the somewhat sharply contrasting views of reality between traditional Māori views and Pākehā perspectives one may expect misunderstandings and disagreements would arise when the two groups meet in the work place. The impact of these differences and the subtle ways in which they play out in the workplace are uncertain, although examination of the underlying differences may offer insights into effective ways of overcoming them. One way in which we can gain insight into the implications of these contrasting views is to explore the impact of cultural differences on time perceptions. We now further explore these perspectives in greater detail and suggest what implications they have for management and work organizations.

Exploring the
Cultural Origins
of Differences
in Time
Orientation
Page | 114

Sociocentricity and Event Time Preference

We first turn our attention to the argument that Māori sociocentricity would create a cultural preference for event time among Māori.

As stated previously, sociocentricity refers a cultural tendency to give primacy to group interests over individual interests and is generally associated with collectivist cultures (Benedict, 1946; Nakane, 1970). Sociocentricity remains remarkably consistent throughout Māori society although the social and economic circumstances that maintained these values have changed (Houkamau, 2006; Liu & Tamara, 1998). This sociocentricity is manifest in various aspects of Māori culture or *tikanga* Māori. According to Mead, "Tikanga are tools of thought and understanding. They are packages of ideas which help to organize behavior and provide some predictability in how certain activities are carried out. They provide templates and frameworks to guide our actions … They help us to differentiate between right and wrong in everything we do and in all of the activities that we engage in. There is a right and proper way to conduct one's self." (Mead, 2003, p. 12). The right and proper way to conduct the self, according to *tikanga*, is to defer to the collective needs. Thus, while contemporary Māori society is culturally diverse (Durie, 1994) even in the present day many aspects of Māori social etiquette are designed to promote group harmony while endorsing singleness of purpose (Love, 2004). For example, in a qualitative study which focused on identifying the key aspects of Māori identity, Houkamau (2006) found when 35 Māori women were asked to comment on the most important aspect of their lives and identity as Māori, 97% reported relationships with others were central to their lives and self views. Many reported that their relationships with their families guided their day-to-day activities and that being Māori was about being loyal to their *whānau* and ensuring that the needs of their *whānau* members were being met. Participants also acknowledged that interdependence was strongly promoted in Māori social contexts and that being Māori meant was about nurturing positive social relationships with others. Individualism, careerism, and seeking individual benefit at the expense of others were also seen as culturally 'bad form' among Māori – and as such women were acutely aware of the need to accommodate those around them from a very young age.

Consistent with this hypothesized sociocentric value system, statistics indicate Māori are much more likely to engage in volunteering work (unpaid community service) than Pākehā in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). In research carried out on community service and volunteering work in New Zealand in 2004 over 70 Māori volunteer workers (who undertook a range of unpaid work within their communities) were interviewed (Ratcliff, Raihania & Walker, 2007). Many Māori in this research reported that common reason for people's motives for undertaking *mahi aroha* (volunteer work) was *tikanga* Māori (Māori custom). In their view, there was no clear differentiation between one's own personal well being and the integrity, growth and well being of one's *whānau, hapū* and *iwi*. In other words participants believed that caring for others was a central part of being Māori and a 'normal' way to spend their time.

Why would sociocentricity promote a preference for event time? We suggest that operating according to individuals' time frames results in a devaluation of relationships to the task or event at hand. Thus, in conducting day-to-day activities, we believe Māori will be more concerned with ensuring that events accommodate the needs of all the people involved as opposed to an individual agenda or external driver, such as the time on the clock.

Marae (traditional Māori meeting places) activities provide a useful illustration of how these values manifest as behaviors. In contemporary New Zealand each Māori tribe has their own marae. Marae remain distinctively Māori cultural spaces and serve as a focal point for conducting tribal affairs and events such as meetings (*hui*), funerals (*tangi*), celebrations and political events. In practice, events such as *hui* held on *marae* are event time oriented. Several features of *hui* are important to note in this regard. For example, the notion of arriving, leaving

and finishing "on time" is subordinate to the concept of allowing enough time to complete the event in the "right" way. The right way according to *tikanga* Māori means allowing contributors to meetings enough time to express all they need to say and therefore being flexible around agenda points and allocated speaking time slots (Mead, 2003).

This means that not only are Māori patient when it comes to waiting for others to arrive, speak, and leave (particularly those who are elderly, but also that attendees tend to remain politely tolerant of the needs of all members to air their views in their own time. It is therefore considered bad form to rush speakers or impose strict time limits on those presenting.   Being pushy, direct, or overly concerned with one's own schedule is seen as impolite during *hui*. In contrast, acting in accommodating and flexible ways to ensure fair treatment is socially endorsed as *tika*, or the right way to do things (Barlow, 1991).

Thus, due to this sociocentric value orientation, overall, Māori views of time are not about being on time but more on ensuring a degree of flexibility around the time needs of all parties. These practices can be seen as underpinned by the cultural imperative towards protecting social relationships. This is not to suggest that Māori allow each other to waste time. Rather, notions of expediency and strict adherence to agenda time slots take a back seat to ensuring fair and equal accommodation of all those present.

Although research in this area is very limited, one study carried out by Berwick-Emms (1995) on Māori concepts of time in relation to pastoral care (social support and mentoring of employees) and how these influence the management of Māori owned and operated businesses provides useful insight into the implications of Māori time perceptions for management practice. Berwick-Emms's (1995) study arose from earlier research she had conducted in 1977 which involved both Māori and Pākehā in trade training schemes. In this research she discerned differences between Māori and non-Māori in terms of time perceptions in relation to employment. Non-Māori were more likely to see punctuality at work as a prime value, and being on time was seen as a crucial aspect of good practice at work. Punctuality included arriving at work at the correct time, completing breaks on schedule, and completing the days required work load on time (that is, according to the scheduled daily finishing time). According to non-Māori, if a worker needed to have time away from work (either a few hours from the day or an entire day) this was seen as an inconvenience for others, disruptive and likely to cause organizational problems. The hassle which was associated with having time off was therefore met with disapproval from superiors, and this acted as a deterrent for non-Māori workers who, by and large, conformed to the event time as required by their employers.

In the case of the 1995 study by Berwick-Emms, different perceptions of time were clearly discernable among Māori. Her study comprised in depth case studies of the managerial practices of three Māori foremen employed by two organizations. The first business was a building company which employed 32 men 22 of whom were Māori. The second smaller organization studied, a painting company, employed six staff, five of whom were Māori. The central aim of the research was to explore and describe how cultural beliefs and practices around pastoral care may influences social relationships and views around time and time keeping practices at work.

In Berwick-Emms' view, Māori have a cultural preference for event time due to the traditional economic practices of Māori tribal communities which were based on survival from the natural environment - hunting, gardening and fishing. Berwick Elms provides this example: in traditional Māori society, "The eels were caught when the winds were blowing in the right direction and the temperature was right for the eels to migrate. The fish were caught when the signs of nature were right…. The crops were planted, cared for and harvested according to the lores of nature" (1995, p. 2). As such, time was seen as dependent on the natural flow of events; things happened as they were 'meant to' happen. In another example of this treatment of time Neich (2001) notes that traditionally Māori wood carvers would take as much time as needed to

complete a task. This meant that while there was set order and structure in work and activities the various stages of creation of a work would not be scheduled into quantifiable units. He notes that according to the traditional Māori view "time was not an abstract measure, but a relative quality belonging to the activity in progress. Thus, a carver simply devoted as much time as a piece of work required for its successful completion." He further observes that once Māori began to produce carvings to sell however, and the production of carvings was needed in order to earn a living by settling the pieces, less time was devoted to tasks and the focus was on creating these according to a European time schedule.

Whiteford and Barns (2002) who note that colonization effectively imposed a European view of time upon Māori and these manifest in differences between contemporary Māori and Pākehā management practices. For example, in relation to the treatment of Māori staff in the two businesses reported, she found that foremen were flexible with start and finish times. As a corollary, if Māori staff were late, their managers assumed that, because they would only be late for work if they had a good reason they would assume that their lateness was justified. Māori staff was also often given time off if they had urgent personal matters to attend to, and this was given with the belief that employees would reciprocate by working longer hours at a later time. The assumption was that Māori employees would honor their employment relationship by not taking advantage of their employer. Breaks, tea breaks, and time off were given flexibly by Māori managers, and relationships between managers and employees at work were seen as more important that purely making money for their businesses. All three foremen in this study validated this view, which is epitomized in this quote: "In the Māori businesses observed time was controlled, not so much by economic loss or gain, as in the non-Māori system, but rather through emotional bonds created through the foreman's interest in the pastoral care of their workers. Thus, there appeared to be an attitudinal difference which manifested itself in different organizational emphases, which in turn created a positive work environment" (Berwick-Emms, 1995, p.13).

Contextualization Through the Past

A second aspect of Māori culture relevant to our present discussion of time perspectives is seeing current situations, events and people as comprehensible only in relation to the events and relationships that precede them.

Whiteford and Barns (2002) note that Māori perceptions of time from a Māori ecology (prior to first contact with Pākehā) reflected a Māori view of the cosmos. From this view all of nature is seen as interconnected and interrelated with all natural beings tracing their origins back to a single pair, the Sky Father and the Earth Mother. From this primal pair, all life emerged and all was seen as interconnected and related within a kinship network. Traditional beliefs chronologically identified three time periods in the Māori cosmos from which the present time emerged. Furthermore, they note that this division of time into different types represents the Māori perception of time as having different qualities. As such, the present time cannot be understood without recognition of what has happened previously. This view underpins the treatment of time from a Māori perspective, not as chronological rather the measurement of time is related to meaning of events and how they relate to each other (Whiteford and Barns, 2002). Toon Van Meijl (1993) discusses this concept noting also Māori position themselves in time and space by identifying themselves with an ancestor, locating that ancestor in time (by their deeds and events) and then linking themselves to that ancestor. As such, time is not measured chronologically but conceptualized by linking historically related events.

This perspective is encapsulated in the often cited Māori proverb: *I nga wa o Mua*, which translates into English as "to turn to the times of the past." In practice, this refers to the attendance of the past before the present (Barlow, 1991). In relation to this proverb, it is

probably more accurate to say that Māori take a non-linear approach to time conceptualization, whereas Māori tend to see past, resent, and future events as being inherently linked and therefore, difficult to conceptualize as being separate points in time (Mead, 2003). In this way, perhaps it is more appropriate to characterize the Māori view of time as circular to reflect the notion of the past, present, and future being inextricably intertwined.

The very nature of Māori language provides further evidence for the intertwined past, present, and future conceptualizations of time. The Māori word for the past is *mua,* also meaning "in front" (Williams, 1971). Thus, in the Māori mindset, the past is in front. Such a perspective is diametrically opposed to the Anglo-American perspective that views time as linear (McKay & Walmsley, 2003).

For Anglo-American cultures, time is located on a linear continuum that has a beginning somewhere in the past, traverses through the present, and continues into the future. Māori contextualization through the past in inextricably linked to Māori collectivist value system. In support of this argument, Binney (1987) has explained how, within Māori oral tradition, there is dialectic between past and present where the past is reordered and the present reinterpreted. The cycle of traditions about the people, land, and events is dynamic and fluid, not static and fixed (Binney, 1987). Hence, the past is not necessarily the precursor to the present, but an inextricable part of it. This statement implies the centrality of relationships and links in time. As such Māori are aware of history, living deeply in time, so that relationship promote remembering – rather than focusing on the immediate situation and what is occurring in the moment. The implication is that, in contrast, Pākehā live more out of time – that is, they experience their lives as 'their own' or removed from history. This promotes easily forgetting the distance past and living in a purely physical and present world (McKay & Walmsley, 2003). This different perspective of time can become a source of conflict between Māori and Pākehā. While there has been little exploration in the intercultural conflict caused by divergent time perspectives in this regard, Nairn and McCreanor's (1991) study (which examined 220 written contributions from individual Pākehā to the Human Rights Commission in 1979 regarding their view of Māori protest) supports the view that many Pākehā believe that Māori need to move on from the past and that Māori are too backward thinking (Nairn & McCreanor, 1990, 1991, 1997). An example of how this way of thinking about time has been at odds with European perspectives was recently articulated by MacDuff (2006) who noted an intrinsic divergence in attitude between Māori and Pākehā parties to the Treaty of Waitangi negotiation processes. As noted above, in recent decades Māori have successfully negotiated to have the Treaty of Waitangi. Treaty negotiations remain a sensitive topic for many New Zealanders (Orange, 1992, 2004) and provide useful insights into the social implications of conflicting time perceptions between Māori and Pākehā. For example, MacDuff (2006) observed that one source of Māori and Pākehā dissent inherent in the Treaty claims resolution process is that Māori views of history are not just based upon the past but also in the future. In other words, Māori negotiators tend to view their role in Treaty negotiations not in terms of dealing with the past but protecting the rights of future generations.

From this research, it could be suggested that conflict between Māori and non-Māori can emerge when Pākehā push for resolution (associated a desire to focus on the here and now and look to the future) while Māori insist on adhering to protocol that ensures that processes are correct and that tribal, ancestral memories are acknowledged alongside the needs of generations of Māori to follow. As the Māori focus is not on expediency but process, Māori may require more time to gather input from *kaumatua* (elderly), attend to the needs of current generations, and also ensure that the rationale for present day decisions is consistent with the needs of future generations. If time restrictions are placed on this process, Māori may be left feeling that their needs and rights to a fair hearing are not being honored, while Pākehā may feel that Māori are

dragging out negotiations and ruminating on events in the past which cannot be changed. While it is possible to argue that these perceptions relate more to a reluctance to see Māori compensated at Pākehā expense it is also possible to see these concepts as deriving from differing perspectives of time and the value placed on the uses of time and the priorities given to past, present, or future orientations. More insight into how each party perceives time may therefore support greater tolerance and good will from both sides.

Evolution and New Zealand Perspectives of Time
While it is possible to discern resilient cultural differences between Māori and non Māori it is important to note that these are somewhat overstated at times. As a reflection of socio-historical processes and social integration (as well as a high degree of intermarriage) generations of Māori have been socialized into mainstream New Zealand culture and raised speaking English as their first language. Some Māori, mainly young and urban, are (at least superficially) physically and culturally indistinguishable from Pākehā and other non Māori and have little knowledge of Māori culture (Callister, 2004; Meredith, 2000). In addition, as being able to operate within mainstream culture is important for upward social and economic mobility many young urban born and raised Māori have had to become more acculturated and acutely aware of the clock orientation of Pākehā and are able to manage themselves accordingly in Pākehā contexts. Some evidence for the development of cross-cultural competence in this regard was found by Houkamau (2006) who demonstrated that younger Māori women (18 -35 years of age) were largely acculturated to Pākehā culture in the work place in terms of professional attitudes and appropriate social conduct. Younger women did not report relinquishing their Māori cultural beliefs and values altogether, rather, they were acutely aware of the 'differences' between Pākehā and Māori terms of appropriate work conduct and were able to change their behavior to meet performance expectations at work. Thus, it is important to recognize that cultural perspectives on time are different among Māori with younger generations of Māori having the capacity to meet the expectations of both Māori and non-Māori social networks by drawing from a pool of competencies gleaned from their exposure to multiple cultural contexts.

It could also be suggested that a high level of social integration could mean that Pākehā are just as concerned with social connections as Māori and that both Māori and Pākehā have a New Zealand cultural orientation of informality and laid backness that leans towards a preference for event time orientation. Research on young New Zealanders, which focuses on converging views of time use would inform how managers can best address tensions and prioritize work activities. If points of convergence can be identified between Māori and Pākehā this can provide clues as to how smoother cross-cultural interactions can be nurtured. More information on this would help us understand how New Zealand culture is continually evolving and how we are working towards shared cultural norms.

As a point of contrast to help us further understand the strong orientation of the Anglo-American cluster towards clock time, we offer another indicator of level of industrialization that functions on a strict schedule: the presence of stock markets. The opening and closing of stock markets are determined strictly by the time on the clock. Traders cannot get in trades before the opening or after the closing bells. Thus, presence of stock markets, partially related to level of industrialization but not synonymous with, is another indicator of a stronger clock time orientation.

We have expounded upon the emic characteristics of Māori culture, beyond membership in the South Pacific temporal cluster, that suggest a strong event time orientation. In summary, Māori views of time, based upon sociocentric values, deference to elders, and contextualization through the past support an event time orientation, more flexible notions of punctuality, and a past time orientation. These emic characteristics elucidate the opposition imposed by the

contrast to Pākehā preferences for clock time orientation, more rigid notions of punctuality, and a present/future orientation.   Given these points of contrast, we now suggest research propositions to explore these differences empirically.

Research Propositions

Based on the previous discussion of general differences in time orientation, the historical context of both Anglo-Americans and Māori, and the cultural background of Māori, we offer several research propositions that can guide future inquiry into this area.   Although these propositions might seem intuitive or obvious given the aforementioned discussion, these proposed temporal orientations and cultural groups have not been tested empirically.   Only through such testing can such specific temporal orientations and cross-cultural differences be more definitively concluded.   The following research propositions flow out of our discussion and can guide future research on both cross-cultural time orientations and domestic New Zealand relations between Pākehā and Māori.

Proposition 1: Because of cultural tendencies towards sociocentricity, Māori will be more event time oriented than clock time oriented.

Māori and other South Pacific island groups are exhibit strong collectivist tendencies. Specific to Māori, we have discussed sociocentricity as a cultural determinant and how it contributes to their collectivist nature.   Because of the emphasis on maintaining in-group harmony and premium placed on relationships, events run their natural course as opposed to the clock or a schedule.

Proposition 2: As a result of emphasis on proper protocol and etiquette (including deference to elders), Māori will showcase more elastic notions regarding acceptable punctuality.

Proposition 3: Because of a cultural norm to contextualize through history and past events, Māori will demonstrate a strong past time orientation.

Managerial Implications

The unique intracultural time dynamic opens up several issues for managers in the domains of intercultural communication (Brislin and Kim, 2003; Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988) and global leadership (House *et al*, 2004; Triandis, 2006). To an extent, we all must conform to the dominant way of understanding time as linear and progressive in modern society. However, there is evidence that alternate understandings of time not only exist but also are gaining acceptance in managerial practice. As a parallel, there is a growing appreciation for indigenous (e.g. Māori) ways of understanding society. As people are increasingly more aware of varying perspectives, the overarching question becomes: how do we reconcile differences in ways that are practical, fair, and necessary? There are obvious issues in intercultural communication related to varying notions of punctuality and time keeping between Pākehā and Māori. For Pākehā who run on clock time, being somewhere between five and fifteen minutes late is generally acceptable. However, one can also understand that fifteen minutes might be pushing the upper limits of punctuality even in some clock time cultures. Being tardy beyond that fifteen-minute window usually requires an excuse and apology around some extenuating circumstances that legitimately prevented an individual from arriving at the appointed time. On the other hand, in cultures that run on event time, time is far more elastic. Punctuality is defined by situational context, so notions of punctuality allow for more flexibility. Bearing in mind that for event time cultures, events are often defined by the presence of people, there is a far less rigid notion of what constitutes being punctual. Thus, for individuals accustomed to operating with event time norms, arriving when it is convenient or when they want to for a certain event may be quite acceptable. Differences could mean that Pākehā view Māori as being too easy

going or even disrespectful if they fail to meet Pākehā standards of punctuality while Māori may view Pākehā[2] as being fastidious and finicky around being 'right on' time. Problems could potentially arise when members from each culture come to work in the same context bringing with them their own norms of clock or event time. Such differences would result from a clash between culturally appropriate norms to either rigid adherence to punctuality or very elastic norms around punctuality and the related culturally appropriate, non-verbal communication messages being sent. The savvy manager would not only be aware of how both time orientations conflict cross-culturally, he/she would also be able to guide and educate workers accordingly on the opposite perspective. Furthermore, such managerial dexterity would contribute to a heightened global leadership perspective that could then have positive implications for management and organizations beyond understanding cross-cultural time orientations. Thus, understanding cross-cultural perspectives in temporal orientations clearly has positive implications for both intercultural communication and global leadership.

Inclusivity is increasingly seen as important in New Zealand society and particularly in relation to effective diversity management (Singham, 2006). Bhawuk and Brislin (1992) note that in order for modern societies and industries to operate inclusively, they need to adapt to accommodate ethnic and cultural differences. Simple insights that promote increased awareness to individualist or clock time preferences operating with Māori may include things like; work on cultivating long-term relationships without expecting instant closeness while for Māori may need to be conscious of imperatives towards time and honoring the European perspectives of punctuality and 'good time keeping'. While education on intercultural perspectives of time has not been a focus of cross cultural or bicultural education programs in New Zealand to date, research conducted by Houkamau (2006) highlighted that education on Māori and Pākehā differences in perspectives on historical breaches of Treaty rights supports harmonious social relationships in the work place and therefore endorses the inclusion of intercultural differences in conception about time, place and culture.

Conclusion

Our hopes for this article are two-fold. First, we hope to underscore the importance of time orientation as an enduring characteristic of culture. As we have demonstrated, attitudes and values surrounding time orientation and the ways in which it provides normative behaviors are deeply rooted in culture. For the Māori, these temporal perspectives are inextricably woven into their socio-cultural fabric. In light of rapid development in New Zealand over the past one hundred years, these temporal orientations remain extremely strong. Pākehā time perspectives seem to be inextricably at odds with those of Māori, but both perspectives are important. We do not attempt to place valence on temporal orientations. Rather, we wish to call attention to the existence of these differences so both managers and other researchers are might acquire heightened awareness of how they impact behaviors in the workplace.

Secondly, we hope to elucidate the cultural roots of Māori time orientation so that there can be more harmonious relationships within a domestic New Zealand context. Rather than merely point out differences between Māori and Pākehā time orientations, we have sought in this article to explain the cultural roots of Māori time orientations. This approach not only calls attention to what the differences might be but also why they exist. We hope that doing so makes contributions to our overall knowledge of cross-cultural differences and stimulates interest in this area. We invite researchers to pick up where this article leaves off and continue this investigation. We also hope that our efforts bear fruit in terms of being enlightening for managers who need to who work with Māori and Pākehā and their differing temporal persuasions.

References

Ancona, D.G., Okhuysen, G.A., & Perlow, L.A. (2001). Taking time to integrate temporal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (4), 512-529.

Awatere, D. (1984). *Māori sovereignty*. Auckland, N.Z.: Broadsheet.

Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga whakaaro. Key concepts in Māori culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Benedict, R. (1946). *Chrysanthemum and the sword.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside.

Berwick-Emms, P. (1995). *Concepts of time and pastoral care within Māori businesses.* Discussion paper (Massey University. Dept. of Management Systems) No. 8. Published: Massey University, New Zealand.

Bell, A. (2009). Dilemmas of settler belonging: roots, routes and redemption in New Zealand national identity claims. *The Sociological Review*, 57: 1, 145 - 162.

Best, E. (1924). *Memoirs of the Polynesian society: The Māori.* The Board of Māori Ethnological Research: Wellington.

Binney, J. (1987). Māori oral narratives Pākehā written texts: two forms of telling history. *New Zealand Journal of History,* 21(2): 16–28.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: hakawhanaungatanga.* Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Kaupapa Māori: Māori Educational Initiatives*. In R. Bishop T. Glynn (Eds.), Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education (1st ed., pp. 61-99). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Brislin, R.W. & Kim, E.S. (2003). Cultural diversity in people's understanding and uses of time. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(3), 363-382.

Byrnes, G. (2006). Relic of 1840 or founding document? The treaty, the tribunal and concepts of time. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 1. 1–12.

Callister, P. (2004). Ethnicity measures, intermarriage and social policy. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand,* 23, 109-140.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination.* Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2004). *Nga Kahui Pou: Launching Māori Futures*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Fyfe, J. (1990). *The Matriarchs: A Generation of New Zealand Women Talk to Judith Fyfe*, Auckland: Penguin.

Goodman, P.S., Lawrence, B.S. Ancona, D.G. & Tushman, M.L. (2001). Introduction. *Academy of Management Review,* 26 (4), 507-511

Hall, E. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Harawira, W. (1997). *Te kawa o te marae : a guide for all marae visitors*. Auckland: Reed Publishers.

Hook, G.R. (2007). A Future for Māori Education Part II: The Reintegration of Culture and Education. *MAI Review,* 1, 1 – 17. Retrieved July 06, 2011, from http://www.review.mai.ac.nz

Houkamau, C. (2006). *Identity and socio-historical context: Transformations and change among Māori women.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland.

Houkamau, C. (2010). Identity construction and reconstruction: The role of socio-historical contexts in shaping Māori identity. *Social Identities*, 16 (2), 179-196.

Houkamau, C. and Sibley, C. (2010). The Multi-dimensional model of Māori identity and cultural engagement. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 39 (1) 8 -38.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M.H., Dorfman, P.W., and Gupta, V. (Eds.) (2004), Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 socieities. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnston, P. & Pihama, L. (1994). The Marginalisation of Māori Women. *Hecate Special. Aotearoa/New Zealand Issue*, 20, 83-97.

King, M. (1985). *Being Pākehā now: An encounter with New Zealand and Mâori renaissance*. Auckland: Hodder and Stroughton.

King, M. (1991). *Pākehā now: The quest for identity in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.

King, M. (2004). *Being Pākehā now: reflections and recollections of a white native*. Auckland, Penguin Books.

Kluckhohn, F. & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Peterson.

Levine, R. (1997). *A geography of time*. New York: Basic Books.

Levine, R. & Norenzayan, (1999). The pace of life in 31 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 30 (2), 178-205.

Liu, J.H, & Tamara, P. (1998). Leadership, colonisation, and tradition. Identity and economic change in Ruatoki and Ruatahuna. *Journal of Native Education,* 22(1), 138-145.

Love, C. (2002). Keynote Address, In Nikora, L.W., Levy, M., Masters, B., Waitoki, W., Te Awekotuku, N., and Etheredge, R.J.M. (Eds). pp. 13 - 18.*The Proceedings of the National Māori Graduates of Psychology Symposium 2002: Making a difference.* University of Waikato, Hamilton, November. Retrieved 06 July 2011 from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/843

Love, C. (2004). Understanding social well being. Māori contributions. *Social Policy Research and Evaluation conference,* Wellington, November.

Macduff, I. (2006). Your pace or mine? Culture, time, and negotiation. *Negotiation Journal,* 22(1), 31–45.

Markus, H. and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98(2),* 224-253.

Marsden, M. (1975). God, man and universe: a Māori view. In M. King (Ed.), *Te Aohurihuri: The world moves on.* (pp 191 – 192). Wellington: Hicks Smith.

Marsden, M. (2003). *The woven universe: Selected readings of Rev. Māori Marsden*, Otaki, NZ: The Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.

McCreanor T. (2005), Sticks and Stones may break my bones. ..: Talking Pākehā Identities', in James H. Liu, Tim McCreanor, Tracey McIntosh and Teresia Teaiwa, eds, *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*, Victoria University Press, Wellington.

McKay, B., & Walmsley, A. (2003). References Māori Time: Notions of Space, Time and Building Form in the South Pacific, *The IDEA (Interior Design / Architecture Educators Association) Journal Online.* Retrieved July 06 2011 from www.idea-edu.com/content/download/.../2003%20IDEA%20Journal.pdf

Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington: Huia Publishing.

Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world.* Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Meredith, P. (2000). *A half caste on the half caste in the cultural politics of New Zealand*. The University of Waikato External Publications.

Moeke-Pickering, T. (1996) *Māori Identity Within Whanau: A review of literature*. University of Waikato Māori& Psychology Unit. 1996. Unpublished Paper. Hamilton: New Zealand. Retrieved July 06 2011 from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/10289/464/1/content.pdf

Pearson, D. (1990). *A Dream Deferred: the Origins of Ethnic Conflict in New Zealand*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Pere, R. (1982). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Māori tradition*. Working Paper #17, Department of Sociology, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Pere, R. (1997). *Te Whēke: A Celebration of infinite wisdom, Reprint*. Wellington: National Library of New Zealand.

Nairn, R. & McCreanor, T. (1990). Sensitivity and insensitivity: An imbalance in Pākehā accounts of Māori/ Pākehā relations, *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 9(3), 293-308.

Nairn, R. & McCreanor, T. (1991). Race talk and common sense: Patterns in Pākehā discourse on Māori/ Pākehā relations in New Zealand. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 10(4), 245-262.

Nairn, R. & McCreanor, T. (1997). Pākehā representations of race relations: Implications for mental health. *New Zealand Journalism Review,* 5, 26-28.

Nakane, C. (1970). *Japanese society*. Berkeley: University of California.

Neich, R. (2001). *Carved histories: Rotorua Ngāti Tarawhai woodcarving*. Auckland University Press

New Zealand Ministry of Social Development. (2006). *The Social Report*. Ministry of Social Development, Wellington: New Zealand.

New Zealand Ministry of Social Development. (2008). *The Social Report*. Ministry of Social Development, Wellington: New Zealand.

Orange, C. (1992). *The story of a treaty.* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Orange, C. (2004). *An illustrated history of Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Pake, T., Maloney, K, & Cleave, P. (1993). *Māori concepts of space, time and number: Tatou kohatu ahu nuku, ahu rangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Koha Press, Te Hau Ora Tinana.

Rangihau, J. (1992). Being Māori. In M. King (ed.) *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Māoritanga*. (pp. 183-190.) Auckland: Reed Publishing

Ratcliff, B., Raihania, J.A, & Walker, A. (2007). *Mahi aroha: Māori perspectives on volunteering and cultural obligations.* Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector: Wellington.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publishers and Daphne Brasell Associates Press.

Royal, C. (2003). Some thoughts on contemporary identity in New Zealand. Paper Presented to PSSM Conference, New Zealand Stage Services Commission. October, Wellington.

Salmond, A (1975). *Hui: A study of Māori ceremonial gatherings.* Wellington: A. W. & A. H. Reed.

Salmond, A. (1978). Te ao tawhito: A semantic approach to the traditional Māori cosmos. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. 87, 1, 5-28.

Sampson, E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. *American Psychologist,* 43, 15-22.

Schriber, J.B. & Gutek, B.A. (1987). Some time dimensions of work: Measurement of an underlying aspect of organization culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 72(4): 642-650.

Selby, R. (1999). *Still being punished*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Sibley, C. G., Harre, N., Houkamau, C., Hoverd, W.J. (in press). The Gap in the Subjective Wellbeing of Māori and New Zealand Europeans Widened from 2005 and 2009. *Social Indicators Research*.

Singham, M. (2006). Multiculturalism in New Zealand – the need for a new paradigm. *Aotearoa Ethnic Network Journal*, 1: 33 - 37.

Smith, N. (1948). *The Māori people and us*. Wellington: Reed.

Statistics New Zealand (2001). Around the Clock: Findings from the New Zealand Time Use Survey 1998–99. Statistics New Zealand: Wellington.

Statistics New Zealand. (2007a). Quick Stats about Māori: 2006 Census. Statistics New Zealand: Wellington.

Statistics New Zealand. (2007b). Quick Stats about New Zealand's Population and Dwellings. Statistics New Zealand: Wellington.

Taylor, S. & Wetherell, M. (1995). Doing Construction Work: Discourses and National Identity. *Sites*, 30: 69 - 84.

Te Puni Kokiri. (1996). *Progress towards closing the social and economic gaps between Māori and non Māori - A report to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.

Te Puni Kokiri. (2000). *Progress towards closing the social and economic gaps between Māori and non Māori - A report to the Minister of Māori Affairs.* Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.

Toon van Meijl (1993). Māori Meeting-Houses in and Over Time Chapter Eight in. James J. Fox. *Inside Austronesian houses: Perspectives on domestic designs for living*. The Department of Anthropology in association with the Comparative Austronesian Project, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University: Canberra. Retrieved July 06, 2011, http://epress.anu.edu.au/austronesians/inside/pdf/inside-whole.pdf

Triandis, H.C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organizations. *Group and Organization Management, 31(1)* 20-26.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end.* Auckland: Penguin.

Webster, A. (2001). *Spiral values: the flow from survival values to global consciousness in New Zealand*. Hawera, New Zealand: Alpha Publications.

Whiteford, G. & Barns, M. (2002). Te Ao Hurihuri New Zealand's First Time (pp. 211-23). Chapter Ten in Wendy E. Pentland, Andrew S. Harvey, M. Powell Lawton and Mary Ann McColl (Eds.). *Time Use Research in the Social Sciences*, New York: Plenum Publishers.

Williams, J. (2000). *The nature of the Māori community*. Paper Presented to PSSM Conference, New Zealand Stage Services Commission. October, Wellington.

Williams, H.W. (1971). *Dictionary of the Māori language*. Wellington: G.P. Print.