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INTRODUCTION
This work is the first in a series of planned articles on the professionalisation history of the Public Relations profession in New Zealand. The focus in the history is on whether Public Relations in New Zealand has managed to professionalise. This section of the history focuses on the emergence of an occupation, Public Relations, from its beginning in 1945 through to 1954, the end of World War II to the formation of the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ). All history is framed by epistemological, ontological and historiographic assumptions that give insights into the institutional and societal relationships operating. The history of Public Relations is an area that has been largely ignored (apart from the history of Public Relations in the USA), and until very recently has not been reflective historically. When history has been mentioned, Public Relations has been treated as a modernist output and considered as being neutral ideologically and strategically (L’Etang 2004). Attention is now being given to how historically, Public Relations has a fundamental input to the political, economic, cultural and social identity and fabric.
The article takes as its frame the concept of professionalisation and considers the evolution of the practice of Public Relations in this context. It discusses key concepts from the sociology of professions and combines this with a descriptive and explanatory narrative of the early development of Public Relations as part of a social process. The analysis of interviews and documentary sources is grounded within the context of historical review. In sense making of the historical documents and interviewees’ contributions looking back fifty years, an interpretive viewpoint shapes, constructs and reconstructs the realities of the past.

OVERVIEW OF PERIOD I, 1945 -1954
The period 1945 -1954 in New Zealand history shows a nation, closely linked to Great Britain, with a managed economy, losing its insularity and gaining economic and cultural independence. With the signing of the Statute of Westminster in 1947 New Zealand became a politically independent country and a member of the British Commonwealth. Rapid change and growth in the New Zealand economy from the end of World War II with a Labour Government till 1946 and then a National Government saw a growing economy and workforce, the population passing the two million mark, and an increase in the size of service occupations.

The formation of Public Relations can be traced back to these immediate post World War II years with some of its earliest practitioners still alive. The rationale for the periodisation of 1945 to 1954, the end of World War II to the formation of the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand, is that Public Relations only began as an activity in its own right after the war years, and continued to be an activity with about a dozen practitioners in total until 1954. In the year prior to that, the Auckland group of practitioners who met regularly for social purposes, decided to establish a body of Public Relations practitioners and PRINZ was formed at a meeting of Public Relations officers held at the Star Hotel in Auckland in September 1953 and incorporated in June 1954.

Public Relations is a discreet activity. Pre 1984 Public Relations practitioners and the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ) have always been concerned to delineate Public Relations from other forms of communication (PRINZ Journals 1954-1984). The records of its early history and development since the formation of PRINZ in 1954 are relatively intact, and are to be found in a PRINZ publication called variously a ’Journal’, a ’News Sheet’, and ’PRINEWS’ over the period. Unless otherwise specified, all such publications are referred to as “Journal”.

For the purposes of this history, the term ‘professionalisation process’ or ‘professionalisation’ means the development of the activity of Public Relations from its early propaganda and Press Agency work in the military of World War II to what the activity of Public Relations encompasses today.

The terms ’professional’ and ’professionalism’ mean the orientation of the activity of Public Relations about its practice. Thus, the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ) is the professional body of Public Relations in New Zealand, and was established to represent practitioners of Public Relations. So, a ’professional’ or ’professionalism’ orientation is a practitioners definition (Pieczka and L’Etang 2001). As opposed to this is a managerial or entrepreneurial orientation, which this history suggests, was implicit in the very nature of the Public Relations as an activity, and is evident in both the professionalisation process
and in the practising of the activity per se. (Grunig and Hunt 1984; Millerson 1964; Cropp 2001; L’Etang 2004).

The term Press Agentery, based on Grunig’s model (1984), aims to publicise the organisation, its product and services, by disseminating a particular viewpoint through the media and other channels of communication with the outcome of favourable coverage or publicity. It is usually one way communication with message dissemination to as wide a range of audiences as possible the main objective. Also to be noted is the term Public Information which is related to Press Agentery in that it is also one way communication but truth is fundamental to the message, with practitioners acting in the same manner as news reporters (Wilcox and Cameron 2006; Cutlip and Broom 2000; Hunt and Grunig 1984).

Within the professionalisation development from 1945, there are a number of issues that are considered: the professionalisation process of Public Relations including the formation, growth and influence of the Public Relations Institute of New Zealand (PRINZ) and the entrepreneurial element in the occupation. In turn, within these, the thrust towards higher education, and the development of that higher education in courses offered at New Zealand tertiary institutions. So, the primary focus of this history of Public Relations is its quest for higher learning, expressed as a dimension of professionalism by the Public Relations Institute. However not all of the above mentioned issues are able to be examined in this defined first period of 1945 - 1954, but are important to note as part of the development of the profession and will be developed further in ensuing articles.

THE PROFESSIONALISATION DEBATE

There are numerous definitions of professionalisation or rather numerous ways that particular activities define themselves as professions, rather than as trades or crafts. Work done by L’Etang (2004), Pieczka and L’Etang (2001), Cropp and Pincus (2001), Abbott (1988) and Heath (2001) summarise the key trends in these debates.

A seminal work by Wilensky (1964) talks of competence, client relationships, professional associations and schools, economic returns to the practitioner, ethical obligations, and the social role a profession has within society. Thus the difference between the auto worker and the physician is that the job of the professional is technical and that the professional adheres to a set of professional norms. The degree to which an occupation fits these criteria is the degree of professionalisation it has. The ‘technical’ aspect here represents a monopoly of skill, denied to other members of society. Under professional norms, are listed technically competent, impersonal and objective and impartiality plus the ‘service ideal’ (devotion to the client’s interests rather than profit).

Dellgram and Hojer (2003, 2005), Parkin (1979) and Murphy (1984, 1988) talk of professionalisation as a collective or societal process involving different professional groups effort to reach status, discretion, autonomy and authorisation; as an individual process with the focus on how the individual can become more “professional” in terms of skills and traits in the course of experiences in practice; as a socialisation process of identity formation of the professional worker with higher education often being the starting point of the process. Professionalisation gives status which is beneficial for identity formation, resource allocation and gives access to knowledge (Pieczka and L’Etang 2001). Thus professionalisation can be seen to be concerned with the control of knowledge, which is in turn related to power and the process of mobilising that power in order to enhance or
defend a group’s share of rewards or resources (Larson 1977). According to Parkin (1979) and Collins (1990) credentialism, the device for securing the market value for a profession, has become more important in the process of professionalisation. It is the intersection between formal requirements based on the educational system and the “real” requirements arising from practice that professions are developed.

It is evident too, from editorial and other commentaries in the PRINZ Journals, that ‘professional’ can also be diluted to an ideology of professionalism (Piecza and L’Etang 2001) with such accoutrements as cars, income and status of the client base being used to gauge the seniority of practitioners. The problem faced by the early practitioners was that ‘new’ occupations like Public Relations lacked the credibility (through the social divisions of labour) of management. Thus, the privileges of ‘professionalism’ and the activity it offers are defined within itself via PRINZ and linked to the work situation (Journals 1954 - 1984).

Thus, the primary reason for Public Relation’s obsession with professionalism is political; they are to do with the division of labour. There are clear political implications in the defining of Public Relations practitioners as members of a distinct “professional class.” Professionalism implies a conservative occupational and political ideology that affects them in their relationships with their agencies, clients, colleagues, and workers in allied fields. Professionalism dictates certain behaviours that are very different from those of non-professionals. Professional Public Relations practitioners are expected to identify with their client’s management perspectives and to assume that what is good for them is good for the Public Relations.

The data and discussion of professionalisation development that follows is focused on the practice of Public Relations and then on PRINZ and while both are independent, they are obviously inter-related. In terms of professionalisation, this period of the history from 1945 – 1954 concerns itself with the establishment of the activity in its own right, that which functions within the commercial and service sectors. So the emphasis in this period is on defining and seeking legitimacy of the activity, thus promoting and protecting its practitioners and technical freedom.

DISCUSSION

This section of the history of Public Relations in New Zealand is part of an attempt to construct an overall explanatory account of the early development of Public Relations in New Zealand. It focuses on the professionalisation of the field and considers the implications of this development. Interviews and documentary data are viewed through the lense of historical review. The focus on professionalisation includes considering the self identity of the professionalizing group. The research does not fall neatly into any paradigms but attempts to construct a balanced account based on the original documentary evidence and oral history interviews with those practising Public Relations in the 1940s and 1950s. As the occupation emerged from its war time press agentry and propaganda practices to that of the more modern Public Relations practices so came the desire to professionalise. Historical narrative inquiry is the story of somebody’s lived experience, and so by its nature is a social text that constructs and reconstructs the realities of the past; ‘truth’ is a reconstructed reality, a historical and culturally situated standpoint that reshapes past events and experiences to create a present meaning. The versions of reality and experiences represented through the interviews enable the interviewees’ viewpoints
to be communicated – a reality construction that is intelligible within the interviewees’ community, organisational, social, cultural and historical location. Extensive quotations from interviewees make room for a reader’s alternative interpretation.

The written documentation for this period prior to 1954 is no longer in existence. It seems to consist of a series of personal notes, clippings from newspapers and magazines, and letters to clients. It appears to have all disappeared in numerous office clean outs. Moreover, the earlier practitioners saw themselves in business, and so, archival material was kept for only as long as such business interests dictated. Thus, the information in this period is all oral history. The work done by John Trenwith in 1991 and the unpublished notes and raw data so collected have created an important source of information for this period. Some of the information for this period was taped at a prearranged meeting of early members of PRINZ in Auckland – Mel Tronson, John Spedding and Jim Payne. Further information was gained at a taped meeting of the oldest surviving practitioners in Wellington in May 1991. The people at that meeting were G Hugh Sumpter, Arthur Reeves and former PRINZ president Arthur Feslier. On separate occasions in July 1991 were taped further oral histories from practitioners Geoff Bentley and George Gair who are from the same period. It is from all these histories, that the information in this section has been completed. The selection of speakers was obtained through Arthur Feslier (on a suggestion from the then PRINZ secretary) as Feslier kept regular contact with his old colleagues. He suggested and selected the people at the Wellington meeting and then referred to the practitioners George Gair and Geoff Bentley as being further useful sources.

According to Geoff Bentley (1991), the earliest form of Public Relations was press agency work. This task was simply writing stories about an organisation that were felt to be in the public interest, and getting those stories published in newspapers or magazines of the day. This task of Press Agency work is still in current usage although in a greatly modified version, but it was the basis of Public Relations in this country (Peart 1994; Sterne 2008).

According to Bentley (1991) the New Zealand Army and Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF) were the two key players in the use of press agency, in their day-to-day activities in the war. The Navy were never as heavily involved, nor saw the need to be. Thus, the origin of Public Relations practitioners in New Zealand were from either the Air Force or Army background. The RNZAF approach to press agency was to advertise for experienced journalists that could be used as war correspondents overseas. Bentley was selected, because of his journalistic background.

The role of such war correspondents was according to Bentley (1991) to cover the war and focus on the exploits of the service. There were others too, in the communications role, such as radio broadcasters, cine-matographers and photographers, as well as the official war artist. But the role of the correspondent was to encourage confidence in the military in a time of great national security; to assist in recruitment for the Air Force or Army, to maintain unity in the service and keep morale high; and to set up displays, exhibits, and speakers for specific occasions. All the news stories that Bentley wrote went to Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF) Headquarters where they were censored before being dispatched to the New Zealand Press Association (NZPA). So, it is clear that the Air Force had an arsenal of communication professionals with which it could use to maintain its role in the mind of the general public, with powers of suppression if the need arose. Implicit in Bentley’s statement too, is that the Air Force had the means to reassemble reality to assist
the war effort, to maintain confidence in the Air Force and keep morale high. As Bentley (1991) noted, “In the absence of any other sources of information, the media were willing to accept that which the Air Force offered to them”.

Bentley (1991) was also convinced that the role of Press Agency in the Air Force would have been identical in terms of function to that of the Army, thus any practitioners who had worked in either military establishment would have experienced similar training and professional press agency experience.

Bentley’s views are supported by interviews with Reeves, Sumpter and Feslier (1991). These interviewees agree that the origins of Public Relations in New Zealand can be traced back to the Army and the Air Force. While there was a little Public Relations being practised in 1946 by individual practitioners such as Hugh Sumpter, the Public Service Public Relations function had its origin in the Post Office in 1948 and was headed by Charles Mcfarlane whom Reeves maintains learnt all of his Public Relations experience from the Army. Reeves is not sure of Mcfarlane’s role in the Army Public Relations, other than he had been fairly senior, and was employed by the Post Office immediately after the war to establish a Public Relations office.

The function of the Post Office Public Relations section was customer relations, media relations, press tours, speech writing for the Post Office Director General and the then Minister of Post and Telegraph, the establishment of a Press Section with photographs, and finally a “damage control” role if problems arose. These roles, according to Reeves (1991) were not dissimilar from that of the Army’s role for Public Relations. But the Post Office also played a significant part in the training of future Public Relations practitioners and in developing a body of knowledge for Public Relations. According to Reeves (1991), this training of future practitioners was a vital function, and while it was ultimately intended for the training to benefit the Post Office itself in its practitioning, many of the trainees left to establish their own practices. However, this in itself also benefited the Post Office, as many of those practitioners retained their Post Office contacts, and established knowledgeable networks between themselves and their former employer. Two Post Office employees per year were also allowed to study at university on a part-time basis so that their “radical thinking” could bring a fresh impetus to the Public Relations office.

Mcfarlane was anxious to establish industry contacts and to exchange practitioning ideas with other companies such as Mobil in New York, whose practitioners were also ex-Military in many instances. Both the United States of America and Great Britain were a little ahead of New Zealand in that in 1948 both the Public Relations Society of America and the British Institute of Public Relations were formed, so Reeves (1991) contends that Public Relations was approximately the same level of practitioning competency and knowledge base in both of these countries with New Zealand a little behind, but drawing on this base for its own practitioning.

By 1950, Sumpter (1991) says that “there were three or four practitioners in Auckland, and these later in about 1952 formed themselves into a small nucleus, and asked (Sumpter) if he would be their Wellington representative”. Gair (1991) noted that this small Public Relations “cell” acted as a knowledge base for its members, “but the association was loose and casual with knowledge and new practitioning techniques being arrived at in an ad hoc method”. Sumpter (1991) feels that there were probably no
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more than five practitioners until 1953.

However, in 1950, the Post Office called the first ever New Zealand Public Relations Conference, held in Wellington. This Conference brought together practitioners from other branches of the Public Service, as well as private practitioners and overseas visitors.

Mcfarlane’s problem, according to Reeves (1991), was twofold. Firstly, the definition of Public Relations was too narrow; and secondly, there was the problem of the ad hoc nature of the existing body of knowledge and the need to get it properly established. The influence of the Army’s reliance on Press Agency meant that practitioners still placed too high a reliance upon that particular aspect to the detriment of other, newer, ideas. The Body of Knowledge was being accumulated but largely by a loose association of Public Relations practitioners who borrowed each others ideas, (and the occasional overseas example) and then tried to improve upon the original. According to Reeves (1991), there was no attempt to formulate a theory that could underpin or attempt to explain why a given technique would work “Successful techniques, seeming to work in isolation, and were transferred from context to context”. The 1950 Conference was convened to offer solutions to these problems.

According to Sumpter (1991), some of these problems were addressed, but the very grey area between Press Agency and Public Relations still persisted. There was a broad field of Public Relations practitioners, with each of them practising as they saw fit from material they had read about or particular activities they had seen. Some of the newer practitioners in the early fifties came into Public Relations without really being aware they were involved in Public Relations; they saw themselves involved in promotional or managerial activities. But towards the end of 1953, Sumpter (1991) says there emerged a difference between the Army and Air Force Press Agency concept and that of Public Relations. This development was no doubt helped by the use of Public Relations practitioners in airline and oil companies with their ideas of firstly a planned Public Relations programme - a campaign - and secondly that of Public Relations being a pro-active, (as opposed to a reactive) activity. These were the two main differences between the Press Agency of the Armed Services and the Public Relations practitioner. As Bentley (1991) points out, “Press Agency practitioners in the Services never had to worry about the success or failure of their work: their brief was to “set it up” and once “set up”, whether the activity succeeded or failed was seen to be outside their control”. He could not tell success from failure until after the event, and in at least two instances, the success of an event was due to factors of coincidence outside of the intended programme.

According to Reeves (1991) and supported by interviewees Feslier and Sumpter, in terms of a source for the body of knowledge for Public Relations, the main source of professional reading was themselves; they wrote to and for each other, with ideas coming out of their own experience and current activities. In the 1940s and 1950s there were a few Public Relations notes about, and a few handbooks, but these were very small. Basically, the practitioners were the writers, a practice that differed little throughout the country. Occasionally overseas material was available if one practitioner were to travel overseas and bring it back. It would slowly circulate among the practitioners, but its availability to a given practitioner depended very much on that practitioner’s Public Relations network of associates. As Reeves (1991) notes
We got the British Post Office to send us their papers regularly and they came out as bulletins from the BPO, and they dealt with publicity and public relations. We used to be always getting publicity and public relations and gradually they dropped the word publicity and it became just public relations. Also on a broad front quite a few of the early public relations practitioners in America had written their little books on public relations so we had quite a few around. They were doing what we were doing, writing a textbook, pamphlet, or a book for their own organisations to fill some need.

Reeves (1991) also noted that these writings were more for general use, just like a textbook for the general public or people who wanted to become public relations practitioners, they were not specific for one industry,

*But nobody was doing any writing in New Zealand because all of us were too busy to produce a general textbook or a handbook…. Even in those early days the term public relations was taking on all sorts of undertones which were not entirely desirable.*

So, the development of an Institute of Public Relations can be seen in part, to be a reaction against the ad hoc nature of the activity in all respects. It is also evident of the need to have some consolidation of the activity and some element of professional status, which would include Codes of Ethics and business practice.

As Reeves (1991) states

PRINZ came about because enough people got together and said,

*We need to have something to bind us together, and create an organisation for lobbying purposes or even just to have an aim. ’ Also to have certain codes of behaviour and try to establish an organisation that would have a standing in the country. The ethics were one of the first things I can remember when I came from Christchurch. I was given a piece of paper to read on the ethics of public relations quoting various authorities. There had been a lot of research done after the war when Charles McFarlane came from the Post Office into Public Relations.*

Thus, a combination of the factors above, the growing members of practitioners, the need to establish a Body of Knowledge, and general maturing of the activity itself, lead to a need to establish an Institute along the same lines as the American and English counterparts. The first Journal issue of PRINZ in 1955 stated “It was felt that there was a constant need for those employed in Public Relations and allied activities to exchange ideas and experiences more regularly,” and then went on to explain its own purpose as “It marks a stage in the development of the Institute and the activity: it will contain Public Relations articles and letters from PRINZ members and it will contain news and articles from overseas publications” (Journal Issue 1 1955).

Credit is given to J.H.C. Payne, Public Relations officer of the Auckland Transport Board, for the time spent in establishing the Institute.

*During the working year he met others engaged in public relations work, but only spasmodically and he felt that if they could be welded into a group they would gain much benefit from a closer knowledge of each other’s work ” (Journal Issue 3 May 1956).*

The first meeting was held at the Star Hotel, Auckland on 17th September 1953 and was attended by twelve people. At the following meeting held a month later, Payne was elected President of the newly formed group. In November 1953 as a result of the report by the
executive committee, it was decided to form the group into a national institute under the name of PRINZ. “Throughout 1954 the monthly luncheons in Auckland continued, a growing membership was recorded and in June of that year the Institute became an incorporated body” (Journal Issue 3 May 1956). Important to note in this drive to professionalise are the people at the first official meeting of the Institute and the predominance in the membership of those involved in government departments - J.H.C.Payne (President), R Alexander, H. Roy, G.F Gair, were all elected to the Executive. At September 1955 the membership stood at 26 members (Journal Issue 1, Sept 1955). By Nov 1955 further government based practitioners, R.H Johnston P & T Department, G. Bentley and B. Carone Air Department, K.J. Sparks Public Relations Officer and M.B. Hayes Christchurch City Council had also joined (Journal Issue 2 November 1955).

Alongside the work for state and municipal bureaucracies, Public Relations agencies such as Hugh Sumpter Associates and Dinniss Cherrington were established, but the bulk of the Public Relations activity was centred around the work done by individual practitioners. The final words go to Reeves (1991) in this brief review of developments:

*I feel the nucleus of the Public Relations movement were people who were involved in a certain number of government departments and then a group who were practising public relations on a broad field. One did this and one did that and they sort of welded into the public relations movement. We were all doing public relations as we had seen it, had read about it and were on a very broad press agency. That was part of it. Industrial relations were all a part of what we were doing right through the 1950s. In the early 1950s there were about ten Public Relations officers, coming on the fringe, most of them, like the true Public Relations practitioner as we know it today.*

**CONCLUSION**

In terms of professionalisation, this period concerns itself with the establishment of the activity in its own right that functions within the commercial and service sectors. Modern practitioners of Public Relations work in diverse areas of communication but the different areas of practice and the skills that each area employs have developed from these early years of Public Relations activity. The seeds of New Zealand Public Relations with its origin in press agentry, involved a small number of practitioners who worked independently with the occasional social and networking meetings for idea exchange. The close ties to Britain meant New Zealand society supported British foreign policy, went to war and as Bentley in 1991 iterated, the government and the military had an arsenal of communication professionals which it could use to maintain its role in the mind of the general public, with powers of suppression if the need arose. Implicit in Bentley’s statement too, is the means to reassemble reality to assist the war effort.

Despite not being labelled as such due to the inherent levels of discomfort with the term, the interviewees articulate a role for propaganda in the story of New Zealand public relations practice and development. During World War II Public Relations supported Military Service and after the war, simply transferred that role to a civilian context, similar to what happened in Britain (L’etang 2004), and the only contexts available were the commercial and service sector organisations. It would appear that these practices had a smooth transition from the military to government and to civilian public relations practices in communication to a civil society. This seemingly apolitical trajectory from propaganda to Public Relations to public and corporate affairs in modern New Zealand practice needs
further examination. It is interesting to note the avoidance or cursory coverage given to propaganda in a range of Public Relations undergraduate texts. No doubt as cultures outside of the USA and Britain start to write their history of public relations, new understandings and uses of the term will emerge.

Interviewees responses also indicate that the four model typology proposed by Grunig (1984) of public relations development – publicity, public information, two way asymmetry and symmetry - cannot be appropriately applied to the local New Zealand context of public relations development with its different path of social, political, economic and cultural evolution and alternative culturally moderated history. Much literature emanating from the USA promotes that their model as being universally applicable and a satisfactory typology to explain professional practice. Motion and Leitch (2001) allude to this in their topography of New Zealand Public Relations, noting that the different context of the practice needs to be reflected in the theoretical differences.

What is clear in the emergence of Public Relations in New Zealand, is the role of the military and local and government agencies on practice and the small almost inconsequential role played by the private sector. Professional status was a clearly articulated goal by a relatively small proportion of practitioners. Concerns included the definition of the field, a body of knowledge and education combined with the desire to establish status for the practitioners. The establishment of PRINZ fulfilled the need to have something to bind the few practitioners together with certain codes of behaviour, create an organisation for lobbying purposes, which would have a standing in the country, with the aim of producing some occupational norms and discourse. PRINZ was established to represent practitioners of Public Relations, but from the start did not capture all practitioners - a feature still evident today.

The formation of PRINZ could be interpreted as an attempt by a small group of government based practitioners to mobilise power and thus control and so direct the body of knowledge in order to enhance or defend the group’s share of rewards or resources (Larson 1977). This same motivation could also be explored in relation to the development of other professional groups in New Zealand. Credentialism, the device for securing the market value for a profession, has become more important in the process of professionalisation and it is in the intersection between formal requirements based on the educational system and the “real” requirements arising from practice that tension is evident in the professions as they develop – a feature that became increasingly evident in the development of New Zealand Public Relations post 1954, the professional entrepreneur tension. Whether this feature is an isolated or common feature of organisational professionalisation journeys in New Zealand is worth exploring.

So the emphasis in this period 1945 – 1954 is on defining and seeking legitimacy of the Public Relations activity, thus promoting its practitioners and technical freedom as the practitioners moved into government and civilian Public Relations. It is clear that it is from a legitimatising desire that the formation of PRINZ is contemplated, and thus the task of the professionalisation of the practitioners of the activity, is present from the beginning.
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