International Journal of Communication 15(2021), 741–758 1932–8036/20210005

Co-Constructing a Print Media Narrative: Interviews With LGBTQ Activists From the 1960s and 1970s in New Zealand

LINDA JEAN KENIX
SUVOJIT BANDOPADHYAYA
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

This article examines how New Zealand activists in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community of the 1960s and 1970s worked to co-create their own media representation and production. Through the memories of 29 activists who were involved in the LGBT political movement of the time, this article explores how LGBT communities used potentially harmful media stereotypes to their own advantage and how they worked to purposefully manage their representation as well as media production. Activists depended on diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing to amplify, extend, bridge, and transform what it meant to be LGBTQ in New Zealand. At the time, the media represented a very mainstream, and conservative, vision of the LGBT community. The media frames and media representations used at the time were systematic processes to reaffirm intended realities of social, economic and political power. The early work of these activists managed to change their intended reality through dogged determination.

Keywords: LGBT, interviews, activism, historical, media framing

Media representation of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community differs dramatically according to geography, religion, politics, and myriad other contributing factors. In much of the world, media are now an instrumental tool for LGBTQ voices, but yet this has not always been the case, nor is this consistent across the globe. Indeed, in parts of the world, the media continue to simply not address the issues of LGBTQ communities. This article aims to examine how prominent LGBTQ activists during the 1960s and 1970s believed they used their tools to affect their print media in one particular country, New Zealand. Through in-depth interviews with 29 individuals who were active in the LGBTQ political movement throughout the 1960s and 1970s, this article examines how LGBTQ communities transformed how print media framed their movement.

It is important to remember that LGBTQ was not even a term used at the time. At the time, this community was largely described as gay and lesbian or homosexual. Transgender individuals and bisexuals were assumed to be in the same community, but these groups were not addressed in the popular lexicon of the 1960s and 1970s. Many things have changed in the past 50 years—the description of this community is

Linda Jean Kenix: lindajean.kenix@canterbury.ac.nz
Suvojit Bandopadhyaya: suvojit.bandopadhyaya@pg.canterbury.ac.nz
Date submitted: 2020-05-22

Copyright © 2021 (Linda Jean Kenix and Suvojit Bandopadhyaya). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd). Available at http://ijoc.org.

just one shift. There is a plethora of names attributed to those who are attracted to the same sex. One of the more recent terms is LBGTTIQQ2S (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, intersex, queer, questioning, two-spirit; Schneider, 2010). However, given that the language surrounding this movement is continually changing, it is important to note that this article fixes on LGBTQ as a contemporary descriptor for this movement. It is explicit hope of these authors that the *Q* in LGBTQ encapsulates the large group of individuals who may not identify strictly as LGBT, but who still identify with the movement as a whole. This research argues that the New Zealand LGBTQ movement worked to purposefully manage their representation and the production of what it meant to be LGBTQ at the time through myriad techniques. This research explores their approaches and tactics to better understand why and how their media representation helped to make this political movement so successful.

The 29 interviews with those who were active in the LGBTQ political movement demonstrate how 1960–70s print media worked with the LGBTQ community to co-create a LGBTQ identity. Media coverage appeared to be a manifestation of the stereotypes of the time. Past research demonstrated that masculine females and feminine males were automatically stereotyped as LGBTQ (Martin, 1995). Before the 1970s, individuals in the LGBTQ community were stereotyped as having cross-gendered beliefs and attitudes (Kite & Deaux, 1987). These stereotypes were used to justify discrimination (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009). Those in the LGBTQ community "were scorned and derided by the heterosexual majority (until the 1970s)" (Kushner, 2012, p. 5). As these interviews will elucidate, the LGBTQ movement was acutely cognizant about those stereotypes, and they used the existing media stereotypes to their own advantage. In conducting research that qualitatively examines how social movement actors worked with media at a specific point and time of great social change, we hope that it may be possible to better understand how media representation and production can assist present political movements.

The 1960–70s LGBTQ Community in New Zealand

In 1961, for the first time, "homosexual activity" between consenting men age 16 or over in New Zealand was not a criminal offense under the Crimes Act. It is important to note that male homosexuality was not decriminalized in New Zealand until 1986, so there remained "effective and influential opponents" to gay liberation in the period between 1961 and 1986 (Carlyon & Morrow, 2013, p. 243). However, the 1960s and 1970s was an intense watershed period "where openness and pride replaced secrecy and shame" (Carlyon & Morrow, 2013, p. 273). Up until that time, being gay was considered an unnatural pathology, and being lesbian was linked with "being mad, bad, and violent" (Cox, 2005, p. 68). There was not a decisive cultural shift as the Australian edition of *TIME* labeled homosexuality as a "pernicious sickness" in 1966 (Guy, 2002, p. 38). Widespread challenges to "cultural homogeneity" continued to intensify as the 1960s progressed (Carlyon & Morrow, 2013, p. 140). This continual transformation of social attitudes continued until 2013, when New Zealand became the first country in the Asia Pacific to legalize same-sex marriage.

Though 2013 stands out as an important landmark for LGBTQ equality, the 1960s and 1970s were an essential period of marked extensive social change: "Gay liberation played a formative role in the emergence of the gay identity we know today. It deeply affected the lives of both men and women, and members of both sexes worked together as activists" (Brickell, 2008, p. 283). As was the case around the Western world, "coming out" was a central component of gay liberation. This was extremely difficult at the

time as both the Catholic and Protestant Churches continued to hold strong influence, and they had condemned LBGTQ individuals and groups as sinful (Jennings & Millward, 2016). Despite this, many were steadfast in their belief that public declarations were key to social acceptance (Brickell, 2008). "Coming out" relied on new ideas about openness, personal freedom and social transformations, and while this approach was not universally embraced, it was influential in changing societal attitudes. Heterosexuality has had long-term social acceptance, whereas being part of the LGBTQ community has historically been considered as something that is in a "private space" (Brickell, 2000, p. 170). The societal legitimacy that heterosexuality has enjoyed in both the public and the private sphere has historically not been the same for those in the LGBTQ community (Kenix, 2019), and thus "coming out" was an entrance into that public space. It is in this societal differentiation that media have played a significant role (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007) in constructing and constituting the identity of LGBTQ community.

An increasing acknowledgement of Māori (the indigenous population of Aotearoa, New Zealand) identity has long been interwoven with a broader acceptance of gay rights. The urbanization of the Māori population greatly influenced the LGBTQ movement (Jennings & Millward, 2016). The first lesbian clubs in New Zealand had an unmistakable Māori presence (Carlyon & Morrow, 2013). The gradual progression in search of Māori LGBTQ identity was witnessed in 1970s when several Māori LGBTQ activists were involved in organizations focused on feminism, lesbian feminism, and gay liberation (Kerekere, 2016). In 1970, the Women's Liberation Front Club hosted the first Women's Liberation Conference. In 1972, Ngahuia Te Awekotku, a prominent Māori LGBTQ activist, was refused visa to the United States because she was "homosexual," which further fueled the Gay Liberation movement and further fused Māori issues with the LGBTQ community (Jennings & Millward, 2016). From 1972 to 1976, several national conferences were hosted across the country with extensive Māori involvement, until the National Gay Rights Coalition was formed in 1977.

Urbanization in New Zealand also facilitated more spatially settled friendship network and communities. In New Zealand, urban spaces became more important in framing notions of homosexual identities and communities. Urbanization played a crucial role in bringing Māori and Pakeha (White New Zealanders) from rural and small towns to big cities for fresh opportunities in the postwar years. However, migration from rural to urban has not always benefitted all New Zealanders. The shift from the rural to urban settings for Māori LGBTQ individuals meant a disconnect with their language and culture and an increasing discomfort to adjust to "living and working in non-Māori and often racist environments. Māori LGBTQIQ coming into cities congregated in networks of 'kamp/camp culture' which was the term for homosexual in New Zealand pre-1970s" (Kerekere, 2016, p. 1). As more people moved to cities, "homosexual networks continued to expand. The cafés and the bars were the most public face of this" (Brickell, 2008, p. 224). The shift from a rural to an urban setting led to an increasing tolerance and acceptance for the gay community by mainstream society.

Some Māori men continue to identify themselves as "takatāpui tāne" (Kerekere, 2016, p. 3). Takatāpui is an umbrella term for same-sex-desiring as well as transgender men and women. Such a term "reinforces indigenous identity and spiritual descent from 'tūpuna takatāpui' (takatāpui ancestors) while replacing the inelegant 'LGBTQIQ' with an inclusivity of gender identities and sexuality similar to the term 'rainbow'" (Kerekere, 2016, p. 3). Thus, conceptualizing identity in itself combines race, ethnicity and culture

for many within the Māori community. Identity has a cultural dimension that allows people to gain a strong sense of their cultural origin along with understanding the sexual component of one's own personality.

Tensions grew within the movement as a whole in New Zealand in the 1970s. There was a push to specifically define "the very nature of same-sex desire" (Brickell, 2008, p. 342). Increasingly, LGBTQ communities urged that "all New Zealanders should explore their sexual potential" (Brickell, 2008, p. 342). This was confronting to some New Zealanders, but many within the movement felt this was a necessary step to bring about citizenship rights for the LGBTQ community. When those in the general population examined their own sexuality, it was hoped that they would then view the sexuality of others with more empathy and think about their own sexuality in new ways. Stereotypes began to fade with the deregistering of homosexuality as a psychiatric illness in New Zealand in 1973. "Being gay," "coming out," "homophobia," "oppression," and "liberation" were now topics of discussion by men and women in New Zealand. Perhaps, more importantly, these terms related to the personal lives of all New Zealanders (Brickell, 2008) and were increasingly reflected in the economic, political and social systems of New Zealand.

The 1960–70s Print Media in New Zealand

Media are, of course, only one part of a much larger system of culture. Mainstream culture is systemically venerated while there is a near wholesale negation of those communities or individuals who remain outside of that monolith (Gross & Gross, 1991). Media representation was and is a manifestation of systemic power—the power of who is dominant and who controls construction of that "mediated" reality. Those who are not represented in the media are indirectly considered powerless. Though some research has challenged the importance of nonelite voices in the media (Ferree, Gamson, Gerhards, & Rucht, 2002), the weight of research has consistently linked the presence of media framing to social power (Dahlberg, 2001; Gitlin, 1980; Singer et al., 2011; Tuchman, 1978). This linkage is due to the intrinsic relationship between framed representations in the media and societies' general understanding of the social world. Carragee and Roefs (2004) argued that that all representations in media must be examined within the "contexts of the distribution of political and social power" (p. 214). Representation determines what is "relevant" (Hertog & McLeod, 1995, p. 4) and "suggests what the issue is" (Tankard, Hendrickson, Silberman, Bliss, & Ghanem, 1991, p. 3).

Even when those outside of mainstream culture do get representation or gain visibility, the way they're represented in the media reflects the biases and interests of the media elites who define the public agenda (Gross, 1991). One has to remember the state of New Zealand in 1960. Outside of a brief political period of a more liberal governance (the Labor Party for three years), New Zealand was led by a conservative political ideology (the National Party) from 1949 until 1972. If media shape our identities and assert what roles we play in the society, then media were replicating the political orthodoxy of 1960s New Zealand and co-creating a decidedly heteronormative space.

In New Zealand, the print media ran exposés in the 1960s and 1970s of an emerging new urban culture where "homosexual men and women who were increasingly finding themselves in a wider moral panic over youth cultures and the proper place of sexuality in post-war society" (Brickell, 2008, p. 276). Newspaper articles on the LGBTQ community were more and more regular by the 1960s. More media exposés also meant

transitioning from a small closeted network to a more cosmopolitan and heterogenous community that craved for "increasingly extensive spaces in the antipodean social fabric" (Brickell, 2008, p. 276).

During the 1970s, the mainstream print media increased its interest in the LGBTQ community (Bennett & Brickell, 2018). In 1973, the *Listener*, a weekly newsmagazine in New Zealand, published a story titled, "Is Being Gay Reason to be Glum?" (Brickell, 2008). They countered and wrote about how members of the LGBT community actually felt liberated. In another issue of the *Listener*, historian Jock Phillips explored the relationships between male homosexuality and Kiwi masculinity. In New Zealand during the 1970s,

> women's magazines, *Thursday* and *Eve,* provided sympathetic coverage of gay rights groups' activities and arguments, and even *Truth* (a print tabloid in New Zealand) was willing to willing to concede—even if rather reluctantly—that most gay activists were seemingly sincere. (Brickell, 2008, p. 335)

Again, though, this representation was not uniform across mainstream media outlets.

It is important to note that television did not even begin in New Zealand until the first official transmission in June of 1960. It took several years for it to gain prominence in the media landscape of New Zealand. At that time, there were three newspapers located in the three main cities of New Zealand, and then one newspaper that was national and located in Auckland: *The Dominion* in Wellington, the *Press* in Christchurch, the *Otago Daily Times* in Dunedin, and the *New Zealand Herald*, which was a national newspaper run out of Auckland. In the 1960s and 1970s, there were two prominent newsmagazines: the current affairs weekly *New Zealand Listener* and the populist weekly tabloid *New Zealand Truth*.

The New Zealand Herald readership continues to constitute a substantial portion of the population. However, representation of the LGBTQ community in the *Herald* was nearly nonexistent in the 1960s and 1970s. Editorials in the Herald were overwhelmingly conservative throughout the 1960s (McMillan, 2012). During the 1960s and 1970s, the *New Zealand Herald* was challenged by *Truth,* which had a very high subscription rate at the time—one in every two New Zealand households bought the magazine throughout this period ("New Zealand Truth," 2020). At the time, this readership dwarfed *The Listener.* Yet the *Truth* was increasingly conservative and had little to no representation of the LGBTQ community during this period. Media reiterate and mirror the social and moral hierarchy of power systems (Gross, 1991). Even if, in this case, sexual minorities were represented, at best they were stereotyped to fit within a larger understanding of heterosexual culture (Gross, 1991).

The LGBTQ community can often be invisible to the mainstream. Though other minorities experience their marginalization performatively—skin color, ethnicity, gender—sexual orientation can be a largely invisible attribute that only surfaces when the individual wants that minority status to be "seen." In absence of any other major source of information, the narrow and negative stereotypes of those in the minority can become the sole representation of any community. In the media, there is a reflexivity to "use popular stereotypes as a code which they know will be readily understood by the audience, thus further reinforcing the presumption of verisimilitude while remaining 'officially' innocent dealing with a sensitive subject" (Gross, 1991, p. 27). During the 1960s and 1970s, homosexuality was indeed a "sensitive subject."

One that was tied to systems of ideological power. It is impossible to remove ideology from the visual framing of the gay and lesbian community—a group that has long been both intensely politicized. Journalists framed news content—and audiences integrated these frames into their world view—through that ideological lens (McQuail, 2005), which very much was a shared culture at the time (W. A. Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson, 1992).

Media representation is premised on a social order. This order reiterates the privileged position offered to heterosexuals (Waring, 1996). Thus, media representation has directly or indirectly constructed the LGBTQ narrative, in opposition to heteronormativity (Kenix, 2016). There is a preponderance of heteronormative media frames (Kenix, 2008) that have long dictated what the LBGTQ community "should" look like, what the LGBTQ community "should" think, and what the LGBTQ community "should" adhere to, to be part of the mainstream community. In other words, it has been the media which have often set the parameters of what the attributes are of being a gay man or lesbian woman in society (Dansky, 2009).

In the relatively recent span of the last 50 or 60 years, LGBTQ representation has changed dramatically in some societies around the world. Indeed, it was the lack of positive LGBTQ representation in the media of the 1960s and 1970s that created a vacuum of representation that contemporary media filled. There was little to no LBGTQ representation in the 1960s and 1970s around the globe (Gross & Gross, 1991). This omission of representation shaped a negative perception of the LGBTQ community in the broader mainstream audience (Jenness, 1995). However, in many societies, media portrayed a growing acceptance and a positive acknowledgment of the LGBTQ community (Levina, Waldo, & Fitzgerald, 2006). That transition did not happen by osmosis. There were actions taken by LGBTQ social movement actors of the time that amalgamated into a purposeful trajectory of social change.

The Co-Creation of Print Media Frames

Media narratives are a reflection of reality, but, of course, there are many "realities." How a reality is portrayed is premised on what media choose to show. How we make sense of the world is through those "realities" learned through the media (Nünning, Nünning, & Neumann, 2010). Media narratives generate possible worlds and media narratives also exert performative power (Benford & Snow, 2000; Peeples & Mitchell, 2007). This is not an unhindered undertaking on the part of media. The resulting media content is due to a conflation of factors that has as much to do with the actors working to generate media coverage—the LGBTQ activists during the 1960s and 1970s—as it has to do with the media itself.

"Collective action" (Klandermans, 1997) frames are constructed, in part, as movement actors negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation, which is defined by those actors as in need of change. These actors argue for frames that make attributions regarding who or what is to blame, they articulate a set of alternative arrangements in media frames that urge others to act and set an agenda for what is needed (Benford & Snow, 2000). This process involves "public discourse—that is, the interface of media discourse and interpersonal interaction; persuasive communication during mobilization campaigns by movement organizations, their opponents and countermovement organizations; and consciousness raising during episodes of collective action" (Klandermans, 1997, p. 45).

There are three subcategories of collective action framing that those who wish to set a media narrative rely on. These categories of frames are "diagnostic framing," "prognostic framing," and "motivational framing" (Snow, Benford, Klandermans, Kriesi, & Tarrow, 1988, p. 198). Diagnostic framing is simply making a problem identifiable and attributable in the press. A problem can be attributable if the narrative can focus blame or responsibility (Benford & Snow, 2000). Prognostic framing involves the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem and the strategies that may be involved for carrying out that potential solution (Benford & Snow, 2000). Finally, motivational framing provides a "call to arms" or rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies for a motive for action (Benford & Snow, 2000). By using these three framing techniques, movement actors build "consensus mobilization" and "action mobilization" (Klandermans, 1988) in the press.

The credibility of any achieved framing is based on three factors—frame consistency, empirical credibility, and credibility of the frame articulators or claims makers (Klandermans, 1988). A movement will not gain traction in the media if it does not have any of these factors. How media frames are projected depends on the credibility of collective action and the perceived credibility of those frame articulators. It is important to note that media and social movements have a symbiotic relationship in which movements are dependent on the media to bring the cause to the wider public (Kenix, 2011). However, it is a relationship bound by mutual dependence.

Methodology

This research was based on 29 interviews that were gathered through the snowball methodology (Boyle, 2004) of information gathering. This methodological approach (also called chain sampling) was essential in finding participants. Interviewees were asked whether they could recommend anyone who was qualified and willing to participate in this research. It is through this methodological approach that the study was able to locate individuals who were prominent LGBTQ activists during the 1960s and 1970s. Using theoretical saturation as a goal, interviews were added until little new information was obtained (Krueger, 1988). Respondents were now 40 to 50 years older than they were at the time of their LGBTQ activism and were asked to recount their activities of that time. All interviewees spoke on the condition of confidentiality, as they did not want other individuals to know certain aspects of their past. New Zealand is a very small country (approximately 5 million people), and the LGBTQ community is much, much smaller. Complete confidentiality was assured, and activists agreed to have their interviews analyzed and published in this article.

One interviewer, who is not an author of this research, conducted all of the interviews and then fully transcribed the data. We, as authors of this research, felt strongly that interviews must be done without our presence to allow interviewees to share stories in their own voice (Bird, 2003) and for us to analyze that content without bias. The interviewer was only told to record the interviewees' account of activist activities in the 1960s and 1970s and instructed to provide input minimally and ask only direct questions. As we were collating and analyzing transcripts for themes, there was a wish to be removed from the data collection. In addition, we did not want to create any false memories on the part of the interviewees, which can derive from a "social negotiation between particular interviewers and rememberers" (Porter, Birt, & Lehman, 2000, p. 507), whereby the interviewer demonstrates high extraversion. Thus, all interviews were conducted by one individual who was instructed to be as direct and silent as possible, to reduce the chances of false

memories occurring. The interviewees sampled came from various class backgrounds across all of New Zealand and were interviewed over a lengthy period of three years. All interviewees were named only on a first-name basis.

Interviews followed a loose structure that was often dictated by the direction of discussion. In several instances, follow-up interviews were held for further clarification and discussion. The discourse from interviews was understood as the representation of a unique province of knowledge, derived from an individualized and exclusive perspective (Hall, 1997). However, this assessment was also situated within a larger shared, cultural environment that necessitated a high level of social and institutional awareness. As such, respondents were asked several times, and in varying ways, about their own understanding of the LGBTQ movement and its relationship with the media.

The analysis of interview data followed other interview research examining large amounts of interview data (Kinefuchi, 2010) and discourse analysis exploring knowledge construction (Fairclough, 2003). This research used a phenomenological approach, which acknowledges that any reality constructed from a narrative exchange between individuals is inherently co-created through perceptions between the interviewer and the interviewee (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Any results reported within this research are intrinsically tied to the researcher's own perceptions as the initial recipient of these messages (Moran, 2000). The goal was to extract as much of the interviewees intended meaning as possible (Kvale, 1996). Toward that goal, this research relied on the steps detailed in previous research (Kinefuchi, 2010), which involved first transcribing all of the interview content and reading through those transcripts in their entirety without any notations. The transcripts were then re-read, with special attention to recurring words and phrases, in an open and self-selective process (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) that revealed associations between media representation and one's own sense of identity. These associations were identified as emerging discourses and viewed within a larger institutional and social context. The transcripts were then read a third time to solidify themes, or dominant discourses (Fairclough, 2003) that existed across interviewees. In several instances a "member check" (Creswell, 1998) was conducted and participants were asked again if the themes uncovered were reflective of their own feelings. Member checks were "the most crucial technique for establishing 'credibility'" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 314).

Once confirmed, this interview data was then contrasted against literature on media and framing to better understand the interviewee responses. In particular, this research asked whether participants relied on diagnostic, prognostic, or motivational framing to develop their media representation. The results of the study should help to build on the literature surrounding media coverage of social movements and could likely assist social movements in the future. Given that media is in a state of constant evolution, and that the results reported here are from meetings that took place over three years about the past, conclusions should be viewed as a representation of one particular moment in time and in one particular place—New Zealand.

Findings and Discussion

In several instances from the interviews, those in LGBTQ communities talked about societal conservativeness associated with the word "gay" or "lesbian." They noted repeatedly how the media rarely used this terminology—however, LGBTQ activists in the 1960s and 1970s felt that they could use this

omission to their own advantage. For example, an interviewee named Tighe stated, "The word *lesbian* was so awful it was forbidden. All of a sudden there was all this publicity, it was on our televisions, it was on our radios, it was in the newspapers, it was everywhere" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Their aim was to "normalize" these terms (Brickell, 2000) and reverse the social construction of homosexuality as "abnormal." Given that during the 1960s and 1970s, media were cautious to address the LGBTQ community and were demonstrably apprehensive in their usage of terms such as "gay" and "lesbian" in the mainstream, it was a difficult undertaking. One interviewee, Martin, stated, "The papers were very conservative in those days. I think the *Star* wouldn't even print the word *gay*. It was always homosexual" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Thus, changing the public lexicon was an aim of these activists. Here, the activists were working on articulating and amplifying their frame in the media. Being happily framed as gay or lesbian was very new in this period, and neither diagnostic, prognostic, or motivational framing had occurred yet. Repeatedly articulating the gay and lesbian frame worked to amplify their cause.

When asked in an interview if there were any difficulties in being gay, Hugh stated, "The biggest hassle is probably being gay in an overwhelmingly straight society" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Their sense of marginalization was omnipresent. Thus, activists first encountered attempts at diagnostic framing. Activists were attempting to make their own sense of marginalization as a problem that could be identifiable and attributable in the press. As stated earlier, media representation is a manifestation of systemic power. In this instance, the LGBTQ community felt decidedly outside the systemic power of the time. As Hugh recalls, "[Chuckles] The camera was quite dramatic, it sort of pulled out and there was Brian and me sitting there getting smaller and smaller and there were all these images of mountains [laughs]" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). The visual of these two individuals getting visibly smaller was indicative of their relative power of the time.

Because the use of the word *lesbian* was decidedly understated at the time, a group of female homosexuals named themselves *Lesbians in Print* (LIP) in response. The fact that it was named LIP gave added impetus to the LGBTQ community and inserted their cause directly into mainstream society. As another interviewee adds,

> Prior to the gay liberation and lesbian liberation, the word *lesbian* was a very, very negative word. So, most of us didn't use it to describe ourselves. "Kamp" was what we were, what I was. But with lesbian liberation a woman called Rose Wood, she said to me, "I don't like the word *lesbian* either," but I got to get used to it because politically I got to reclaim this, so I went around saying "lesbian, lesbian" to get used to it, so I did that too. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

Here, again, activists were struggling to have their movement both articulated and amplified in the press. The cautiousness of media to construct the LGBTQ narrative played a twin role during that time—on the one hand, it was challenging to use terms like "gay" or "lesbian" in mainstream discourse. Yet, on the other hand, when these terms were used in the media, they were given an added importance that they would not have had otherwise. The fundamental existence of lesbians as people in New Zealand became diagnosed (Benford & Snow, 2000) in the media. Thus, the very usage of these terms gave positive media

attention to LGBTQ groups using mainstream media. It also demonstrated to other lesbians as well as to the larger mainstream community that being lesbian was acceptable.

Media, at the time, relied on stereotypes that were reconstituted ideologically (McQuail, 2005) to portray a negative impression of a gay man or a lesbian woman. For example, one of the interviewees reflected on a discussion that he had had with a group of fathers: "They said, amongst other things, that those kind of people should be allowed to live and that you could tell who they were because their eyes sparkled" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). There was a preconception of what it meant to be gay (sparkly). These kinds of misconceptions largely emerged from media discourses of the time and created a self-sustaining impression. Therefore, many in the LBGTQ community felt that they had to work at reconstituting the media narrative:

> We hadn't then been curtailed into the kind of "you have to look and appear in a certain way," so when we were (in the media) it was outrageous because one of the guys had black nail polish on and that was the kind of like (mimics and shocked gasp) and the whole of New Zealand saw it. So, the main thing was to bring the issue. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

These individuals knew that the public's main understanding of any social issue derived from a framed construction provided by media (Ryan, Carragee, & Schwerner, 1998). Therefore, they actively worked to set the narrative and extend the frame, so that potentially their interests would become the concerns of outside potential adherents (Benford & Snow, 2000). Sandy adds, "We became visible, they never used the word *lesbian* in newspaper reports" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). This challenged the primary narrative constructed by the media and provided a counternarrative that became visible in the mainstream. As this counternarrative by the LGBTQ community gained visibility, the LGBTQ communities worked to bridge the frame (Benford & Snow, 2000) and develop that alternative narrative further.

In one instance, Jenny states, "I was making myself available for the interview. . . . And then I did an interview for the *Auckland Star*, and the *Auckland Star* did a whole page with four different lesbians" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). This counternarrative framing gained more significance in society as the LGBTQ community became more visible and their frame became amplified. This counternarrative also gained more significance as popular personalities who were closeted started coming out, which further strengthened the presence of the LGBTQ community in New Zealand. Hugh adds, "Peter Sinclair was well-known; Max Crier still wasn't out really . . . and yet he was widely known to be gay" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). The LGBTQ framing thus bridged to prominent personalities in New Zealand and—"People who were out were just ordinary guys and were rare and they were jewels" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Hugh knew then that these individuals worked as essential motivational frames in the press, both for other LGBTQ readers and for the media itself. Every prominent individual provided a clear rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action just by being themselves.

Collective action media frames of the time were discussed by interviewees and reflected the society of that time. In many ways, print media set and enshrined the cultural beliefs and ideological affirmations of society in the 1960s and 1970s. Anything "unconventional" gave emergence to a new frame and subsequently a new narrative that the LGBTQ community made the best use of at that point of time. This frame transformation provided a strong counternarrative to the exiting dominant frame (Benford & Snow, 2000). As Emmy states,

> I think in that case, the direct action that we took really helped raise—I mean, it was national news for more than 24-hour news cycle, which is remarkable, considering that you basically have to throw a dildo at a trade minister to get that kind of national attention for that long. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

These actors were creating a spectacle within the media that guaranteed coverage (Debord, 2012). This diagnostic framing was working to the advantage of the LGBTQ community. They were clearly identifying a problem and began prognostic and motivational framing to help shift the prevailing narrative.

In one interview, Martin discusses how a teacher wrote a straightforward letter to the Ayatollah in Iran, which became misinterpreted. Iranians perceived the letter as a "a death threat from the homosexuals in New Zealand [laughs Martin]" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). The New Zealand ambassador to Iran at the time had to publicly apologize. His apology was on behalf of the national government to the country of Iran. Because of this incident, Martin recalls that he was summoned by *The Press*, of Christchurch, to see the chief reporter who published the original letter the next day. Martin states, "So, it was great, and people realized we were there" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Martin clearly understood that this representation was determining what was "relevant" (Hertog & McLeod, 1995, p. 4). He was extending the frame of being LGBTQ to a credible and worthy minority group.

Some organizations of the time, such as The Hero Project, worked to alter the stereotype of gay people. This organization actively worked to change the narrative and define relevance. Alan states,

> With good PR and presenting to the public the image of gay people as succeeders in society rather than being portrayed as tragic stereotypes, such as "the one who dies in a movie" being a classic example. Here were gay people having party and the public loved it! (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

The Hero Project used the existing stereotype to alter the impression of gay people as normal people. Thus, the stereotype was used by the media to portray a conservative frame of the LGBTQ community and the same existing frame was included by the LGBTQ community to address the narrative of normality in society (Gross & Gross, 1991). It must be noted that the extended frame that emerged from the existing narrative helped the LGBTQ community to gain more sympathy and validation so that they could expand their message (Debord, 2012; Kellner, 2010).

The gay community at the time was represented by the media as exclusively White. For instance, Tighe stated, "There is definitely an attempt by the media to force us to have the most-Whitest face leading

the movement for No Pride in prisons. The majority of people who are involved are people of color, so it's just not going to happen" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). Here, the print media diagnosed a different problem, then identified by social movement actors (Goffman, 1974), which led to a frame dispute. There was a conflict between what social movement actors intended to project through the print media and what print media diagnosed as the frame, which was based on the stereotypes. In the short term, many in the gay community did not see how they could participate in any frame alignment process if their own members were so fundamentally misrepresented.

From the point of media representation, the framing of the time was based on a conventional frame, which reflected the heterosexual view (Gross & Gross, 1991). It is within this existing framing that the LGBTQ community further propagated counternarratives to gain recognition. The LGBTQ community used the motivational framing (Benford & Snow, 2000) for engaging in ameliorative action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive. The idea of a cohesive identity formed through social movements gave credence to the collective action frames (Benford & Snow, 2000). Moreover, cohesive identities were sustained through collective action and extended frames that sustained participation. The collective identity of the LGBTQ community made the counternarrative frame significant in contestation with the diagnostic frame that was created by print media.

The conservative and somewhat biased print media representation of the time also impacted production and distribution channels. In terms of media representation, Fran mentions that

> it was quite hard to get books and stuff like that. Over here, the book trade was quite regulated, although you had quite a variety of books compared to what you get now, and a greater variety of book shops that you get stuff from, but a lot of books that had anything about homosexuality were banned. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

The representation of those in the LGBTQ community was symbolically annihilated (Gross & Gross, 1991) from mainstream print media discourse at the time. Media access to any content related to the homosexuality was socially and politically regulated (J. Gamson, 1995).

In another interview, Fran stated that

> you had to make hard copies of things and then you had to have a way of getting those hardcopies to people. Try and make them interesting, accessible. I think we did better at accessible, like using cartoons a lot, some of the groups did that. And you know, be visible, hold meetings, hold protests, so people knew who you are. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

This approach seemed to work symbiotically between print media representation to print media production by the LGBTQ community. Activists were working to diagnostically frame the issue of being gay in New Zealand. They simply had to find indirect ways to insert their counternarratives into the mainstream. There were gay–lesbian coalitions that helped to form LGBTQ access to the media. As Sandy suggests,

> The coalitions were interesting, it was mostly young gay men and a variety of women from different age groups, but a lot of us had been involved in the gay library and the women, um . . . it was a Pacific Island and Māori women's group, they had their own group. (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17)

All of these coalitions gave an added impetus to sustain a narrative within the media. These organizations brought potentially tangential issues affecting the LGBTQ community to the forefront, therefore diagnostically framing what is important and prognostically articulating proposed solutions.

The self-initiative of media production by the LGBTQ community in New Zealand during the 1960s and 1970s gave the group validation and sympathy (Kellner, 2010) in the wider community. This helped to bring their issues to the forefront and also helped to further reforms. By strategically using motivational framing in the press, the LGBTQ community had a clear "call to arms." The apprehensiveness of the print media at that time to address the LGBTQ community forced those within that community to find indirect ways to use media to their own advantage. Fran mentions that the main point "was to make the content 'accessible'" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). This sustained initiative also displayed the sheer resilience (Craig, McInroy, McCready, & Alaggia, 2015) of the LGBTQ community and the concern that something needed to be done to address their concerns. Media can "provide participants with opportunities or (a) coping through escapism, (b) feeling stronger (c) fighting back and (d) finding and fostering community" (Craig et al., 2015, p. 262). In numerous instances, the interviewees pointed out that self-initiated media production gave voices to the LGBTQ members, and they felt empowered. One interviewee noted that pamphlets given to members of Parliament was one way that the LGBTQ community asserted power. Simply put, one interviewee stated that the LGBTQ community during that time "did everything that was accessible to them." Another interviewee said, "It was either electronic media, television or radio, or print media, and we used a lot of that. There were many meetings small and large, public meetings, rallies you name it" (Confidential, personal communication, 2014–17). All of this media production was done to sustain momentum of the extended frames that had now escaped to the mainstream discourse. LGBTQ coalitions, bridging magazines such as *Lesbians in Print* and self-initiated media production, all worked to sustain momentum, which sustained the extended frame (Benford & Snow, 2000) and worked to build the main frame of collective action.

Conclusion

This research examined how LGBTQ activists produced media content and engaged with the media to create a beneficial representational frame for the LGBTQ movement in New Zealand during 1960s and 1970s. This research discussed the historical representation of the LGBTQ community and the process of that change. Much of the work undertaken by the LGBTQ community at that time worked to reverse this trend. Activists depended on diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing to amplify, extend, bridge, and transform what it meant to be LGBTQ in New Zealand.

At the time, the media represented a very mainstream, and conservative, vision of the LGBTQ community. These media frames and media representations were systematic processes to reaffirm social, economic, and political power. Media narratives of the time were created to project an intended reality. This

is, of course, still the case. However, the early work of these activists managed to change that intended reality through dogged determination.

Collective action frames and its constituents—diagnostic framing, prognostic framing, and motivational framing—were discussed at length. These frames were generated by interactive and discursive processes, which in turn were articulated and amplified in the media. The 29 interviewees for this research made clear that only by diagnostically framing their cause in the media (through coalitions and other means) were they able to articulate and amplify their community through a careful process of prognostic and motivational framing.

In our findings, we discussed how media rarely used terminologies at that time that were related to the LGBTQ community. Instead, media relied on stereotypes and a decided heteronormative lens of representation. The LGBTQ community used these existing stereotypes to their own advantage and offered a much stronger counternarrative to sustain their existence in the public sphere. This reversal of representation was essential to the growth of the LGBTQ movement. Further, to remain in the public view, the LGBTQ community self-initiated production channels that worked to sustain their presence. Any event that did not fit within the conventional frame of media at the time gave the movement an added impetus. This meant that the LGBTQ community used the collective action frame to its own advantage by bridging an extended and alternative frame for the LGBTQ community. This was a purposeful framing that constituted their own identity. In many ways, the self-initiated media production extended their own identity constitution and was a tool of liberation against the societal and institutional oppression of the time.

An obvious limitation to the study is that it is historical. As such, many of the respondents may have had a different recollection of events then actually occurred at the time. This limitation is outweighed by the importance of simply recording this history. It is hoped that doing so will provide for a better understanding of how marginalized groups can gain power in mainstream society. Another limitation is simply the small sample size. Future work should try to increase the number of interviewees so that research can gain a much wider understanding of the LGBTQ movement in the 1960s and 1970s.

References

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*(1), 611–639. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Bennett, J. E., & Brickell, C. (2018). Surveilling the mind and body: Medicalising and de-medicalising homosexuality in 1970s New Zealand. *Medical History, 62*(2), 199–216. doi:10.1017/mdh.2018.4

Bird, S. E. (2003). *The audience in everyday life: Living in a media world*. London, UK: Routledge.

Blashill, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). Gay stereotypes: The use of sexual orientation as a cue for gender-related attributes. *Sex Roles, 61*, 783–793. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9684-7

Boyle, M. P. (2004). *Social networks, mass media, and efficacy: Implications for protest participation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Brickell, C. (2000). Heroes and invaders: Gay and lesbian pride parades and the public/private distinction in New Zealand media accounts. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography, 7*(2), 163–178. doi:10.1080/713668868

Brickell, C. (2008). *Mates and lovers: A history of gay New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Godwit.

Carlyon, J., & Morrow, D. (2013). *Changing times: New Zealand since 1945*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Carragee, K. M., & Roefs, W. (2004). The neglect of power in recent framing research. *Journal of Communication, 54*(2), 214–233.

Cox, L. (2005). That's what I am: I'm a lesbian. In A. Laurie & L. Evans (Eds.), *Outlines: Lesbian and gay histories of Aotearoa*. Wellington, New Zealand: Lesbian and Gay Archives (LAGANZ).

Craig, S. L., McInroy, L., McCready, L. T., & Alaggia, R. (2015). Media: A catalyst for resilience in lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 12*(3), 254–275. doi:10.1080/19361653.2015.1040193

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dahlberg, L. (2001). The Internet and democratic discourse: Exploring the prospects of online deliberative forums extending the public sphere. *Information, Communication & Society, 4*(4), 615–633. doi:10.1080/13691180110097030

Dansky, S. (2009, March 1). *The look of gay liberation*. Retrieved from http://www.glreview.org/article/article-554/

Debord, G. (2012). *Society of the spectacle*. London, UK: Bread and Circuses.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ferree, M. M., Gamson, W. A., Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (2002). Four models of the public sphere in modern democracies. *Theory and Society, 31*(3), 289–324.

Gamson, J. (1995). Must identity movements self-destruct? A queer dilemma. *Social Problems, 42*(3), 390–407.

Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18*, 373–393.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gross, L. (1991). Out of the mainstream: Sexual minorities and the mass media. In M. A. Wolf & A. P. Kielwasser (Eds.), *Gay people, sex, and the media* (pp. 19–46). New York, NY: Haworth.

Gross, L., & Gross, L. (1991). Out of the mainstream: Sexual minorities and the mass media. *Journal of Homosexuality, 21*(1–2), 19–46. doi:10.1300/J082v21n01_04

Guy, L. (2002). *Worlds in collision: The gay debate in New Zealand, 1960–1986*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–74). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Hertog, J., & McLeod, D. (1995). Anarchists wreak havoc in downtown Minneapolis: A multi-level study of media coverage of radical protest. *Journalism Monographs, 151*(June), 1–48.

Jenness, V. (1995). Social movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes: The gay/lesbian movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem. *Social Problems, 42*(1), 145–170.

Jennings, R., & Millward, L. (2016). A fully formed blast from abroad?: Australasian lesbian circuits of mobility and the transnational exchange of ideas in the 1960s and 1970s. *Journal of the History of Sexuality, 25*(3), 463–488. Retrieved from http://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/629667

Kellner, D. (2010). Media spectacle and media events: Some critical reflections. In N. Coulldry, A. Hepp, & F. Krotz (Eds.), *Media events in a global age* (pp. 76–79). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Kenix, L. J. (2008). From media frame to social change? A comparative analysis of same-sex rights in the United States and New Zealand Press. *Australian Journal of Communication, 35*(3), 105–128.

Kenix, L. J. (2011). *Alternative and mainstream media: The converging spectrum*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.

Kenix, L. J. (2016). A straight gay wedding? News images of same-sex marriage in the mainstream and alternative New Zealand press. *Communication, Politics & Culture, 49*(2), 25–49.

Kenix, L. J. (2019). Exploring national culture through international media: The publication of a viral pro-LGBT image compared against a nation's wealth, level of religion, and democracy. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 49*(March), 1404–1634.

Kerekere, E. (2016). LGBT Activism among Māori. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies*, 1–5. doi:10.1002/9781118663219.wbegss666

Kinefuchi, E. (2010). Finding home in migration: Montagnard refugees and post-migration identity. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 3*(3), 228–248.

Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(1), 83–96. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x

Klandermans, B. (1988). The formation and mobilization of consensus. *International Social Movement Research, 1*, 173–196.

Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Krueger, R. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Newbury Park, NJ: SAGE Publications.

Kushner, B. (2012). *The life and ageing exeriences of gay men over the age of 65 in New Zealand* (Master's thesis). Massey University, Albany, New Zealand.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Levina, M., Waldo, C. R., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2006). We're here, we're queer, we're on TV: The effects of visual media on heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(4), 738–758.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, NJ: SAGE Publications.

Martin, C. L. (1995). Stereotypes about children with traditional and nontraditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 33*(11), 727–751. doi:10.1007/BF01544776

McMillan, K. (2012). Media and politics. *Te Ara—The encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved from http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/mi/media-and-politics/print

McQuail, D. (2005). *Mass communication theory* (5th ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. London, UK: Routledge.

Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. London, UK: Routledge.

New Zealand truth hits the news stands: 24 June 1905. (2020). *NZ History*. Retrieved from https://nzhistory.govt.nz/new-zealand-truth-hits-the-stands

Nünning, V., Nünning, A., & Neumann, B. (2010). *Cultural ways of worldmaking: Media and narratives* (Vol. 1). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Peeples, J. A., & Mitchell, B. (2007). "No mobs—No confusions—No tumult": Networking civil disobedience. *Electronic Journal of Communication, 17*(1/2), 290–306.

Porter, S., Birt, A., & Lehman, D. R. (2000). Negotiating false memories: Interviewer and rememberer characteristics relate to memory distortion. *Psychological Science, 11*(6), 507–510. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00297

Ryan, C., Carragee, K. M., & Schwerner, C. (1998). Media, movements, and the quest for social justice. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*(2), 165–181.

Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication, 57*(1), 9–20.

Schneider, R. J. (2010). Going alphanumeric. *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide, 17*(1), 11.

Singer, J. B., Hermida, A., Domingo, D., Heinonen, A., Paulussen, S., Quandt, T., & Reich, Z. (2011). *Participatory journalism: Guarding open gates at online newspapers*. Maiden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Snow, D., Benford, R., Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H., & Tarrow, S. (1988). From structure to action: Social movement participation across cultures. In D. Snow & R. Benford (Eds.), *Ideology, frame resonance and participant mobilization* (pp. 197–217). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). *The basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Tankard, J. W., Jr., Hendrickson, L., Silberman, J., Bliss, K., & Ghanem, S. (1991, August 7–10). *Media frames: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement.* Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Boston, MA.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Waring, H. R. (1996). *Media system dependency and identity: The development of America's gay and lesbian alternative media and the transformation of homosexuality* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles.