


Whitepaper

New Zealand vs World: Hogan 360 Comparison

Authored by: Elliot Phillips



Executive summary

Understanding similarities and differences in the multi-rater performance of leaders can help to support the development of leadership talent within organisations. One interesting area of exploration is the differences that exist between leaders in various countries. This white paper summarises research conducted into the differences in multi-rater performance and highlights strengths and opportunities for leaders in New Zealand.

- The multi-rater assessment data highlighted many consistencies between leaders in New Zealand and other countries, drawing attention to areas of similar effectiveness. There were also instances where leaders in several countries had significantly different ratings to leaders in New Zealand. Leaders in New Zealand performed significantly better than some countries on a range of capabilities assessed within the Hogan 360. However, there were also instances where leaders in New Zealand were found to demonstrate capabilities less well than leaders in other countries.
- When looking at the top ranked strengths of leaders in New Zealand and those in other countries, there were many commonalities including possessing a strong work ethic and having solid abilities, experience, and knowledge applicable to their roles. There were also areas where leaders in New Zealand had strengths that were ranked much higher for leaders in New Zealand relative to leaders in other countries such as being customer-focused and good with clients.
- Among the top ranked opportunities to improve, there were also many shared results speaking to common leadership development needs regardless of which country leaders are in. These included stopping taking on too much and spreading oneself too thin, challenging poor performance, and delegating more. There were also opportunities that were ranked more highly for leaders in New Zealand that were not present unanimously across other countries. These included setting clear goals and performance indicators and being more available and visible in the workplace.

Background

Due to the impact of globalisation, there are now numerous organisations that have leaders based across multiple countries. There are also leaders who need to manage diverse workforces across multiple countries. In order to compete successfully on an international front, it can be useful to understand the differences between leaders in various countries, helping to identify relative strengths that can be leveraged to provide an advantage as well as any areas that may be relative opportunities to improve.

Previous research examining country differences in leadership has found that there tend to be aspects of leadership that are universal as well as aspects that can differ from country to country. For example, the Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) project examined leadership across 62 nations and found some leadership behaviours were universally effective while others were more culturally sensitive (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Looking specifically at New Zealand, the results of the GLOBE project indicated that in comparison to other countries, New Zealand stands out as placing importance on performance standards. They also support practices that encourage collective action and the distribution of resources (Kennedy, 2007).

Among New Zealand leaders, Team Leadership and Inspirational Leadership styles have been found to be associated with successful leadership (Trevor-Roberts, Ashkanasy & Kennedy, 2003). Team Leadership involves universally recognised elements of leadership associated with success (such as being visionary, decisive, and having integrity), however, New Zealand leaders have been found to display these behaviours specifically in a team context or environment. Meanwhile, Inspirational Leadership (i.e. displaying enthusiasm and confidence while being performance oriented) was found to be a unique and distinctive feature of New Zealand's effective leaders.

When considering what could hinder leadership effectiveness in New Zealand, Trevor-Roberts et al. (2003) explored whether the leadership behaviours that universally impeded leadership effectiveness had the same relationships in New Zealand. They highlighted two styles of ineffective leadership; narcissistic leadership, and bureaucratic leadership. Narcissistic leadership reflects a style of leadership that is autocratic, individualistic, and non-participative. These elements contradict the behaviours associated with the effective leadership styles outlined above, reinforcing New Zealand's affinity for modesty and integrity. Similarly, bureaucratic leadership emphasises managing a process as opposed to managing a team, opposing the Team Leader behaviours associated with leadership effectiveness (Trevor-Roberts et al., 2003).

One method of exploring leadership effectiveness is to measure leaders' performance. Namely, it is insightful to measure their perceived performance from the perspective of those they work with. By obtaining information on how a leader's performance is perceived by other key stakeholders such as peers, direct reports, and managers, you gain insight into how a leader is performing and their professional reputation. To obtain this information effectively, 360-based multi-rater assessments are often used. These assessments allow you to then objectively compare leaders from around the world based on a common empirical metric, highlighting their commonalities as well as their relative strengths and opportunities.

Methodology

Participants

Data was analysed for a sample of 22,365 subjects who completed the Hogan 360 between 1st January 2012 and 31st December 2021. The sample consisted of 200 subjects in New Zealand and 22,166 subjects in the following countries that were used for comparison; Australia, Canada, China, India, Japan, Mexico, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States. A breakdown of the sample by country can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Sample size per country

Country	Number of subjects
Australia	11354
Canada	478
China	368
India	372
Japan	834
Mexico	703
New Zealand (Aotearoa)	200
Singapore	508
United Kingdom	968
United States	6581

The countries included in this study were selected on the basis that they met the appropriate sample size for analysis, and also represented culturally distinct business environments.

The sample consisted of subjects from a diverse range of sectors and industries including (but not limited to) banking and finance, building and construction, healthcare and medical, hospitality, IT and telecommunications, professional services, and sales and marketing.

Measures

The Hogan 360 (Peter Berry Consultancy, 2018) is a multi-rater survey that gathers leadership feedback from a variety of key stakeholder groups (i.e., managers, peers, direct reports, and others such as customers or stakeholders). As shown in Figure 1 below, the tool covers four key domains and 14 underlying competencies.

In its current form, the Hogan 360 includes:

- 50 scaled items rated on a 7-point scale where 1 is 'Does not describe this person at all' and 7 is 'Describes this person exactly'. The 50 items are all mapped to the four quadrants of the Hogan 360 Leadership Model and their corresponding sub-themes.
- Ranked items designed to identify the top four key strengths and top four key opportunities to improve. Raters choose the top four strengths/opportunities from 26 items where the top selected item has a weight of 4, the second has a weight of 3, the third has a weight of 2, and the fourth has a weight of 1.
- Three open-ended questions focusing on strengths, opportunities, and overused strengths.

This study focuses on data from the scaled items, as well as the ranked items designed to identify top strengths and top opportunities to improve.



Figure 1. The Hogan 360 Leadership Model

Statistical analysis

To assess whether there were differences between New Zealand and the rest of the world, a series of ANOVAS were performed with a p value set to .05, and Bonferroni correction was applied to ensure that only statistically valid and meaningful differences were identified.

Results

Table 2: Mean Hogan 360 Scores by Country

	NZ	AUS	CAN	CHI	IND	JAP	MEX	SING	UK	USA
Overall Score	5.62	5.62	5.60	6.09**	5.72	5.41**	5.58	5.44**	5.68	5.63
Self-Management	5.71	5.73	5.71	6.19**	5.83	5.55**	5.69	5.54**	5.78	5.77
Integrity	5.79	5.83	5.79	6.23**	5.88	5.61**	5.82	5.63**	5.88	5.86
Resilience	5.62	5.62	5.61	6.14**	5.76	5.48	5.51	5.44*	5.66	5.66
Relationship Management	5.55	5.56	5.52	6.05**	5.68	5.32**	5.47	5.39**	5.61	5.57
Communication	5.54	5.55	5.51	6.04**	5.66	5.37**	5.49	5.42	5.59	5.57
People Skills	5.51	5.53	5.50	6.01**	5.65	5.23**	5.42	5.32*	5.58	5.56
Team Player	5.52	5.55	5.47	6.04**	5.66	5.32**	5.41	5.38	5.59	5.54
Customer	5.66	5.63	5.60	6.13**	5.80	5.37**	5.61	5.44**	5.70	5.63
Working in the Business	5.80	5.77	5.80	6.16**	5.84	5.58**	5.75	5.59**	5.87	5.80
Capability	6.05	6.02	6.01	6.25**	6.03	5.86**	5.92*	5.78**	6.09	6.05
Efficiency	5.53	5.54	5.54	6.11**	5.68	5.33**	5.55	5.43	5.63	5.51
Results	5.80	5.81	5.80	6.12**	5.82	5.60**	5.81	5.58**	5.89	5.85
Engaging	5.78	5.68	5.80	6.18**	5.83	5.53**	5.72	5.57**	5.83	5.74
Working on the Business	5.39	5.40	5.40	5.97**	5.54*	5.20**	5.44	5.25	5.48	5.39
Accountability	5.41	5.40	5.48	6.06**	5.57*	5.45	5.49	5.34	5.53	5.40
Motivation	5.33	5.32	5.26	5.94**	5.53*	5.01**	5.29	5.18	5.33	5.35
Strategy	5.31	5.35	5.37	5.95**	5.49*	5.15*	5.46	5.18	5.45*	5.33
Innovation	5.48	5.50	5.50	5.96**	5.58	5.18**	5.53	5.31*	5.59	5.47

Note: NZ = New Zealand, AUS = Australia, CAN = Canada, CHI = China, IND = India, JAP = Japan, MEX = Mexico, SING = Singapore, UK = United Kingdom, USA = United States of America
 Note: *p<.05, **p<.01

Looking initially at the overall score on the Hogan 360, there were significant differences between leaders in New Zealand and leaders in China, Japan, and Singapore. Leaders in China received significantly higher overall scores than leaders in New Zealand, who in turn scored significantly higher than leaders in Japan and Singapore.

Focussing on the four leadership quadrants, we see similar relationships across Self-Management, Relationship Management, and Working in the Business, with leaders in China scoring significantly higher, and leaders in Japan and Singapore scoring significantly lower than leaders in New Zealand. For the Working on the Business quadrant, leaders in China still scored significantly higher than leaders in New Zealand, and leaders in Japan significantly lower. However, there was no significant difference between leaders in New Zealand and Singapore for the Working on the Business quadrant. There was an additional significant finding in the

Working on the Business quadrant, with leaders in India scoring significantly higher than leaders in New Zealand.

When looking more closely at the competencies underlying each of the four leadership quadrants, we can identify the components of the Hogan 360 that are contributing to the significant differences found at the overall score and quadrant levels. Leaders in China consistently scored significantly higher than leaders in New Zealand across all of the competencies in the Hogan 360 model. Meanwhile, scores for leaders in New Zealand were significantly higher than scores for leaders in Japan across all but two of the competencies, Resilience and Accountability, where no significant difference was detected. There are also several instances among the competencies where New Zealand scored significantly higher than leaders in Singapore including for the competencies Integrity, Resilience, People Skills, Customer, Capability, Results, Engaging, and Innovation.

Lastly, there are single instances of significant differences between leaders in New Zealand and Mexico (with leaders in New Zealand scoring significantly higher on the Capability), and leaders in New Zealand and the UK (with leaders in New Zealand scoring significantly lower on Strategy).

Turning to the top strengths and top opportunities to improve, common strengths and opportunities were found among all 10 countries, as well as areas where leaders in New Zealand stand out from leaders in other countries.

Table 3: Top strengths ranked results for New Zealand and corresponding rank position for comparison countries

Strengths	NZ	AUS	CAN	CHI	IND	JAP	MEX	SING	UK	USA
Works hard with a strong work ethic	1	2	2	1	5	5	4	3	2	2
Has solid technical ability, experience, and knowledge	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Is steady and calm under pressure	3	3	4	3	2	3	9	4	5	4
Has a positive and enthusiastic attitude	4	6	6	7	6	4	8	5	4	5
Is customer focused, and good with clients	5	9	11	11	9	12	5	10	9	9
Has a professional approach	6	5	5	4	4	2	6	6	3	6
Is action-oriented and gets things done	7	4	3	2	3	6	2	2	6	3
Has high ethical standards and integrity	8	7	10	18	11	7	7	11	11	8
Is competitive and determined	9	13	9	19	17	18	3	8	10	10
Has strong leadership skills	10	10	7	8	8	11	13	13	8	11

Note: NZ = New Zealand, AUS = Australia, CAN = Canada, CHIN = China, IND = India, JAP = Japan, MEX = Mexico, SING = Singapore, UK = United Kingdom, USA = United States of America

Table 3 shows the top 10 ranked strengths for leaders in New Zealand, and how their rankings compare to leaders in other countries around the world. Many of the strengths tended to have similar rankings across the countries examined in this study, including the top ranked strengths of working hard with a strong work ethic, having solid technical ability, experience and knowledge, and being steady and calm under pressure.

That said, leaders in New Zealand tended to have a relatively higher ranking for the strength of being customer focused and good with clients compared to leaders in most of the other countries examined. Leaders in New Zealand were also ranked relatively higher than leaders in Australia, China, India, and Japan for being competitive and determined. However, leaders in most of the other countries examined tended to be ranked relatively higher on the strength of being action-oriented and getting things done compared to leaders in New Zealand.

Table 4: Top Opportunities to Improve ranked results for New Zealand and corresponding rank position for comparison countries

Strengths	NZ	AUS	CAN	CHI	IND	JAP	MEX	SING	UK	USA
Stop taking on too much and spreading yourself too thin	1	1	1	4	3	1	3	2	1	1
Challenge poor performance	2	2	2	1	2	18	1	1	3	2
Delegate more	3	3	3	6	1	5	4	5	2	3
Motivate others and improve morale	4	5	5	5	9	2	7	4	6	5
Set clear goals and performance indicators	5	4	4	11	7	9	12	10	4	6
Share knowledge and resources	6	6	6	7	6	11	9	11	5	4
Show leadership on issues	7	8	11	3	5	3	14	3	10	11
Be more available and visible in the workplace	8	9	9	21	15	8	21	15	8	10
Look at the big picture – the organization’s overall goals	9	11	10	2	8	7	16	7	7	14
Give appropriate feedback	10	10	12	9	12	10	2	12	12	12

Note: NZ = New Zealand, AUS = Australia, CAN = Canada, CHIN = China, IND = India, JAP = Japan, MEX = Mexico, SING = Singapore, UK = United Kingdom, USA = United States of America

Table 4 shows the top 10 ranked opportunities to improve for leaders in New Zealand and how their rankings compare to leaders in the other countries examined. The need to stop taking on too much and spreading oneself too thin as well as delegating more were found to be key opportunities for improvement for leaders in New Zealand as well as leaders in the other countries examined. Similarly, with the exception of Japan, challenging poor performance was found to be another key opportunity to improve for leaders in New Zealand and the other countries examined.

Meanwhile, leaders in New Zealand were found to have greater opportunities to improve in comparison to leaders in China, Japan, Mexico, and Singapore in relation to setting clear goals and performance indicators. Similarly, when compared to leaders in China, India, Mexico, and Singapore, leaders in New Zealand were ranked relatively higher in having the opportunity to improve in relation to being more available and visible in the workplace.

Implications

Understanding similarities and differences in the multi-rater performance of leaders in New Zealand and the rest of the world can help to support the development of leadership talent within organisations. The current research provided insights into multi-rater assessment performance and highlighted strengths and opportunities for leaders in New Zealand. There were several areas where performance was similar for leaders in New Zealand to the performance of leaders in the other countries examined as well as some noticeable differences.

Overall 360 Performance

New Zealand leaders were found to have statistically similar perceived leadership effectiveness (as indicated by the Hogan 360 overall score) as leaders in Australia, Canada, India, Mexico, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This highlights that leaders in New Zealand are likely to be viewed by their managers, peers, reports, and other stakeholders as similarly effective as leaders in these other countries.

However, there were several significant differences found in perceived leadership effectiveness when comparing leaders in New Zealand to leaders in China, Japan, and Singapore. Specifically, the results indicated that leaders in New Zealand tend to be perceived by their managers, peers, reports, and other stakeholders as more effective than how leaders in Japan and Singapore are perceived, but less effective than how leaders in China are perceived.

By looking into the differences perceived at the leadership quadrant level we can obtain a greater understanding of what underpins these differences.

Self-Management

Starting with Self-Management (i.e., resilience, self-regulation and personal awareness), the results suggest that leaders in New Zealand tend to be perceived as professionally managing themselves more effectively than leaders in Japan and Singapore. Leaders in New Zealand were also more likely to be perceived as resilient relative to leaders in Singapore. However, leaders in New Zealand were perceived as demonstrating lower levels of professionally managing themselves and resilience than leaders in China.

Relationship Management

When looking at Relationship Management (i.e., the ability to get along with others and build trusting, loyal relationships), leaders in New Zealand were perceived as being more effective at relating appropriately to others and having strong interpersonal skills in comparison to leaders in Japan and Singapore. However, leaders in New Zealand were perceived as demonstrating lower levels of these skills relative to leaders in China.

Taking a more granular look at these differences, comparisons between leaders in New Zealand and leaders in Singapore were significant across all Relationship Management competencies except for Communication and Team Player. This suggests that the relative strengths of leaders in New Zealand, when compared to leaders in Singapore, were associated with an ability to understand and respond to external stakeholders' needs. However, they were perceived as being equally as effective when it came to being a team player.

The comparisons between Relationship Management competencies for leaders in New Zealand and leaders in Japan were significantly higher for leaders in New Zealand across all competencies, highlighting a greater likelihood for leaders in New Zealand to exhibit these behavioural strengths. This relative strength for leaders in New Zealand reflects Trevor-Roberts, et al.'s (2003) observation that Team Leadership is associated with successful leadership in New Zealand.

Working in the Business

Leaders in New Zealand were perceived as displaying the skills associated with Working in the Business (i.e., striving for operational excellence and focusing on

achieving results) more proficiently than leaders in Japan and Singapore, but less effectively than those in China. Looking at the underpinning competencies driving these differences, it was found that leaders in China scored higher than leaders in New Zealand across all of the Working in the Business competencies, and leaders in Japan scored consistently lower than leaders in New Zealand across all of these competencies. Leaders in Singapore also scored consistently lower than leaders in New Zealand across all of the Working in the Business competencies, except for Efficiency where there was no significant difference.

Looking at the comparisons between leaders in New Zealand and Singapore across the Working in the Business competencies, leaders in New Zealand were more likely to be seen by others as being highly experienced for their roles, engaging, and delivering to a high standard, while being equally perceived as efficient with their time as leaders in Singapore. This ability to be engaging and bring enthusiasm to their role while maintaining a delivery focus is in line with the Inspirational Leadership style, which is a distinctive feature of New Zealand's effective leaders (Trevor-Roberts et al., 2003).

Additionally, the higher scores around being achievement orientated and delivering to a high standard, as seen when comparing New Zealand's Working in the Business competency scores to those in Singapore and Japan, reinforce the observation from Kennedy (2007) that New Zealand leadership places importance on performance standards.

While not contributing to a larger theme, leaders in New Zealand were also seen as having greater experience and ability in relation to their roles than leaders in Mexico, as indicated by their significantly higher score on Capability.

Working on the Business

Looking at Working on the Business (i.e., innovation, strategic insights, and building motivated, accountable teams), leaders in New Zealand were perceived as displaying these skills more effectively than leaders in Japan, however, they were perceived as less likely to exhibit these behaviours than leaders in India and China. Scores for leaders in China were universally higher than for leaders in New Zealand at the competency level, but nuances can be found when looking at the comparisons between New Zealand and Japan, and India.

Starting with Japan, leaders in New Zealand were perceived as demonstrating higher levels of each of the underlying Working on the Business competencies except for Accountability where no significant difference

was found. This indicates that leaders in New Zealand were likely to be perceived as more innovative, strategic and fostering engagement than leaders in Japan, while being equally as likely to provide consistent constructive feedback to their teams.

When looking at India, leaders in New Zealand were more likely to be perceived as stronger at managing performance via feedback, engaging others, and thinking long-term, and leaders in both countries were likely to be seen as equally strong in suggesting and supporting new ideas.

While not significantly different at the quadrant level for Working on the Business, leaders in New Zealand had two significant differences in the underlying competencies when compared to leaders in the UK and Singapore. Firstly, leaders in New Zealand had a significantly lower score on Strategy than leaders in the UK, suggesting leaders in the UK were perceived as being stronger at thinking about the long-term vision and sharing that with others.

Secondly, leaders in New Zealand scored significantly higher than leaders in Singapore for Innovation, indicating that leaders in New Zealand were likely to be perceived as stronger at suggesting and supporting ideas that improve processes and deliverables. The strength of leaders in New Zealand around Innovation in combination with the strength around Team Player further enforces Trevor-Roberts et al.'s (2003) observation that Team Leadership is associated with effective leadership in New Zealand.

Strengths and Opportunities

In addition to the Hogan 360 scaled items, we also looked at the ranked top strengths and opportunities to improve for leaders in New Zealand and how those compared to other countries' rankings.

Similar to most of the other countries examined, the top ranked strengths for leaders in New Zealand included working hard with a strong work ethic, having solid technical ability and expertise, and being steady under pressure. However, leaders in New Zealand were found to obtain a relatively higher ranking for the strength of being good with clients and having a customer focus. This corroborates the theme highlighted above where leaders in New Zealand displayed high scores on the competency Customer.

Despite being in the top 10 strengths for leaders in New Zealand, being action-oriented and getting things done was ranked relatively higher for leaders in most of the comparison countries. While leaders in New

Zealand were likely to be perceived by others as being action-oriented and getting things done, there may be an opportunity for further development in relation to this competency.

There were mixed findings for the strength of being competitive and determined. While it was ranked in the top 10 for leaders in New Zealand, several countries such as Canada, Singapore, the UK and the USA ranked this strength similarly, whereas Australia, China, India and Japan ranked it relatively lower, and Mexico ranked it as relatively higher. So while New Zealand leaders were perceived as competitive and determined, its prevalence varied depending upon the comparison country.

Looking at the opportunities to improve rankings, similar to most of the other countries examined, the top ranked opportunities for leaders in New Zealand included stopping taking on too much and spreading oneself too thin, challenging poor performance and delegating more. These speak to common development opportunities that are likely to be beneficial to include as part of development initiatives for leaders.

A couple of opportunities also emerged as being relatively higher opportunities for leaders in New Zealand. One opportunity was around setting clear goals and performance indicators. This may dovetail with the action orientation piece above, suggesting that leaders in New Zealand may benefit from adopting an approach of setting clear goals and objectives for themselves and others. The other opportunity that was ranked relatively higher for leaders in New Zealand was around increasing their visibility and availability in the workplace, suggesting that making sure they are immediately accessible to their teams and peers may improve their performance.

Concluding comments

When considering how best to approach the professional development of leaders, it is important for organisations to understand how their staff compare and contrast to a global talent pool. Understanding relative strengths that can be leveraged to provide an advantage as well as any areas that may be relative opportunities to improve, best positions an organisation to compete successfully on an international front.

For multi-national companies with leaders based in New Zealand, some aspects of leadership will be common among their global leadership teams. However, there may also be strengths and development areas that are more unique to leaders in New Zealand. Keeping these more unique leadership elements in mind, organisations can create more potent selection and talent development processes.

Many of the significant findings in this study exist between New Zealand and countries in the Asia Pacific region. This highlights the relevance for multinationals who operate across New Zealand and this region to understand differences that may exist in how a leader's performance is perceived by others and the implications that it may have when it comes to the evaluation and development of leadership talent.

It is worth noting that while significant differences have been reported between the countries included in our analyses, there is also variance within each country's scores on the Hogan 360. The findings of this study provide a helpful perspective on leaders' varying strengths globally. However, it is important to emphasise that we cannot assume an individual will have certain strengths because of the country they work in. Each leader possesses idiosyncrasies that need to be taken into consideration within selection and development processes.

References

Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 504-518.

Kennedy, J. C. (2007). Leadership and culture in New Zealand. In *Culture and Leadership Across the World* (pp. 431-466). Psychology Press.

Peter Berry Consultancy. (2018). *Hogan 360 Technical Manual & Administration Guide* (2nd ed.). North Sydney, Australia: Author.

Trevor-Roberts, E., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Kennedy, J. C. (2003). The egalitarian leader: A comparison of leadership in Australia and New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20(4), 517-540.

About Peter Berry Consultancy (PBC)

PBC is a multidisciplinary global consulting firm with 30 years' experience in the delivery of solutions aimed at maximising the potential of individuals, teams, leaders and organisations. We undertake research to support our evidence-based solutions and have a network of partners and distributors globally.

PBC is the Australian and New Zealand distributor of Hogan Assessments and the authors of a range of diagnostics including the Hogan 360 suite, Agile suite, High Performing Team Assessment (HPTA), and co-authored the Hogan Safety Climate Survey.

Peter Berry Consultancy Pty Ltd

info@peterberry.com.au | www.peterberry.com.au
ABN 77007400606

Sydney Office

T: +61 2 8918 0888
Level 8, 201 Miller Street North Sydney, NSW 2060

Melbourne Office

T: +61 3 8629 5100
Suite 303, 430 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000

Peter Berry Consultancy New Zealand LP

info@peterberry.co.nz | www.peterberry.co.nz
NZBN 94 2905 0294 0295

Auckland Office

T: +64 9 941 9790
11 Britomart Place, Auckland CBD, Auckland 1010

No part of this work may be copied, reproduced or transferred to any other form or expression without the expressed written consent of Peter Berry Consultancy Pty Ltd.

WP0042

CONTACT US: info@peterberry.co.nz

