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Abstract

This thesis is concerned with the introduction and development of western psychology in New Zealand during the period 1869 – 1929. The foundations of psychology coincided with the early foundations of the country and the building of the first university colleges. The evolving colonial university system provided opportunity but also institutional limitations on the development of the subject. Sir Thomas Hunter introduced experimental psychology and established the first psychology laboratory in 1907 at Victoria College. Hunter was supported in this by his American based mentor, Edward B. Titchener. Hunter played an important role in campaigning for university reform and worked tirelessly to promote both the study and application of psychology.

This thesis argues that historic global and local events were crucial to the development and advancement of psychology in New Zealand. World War 1 ended in 1918 and was followed by a deadly flu epidemic. These events led to new theories and developments in psychology, many of which were imported to New Zealand and adapted to suit local needs. Local changes in approaches to health care and social management opened opportunities for a professional role in psychology. Throughout the 1920’s psychologists expanded their field of influence and began to develop applications for psychological knowledge.

By 1929, psychology had become firmly established as a discipline worthy of individual attention. New Zealand had not yet begun to produce significant psychological research but provided a unique host society in which, in the space of sixty years, the study of psychology was introduced and developed and largely kept pace with international advances.
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Introduction

In this thesis the history of psychology in New Zealand between the years 1869 – 1929 will be examined. At the start of this period, New Zealand was an isolated outpost of the British Empire with a relatively sparse population. Geographically isolated from Britain and with a difficult topography, New Zealand was in many ways a challenging prospect for immigrants. However, this isolation encouraged a very practical and adaptable mindset which, together with a developing sense of national identity, created a unique host society into which the discipline of psychology was introduced and developed.

That the history of psychology is a worthwhile subject for study is undeniable. The study of the mind is a popular and influential discipline which has spread across much of the world (Turtle, 1987). Without a history and a shared philosophy, both local and global, psychological research becomes a series of barely related topics in a field so diverse it is sometimes difficult to see the relationship between its many branches. Whether this is diversity or chaos is a matter for debate but it is suggested that in order to navigate its future a discipline needs to understand and value its past, to avoid repeating mistakes and to help resolve current dilemmas by examining their origins and development (Morris, Todd, Midgley, Schneider & Johnson, 1990). Psychology, due to the nature of its subject matter and its influence in society, has a responsibility to understand the background of its own knowledge base and application, and to acknowledge, along with successes, the errors and omissions. History provides the means for doing this and also highlights the local conditions and concerns and professional debates and disputes which help direct the professionalization of a discipline. As argued by Farmington, 1949 (cited in Morris et al., 1990, p 133),
History is the most fundamental science, for there is no human knowledge which cannot lose its scientific character when men (and women) forget the conditioning under which it originated, the questions it answered, and the function it was created to serve. A great part of the mysticism and superstition of educated men (and women) consists of knowledge which has broken base from its historical mooring.

This thesis is based on the premise that the forces affecting the development of psychology in New Zealand have been predominantly external, rather than internal to the discipline, such as the effects of World War 1 and the increased focus on public health. Therefore, I give priority to individual and situational factors over theory and research developments, most of which were developed outside New Zealand. The economic, cultural and social environment of the time and place and key individual participants are examined. Although many of the facts of New Zealand’s early history of psychology have been documented, these contextual elements have often been neglected in favour of the internal developments of the science, its academic history and the search for professional origins.

Jackson (1998), in a doctoral thesis on the subject, took a philosophical perspective, using consciousness as a framework. His work is primarily concerned with the origins of academic psychology within the University of New Zealand (UNZ). Youngmeyer (1992) examined in detail, the acquisition of the equipment and the laboratories required for the practice of the burgeoning scientific approach to psychology. This thesis argues that it took a mixture of personalities, bureaucratic vagaries, historic events (such as war) and the demands and needs of society to shape the growth and development of the discipline in New Zealand. Important too, from this perspective, were the relationships and alliances.
formed within and between the University and the community, and, for the lucky few, with the international community of psychologists.

**Source Material and Methodology**

This thesis uses a variety of source materials to examine both the contextual, institutional, political and social factors influencing the development of psychology and also the factors shaping psychology internally as a scientific discipline in New Zealand. The chapter schema is not entirely chronological but moves backwards and forwards in time to highlight specific issues.

Many secondary sources have been helpful, in particular the New Zealand chapter of the *Oxford Handbook of the History of Psychology* (Haig and Marie, 2012), and several works by Alison Turtle (1987; 1989; 1995). Most secondary sources have focused on a specific area of interest or have provided broad, but relatively brief, overviews of New Zealand psychology history. I believe there is a gap in the literature for the contextual approach I have taken. I have used primary source materials where possible; the language used, and attitudes expressed, have helped put the subject into its historical context, giving something of the flavour of the time. Several texts written by people involved in events have been useful, in particular the various lectures of Sir Thomas Hunter and Boring’s (1929) edition of a *History of Experimental Psychology*. One particularly useful source of information has been the letters between E. B. Titchener and Sir Thomas Hunter, collected by Brown and Fuchs (1969). One drawback with the source material, written almost exclusively by well educated men, has been a limitation of outlook. The same can be said of the institutional and official records. Although this does not diminish the value of the accounts, it is a limitation, as was the tendency, in the time period under discussion, to lionise an admired individual. For
example, many of the writings about Sir Thomas Hunter by his contemporaries are very deferential.

Newspapers have been a particularly helpful source of information. Newspapers were vital to communication in a colony not only geographically isolated from the rest of the world but internally consisting of just four major population centres strung out across two islands. Economic conditions and a pioneering unity of purpose led to the establishment in 1879, of the New Zealand Press Association, a cooperative model for news gathering and dispersal (Harris, 2008). This proved very helpful for the current research as once a news item was picked up by the Press Association it tracked through most of the major local papers under different title headings. Another benefit of early newspaper sources was the generous type allowance given to reports from the professors of the UNZ. For example, a newspaper write-up of a public lecture on an issue of topical interest could be several pages long, including discussion of the audience response. When pioneering the introduction of the ‘new’ or scientific psychology, academics made good use of the press and articles often carried much more information than would be expected today.

Scope

The first sixty years of psychology in New Zealand will be addressed in this thesis. Several issues and many people remain unexamined here and merit further attention but fall outside the scope of this paper. For example, it is possible to compare developments in New Zealand psychology to those in Australia; however this has been addressed in the works of Ross St. George and is only briefly alluded to in this paper. Another issue not examined in is the severe economic depression, the effects of which were already becoming apparent in the late 1920’s and continued until the outbreak of World War Two. This
depression affected the intellectual climate of the period; however, the time frame of this paper does not allow a thorough examination of the effects of the depression on psychology. What follows is a brief outline of the rest of the present thesis, examining the influence of the social, political and institutional factors on the development of New Zealand psychology and argues that these factors were far more influential than the internal, disciplinary factors. It also highlights the way in which New Zealand psychologists, such as Sir Thomas Hunter, were often thwarted in their attempts to establish psychology as a scientific discipline by local and British-imported institutional structures and yet managed, despite these limitations to keep pace with the rapid global development of the discipline in this time period.
Chapter one: Maori, settlers and the University of New Zealand

The settlers set about building the institutions they valued and recreating the traditions from home, adapting them freely to meet the needs of the colony. The University Colleges were an early and impressive outcome of this industry. Philosophy, though a successful discipline in the new land, was nevertheless a classic subject and the colony needed practical and professional skills and newer ideas. Maori had little involvement in the development of psychology during this time period.

Chapter two: The first four university colleges

The establishment of psychology within each affiliated college of the UNZ is examined. The efforts of a number of key people were vital in the first stages of this process. The early history of psychology is closely related to the workings of the UNZ and the development of the individual affiliated colleges.

Chapter three: Thomas Hunter, university reform and experimental psychology

With a university career spanning 1904 – 1951, as a teacher, an administrator and a university reformer, Thomas Hunter was an important early facilitator of New Zealand psychology, sometimes called the ‘father of New Zealand experimental psychology’ (Beaglehole, 1946; Kemp, 2007). Hunter and colleagues, sometimes collaborating but more often working in isolation in one of the four university colleges, taught psychology as a sub topic of philosophy, eventually expanding it into a discipline in its own right. Hunter introduced scientific methods and created the first psychology laboratory, within a timeframe that kept New Zealand abreast of the rest of the world (Beeby, 1992; Kemp, 2007).

Chapter four: Education and psychology

Angela Berliner
Masters thesis psychology
History of Psychology
Psychology, while derived from philosophy, was also to some degree hindered by it within the UNZ. Education departments were quicker to see the potential benefits of the subject, as it related to teaching method and were willing collaborators with the early psychologists (Winterbourne, 1953).

**Chapter five: A world war, a disease and the neuroses of war**

In the years 1914 – 1919, New Zealand suffered the consequences of a world war and a pandemic disease. The full impact of these events is not necessarily well understood. For psychology, they led to some of the conditions (increased public health legislation for example) which helped accelerate the expansion of the discipline during the 1920’s. Psychologists and psychiatrists in many countries struggled to explain and treat the phenomenon of ‘shellshock’ or neurasthenia. As a result, waves of new ideas were developed and introduced into New Zealand, reducing its isolation, aided by advances in communication and the increased availability of books and journals.

**Chapter six: Applying psychology**

In the aftermath of war, the UNZ took its expertise out into the community and psychological subjects (amongst others) were lectured at popular workers’ meetings held in libraries and town halls. The growth of the institutional infrastructure and legislation needed to support an independent nation, such as public health and welfare measures, also helped provide professional opportunities in the discipline and the groundwork was laid for the future of educational, industrial and clinical psychology. This was the age of the expert, the mantle of which was adopted with some alacrity in New Zealand (Beeby, 1992). The discipline was still immature and plastic and while making its presence felt in society it was also influenced by society in a reciprocal fashion. The 1920’s also saw signs of psychology
taking on an identity and a conscious role in shaping New Zealand society (Taylor, 2005). The best example of this may be the stand taken by psychologists against the eugenics movement within New Zealand, and, while only a small part of the eugenics story, it is significant to the story of psychology. While this was perhaps a pinnacle point, the late 1920’s also saw the start of a severe economic depression which would continue into the next decade, described by Sutherland (1931):

Never before has a New Year dawned under such a universal cloud of fear, uncertainty and want, and this is in the midst of such abounding plenty. Every section of every nation in the world is assailed by Fear: and this fear is not an intangible thing – but a real menace (p. 3).

The complex economic conditions caused a period of retrenchment to the advance of psychology which would only, in cyclical fashion, change with the end of the next major world war. For this reason the period after 1929 is outside the scope of this thesis.
Chapter one

Maori, Settlers and the University of New Zealand

Polynesian explorers first settled New Zealand over 700 years ago. A small number of sailors, whalers, traders and missionaries began arriving at the start of the nineteenth century. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 brought New Zealand into the British Empire and this distant outpost of the Crown experienced a third and more rapid wave of British and European migration during the 1840’s and 1850’s (Jackson & McRobie, 2008). Geographical divisions and cultural variations that had existed in the United Kingdom often continued in the new country (Haig & Marie, 2012). The Scottish Presbyterians, the English Anglicans and the Irish Catholics (the Welsh largely stayed home) were often recruited by local immigration schemes and settled in specific areas. Despite regional differences there was a substantial degree of cultural homogeneity amongst the settler population. That included a British intellectual and social model and knowledge of the institutions required to uphold it (Tennant, O’Brien & Sanders, 2008).

These immigrants brought with them Western philosophy and its associated discipline of psychology; in doing so they faced difficulties but no notable opposition. Describing modern psychology as being “spawned by British mental philosophy and evolutionary biology in interaction with German physiology, and conceived against a rising swell of nineteenth century positivism,” Turtle (1987, p. 1) claimed that psychology was introduced into what was virtually a cultural vacuum in Australia and New Zealand, as the native populations were too small or too alien to influence matters. The established Maori cultural base was often denigrated by European settlers who followed a more individualist ethos of self betterment which was antipathetic to the Maori collectivist culture (Tennant, O’Brien &
Sanders, 2008). Maori were soon vastly outnumbered by the colonists, an important factor in the lack of Maori input at this stage of the history of psychology. In 1858, the General Census began including Maori as well as European inhabitants and recorded roughly equal populations of 59,413 European and 56,409 Maori. From this point Maori endured a decline, largely due to imported diseases and high child mortality rates (McLintock, 2009).

Meanwhile with the addition of government assisted immigration the European population increased dramatically by over 160% in the decade up to 1871. By the 1890’s the Maori population had reduced to 50,000 in an overall population of 800,000 (Te Ahukerau, 2013).

With such a small and declining Maori population, the indigenous practices, beliefs and ‘ways of knowing’ existing at the time were likely to have been largely insignificant to the immigrant population, hence Turtle’s (1987) reference to a ‘cultural vacuum’. According to Buck (1940), there was an absolute disregard for Maori psychology and, in the history of the states guardianship of Maori, never any interest in “the culture and the psychology of the Maori with a view to inaugurating schemes to help him adjust himself to changing conditions” (p. 15). Maori were faced with the perceived threat of extinction; leaders had to deal with reversing the decline while reviving their Maori culture and adapting where necessary to Pakeha ways (Sutherland, 1940). In 1928, the Chancellor of the University of New Zealand, J. M. Brown (1928, Senate Minutes), noted the new inclusion of Maori language into the University curriculum. He believed that in order to rule the Polynesian dependencies New Zealand officials should know the languages, culture and belief systems of the people (although noting that Mother England had managed very well without this effort). Campbell (1943) claimed that New Zealand had missed an opportunity to become a centre of Polynesian studies and was generally backward in cultural, psychological and
socio-economic fields. However, this failed to recognise the early work of New Zealand researchers in ethnographic surveying, anthropology and cross cultural psychology. Ivan Sutherland, a professor of psychology and philosophy (1924 – 1952), developed a strong personal relationship with Maori and recognised the intimate loss that Maori had suffered in losing so many of their cultural forms and the need to study personality development with this in mind (Sutherland, 1946; Sutherland, 2013). In the 1920’s and 1930’s some psychologists, including Ernest Beaglehole, developed an interest in ethnographic surveying and anthropology. Beaglehole researched several Pacific communities in this period and went on, in the 1940’s, to study and write about Maori communities in the Kowhai region (Kemp, 2007). It was not until the 1970’s that Maori specific psychology, by Maori for Maori, would develop momentum (Haig & Marie, 2012). For this reason, Maori are not considered in this essay which focuses on the importation and development of a colonial psychology.

The University of New Zealand

Ships’ passenger lists of the first decades of the colony show that only a small minority of the incomers were skilled or educated people. Many of the immigrants arrived on assisted passages provided by the New Zealand Company. At least half of these were children and most of the adults were skilled rural workers (Philips, 2013). These immigrants would form the initial market for academic philosophy and psychology in New Zealand and, while not the traditional demographic for university recruitment, they did have an appetite for academic institutions. The Otago Association, which recruited settlers from Scotland for the Otago Scheme, understood that Scots immigrants would be unimpressed by any migration scheme which did not have allowance for an education system similar to the
existing one in Scotland. Schools and a University were therefore treated as a priority in the new colony (Graham, 1981; Thompson, 1919). In 1869 the Provincial Council of Otago, enjoying the relative wealth brought by the Otago gold rush and the rise in immigration, established and endowed a University of Otago. Around the same time, the Presbyterian Church, worried about producing suitably educated candidates for its ministry, worked out a plan for a theological college. When funding for this proved to be inadequate, the Church chose instead to fund a chair of Mental Science in the University to join three other chairs founded in Classics and English, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and Natural Science (Thompson, 1919). It was at this point in 1869 that the history of psychology in New Zealand began, albeit in a very small way as a subtopic of its parent discipline of Philosophy and dependant on the success of an academic institution that had only just been established. That the first New Zealand chair in philosophy was funded by a religious institution was to be a source of difficulty for the progress of psychology, as was the next development, that of the University of New Zealand.

In 1870 the New Zealand General Assembly, after discussions with the Provincial Council of Otago, decided that the colony required a colonial, not just a provincial, university. There was some provincial rivalry; the Colonial Treasurer Julius Vogel had introduced population based funding and it was considered the work of the provinces to encourage immigration (McKinnon, 2012). With the difficult geography of New Zealand and the dispersed and sparse population the positioning of an important institution such as a University was a contentious issue. Otago representatives first suggested that their university be absorbed into the colonial University of New Zealand which would be situated in Dunedin, but these negotiations foundered on the crippling lack of bureaucratic
experience of the University Council; not knowing quite what to do, the Council simply did nothing (New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, 1871). Canterbury College, established around the same time as Otago, took competitive action (petitioning parliament for a single New Zealand university) which hastened agreement by Otago. Several points were negotiated between Otago and Canterbury and agreed by the UNZ Council, including that ‘the standard of degrees should be no lower than that of the University of Melbourne’, and, more importantly, that ‘all examinations, to maintain a high standard and secure perfect fairness, should be conducted from Great Britain’ (Beaglehole 1937, p. 101). In 1874, the University Act was passed, establishing the University of New Zealand as an examining and administrative body and prohibiting it from teaching. Teaching would be done by affiliated colleges. This was a decision which was to affect academic life in New Zealand profoundly and would impact on the development of psychology, as will be discussed. In turn, Otago University suspended its power to confer degrees and became an affiliated university college of the University of New Zealand, not regaining its independence until 1962 (Beaglehole, 1937; Hunter, Laby & Von Zedlitz, 1911; NZPD, 1871). Other affiliated colleges joined Canterbury and Otago; Auckland in 1882 and Wellington in 1899 (Hunter, 1952). By 1879 all examinations were assessed by examiners back in Britain (Wild, 1966). The individual growth of psychology in these four institutions will be considered in more detail as will the UNZ framework that all were obliged to work within and the individuals that helped (or hindered) that growth.

Beaglehole (1937) observed that whatever was undertaken by the early settlers was done with energy and optimism but with no clear understanding of the challenges that
would be faced. The first Chancellor of the UNZ, H. J. Tancred (1879) was clear in his opinion of the role of the University

“The principle of the University of New Zealand is that facilities for higher education should be distributed among as many centres as possible . . . it is desirable to bring the benefits of higher culture within the reach of the great mass of the population . . . the conferring of degrees is a means to an end, that end being the diffusion of learning and culture over as wide an area as possible and the establishment of university education on a really national basis” (cited in the Reichel-Tate Report 1925, p. 5).

A precedent for a non-teaching university had already been set in the United Kingdom. The UNZ was modelled along the lines of the progressive University of London which also functioned mainly as an administrative and examining body and did not teach. It consisted of a network of colleges throughout the United Kingdom. In theory, a non teaching university was democratic, widening the availability of higher education, reducing personal influence and allowing papers to be marked purely on merit. By allowing the colleges to simply teach, it was thought that differing belief systems or dogmas could find their own expression in individual institutions allowing for more, not less, cooperation overall (Beaglehole, 1937). However, the New Zealand colonists seem to have overlooked the fact that the University of London had problems of its own and arose from a mistake resulting from complex provincial rivalries between competing institutions during a period of controversial educational reform (Reichel-Tate Commission, 1925).

While the UNZ was theoretically in charge of setting standards and awarding degrees, the adoption of an external system of examinations meant that examinations were marked
by academics back in England in accordance with a curriculum devised by the Senate of the UNZ. The Senate was largely made up of lay people and had overall control of all aspects of the University. This examination system was meant to control standards and increase the prestige of a New Zealand qualification by using well respected examiners. However, it allowed little autonomy to either the New Zealand teacher or the English examiner, increased the level of bureaucracy and created difficulties in communication (Hunter, 1940). The New Zealand system was envisaged to have a high level of cooperation between the governing bodies and professorial boards of the four colleges, and the University senate, but in reality this did not happen (Hunter et al., 1911). The need for such a high level of institutional collaboration appeared to hinder new initiatives; Thomas Hunter’s efforts to establish experimental psychology at Victoria College being a case in point (which will be discussed below). In addition to these internal difficulties the external examination system involved sending and receiving examination papers across the world, by ship, without the benefit of telephones and airmail. Furthermore, the system appeared to imply a lack of trust in teachers. This, according to the Reform Association, together with the failure to allow teachers any significant involvement in the administration of the institution, made any serious claim to a university questionable. Calls for reform began almost as soon as the system was in place. In contrast to Tancred’s (1897) vision of a University’s role, the view of the New Zealand University Reform Association (Hunter et al., 1911) was very different:

A University’s task is to combine higher and professional instruction with the advancement of knowledge . . . a University ranks high or low in the world’s esteem according to the repute of its teachers as men of science, and according to the value and volume of the scientific output of its students (p. 43).
This view elevated the importance of both good teachers and university research; both aims appeared to have been frustrated by the UNZ. The University Reform Association went on to claim that:

The University’s disregard of the principles of education has led to carelessness in the appointment of teachers, poor facilities for teaching, the absence of adequate libraries and the neglect of research. The evidence of three royal commissions on London University shows that exactly similar efforts resulted from the original London system which New Zealand followed (p. 12).

However, lacking new traditions and infrastructure, the settlers set about replicating systems and institutions that were familiar from the old world. Some believed that the new colony, being underpopulated and undereducated, was simply not ready for a university. As discussed, the majority of immigrants were of a skilled farm labouring class. The Education Act of 1877 had established free compulsory schooling but about half of all children did not attend school and university remained largely for the well off (Swarbrick, 2012). The external examination system proved to be a contentious issue in New Zealand but was long lived and has since been used (seemingly with far less controversy) for psychology candidates in other developing countries, such as in Bangladesh (Blower & Turtle, 1987).

Scholarships to study back in Britain were a recurrent pattern seen in British colonies (including New Zealand), where a university education served to reinforce the values and ideas and position of the colonial power (Turtle, 1987). As psychology was not a well established subject in the colony, travel scholarships were particularly
important. The benefits gained by the likes of Thomas Hunter, E. B. Fitt, Ivan Sutherland and Clarence Beeby, who all managed to study abroad early in their careers, were immeasurable. The international psychological fraternity was a small one and those New Zealand students who had the opportunity to study abroad were able to work with people whose names are still familiar in psychology text books and histories. For example, Thomas Hunter worked with Lightner Witmer and E. B. Titchener, Arthur Fitt studied under Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig, and Clarence Beeby worked with Cyril Burt and was supervised by Charles Spearman. However, only a small minority of psychologists gained travel scholarships, a situation which improved slightly with the establishment in 1919 of the Post Graduate Scholarship in Psychology which sponsored one student per year (UNZ Calendar, 1922). There was also a lack of opportunity for professors to travel or take sabbatical leave which was eventually highlighted in the Reichel-Tate Report (1925) as a necessity for the cultivation of a spirit of research in the University.

The New Zealand University system was largely a colonial import and while it seemed to offer the settlers a familiar and achievable means of providing higher education it entailed several problems and was always controversial. In addition to the issues of the UNZ there were distinct differences between the four colleges and the way in which they established the study of psychology, these will be examined next.
Chapter Two

The First Four University Colleges

The development of experimental psychology and the use of scientific methodology were still new concepts being developed principally in Germany, Britain and other parts of Europe and America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Psychology in New Zealand, as elsewhere, was embedded within the classical study of Philosophy under the heading of mental science (alternatively termed mental and moral philosophy and incorporating ethics, logic and economic philosophy). At this early point in New Zealand history, the introduction and development of new concepts in science and psychology depended not just on the federal institution of the UNZ but on the individual colleges and the people they hired.

The inaugural Otago chair in Mental and Moral Philosophy (which included ethics and psychology components) was awarded to 27 year old Duncan MacGregor, a very successful and outspoken Scottish academic who had been a student of Alexander Bain (Otago Witness, 1906; Press, 1906). MacGregor filled the role for fifteen years and was described by Sir Thomas Hunter (1952) as being ‘a brilliant and fearless exponent of his subjects’, (although Hunter’s praise could only have been based on the reports of others because he did not study under MacGregor as was suggested by Haig and Marie, 2012. MacGregor had gained a diploma in medicine in 1870 and this was reflected in his introduction of a course in the structure and function of the nervous system (Haig & Marie, 2012). Under MacGregor, psychology instruction was partly speculative and partly empirical, making up a quarter of the B. A. degree and including the physiology of the nervous system, instinct, the senses and intellect, abstraction, perception and an
ethics component (Hunter, 1952). However, MacGregor, despite his academic brilliance, was subject to strong criticism. Some of his views on theological issues were termed ‘materialist’ and brought him into long conflict with the Presbyterian Synod who funded the chair. The Otago Witness (1906) reported:

Dr. McGregor [sic] was thought at first to be singularly “sound in the faith” but great and bitter was the disappointment when his teaching showed his mind to be deeply tinged with the materialism of his old master, Professor Bain (p. 48).

MacGregor wrote a series of articles entitled “The Problems of Poverty” (1876, cited in the North Otago Times, 1877, March 19) which appeared to express belief in evolutionary theory and MacGregor was accused of holding Darwinian views. Despite the growing conflict with his employers, MacGregor was an influential teacher who took a strong and progressive stance on many issues, such as supporting the right of women to a university education. At one point he was the only person teaching mental science in New Zealand but that did not prevent him from simultaneously working as the Medical Officer in charge of the Otago Lunatic asylum (1876 – 1882). This, perhaps, was an unsuitable role considering MacGregor’s harsh views on the less fortunate members of society. He left the university in 1885, and in 1886 was appointed by the Stout-Vogel administration to the position of Inspector General of Asylums and Hospitals for the Colony, at a salary of £1200 per annum (double the average professor’s salary), making him the highest paid official in New Zealand (New Zealand Herald, 1889, July 3). It is interesting to note that his benefactor, Sir Robert Stout, had been a student of MacGregor’s, (and was possibly the first student to enrol in the University), gaining a first class pass in mental science and economic philosophy (Hamer,
1993). Furthermore, Stout was a relative by marriage, who named his son after MacGregor. (This Thomas Duncan MacGregor Stout was to be knighted for serving as the first Chancellor of Victoria University). The situation was debated in Parliament but MacGregor kept his lucrative position until his death in 1906 (Observer, 1889, July 6; Press, 1906, December, 17). These influential alliances were common in the narrow society of early New Zealand.

Following MacGregor’s resignation, there was a high level of community interest in the selection of the next mental science professor. The Southland Times (1885, December 2) reported:

A dull exponent of the different schools and systems of metaphysical thought is not the person we want; and neither is it a brilliant theorist tainted with the materialism and steeped in the pseudo-philosophy of the time (p. 2).

The Presbyterian Synod, having struggled to control and limit the influence of MacGregor, hired a very different man as his replacement and arranged an employment contract which would allow them to take steps to prevent the ‘unwarranted intrusion of pernicious opinion’ (Southland Times, 1885, December 2, p. 2), and remove the incumbent on six months notice (Thompson, 1919). Reverend Dr. William Salmond had started out as the theological teacher in the colony and was admired by the Presbyterians. However, once established in the university Dr. Salmond infuriated his supporters by publishing a pamphlet, “The Reign of Grace” (1888), challenging the Calvinist religious doctrine on salvation. A scandal ensued and Salmond found himself condemned as a heretic by the Presbytery of New Zealand. Salmond was aware that the publication would create controversy and accusations of deception as his views were only made clear ‘since breathing the air of a secular profession’
One of Salmond’s most vociferous critics, Reverend James MacGregor (no relation to Duncan MacGregor), highlighted the difficulty and conflict that existed around this particular chair of mental and moral philosophy, when he argued that it was created and endowed by the church as ‘a contribution of moral teaching to the National University curriculum’ (MacGregor, 1888). Dr. Salmond stood his ground with his employers and held the post for twenty eight years but he was not quick to court controversy again. While Salmond was still teaching in Otago his son became the first Professor of Philosophy at Canterbury, again highlighting the very narrow social and professional circles that these early leaders moved in (Otago Daily Times, 1917, March 7).

By the time the third professor of mental science in Otago was hired, the colony had established itself well enough to provide a local man who had been educated in the colony, the Rev. Dr. Frank Dunlop. At this point the UNZ Council took steps to limit the Synod’s influence on appointments. Having the Synod choose philosophy professors on the basis of their theology had been a continuous source of conflict and theological interference continued to create problems into the twentieth century (Thompson, 1919). While Otago had been quick to establish a university, the religious basis of the funding for the chair of philosophy had an effect on the nature of the role, limiting academic freedom and may explain why Otago was relatively slow in developing an interest in the growth of scientific psychology, compared to the Canterbury and Victoria colleges. The first lecturer in experimental psychology hired by Otago was Henry Ferguson in 1930 who described being met at the station on his first day by both the philosophy professor, Dr. Dunlop (who was to die the following year), and Dr. Lawson, the Professor of Education. Both professors would require teaching assistance from Ferguson, illustrating quite neatly the flexible or perhaps
blurred, professional boundaries at the time (Ferguson, 1979).

Further north the Province of Canterbury was formed by the Canterbury Association with the aim of creating a Church of England colony in New Zealand and a university reminiscent of Oxford (Gardner, 1979). As in Otago, settlers had debated the readiness of the colony for a university. Initially a college union was formed between Christ’s College and the Canterbury Museum and lessons began. Spurred on by provincial rivalry, and the achievements in Otago, Canterbury petitioned parliament in support of the University of New Zealand. A timely request from the UNZ for applicants for affiliations and subsidies followed and in 1872 the Union was granted affiliation with the UNZ, subsequently to disband and from 1874 to 1962 Canterbury was an affiliated college of the University of New Zealand (Wild, 1966). The haste of this move can be understood better when viewed in the context of the provincial administration of the time which meant Canterbury was in direct competition with Otago, particularly for immigrants, and needed to keep pace with improvements made there. Fortunately, Canterbury was entering a short period of wealth which led to both an expansion in the school system and the university. Canterbury faced similar problems to Otago in recruiting professors and finding enough suitably prepared students (Beardsley, Gardner & Carter, 1979). Three professors were recruited from England, their chairs being in English and classics, mathematics and natural philosophy, and physics and chemistry (Press, 1873, September 2). But, by 1878 the short lived ‘Vogel Boom’, a period of unsustainable financial buoyancy based on immigration and borrowing, was over. Immigration all but ceased and financial restraints were felt across the education sector (NZ Tablet, 1878; Phillips, 2013). Poorly paid lectureships were established in several subjects, appealing to the thrift of the board of governors as it was far cheaper to hire a
local man to lecture in a subject than to invest in an unknown professor from England.

Competition increased with the opening of Victoria College in 1899 and Canterbury took the decision to continue its expansion despite low student numbers.

In 1901 (the same year that the British Psychological Society was established) a part time lectureship in Mental Science was established and in 1903, a locally sourced lecturer, C. F. Salmond (whose father was the Otago incumbent) began lectures in mental and moral philosophy. Salmond was primarily a philosopher; he took an introspective approach to psychology and was never to become enthusiastic towards Freud, mental testing or the new scientific psychology (Greer, Sloane & Hornblow, 1986). Salmond was promoted to the status of professor in 1914 when a chair of mental science was established (Evening Post, 1914, March 31). C. E. Beeby, who both worked and studied under Salmond, was critical in his assessment of Salmond’s teaching skills. Writing in 1992, Beeby said “For nearly seventy years I have harboured a mild grievance against a teacher who could squeeze the life out of a subject as grand as philosophy and present me with only its dry bones” (p. 54). Beeby further claimed that Salmond had a “precise, dry mind that had ceased to grow before I knew him” (p.52). In 1923 the introduction of a faculty structure meant that Salmond’s department of Philosophy was now headed by James Shelley, Professor of Education, as Dean of the Faculty of Mental and Moral Philosophy. An interesting development (which will be discussed further), was the hiring of Clarence Beeby in 1923 to establish a laboratory for the teaching of experimental psychology (Beeby, 1992). Salmond was said to be the most obstructive of the philosophers to the development and separation of psychology from philosophy and was particularly opposed to the introduction, in 1916, of optional psychology papers in the UNZ philosophy examinations (Beeby, 1992). However, it was at
Canterbury that the affiliation between education and psychology was evident early on (by 1923) and some recent histories may have misjudged Salmond’s apparent resistance to experimental psychology (Youngmeyer, 1992). Canterbury was also the forerunner in public lecturing on Psychology, having begun in 1916 with a tutorial for the Workers Education Authority (WEA), with twenty people attending. Before Otago, Victoria or Auckland had even begun to conduct WEA classes, Canterbury was successfully running its third year WEA psychology course (Senate proceedings, 1916; 1918).

Auckland College, established in 1883, was the first in the North Island and had something of a ‘poor relation’ reputation, as the city was considered uncultivated and uncultured (Sinclair, 1983). Many of the students were from the teaching college and the majority of the classes were held in the afternoons and evening. Mental Science did not start until 1910 when a lectureship was given to a dubious character, Joseph Grossman. Grossman had graduated from Canterbury College with triple honours, later teaching there. He was a successful journalist and by all accounts an inspiring lecturer. He also had an extended period of bankruptcy and a record of four counts of forgery (for defrauding a colleague at Canterbury College) for which he served two years in prison (Evening Post, 1898, September 13; Wairarapa Daily Times, 1898, November 15). Before Grossman’s time at Auckland was over, he would again return to his old form and defraud the Philosophy Professor, William Anderson, out of enough money to bring him to the brink of ruin (Pigden, 2011). However, he was said to be an attractive, magnetic man and a prominent rugby player and Auckland hired him. Mental science was just one of Grossman’s suspiciously wide repertoire of taught subjects (even by the polymath standards of the day), until handing the subject over to the more single minded Anderson in 1928. Grossman confessed his latest...
fraud and was dismissed in 1931 (Sinclair, 1983). Anderson’s interests were very much in the philosophy camp, unfortunately his strong Scottish accent was unintelligible and he was said to be a rigid, uninspiring teacher, a “dull dog” who (in tandem with Grossman) opposed all change (Pigden, 2011; Sinclair, 1983). Between Grossman and Anderson, psychology got off to an unpromising start in Auckland. Anderson, who openly claimed that nothing of significance had ever been discovered in psychology, was able to restrict the teaching of psychology to some unscientific, non experimental lectures in mental science, until his retirement in 1956 (Sinclair, 1983). As in Canterbury, it was to be the Education department that fostered an interest in psychology. In 1923 Arthur Fitt was awarded the Chair for Education in Auckland (New Zealand Herald, 1923). Fitt had studied philosophy and psychology under Thomas Hunter in Victoria, gaining an MA degree in 1909 with a thesis on dream consciousness (Colonist, 1909, April 16). He studied under Professor Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig in 1911-1914 and there completed his Ph.D with a thesis on dreams (Fitt, 1954; Sinclair, 1983). Sinclair (1983) went on to claim that Fitt introduced experimental methods to New Zealand and was in effect the first professor of psychology in the colony, (Ernest Beaglehole was the first actual professor of psychology in New Zealand (in 1948), although clearly Thomas Hunter in effect, filled the role long before then). After gaining his doctorate in Leipzig, Fitt spent several years working abroad, first as the Head of Education in Rhodes University, South Africa, moving to Melbourne University in 1917 to lecture in Experimental Psychology for three years. There appears to be little record of Fitt’s experiences studying in Leipzig, the timing of which may have been somewhat sensitive. He graduated on the brink of World War One and Professor Wundt soon after became prominent amongst a group of German academics for writing anti-English pamphlets which
blamed England for the war, these were widely discussed and condemned in New Zealand (Evening Post, 1914, October 23). Fitt was unusual at the time in being active in both research and publication. His output included a book on early Industrial Psychology *The Human Instincts in Business* (1922), which was aimed at business people rather than academics and based on his work in Melbourne. Psychology was said to be Fitt’s ‘pet subject’ (NZ Truth, 1927, February 17), and he would go on to become the inaugural Chairman for the New Zealand branch of the British Psychological Society in 1954, calling for New Zealanders to apply a global perspective to psychological research. Perhaps the most original description of Fitt comes from a news article of the period, “there is nothing of the stay-at-home-get-into-a-groove-and-stay-there-sort about Dr. Fitt” (NZ Truth, 1927). Fitt was one of the very few to publish a psychology research paper in the Australasian Journal of Philosophy and Psychology (1923) and was possibly the first to deliver a psychology talk for the WEA over the radio, “Why and how we dream” (Evening Post, 1929, September 24).

Victoria College was the last of the four colleges to be established in 1899. The four founding professors were hired in the United Kingdom; John Rankin Brown, Hugh Mackenzie (an English professor who would also cover mental science lectures), Thomas Easterfield and Richard Maclaurin, all set sail together for New Zealand with wives and nine children in tow. The group believed that a university awaited their arrival and spent the long voyage working out their hierarchy and making plans. On arrival (notably on April Fools’ Day) they were faced with the reality of a university that had no buildings. Within weeks they had borrowed offices and classrooms around the city and lectures were begun, mostly conducted in the evenings (Evening Post, 1933, October 4; 1936, October 9).

Eventually, despite a lack of government financial support, the college acquired a
building and in 1904 the Council hired a young Otago school teacher, Thomas Hunter, to lecture in Mental Science and Political Economy. According to Beaglehole (1946), the Council had little idea of what they were doing and were as impressed by Hunter’s football skills and outdoors-man persona as his academic proficiency (Beaglehole, 1946). For both psychology and Victoria this turned out to be a fortunate appointment as Thomas Hunter would remain at Victoria for nearly half a century, lifting the profile of psychology, introducing and promoting experimental psychology and campaigning for university reform. Hunter is amongst the most significant participants in the history of New Zealand psychology. Unfortunately Thomas Hunter was notorious for not putting anything on paper unless he absolutely had to and much of the record was in his head and died with him. The papers of Thomas Hunter are almost certainly nonexistent or very scanty (Frean, n.d.). However, a collection of letters between Hunter and the British born but American based psychologist Edward B. Titchener, was collected by Brown and Fuchs (1969) and provide some personal insight and background to the work of the man who pioneered experimental psychology in New Zealand.
Chapter Three

*Thomas Hunter, University Reform and Experimental Psychology*

Thomas Hunter arrived in New Zealand in 1880 with his English parents and four siblings, including his influential older brother Irwin. Both brothers were considered to be intelligent, bluntly honest and rebellious by temperament (De La Mare, 1946; Von Zeidlitz, 1946). The Hunter brothers were renowned for their rugby skills; Irwin published a successful book on coaching and Thomas represented Otago in Rugby Union (The Spike, 1939). Rugby and coaching skills were a sought after commodity in the colony; contemporary accounts of university sports are lively and clearly this was an arena where influence could be gained which went well beyond sport. De La Mare (1946) suggested that in these early days of the UNZ a man could as likely get a position based on his football skills as his academic skills (which may help explain Auckland’s oversight of Grossman’s dubious practices). Hunter was said to have gained the respect of the more ‘physical element’ of the student body on the basis of his reputation for sports. As a star half-back and a ‘big noise in Rugby Union’ he was immediately popular with students (De La Mare, 1946). Presumably, this popularity was beneficial in terms of generating student interest in his introduction of experimental psychology.

Hunter had studied under William Salmond in Otago, achieving an arts degree in mental and moral philosophy, later adding a science degree. After being hired by Victoria College in 1904 he developed a strong desire to see psychology stand autonomously from philosophy and seeing scientific psychology as the best route he wasted little time (Haig & Marie, 2012). Showing early signs of his exceptional networking skills, Hunter made contact with the renowned English researcher Edward Titchener.
Titchener had been a student of the hugely influential Wilhelm Wundt of Leipzig, the German philosopher credited with establishing modern psychology by having introduced empirical scientific methods to the study of consciousness. Wundt developed what became termed the ‘new psychology’ or ‘physiological psychology’. He sought to examine consciousness by supplementing physiological experimental methods with a psychological set of procedures capable of producing observable and measurable data on the internal experience of an individual. His investigations concentrated on sensation and perception with the experimental psychologist controlling the physical, experimental stimulus and the participants introspectively observing their own individual responses (Boring, 1929; Kim, 2014). Students of Wundt had taken these experimental methods to America where they thrived. Titchener, a gifted Oxford student, had studied philosophy for four years but found Oxford far from encouraging when he became interested in Wundt and the ‘new psychology’ so he went to Leipzig and studied directly under Wundt (Boring, 1929). Later, frustrated in his attempts to advance experimental methods in England, he moved to Cornell University in America and successfully established systematic experimental psychology there (Brown & Fuchs, 1969). Titchener, a magnetic man and a prolific writer, eventually became something of an outsider in America, a force for an older and more conservative German scientific tradition of pure introspective psychology (Boring, 1929). His own experiences made him a sympathetic mentor to the young, energetic Thomas Hunter who was about to face his own difficulties when trying to introduce the ‘new psychology’ to New Zealand. The following discussion is largely based on the letters between the two men, collected by Brown and Fuchs (1969).

Hunter’s initial approach to Titchener was to ask for advice on the equipment needed to
set up an experimental laboratory, having secured a £50 grant from Victoria (Brown & Fuchs, 1969). Titchener’s response was a mix of practical advice and encouragement and the first of many polite requests for postage stamps (Titchener very rarely left his adopted home town and was a keen stamp collector). A long friendly correspondence developed which perhaps helped Hunter to overcome the isolation of trying to establish psychological science at a time when it was little understood in New Zealand. In 1906 Hunter managed to get leave to explore his growing interest in experimental psychology and took up Titchener’s invitation to base himself at Cornell. He spent three months there learning about the methods and scope of psychological experiment from Titchener himself and from this base he spent months visiting several laboratories across America (Titchener testimonial, 1907). A visit to Pennsylvania to visit a clinic established by Professor Lightner Witmer (another ex student of Wundt, credited with establishing Clinical Psychology), turned out to be of particular relevance. Hunter would go on to establish a child guidance clinic at Victoria on a similar basis to the Witmer clinic. Hunter also visited Britain which, at this point in time, had little tradition of psychological research, remaining more resolutely philosophical, and had only one psychological laboratory at Cambridge (Titchener to Hunter, 1905, 1907; Hunter, 1952). After this visit Titchener continued through letters to mentor and encourage Hunter in his research ambitions. Hunter returned to Victoria “all Titchener and Cornell” (Beaglehole, 1946) and his long, discordant relationship with the UNZ was set in motion. This was perhaps inevitable, for while Britain was no more advanced in psychological research than New Zealand itself, Britain nevertheless continued to influence the development of course content in New Zealand and furthermore the UNZ system was not conducive to the production of original research. Hunter aspired to the American model of
research that he had now experienced, with its encouragement of the German experimental psychology, laboratories and generous funding and also perhaps the excitement of a variety of new ideas before Watson’s behaviourism began its domination and the introspection of the ‘new psychology’ was rejected (Boring, 1929).

For Hunter, the difference between his American experience and his return to New Zealand must have been sobering. The UNZ encouraged a form of lethargy towards research. Even if research capable professors were available (and many were clearly not), there was little to motivate students towards doing localised research that would be irrelevant to their English examiners. An English university existed primarily to teach a set body of knowledge, and original research was not generally considered a university function (Sinclair, 1983). Furthermore, external examinations were an incredibly slow process; papers had to be sent to England by sea, then marked and returned. For a professor to make any change at all, even introducing a new text book, would mean getting an agreement by all four colleges and then having it ratified by the Senate in a convoluted and time consuming process (Gordon, 1946). To establish a new scientific tradition Hunter would need to achieve both institutional changes (laboratories, course work and examinations) and promote the ‘New Psychology’ in order to attract funding, interest and students. This promotion would need to be accomplished with few tools other than personality, word of mouth and local newspapers. Hunter’s initial action in setting up his small laboratory (the first in Australasia) was important but it was to be just one step in the prolonged process of establishing experimental psychology and the wider picture of showing psychology to be worthy of recognition as a separate discipline from philosophy.
By 1908 Titchener’s encouragement was tempered with commiseration. The frustrations of a heavy workload, lack of time and the limitations of the English style syllabus were clearly obstructing any plans of Hunter’s to produce his own research. However, he did make progress as a teacher in advancing experimental methods at Victoria. In a letter dated 20/07/07 Titchener congratulated Hunter on a ‘successful demonstration’. Brown and Fuchs (1969) assumed this to be the “queer idea” briefly referred to by Beaglehole (1946, p.97) relating Hunter’s invitation to the University Council to attend a practical demonstration of experimental psychology. Hunter was far more ambitious than this implied. He had written to the Council asking for an annual laboratory grant of £50 and two rooms to create a laboratory in. Council required some time for consideration and arranged a special meeting during which Hunter gave a demonstration of experimental psychology (Evening Post, 1907, July 18). He included sight and hearing tests, and put forward the idea that experimental psychologists should be attached to training colleges to identify cases of mental deficiency. He also confidently asserted that the new system had now superseded the traditional of teaching psychology. One member of the council present at the meeting admitted later that he had previously associated the subject with ‘table rapping’, which (considering this was a member of the university council) shows the level of non cognizance that Hunter had to address in his efforts to establish his subject. It was Sir Robert Stout, a man who often clashed with Hunter, who provided staunch support for the establishment of this laboratory, asserting that no one could become a teacher without knowledge of psychology and that required the use of a laboratory (Evening Post, 1907, September 19). Hunter was given his £50 per year, he got one room for a laboratory and having gained the confidence of the Council was made Professor of Mental Science a few months later.
(Evening Post, 1907, November, 21). This was a crucial event. Hunter’s gaining of a
Professorship meant a larger degree of academic and professional freedom and a position
to speak from on a variety of issues, academic, social and political. However, with the wider
University issues about which he was passionate, his influence was limited and it took many
years of collaborative campaigning to bring about change. Typical of the tenacious Hunter,
he continued arguing for his second room, having already planned to name it after
Titchener, once it was big enough to do his mentor justice. In 1908 Hunter wrote to
Titchener:

> When the dignity of the place admits it, it shall be named as it is always
> presented in my mind – the ‘Titchener laboratory’. May it someday be worthy
> of the name and offer to other inquirers something of the facilities Cornell
> extended to me (Brown & Fuchs, 1969, p. 24).

In Hunter’s efforts to gain the support of the Council the breadth of his claims and
confidence of his salesmanship is compelling. He seemed to be constructing a framework
that shadowed the German and American course of development from philosophical
psychology to experimental psychology to applied psychology; in this case the application
would begin through an association with education which will be discussed further. To
pursue an applied role for psychology Hunter would need to move away from the ideals of
‘pure’ research exemplified by his mentor and he did this quite rapidly and effectively.

One of the few letters existing from Hunter (Hunter to Titchener, 1908) discusses the
headway being made in experimental psychology; the interest being generated amongst
teachers and the word of mouth interest spread by the visitors he has encouraged into his
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laboratory. Hunter discusses a ‘short article’ he has in the newspaper which he is planning to post to Titchener but has misplaced. Brown and Fuchs (1969) were unable to source it, but I believe that it was an article entitled “Experimental Psychology” published in the Wellington Evening Post (1908, March, 21). The article does not supply an author’s name (which was not unusual at the time), but given the date, style and depth of knowledge it points strongly towards Hunter (see appendix A). If correct, this is an early example of Hunter’s campaign to promote and explain psychology outside the confines of the University. In the article the credibility of using observational methods in psychological experimentation was carefully explained and defended. Credit was given to the early work of Ernst Weber and Gustav Fechner and the further developments of Wundt, and a case was made promoting the application of psychology research, particularly in the teaching profession. This foreshadowed Hunter’s later enthusiasm for integrating psychology into the solutions to many real world problems, such as juvenile delinquency and child guidance. A few months later, in 1909, giving a well received lecture on ‘Psychology in Education’ to a packed audience of teachers, Hunter claimed the areas of memory, attention and thought processes as the domain of the psychologist (Titchener had just written two books related to these subjects, Psychology of Feeling and Attention (1908) and Experimental Psychology of the Thought-Processes (1909), which he had gifted to Hunter), and put forward the benefits to education of utilising the expertise of the psychologist. He went so far as to claim that it was criminal to put anyone in charge of children without a trained knowledge of mental development (Evening Post, 1909). These claims of the practicality and pragmatic benefit to the colony of psychology were bold; psychological research was in its infancy and there was not a large body of knowledge on the subject. Hunter himself, a leading New
Zealand expert, had little training, having completed his psychology studies under a philosopher, Professor Salmond, and spending several months visiting American laboratories. Hunter’s assertions on the expertise or trained knowledge of the psychologist were very premature, but by claiming jurisdiction over certain areas of knowledge and claiming skills in the application of that knowledge Hunter demonstrated a professionalising strategy which possibly helped to establish the independence of psychology from philosophy.

Hunter was at this point working in near isolation with experimental psychology in New Zealand. He seemed in this, and in many areas that attracted his interest, to be ahead of his time. The other university colleges were either not ready for or were hostile to the idea of separating psychology from philosophy. It is curious that Hunter did not follow a well-trodden path and take advantage of the opportunities abroad; Titchener certainly encouraged the idea and in fact had recommended him for a founding chair in experimental psychology in an American college (Titchener to Hunter, 1908). But Hunter had a growing family and no longer felt free to move as he might like. He also described himself as being in a battle and one in which he has made significant advances in establishing experimental psychology. Hunter (1909) wrote:

There has been a good deal of quiet fighting here and to a degree I have made “good” and per chance it will be found to have been a good work in fighting the experimental question out here and if possible making the way easier for subsequent men. (p. 25).

He determined to remain in New Zealand despite the lack of like-minded colleagues but it is the ‘battle’ rather than personal research that now appeared to be Hunter’s prime focus.
The pursuit of psychological research was part of an international rather than a New Zealand scene. As Hunter himself states in 1923, New Zealand had ‘no public for scientific work in psychology’ (Hunter to Titchener, 1923). Hunter’s effectiveness was most evident when he turned from global thinking to local thinking as a New Zealander dealing with national concerns. It would be several years before New Zealand psychologists would start to find international success and then it would first be in fields related to psychology, such as education and anthropology (Haig & Marie, 2012; Kemp 2007). Hunter changed direction from pure experimental psychology and he began to look at opportunities for the practical application of psychology to meet some of the many needs of the colony. Hunter’s early career success gave him some degree of freedom in the way he approached this task and the direction he took his subject (although of course, he was still limited by the requirements of the UNZ). When Clarence Beeby, another clever and ambitious philosophy graduate, took up laboratory work in Christchurch a decade later, he was to find himself at odds with the intractable views of the Professor of Philosophy and caught between the shifting boundaries of education and psychology (Beeby, 1992). This will be returned to later.

Soon after World War One, Hunter revived his correspondence with Titchener after a long gap, encouraging his protégée Catherine Braddock to travel to America and study with his old mentor. The plan was for Braddock to return to Victoria and take over the experimental psychology laboratory (by this time Hunter himself was already busy with several other projects, mostly administrative). Hunter complained that the other three Philosophy department heads were actively obstructive towards experimental work and he had pinned some hope on Braddock’s assistance (Hunter, 1922). If things had gone to plan,
the history of New Zealand psychology could have been a little different with, perhaps, a woman of note in early psychology. Hunter’s faith in Braddock seems to have been based largely on her displaying character “by throwing up the Course in Botany in which she had made some progress for one in Philosophy…. She had a very uphill fight.” (Hunter to Titchener, 1922). Braddock was able to study experimental psychology at Victoria with the aid of a Jacob Joseph scholarship. When this ended she became the first recipient of the new (and very timely) Post Graduate Scholarship in Arts in 1919 (established by Hunter) which enabled her to travel abroad and study (Hunter to Titchener, 1922; UNZ Calender, 1922). Braddock chose, due to ongoing personal problems rather than research interests, to spend a year studying experimental research in Cambridge, but was disappointed there, and travelled on to Cornell to study directly under Titchener at his Research School in Psychology. Braddock’s research paper An experimental study on cutaneous imagery, from her time with Titchener was published (American J. Psychology, 1921) as was her (posthumously) published thesis An Experimental Study of the Visual, Negative After-Image (American J. Psychology, 1924). One other work of Braddock’s, The stoic attitude, was an effusive philosophical piece, part published in the first volume of the Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy (AJPP, 1923). However, Braddock’s potential was cut short. She died of influenza at Cornell in 1921, on the night before she was due to present her Ph.D. degree thesis (Spike, 1922). She was cared for by Titchener’s family and her complicated personal affairs were dealt with by Hunter. Braddock’s brief appearance in the history of New Zealand psychology illustrates several points; that opportunity existed for women to enter and progress in the field, the value of scholarships in attracting research students and the alliances and connections that could form in the small international community of
psychologists. There is a peculiar postscript to the story of Catherine Braddock. When Titchener and his assistant went through her papers, expecting to publish her thesis posthumously, they found nothing. Having held weekly meetings with Braddock during which she appeared to be reading from a manuscript, Titchener was astonished to find there was not a scrap of written work. Nothing but a neat collection of observers’ reports, no notes or manuscript and no evidence for the claims she had made. Whether the work was lost or had simply never existed was never discovered. A short thesis was published, cobbled together from the available information by Titchener and his assistant in a work credited to Braddock (AJPP, 1923).

The next Post Graduate Scholarship in Arts was won by Ivan Sutherland; another gifted student of Hunter’s who went on to establish Cultural Anthropology in New Zealand (UNZ Calendar, 1922; Sutherland, 2013). These scholarships were very important. Those like Hunter, Sutherland and Beeby, who had the opportunity to travel and study abroad, had many advantages over those that remained behind but scholarship opportunities were rare within the UNZ. In 1921 the UNZ Calendar identified just two free return passages available between Australia and Britain for UNZ graduates, the selection was contested and judged by the Senate (UNZ, 1921). Hunter planned to send out another student, William Bickerton, this time directly to Titchener, but as Bickerton failed to win the only travel scholarship available it never happened; his papers were given poor marks by an English examiner not trained in psychology and Hunter was again stalled by the system (Hunter to Titchener, 1923).

**University reform**

Hunter’s frustration with what he saw as a dysfunctional system had led him in 1910 to
join other Victoria professors Thomas Laby and George Von Zedlitz in formalising efforts for university reform by agitating for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the University, producing together the brochure *University Reform in New Zealand* (1911). This publication clarified what many felt were the weaknesses of the UNZ. Governance of the four colleges, both financial and academic, was conducted by the four College Councils. Three of the college councils banned professors from sitting on the board and Otago allowed two (from a total of 12 council members). Overall academic control was in the hands of the Senate which met only once a year for a laborious two week session with no apparatus to carry out decisions even if they were made. Teaching staff had, along with little power, an equivalent lack of responsibility and teaching standards were poor (Hunter, 1940; 1952). Professors complained, with good cause, that the classes were now too large and the chronic funding shortage meant that sabbatical leave, travel and research scholarships were almost unheard of (Beaglehole, 1937; Hunter, 1940; Hunter et al., 1911).

While the Reform Association did not single out Psychology in their arguments, Hunter’s particular frustrations at the time with issues that he believed were hindering the development of experimental work were emphasised, in particular, the lack of professorial control and the absence of a research culture. Hunter believed the existing system was holding psychology back in New Zealand and that the creation of four independent universities, each capable of developing their own fields of expertise, would be the best solution. Eventually, all four colleges joined the call for reform (Beaglehole, 1937; Hunter, Laby & Von Zedlitz, 1911). Sinclair (1983), in his history of Auckland University, is critical of the reformers, describing them as obsessing over the faults of the UNZ and describing Hunter as a radical and a stirrer. The comments are perhaps unfair; at the time when
Hunter was battling to establish research based psychology courses, those at Auckland were still battling to get toilets installed (Sinclair, 1983).

The reform movement had strong opposition. Sir Robert Stout, a liberal politician with an interest in education, had with age become increasingly opposed to university reform. Stout was an intelligent and intimidating man, twice New Zealand premier, a long standing member of the UNZ Senate and UNZ Chancellor from 1903 – 1923. He was particularly hostile to any professorial control of the university and had become opposed to university research. It was with some audacity that the Reform Association referenced Stout’s own (1879) assertions on the need for professorial control to address the lack of University research, knowing that Stout had long since reversed these views (cited in Hunter et al. 1911). Stout could be dogmatic. In 1919 he claimed that as the value of external examinations had been proven to the University of Wales “it appears that should settle the argument” (Senate minutes, 1919, p. 9.). Despite a shared background in mental science, Thomas Hunter and Robert Stout were frequent adversaries (De la Mare, 1946). However, what caused Hunter the most difficulty was not the authoritarian Stout but the opposition to change that he believed he faced from the three other heads of philosophy departments (Beeby, 1992; Hunter, 1922), not all of whom had agreed with his views on university reform or experimental psychology. Speaking of Professor Salmond in Canterbury, Hunter (1923) said: “The professor of Philosophy there is strongly opposed to experimental psychology and has done his best to prevent the university from recognising the experimental work done here” (p. 32). Hunter was also in conflict with his Auckland colleagues; Anderson and Grossman published an open letter in the Press complaining (amongst other things) about Hunter’s advisory role on the Reichel-Tate Inquiry for the 1925
Royal Commission (Auckland Star, 1925). In this unusually public manner Anderson and Grossman withdrew their own witness testimony in protest, stating that “we object to the association of Professor Hunter with the Commission in any capacity” (p. 14). There seemed to be a lack of common purpose between the various professors of mental science and philosophy.

The reformers had some success; the control of the affiliated colleges of the UNZ became distributed between three groups; the Senate (which now had a proportion of professors serving on it), a Board of Studies (devised to advise the Senate of academic issues, consisting of five representatives of each of the Professorial Boards), and the General Court of Convocation. Hunter continued from his new establishment position on the Senate, to push for a full investigation into the university but working within the system brought its own problems and Hunter could no longer take the offensive position (Von Zeidlitz, 1946).

In 1924 Hunter was pleased to tell Titchener that he had succeeded in his bid to have experimental psychology made a separate subject in the B.Sc. degree, separating it from philosophy and meaning the subject would need to meet the same research standards as any other science (Hunter to Titchener, 1923). This was the first major advance for the psychology curriculum since optional psychology questions were introduced in 1916 for the laboratory course students (Brown & Fuchs, 1969). In 1926 further academic advances were made when psychology became a subject for the pass stage of the bachelor of sciences degree (Haig & Marie, 2012). The initial stage of gaining recognition for experimentalism had been achieved and the laboratory was filling with students but Hunter was frustrated at the low level of laboratory work (described as ‘drill work’), the difficulty in recruiting advanced students and the need to remain in line with the other heads of
Philosophy departments (Hunter, 1924).

Standardisation became a concern to Hunter in the early 1920’s, both in the laboratory, where he had finally started keeping records, and in the general state of psychology as a subject. After relative obscurity there was a popular post-World War One fascination with the subject but its immaturity was visible. Psychology was becoming associated with psychoanalytic theory and a variety of unscientific therapies and practices. For Hunter and the other academic psychologists there was a gulf between the introversion of psychoanalysis and the science of academic psychology (Lovell, 1923). In 1924 Hunter wrote of these concerns to Titchener saying that

The psychological world seems to be in a chaotic condition... Unfortunately the applications of psychology are so enticing; much of the work in these directions will be thrown on the junk-pile before long. In the meantime the subject suffers. We are sadly in need of a comprehensive view of psychology as a science, with phrases like the unconscious, psycho-analysis etc. placed in a proper perspective (p. 36).

Recognition of the need for better organisation of the subject matter did not preclude the academics from sharing an interest in the varied and widening approaches to the subject; these were largely driven from within the universities and were a major feature of the time. What was more apparent was a lack of specialisation. For example, in 1927 Hunter gave a public lecture to discuss psychological clinics for children. In his somewhat rambling lecture he discusses his admiration for the French work on mesmerism (hypnosis) and the scientific principles of the phenomenon. In the same lecture he tackled experimentalism, mental
testing and child psychology and spoke at length about Freud with an uncritical admiration (Hunter, 1927).

The Hunter-Titchener letters provide a glimpse into the daily struggles and achievements of two early psychologists on opposite sides of the world and are a rare personal record of Hunter’s thoughts and ideas. The letters also illustrate the processes by which psychological ideas travelled, despite few available books or journals, limited travel and no airmail. Wundtian psychology was introduced to New Zealand in a time frame that was not far behind other, more developed countries due to Hunter’s early opportunity to travel and his long term relationship with Titchener. Boring (1929) described Titchener as being a lesser scientist than Wundt but a far more influential one because he was able to travel to Cornell at the right time where he found support to follow laboratory based psychological research, wrote numerous texts and manuals on his subject and shaped the research of his students. Hunter, by contrast, could only progress in small stages, needing first to tackle the systemic obstructions to psychological research. For Hunter this meant not just in Victoria but, due to the UNZ system, in New Zealand generally (everything from a lack of laboratory equipment to university reform) and in this he was tenacious. While Titchener had no interest in applied psychology (Boring, 1929), Hunter quickly became acutely aware of the uses to which psychological knowledge could be put (although perhaps less aware of the limitations of that knowledge) and was interested in the wider needs of society. Prior to World War One, psychology was no more of a profession in New Zealand than it was in Britain. This created an economic handicap delaying the growth of psychology in both countries. American and German psychologists found more support within their universities and employment was available in the laboratories of both countries (Boring, 1929).
the growth of psychology was assured early in the twentieth century, by the demand for its applications in the medical, industrial and educational fields (Hearnshaw, 1964). America was also enthusiastic in developing professional roles for psychology, particularly in mental testing, education, industry and clinical work (Goodwin, 2012). In New Zealand, psychology may have been obstructed by philosophy within the University, but progress was made with the formation of new professions and disciplines, largely in response to events which will be discussed later in this thesis. Hunter’s objectives soon expanded towards the applications of psychology, the provision of specialised services and the development of the institutions to support these. In this he was, as usual, ahead of his time (Beaglehole, 1937; Boring, 1929; Brown & Fuchs, 1969).

Hunter has been described as an ‘unabashed rationalist’ (Taylor, 2005), but above all else he was a very practical and energetic man whose interests tended to be wide rather than deep and who was quick to grasp new trends and ideas. Despite his early enthusiasm to establish the new experimental psychology in Victoria and his criticism of the UNZ for not encouraging research, his own research career was entirely unremarkable, much of his published work tackled social issues and he published nothing of a scientific nature. His energies were often directed at what he saw as the failings of the UNZ. He also showed a prodigious capacity for sitting on (and usually heading) the committees and boards of almost every endeavour that crossed his professional path. He became a member of the UNZ Senate (1912), Vice Chancellor of the UNZ (1929), and Principal of Victoria college in 1938 (Williams, 1954). He was also the founding Chairman of the New Zealand Council for Education Research in 1934 and served for twenty years until his death in 1953. He showed himself to be a far more talented teacher and administrator than he was a scientist. He was
a pioneer, often credited with paving the way for others to succeed and he encouraged the talents of some of New Zealand’s best known early psychologists including Clarence Beeby, Ivan Sutherland and Ernest Beaglehole.

**Outcomes of the Reichel-Tate Royal Commission of Inquiry**

In 1925 the long campaign for university reform was vindicated by the findings of the Reichel-Tate Royal Commission of Inquiry into the constitution, workings, standards and facilities of the University of New Zealand. Hunter (who had served as an advisor for the Senate) hoped that re-organisation would lead to greater freedom to develop modern psychological work (Hunter to Titchener, 1925). The commission credited the years of agitation by the “University Reform Movement” as having done an immense service to education in the Dominion by drawing attention to some serious failings. It was still possible for a New Zealand student to complete a degree without moving beyond first year courses and science degrees were awarded without examination of laboratory work due to the external examination system. Even with these ‘soft’ standards, many students never attended lectures and in 1924 it was found that a full 31% of the philosophy students failed their first year examinations (Reichel-Tate Commission, 1925). Particular criticism was aimed at the lack of research from under-skilled, overworked and unmotivated University staff. The Royal Commission’s report recommended that professors should not be hired unless they could show their contribution to research in their subject. On this point, very few professors of Philosophy and Mental Science would have qualified. Special condemnation was given to the appalling state of the UNZ libraries.

**Libraries, books and journals**

New Zealand’s isolation meant that the choice and supply of books and journals was of
particular consequence. All four colleges endured the effects of inadequate funding and the state of the university libraries was a particular problem (Reichel-Tate Commission, 1925). The first few professors imported to Otago were instructed to purchase and bring their own libraries with them up to the sum of £50 each (Thompson, 1919). These nucelonic libraries were pitifully inadequate and books were highly valued; when a popular Otago professor, Mainwaring Brown, disappeared on a hiking trip, a bequest for his personal books to be brought from Scotland and given to the university was considered newsworthy (Thompson, 1919). Scarcity of texts was compounded by the bureaucracy of the UNZ which made making any changes to set texts a tedious and slow process (Gordon, 1946). Jackson (1998) analysed the psychology set texts used across the four original university colleges and found a high degree of similarity in the foundational period. MacGregor introduced Sully’s *Outlines of Psychology* (1884) to Otago, a large, often reprinted book with a special reference to theory of education; it became used in all four colleges until the 1920’s. Sully’s easily readable book discussed psychology as being chief of the moral sciences, distinct from the natural sciences but none the less a science, employing introspection as its main method. Topics covered included attention, sensation, perception, and memory and moved on to tackle issues of application such as the will and discipline (Sully, 1985). Jackson’s (1998) study does not list any of the works of Alexander Bain as being a set text. However, it is highly likely that MacGregor (who had studied under Bain) would have introduced Bain’s (1868) *Mental and Moral Science: A Compendium of Psychology and Ethics*. Another very influential book was Hoeffding’s (1891) *Outlines of Psychology*. These two books were the only recorded set texts used in Canterbury and Otago until after the turn of the century when George F. Stout’s *Manual of psychology* (1910) was introduced to all four colleges.
Stout’s work was part of a university tutorial series. By the third edition (1924) scientific methods and data collection were addressed to some degree, although the book still appeared to offer little to a student wanting to engage in experimentation. With few exceptions and additions, these three books, all offering a highly theoretical treatment of psychology with an introspective and speculative approach, formed the basis of psychology teaching in New Zealand up until the 1920’s, at least as far as set texts were concerned. It was estimated that in 1925, the total number of volumes in the UNZ libraries across all subjects totalled between 40,000 and 45,000 (and many of these were duplicates across the colleges). This made New Zealand’s combined college libraries inferior to even the smallest of British university libraries (Bangor in Wales) and made quality thesis work almost impossible (Reichel-Tate Report, 1925). Beeby, for example, managed to write a first class master’s thesis in 1923 only by using books borrowed from Victoria College, there being nothing at all suitable in Canterbury (Beeby, 1992). There were exceptions; Hunter introduced a range of new psychology books to Victoria and Fergusen described a very comprehensive list of books on his 1930 reading list in Otago (Fergusen, 1979).

Recommendations were made by the Royal Commission for a University Press, subsidized and controlled by the University, to publish research. Efforts had in fact been ongoing for nearly a decade to persuade the UNZ Senate of the need for a University Press. Without this there was no option for the publication of non commercial scholarly works, including research, journals and text books (this did not come to fruition until 1946 but then produced only 17 publications before closure, due to the Senate’s refusal to support the activity financially (Barrowman, 1991)).

Australian universities tried to alleviate the difficulties imposed on intellectual activities
by geographic isolation with generous systems of sabbatical leave (Turtle, 1995), New Zealand, as discussed, did not. Learned societies were a means to improve communication. The Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), held gatherings which provided a forum for meetings and publications. Psychology was represented jointly with education and from 1926, also with philosophy under Section J (Turtle, 1989). This institutional relationship with education was contentious and probably premature as psychology was still closely linked to philosophy, and in 1923 this was recognised in the formation of the Australasian Association of Psychology and Philosophy (Turtle, 1995).

Possibly the biggest advance for New Zealand, in terms of gaining up to date information on trends and developments was the introduction by the AAPP, in 1923, of the *Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy* (AJPP). Australian and New Zealand psychologists shared similar problems in introducing a new discipline against a backdrop of low populations and geographical isolation, and even with the combined audience of both countries readership would not have been enough to support a psychological publication. For the first years of its existence the journal functioned with a dual remit but over time came to favour philosophical discussion (Turtle, 1995). The AJPP provided a much needed publishing outlet and an important source of professional communication and was well staffed by New Zealanders. William Anderson, Frank Dunlop, Thomas Hunter and C. F. Salmond, were all credited with assisting the editor and represented each of the Philosophy departments of the dominion. An examination of the New Zealand submissions (1923-1930) shows that New Zealand psychology submissions were few. Thomas Hunter submitted several articles on philosophical and social issues. William Anderson had several philosophical articles published throughout the period. Arthur Fitt had an experimental
study on the subject of attention published in 1923, and Reo Fortune appeared in 1926 with two psychology papers on the psychology of sleep and the effect of sleep on muscular activity. Other New Zealand submissions over the period related to education and philosophy. Salmond (1923) wrote in the first edition,

‘The interest in Philosophy in New Zealand has greatly deepened and extended of recent years. Many have felt the need of a nearer market for their work than that offered by the British Journals of Philosophy. It is possible also that the Journal may disclose a new type and temper of Philosophy under these Southern skies.’ (p. 74)

The sentiment could be equally applied to those involved in psychology. While the quality of the Journal submissions appears unremarkable and philosophy was better represented than psychology, its real benefit was probably the reduction in isolation and the communication it provided with professionals in other parts of the world.

Tangible institutional advances were made after the 1925 inquiry, with the four colleges now becoming constituent colleges and professors of the colleges became (within limitations) professors of the University (Hight, 1937). Another major step forward was the recommendation that the four colleges no longer be restrained to provide identical courses or methods of examination. This prepared the way for future specialisation and diversity in psychology between the four colleges (New Zealand Council for Education Research, 1943). It was to be 1962 before the University of New Zealand was finally disbanded after almost a century. Hunter was to continue his opposition of the UNZ throughout his long career but Titchener’s prediction that Hunter would have a “brilliant career as an investigator” was

Psychology could have struggled for survival as just one of far too many UNZ subject choices, described by the Royal Commission (1925) as a situation of ‘quantity over quality’. That the subject did not succumb to this fate was partly due to events within the colleges which saw the teaching profession foster an interest in psychology as related to teaching methods. Additionally, external events related to the aftermath of World War 1 encouraged a much wider interest in psychology from a society struggling to adjust. These developments coincided to a large degree. Education will be discussed next, followed by an examination of some of the external events, including war, which formed the social context of the time.
Chapter Four

*Education and Applied Psychology*

Teacher training colleges developed alongside the four University colleges, mainly conducting the two-year course for primary school teaching. A minority of these students pursued concurrent university courses for post primary teaching. A four year M.A. degree course existed in the University’s Departments of Education without there being any organic relationship between the training colleges and the Departments of Education (Campbell, 1943). The study of education increasingly included psychology papers and provided a major impetus towards applied psychology aided by the cooperative relationship that developed between the two disciplines (Haig & Marie, 2012, St. George, 1990). In 1909 Hunter wrote that he had succeeded in separating experimental psychology from logic, ethics and philosophy, allowing the teachers, who are very keen to be trained in psychology, to devote their time to it (Hunter, 1909). By 1915 the thesis for the M.A. degree in education could be on a psychological topic (Winterbourne, 1953). As the University syllabus developed, there was a growing interest in child development, the relationship between mental and physical growth and (as seen throughout this time period) a fascination with the inherited and environmental influences on children (Beeby, 1992).

Education developed faster in the university system than psychology. This made sense. The colony valued practical skills, and education was highly valued whereas psychology was new and had yet to establish its uses in society. Educators were quick to appreciate the potential of psychological knowledge and laid claim to several areas related to ‘method’ (Winterbourne, 1953). Hunter found that education departments were more prepared to change the curriculum insofar as education needs went. In comparison, apart from Victoria,
the philosophy departments were slow to admit changes (Hunter, 1952). In 1920 a post
graduate diploma in education was available which offered a paper in experimental
education. Syllabus revisions continued to emphasise psychological knowledge in
education. One of these revisions led to a paper on educational psychology and another
paper had a strong practical component in educational research where the student would
spend the bulk of the course in the laboratory (Winterbourne, 1953). Canterbury College at
this point took strides in psychological research via the Education department of Professor
James Shelley and his assistant, Clarence Beeby.

Shelley was a polymath academic, keen on exploring new ideas. In 1920, while head of
education at Canterbury, he had already introduced lectures in occupational psychology
(Jamieson, n.d.). Shelley had also started dabbling with intelligence testing in 1920 with
tests he had imported from England (Beeby, 1979). Beeby had completed philosophy
studies in Canterbury, later claiming that he had no recollection of hearing about Freud,
Jung or Spearman through the philosophy department. He was employed in 1923 as an
assistant to Professor Salmond (head of Philosophy) and Shelley (head of Education).
Beeby’s role under Salmond was routine teaching and marking, but he was also tasked with
setting up a psychology laboratory (despite never having seen a laboratory or having any
experimental experience) for the teaching of the subject, in conjunction with Shelley.
Salmond had a reputation for being resistant to experimental psychology and, to make
matters more difficult, Beeby was at the time studying under Salmond for his MA degree, a
matter dealt with by simply ignoring the existence of the laboratory (Beeby, 1992). Salmond
has been described in modern histories as a man single-minded in his devotion to
Philosophy, “the Queen of the Sciences”, who neglected the psychological aspect of the
subject (Beardsley et al., 1973). Beeby claimed that Professor Salmond, having opposed Hunter’s moves in establishing experimental psychology, never once set foot in the psychology laboratory at Canterbury (Beeby, 1992). However, Youngmeyer (1992) claimed that Salmond was an overworked philosopher who had been teaching psychology with no assistance for years and that the causes of his opposition to experimental psychology have been misunderstood. Salmond wanted psychology separated from philosophy and given improved status with its own chair, having recognised that it was time for psychology to stand alone and head the developing social sciences (Youngmeyer, 1992). In the first edition of the Australian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy (AJPP, 1923), Salmond discussed the rapid growth of experimental psychology and laboratories in the University:

    Otago, the first to start, here lags behind. Is this, dare it be asked, folly or wisdom on the part of Otago? As long as Psychology remains in our University curricula merely as a sub-branch of Philosophy, is it right that Experimental Philosophy should occupy much of the students’, not to mention the Professor’s time? (p. 74).

Salmond may have been pleased to offload psychology and he may not have had the time, knowledge or inclination to teach a rapidly changing subdiscipline, but it is not clear if, or to what degree, Salmond held psychology back at Canterbury.

    Thomas Hunter gave Beeby invaluable help, introducing him to the equipment and practical work of his Victoria laboratory. Beeby was later to discover that Hunter had given up a chunk of his vacation time to teach him, also providing him with detailed notes and instructions. As a result, the laboratory courses that Beeby introduced at Canterbury were also strongly influenced by Wundt and Titchener. The syllabus included sensory perception,
attention and reaction times, memory, learning, fatigue, mental imagery and associated ideas (Beeby, 1979). Beeby and Shelley worked hard making most of their own equipment, which was quite normal at the time and luckily Shelley was something of a handyman with wood and metal work (Youngmeyer, 1992). The laboratory also naturally evolved into something of an informal psychological clinic, where Beeby and Shelley conducted mental tests and gave psychological advice (which the empathetic Shelley was naturally good at). Due to this clinical aspect of their work, Beeby developed an interest in delinquency (an issue of some social concern at the time). After a period in England studying for a PhD under Charles Spearman and Cyril Burt, Beeby returned to Canterbury in 1928 to take charge of the Psychological and Educational laboratories. Beeby credited the mentorship that he had received from both Hunter and Shelley in helping to shape his long term career success; in these early years he primarily thought of himself as a psychologist with an interest in education (Beeby, 1992). In 1934 Beeby left the university to become the Director of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research and would go on to have a distinguished international career in education advising other nations on education systems, largely through his work with the United Nations (Kemp, 2007). However, in the 1920’s, just as Hunter had before him, Beeby came to believe that there was no future for him in pure laboratory research; the social climate in New Zealand being more rewarding of new ideas and practical applications of knowledge to solving problems. Shelley and Beeby, like Hunter, became heavily involved with WEA lectures and requests for psychological help were generated by these forays into the community. The laboratory at Canterbury had always functioned more as a clinic than a scientific laboratory, although its specific purpose appears to have been quite vague. Anxious parents came with their children for advice, as they
would do at Victoria’s child guidance clinic, but the Canterbury clinic work soon expanded into Vocational Guidance and Industrial psychology (a rapidly growing area with fears over mechanisation, repatriation of veterans and the encroaching economic depression) and work with children was expanded into the classrooms (Alcorn, 1999).

Henry Ferguson, teaching experimental psychology in Otago, described some of the differences between the laboratory courses for education students and those for psychology students in 1932. According to Ferguson, the psychology students had been nurtured in the Weber-Fechner-Wundt-Myers-Bartlett-Collins-Drever tradition. Education students concentrated on Darwin-Galton-Binet-Burt-Thomson-Thorndike. Education lectures were concerned with mental testing, the history and different types of tests, the need for norms and standardisation and other statistical techniques. There was also an emphasis on delinquent children and laboratory time was mainly spent in the testing of children. It was the use of tests and comparison of results which were being examined rather than any original approach to either testing or delinquency. In comparison (and according to Ferguson of no scientific relevance at all other than avoiding overlapping courses) psychology students covered a different set of topics; sensory acuities, perception, reaction times, attention, retention, memory, emotion etc (Ferguson, 1979).
Chapter five

A World War and a World Disease

Some of the institutional developments in academic psychology have so far been addressed, but these form only part of the story and it is necessary to take a step back in time for a broader, more contextual perspective of events influencing the discipline as it entered the 1920’s. In 1914, as the internal disputes of the UNZ continued, a major war had begun in Europe in which New Zealand would be fully involved. The war soon overshadowed all else and the UNZ shared with other youth based institutions in Europe the effects of a long conflict. In answer to inadequate recruitment rates the Government brought in the 1916 Military Service Act, introducing compulsory conscription for all men up to the age of 48 (NZ Official Yearbook, 1917). The consequences for the University were predictable; young men came of age and left the emptying classrooms, often never completing their studies. In New Zealand University histories the experience of World War One is poorly documented. The University historian J. C. Beaglehole (brother to psychologist Ernest Beaglehole), devoted a scant few lines to the experience of war in his History of the University of New Zealand (1937). Overall, from approximately 2383 college men who went to the war, 20%, were killed. Although there is no direct evidence on the effects on the growth of psychology at the time, estimates of the numbers of college men involved in the war and the death rate give an indication of the level of disruption experienced by the University of New Zealand as a whole:
Table 1

Summary of War Service for the University of New Zealand 1914 - 1918

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Active Service</th>
<th>Death rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


After four years, with an end to war in sight, another threat emerged in the form of a virulent disease popularly (and inaccurately) known as ‘Spanish flu’. As a result of the war, the disease spread unchecked and was carried from country to country by mobile armies and troop ships. The highly contagious virus had an estimated morbidity rate of up to a third of the world population within a matter of weeks (Taubenberger & Morens, 2006). Due to the scale and scope of the crisis, mortality rates are best estimates; current belief is that at least 50 million people died of the influenza, ten times the rate of war dead (Rice, 2003).

For the universities, the influenza outbreak meant yet more loss of life and disruption as the institutions were closed and the healthy were put to work caring for the sick (Bradshaw, 2005). New Zealand wartime propaganda and a perfunctory department of public health meant that the disease was not dealt with effectively and infection control measures were poorly understood as can be seen in the decision to allow an infected troop ship, the Niagara, to disembark in Auckland. New Zealand was hit hard by the disease in October and November, 1918 (Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives AJHR, 1919).

To put these events into perspective, New Zealand, with a population of just over one
million, suffered the loss of 18,500 men over the four years of the war. In just over two months the influenza contagion struck 49% of the population, killing 8,570, including 2115 Maori (Wilson, Baker & Summers et. al., 2012). The pattern in New Zealand reflected experiences abroad; the young and fit, the most productive and reproductive segment of the population, were hit hardest. Thousands of children in New Zealand were left orphaned in the care of the state. The infrastructure failed to cope with the high morbidity rate and health services had proven to be inadequate (AJHR, 1919). In a pattern also seen in the United Kingdom, younger doctors had been conscripted to the armies (including New Zealand’s public health experts), leaving civilian populations to the care of less scientific, older doctors who trained during the Victorian era and the impotence of their unscientific methods was unmistakeable (Honigsbaum, 2012). When the pandemic experience was later examined by a government inquiry, this failure of outdated methods was recognised with calls for more scientific and research based expertise in health and social welfare (AJHR, 1919). The socially catastrophic and all enveloping experience of the pandemic has possibly not been fully absorbed into the story of New Zealand’s early development and remains an event that is still being constructed and reconstructed over time (Phillips, 2004).

In an underpopulated colony recovering from war, this further loss of life was keenly felt. Health was viewed as an important national commodity (Bryder, 1982). Dr. Thacker announced in parliament that the worth of each inhabitant lost to the nation was £5,000; an immense sum, which provided the government with motivation to address public health (New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, 1918). As seen in the Report of the Influenza Epidemic Commission (AJHR, 1919), calls soon followed for improvements in the national standard of health and in child welfare particularly. The pandemic, as part of the social environment of
the time, played a large role in post war calls for change, reform and increased social management. There was recognition too of the need to connect with the rest of the world on health issues, leading to support at a later date for the World Health Organisation (AJHR, 1919). This evolution in health, from the private to the public and government domain, enrolling also child and social welfare, could be seen in the new Health Act 1920; a piece of legislation that came out of the Royal Commission examining the pandemic. The Health Act led to the establishment of the Department of Health which had a larger scope of function than the old Department of Public Health and continued to expand rapidly into activities classed as ‘social medicine’ (McLintock, 1966). One aspect of the changes was a new reliance on ‘expert opinion’ and the importance of research and science in the health of the population (Bryder, 1982).

These continuing developments in the infrastructure of education, health and social welfare provided a foothold for the application of psychological knowledge as a solution to the problems of humanity. It was within this milieu of institutional expansion, scientific advancement and individual suffering that the progression of psychology in New Zealand accelerated. This was further intensified by the need to understand the problems of returned service men.

**Psychology, psychiatry and the neuroses of war**

An address by James Shelley, at the unveiling of the Canterbury College War Memorial (1938), highlighted not only the tangible loss of the war dead but also drew attention to the struggles of the returned veterans, many of whom never recovered the years when they would have been studying for a profession and “came back to find that the life of peace had hurried past them and left them beggars at the doors of the next generation” (Shelley, 1938,
p8). This was the period of the so called ‘lost generation’ of disillusioned, unsettling young men, many suffering the mental and physical effects of war.

In the first year of war British military authorities had noticed unusual symptoms affecting the ability of fighting men, such as paralysis and loss of speech; symptoms were collectively nicknamed ‘shellshock’ by men in the trenches (Collins, 2012). The initial New Zealand response to shellshock was disciplinary; emotional breakdown of a type seen in shellshock was viewed as cowardice (Neal, 2001; Stone, 1985; Styles, 1997). As the numbers of sufferers increased, the conceptualisation of the condition had to adapt to accommodate mental distress in a picture of war that did not threaten the image of heroic masculinity or suggest hereditary taint of large numbers of New Zealand’s finest (Styles, 1997; Neal, 2001). Initially, the somatic explanation of the medical profession dominated. This changed somewhat, as the emerging profession of psychiatric medicine, generally concerned with running insane asylums, attempted to establish an influence in this highly topical area. A move by psychiatrists, towards “nervous” disorders and away from the stigma of “madness” opened the way for psychiatry to attempt to cure and even prevent mental illness. This meant an association with the neurologists and psychologists, and provided an arena where the emerging professions of psychiatry and psychology began to assert their scopes of influence (Jansz & van Drunen, 2004). Psychiatric medicine maintained its adherence to a disease based medical model but this approach yielded little in the way of effective treatments until the 1930’s, when psychiatrist adopted several risky and radical approaches, including drug therapy, lobotomy and electric shock treatment. These treatments often appeared both scientific and effective (at least in the short term) and would eventually bolster the professional standing of psychiatry (Thompson, 1992).
It has become an established part of the war story that the initial understanding of shellshock as trauma to the central nervous system transformed over time into a psychological interpretation of emotional and mental trauma. This interpretation advanced the psychodynamic approach to psychological medicine (Loughran, 2012). However, to delineate shell shock as belonging to either a physical or psychological paradigm would be to oversimplify the divergence between the psychologists and the psychiatrists. Psychologists were not averse to physiological explanations. An evolutionary paradigm shared by doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists allowed for some degree of shared middle ground where physiological elements of shell shock could be addressed (Loughran, 2012). Freudian views, previously considered unscientific, now gained a foothold in Britain. Psychoanalysis offered what appeared to be an achievable treatment option, a practical tool which was largely adopted by the medical psychologists (psychiatrists). Freud claimed “psychoanalysis was born of medical necessity. It originated in the need of helping [sic] the victims of nervous disease to whom, rest, hydropathy or electrical treatment could bring no relief” (Freud, 1917, p. 42).

It was the psychology camp that had the biggest impact. C. S. Myers, an experimentalist from the Cambridge Psychological Laboratory took on the official responsibility for dealing with shellshock and the Cambridge laboratory made considerable contributions to medical psychology (Boring, 1929; Haig & Marie, 2012; Hearnshaw, 1964). The war was a catalyst in America and Britain for the growth of clinical psychology which, together with the new clinical tool of psychological testing gave psychologists an applied role outside of the universities (Haig & Marie, 2012; Jansz & van Drunen, 2004). Clinical Psychology would not be formally introduced to New Zealand until George Shouksmith...
established a professional postgraduate program in 1960 at Canterbury following the introduction of a clinical psychology MA (Black, 1972). However, the application of psychology was established in several fields (such as industry and education) well before then.

The war brought psychotherapy into mainstream psychiatric practice but in New Zealand a lack of both doctors and knowledge of psychotherapeutic treatments meant that the experiment was limited (Parsons, 2012). Squads of army doctors had completed condensed three month training courses in psychoanalysis and these new doctors, trained in Britain in the ‘new psychology’ brought psychotherapy to the Queen Mary Military Hospital at Hamner Springs (Stone, 1985). This became designated as a specialist hospital in response to public stigma about mental illness, strictly segregating the soldiers by recognising shell shock as a nervous disorder of war rather than a common mental disorder (Styles, 1997). Newspaper articles of the time portrayed the growing public awareness of psychology and a clumsy, uncritical use of scientific terms which were now clearly all the rage. Dr Izzard, for example, returned to Hamner Springs from training in London, to treat shell shock patients with the ‘new branch’ of scientific psychotherapeutic treatment. He was, he claimed, experiencing wonderful results with the new science of hypnosis and autosuggestion. Dr Izzard shared a ‘curious scientific fact’ that wounded men never suffered shellshock as the satisfaction of having ‘done their bit’ rendered them immune from brain damage (The Press, 1919, December 12). After four years of trench warfare the best a traumatised soldier could hope for was a Dr. Izzard. Regardless of the naivety of the scientific claims for the new treatments there seems to have been a genuine sense of commitment fostered by the London clinics. Viscount Knutsford (chairman of the London
Hospital) spoke in the House of Lords about the sense of ‘pride and devotion’ given to the search for treatments of war neurosis; he also called for cooperation amongst practitioners rather than bold claims of cure by individuals (Kings Country Chronicle, 1919, June 21). This was the atmosphere that those like Dr Izzard had trained in before returning to New Zealand to practice; the government at the time optimistically expected the specialist skills to be defunct within a year (Ashburton Guardian, 1919, October 10). However, by 1922 the military hospital came back under civilian control as the psychiatrists saw similarities between nervous disorders of civilians and those of the traumatised soldiers (Fenwick, 1920). An article in the New Zealand Medical Journal discussing care at Hamner outlined a compassionate and often commonsensical approach to treating neuroses. Dr. Fenwick (who at one point had charge of the Queen Mary Military Hospital) endorsed rest, routine and ‘aspirin’ but also endeavoured to incorporate Freudian concepts of ‘psychic conflict’ and the subconscious mind in a way that was increasingly seen in writings of the 1920’s. Dr. Fenwick’s rambling musings on the repression of the neuropath in need of the physician to “dig out repressed complexes from the subconscious mind to hand them back to the patient to be dealt with destructively by their conscious mind” were far from representative of a scientific model of medicine. It was perhaps a model of desperation. Dr Fenwick examined the medical approaches to neurosis at the time and made a plea for further exploration of psychological approaches in the face of medical limitations (Fenwick, 1920).

The immediate impact of shell shock on New Zealand psychology was limited, the discipline was not ready to take an effective role in developing or administering treatment and so the opportunity was lost. By 1930 many New Zealand psychiatrists, led by the influential Dr. Truby King, came to assert that psychotherapeutic methods were ineffective
and the fledgling efforts to introduce psychotherapy in New Zealand declined as psychiatrists asserted control in the professional arena of mental illness (Parsons, 2012; Styles 1997). However, the broadening of the concept of mental illness to include psychological as well as physiological causations and the increase in texts and psychological theory of abnormal psychology, helped lay the foundations for the specialism of clinical psychology in the field of mental health (Stone. 1985; Styles, 1997).

Towards the end of the war, the coalition government was faced with the unprecedented problem of repatriating over 100,000 men to whom the nation felt indebted (Neal, 2001). A recent work by Parsons (2012) suggests that the political rhetoric of the Returned Servicemen’s Association (RSA) may have given an incorrect impression that the veterans were treated unsympathetically. The RSA were lobbying to gain repatriation extensions on provisions for sick and disabled veterans. However, as discussed, both doctors and psychologists were committed to finding effective treatments for the effects of war. There is also, overwhelming evidence of public sympathy and a desire from officialdom to meet the nation’s obligations to its veterans (Parsons, 2012). The British Government through its Ministry of Pensions had set up numerous clinics to deal with the influx of shell-shocked men and implored doctors to hand over patients suffering with shellshock to practitioners with experience in psychotherapy (Stone, 1985). Psychologists at Queen Mary hospital had, in 1922, identified stress related to the transition back to civilian life as being a major cause of psycho-neurosis and a similarly enlightened approach was seen in the New Zealand government’s acceptance of the psychological issues of repatriation; government officials were not inclined to automatically accept the medical viewpoint. A more psychological approach was evident in the government’s recognition of the psychological problems of
long term dependency on benefits and steps were taken to help the veterans rehabilitate to civilian life. A key initiative was the land settlement scheme which enabled soldiers to buy cheap farms with government loans; regardless of whether or not they had farming experience (AJHR, 1930).

The need to understand and treat shellshock (and other war related psycho-neuroses), and to rehabilitate returning soldiers, affected every nation involved in the war. This in turn, led to an increased interest in, and spread of, psychological ideas and developments, encouraged by the post war growth of international cooperation as can be seen in the development of the Australasian Association of Philosophy and Psychology and the AJPP. For this reason World War One has been described as a watershed for British psychology (Boring, 1929). New Zealand psychology, as discussed, was developing slowly until this point. The effect of the war on New Zealand psychology was less marked than in Britain but there was clearly an increased awareness of the subject. Focus shifted from the pursuit of psychological knowledge within the university colleges, to the application of it in society.

**Repatriation of war veterans**

The effect on New Zealand society of the return of significant numbers of psychologically wounded men and the ability or otherwise of families to cope with them, is an area that has received relatively little attention. There was some ambiguity in the diagnoses of the war neuroses and few reliable figures exist to indicate which conditions (shellshock, neurasthenia, alcoholism etc), were prevalent. Inpatient psychiatric records do not necessarily illustrate the wider situation; both because of the ambiguity of diagnoses and also the reluctance of many men to enter a psychiatric institution (for example, Maori rarely appear in psychiatric admission figures of the time). The challenge of supporting affected
veterans in the home and community may have been one of the factors behind a developing popular movement in the 1920’s which brought modern psychology into the realm of the general public. The general appeal of psychoanalysis was suggested by Collins (2012) as a partial explanation for the rise in popular or practical psychology. A British psychology publication *The Psychologist Magazine* recognised the growing public interest in the practical use of psychology and published a handbook of ‘practical’ psychology. This publication was clearly inspired by the interest in neurasthenia which affected so many families (Collins, 2012). This psychology handbook was followed by others in user friendly language, similar to the self-help literature available today. Interest was also visible in a growing number of clubs providing lectures, mail order courses literature on practical psychology. The trend was evident in New Zealand and went beyond the popular fascination with psychoanalysis, hypnotism and phrenology; people were interested enough to take courses and attend lectures and the University responded. The importance attached to supporting Workers Educational Association (WEA) courses was highlighted in the 1925 Royal commission which singled out these community education initiatives as an important aspect of the University’s role. Hunter used the opportunity to take psychology out to the public by providing well attended WEA lectures on popular psychological topics of the day, for example the psychology of the child, the psychology of the adolescent, the ‘new’ psychology and the problem of the delinquent, were all areas addressed in public lectures, sometimes held in series as short courses in psychology (Evening Post, 1929, September 24). Hunter was tireless in his WEA work and has been described as a ‘founding father’ of the association (Hall, 1970). Ivan Sutherland in Victoria, Salmond, Shelley and Beeby in Canterbury, and Arthur Fitt in Auckland were also active in taking psychology out into the
community through WEA lectures. Subjects other than psychology had always been offered on the WEA programmes but psychology now had a particular social relevance and the WEA gave the emerging discipline a way to reach the public. It was this exposure through the WEA lectures that often led Hunter, Beeby and Shelley to offer psychological advice to individuals through the university clinics which were beginning to take shape in the 1920’s (Beeby, 1992; Hunter, 1927).

These experiences of war and disease affected New Zealand, leading to changes in public health and attitudes to social welfare. The UNZ responded to the changing demands of society by reaching out into the community with WEA lecture programmes. For psychologists in particular, public interest was high and the individual colleges responded, lectures were given on many areas of psychology. Both in New Zealand and in Britain and America, psychology was about to expand rapidly.
Chapter six

Applying Psychology

An area where New Zealand did not lag behind the rest of the world was that of addressing problems of child development. In Britain the setting up of state schooling in the 1880’s was a catalyst for investigation into physical and mental retardation in children. New Zealand had set up its own school system in 1870, an impressive achievement in a new colony. This, together with increased awareness of child welfare problems following the investigation into the influenza pandemic and a progressive public health system meant the physical hygiene movement was planted on fertile ground. By the 1920’s the mental hygiene movement was also underway, described simply as the application of current knowledge to address the causes and prevention of mental disorders and emotional abnormality (Beaglehole, 1950). The child welfare movement had made huge gains in child health and infant mortality in New Zealand with its internationally admired Department of Health. The 1925 Child Welfare Act formalised the existing welfare role of the education department by creating a Child Welfare Division. The Act was primarily aimed at children in state care, but it also included other vulnerable children such as delinquents (already of interest to the psychologists) and made provision for separate courts for child offenders and provided for child Welfare Officers (Wright, 1925).

An innovative development was the establishment of specialist clinics within the university colleges, to diagnose and treat major and minor mental problems in children. By the mid 1920’s, psychology had crossed into mainstream consciousness (as seen in the interest in practical psychology and the attendance at WEA psychology lectures). Theory was developing rapidly in different schools of thought, although this was still imported...
rather than instigated in New Zealand. Applied psychology was beginning to develop in several areas, notably education, business and industry and health. In the post war world of improved communication and institutional cooperation, ideas were eagerly shared and debated.

The University Child Guidance Clinics were the first psychological clinics in New Zealand, the establishment of which was initially somewhat ad hoc in both Victoria and Canterbury, where the existing laboratory spaces and the involvement of tutors in public lecturing seemed to coincide during a time when problems of child development and mental hygiene were very topical (Beeby, 1992). The clinics answered a need and demand from communities for psychological advice, provided an opportunity for field training of students and modelled an early template for interdisciplinary work in both education and mental health. The clinics may not (due to their small size and underfunding) have had a major impact on society but they were a significant progression for both the University and the discipline, responding to the community and taking expertise into ‘the field’ in ways perhaps more familiar to the technical departments. It was the proactive approach of the education sector rather than the University philosophy departments that made the establishment of clinics possible: Hunter had the support of W. H. Gould (chair of education) in Victoria, Beeby and Salmond collaborated with James Shelley in Canterbury, and Ferguson had the support of Dr. Lawson in Otago. In Auckland it was Professor Fitt, (chair of education) who promoted psychology. The infrastructure for intervention in child psychology had already begun to be established through public health measures. As discussed, the Ministry of Education had already established the requirements for a Health Officer and psychological services for children under the care of the State. The 1925 Child Welfare Act expanded
provisions and drew attention to the area of delinquency, which was adopted as an area of special interest by the psychologists (Hunter, 1927; 1929). Hunter explained that some cases came to the guidance clinic directly from the Child Welfare Department and the Juvenile court following the introduction of the Child Welfare Act (Hunter, 1927), in this way the new legislation directly legitimised the new psychological services; there being no other similar service providers. The Education department had no psychological services until 1943 but the need for such services was recognised by teachers and others and led to the collaborative work of the Clinics (Winterbourne, 1953).

The Freudian ideas which were very popular in the 1920s extended a strong influence in approaches to childhood. Armed with the work of Freud and, later, Piaget, the psychologists’ promoted the new gospel of the Individual Child. Hunter (who appeared keen on Freudian thinking) had given a well attended series of public lectures for the Wellington WEA on child psychology. During these lectures Hunter claimed that Freud and others had conclusively proven that psychopathological states were the result of conflicts producing disharmony or disassociation in the personality. Furthermore, claimed Hunter, it was now clear that the first few years of a child’s life were the most critical (Hunter, 1927). Hunter, Shelly, Beeby and colleagues, sought a more humane and individual approach to children experiencing difficulties at school and at home, particularly the delinquent child. Hunter, confident that psychology now rested on firm scientific foundations, believed that it should, like all sciences, be applied where needed to the problems in its field. Hunter, as mentioned, had early in his career visited the Pennsylvania Child Guidance Clinic of Lightner Witmer. Witmer clinics had proven very successful in America working on a collaborative system with input from a psychologist, trained ‘examiners’, a doctor (when needed) and a social worker.
worker (Blampied, 2012). Hunter was also influenced by the British psychologist Sir Cyril Burt, another multi-faceted psychologist who took academic psychology into applied fields in Britain, in particular the areas of mental testing and Child Guidance Clinics (Hearnshaw, 1964; Hunter, 1927). At Victoria in 1926, Thomas Hunter and Ivan Sutherland of the psychology department, joined forces with the college Department of Education and the School Hygiene Division in Public Health and set up a Saturday morning clinic for pre-adolescent children. These three departments, represented by Hunter and Sutherland, Professor Gould and Dr Ada Paterson, worked collaboratively and somewhat informally on Saturday mornings. The addition of Paterson was a boon; a medical doctor with years of experience in the school system, she, alone of the group, had real experience in conducting child assessments and a growing interest in mental wellbeing. In addition, Paterson had a gift for dealing with people in an approachable way (Tennant, 1996). Hunter brought his laboratory experience and psychological knowledge. Students of both psychology and education were willingly involved to assist, gaining a rare opportunity for placement experience. This was pioneering work and there was clearly a need for such a clinic at the time, evident in the level of professional support it received. The process adopted involved Professor Gould liaising with the school teachers and parents, Paterson conducting physical examinations, Sutherland conducting psychometric testing and Hunter interviewing families. Welfare Officers and School Medical Officers cooperated, providing reports on the family situation and regular referrals (support also found forthcoming in the Canterbury Clinic and the Otago University Clinic). There were no other psychological services available to schools until community services became established and the University clinics moved into a research and training based role from 1953 (Conner, 1959). The interdisciplinary case study
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approach (similar to the Witmer Clinics) was the same across all the University Guidance Clinics. Hunter wrote in 1927: “If the disorders of this complex personality are to be understood and treated the medical man, the psychologist, the educationalist, and the social worker must all co-operate to that end” (p. 31).

Otago officially launched its clinic in 1939 but had been informally offering help and advice for several years before that. Perhaps the slower start to Otago’s clinic was beneficial as it appears to have been set up under more defined terms. Otago’s main goals were to provide a service to the public, training for advanced students and to conduct research in clinical methods in education (Conner, 1959). A clear point of difference in Otago was the more formalised record keeping (including statistical information) which was lacking in the more ad hoc approach of the earlier clinics (Mitchell, 1956).

Despite the ostensible abundance of ‘expertise’ these ventures were breaking new ground, and, according to Beeby (1992), somewhat amateurish. The confidence expressed in the Clinic’s expertise, by the operators themselves and by the media, seems stunningly naïve and premature. Hunter himself had no training or notable experience in child welfare work yet talked with authority about ‘the occasional need to remove children from their families entirely’ (Hunter, 1927). Although they were working with a vulnerable client group there appeared to be limited understanding in these early stages, of the many issues involved in taking on the mantle of the ‘expert professional’. There seems to have been very little personal insight or accountability amongst the new psychological practitioners, and no ethical guidelines or codes of practice to protect the child or family from poor practice. Beeby talked candidly in later years about the dangers of this climate and the desire to apply inadequate knowledge derived from reading and ‘scrappy’ experience; the
line between ‘expertise and charlatanism sometimes appearing perilously narrow’ (Beeby, 1992). Sutherland, also, sounded a realistic note, speaking publicly about the risks inherent in psychometric testing and the limited value it held when conducted mechanically and without understanding of the child’s social world (Evening Post, 1931). However, the insight shown by Beeby and Sutherland to the limitations of their knowledge seems to have been the exception rather than the rule in this exciting period. Beeby said in later years, “In the 1920’s we knew too much, too soon, too surely, and some of the things we attempted bring a blush to the cheek in 1979” (Beeby, 1979, p6). Hunter, despite his confidence in the new psychological theories, did carry some awareness of the possibility that damage could be wrought on the child in poor psychological practice (‘good’ practice did not appear to be defined). In 1927 during a public lecture on the clinics he warned “we must ever be conscious of our ignorance; the cocksure attitude is nowhere more disastrous than in dealing with personality” (p. 36). However, this warning was aimed at the dangers of ill trained persons; presumably the Victoria Guidance Clinic staff considered themselves well trained. Hunter believed that the best protection was simply maintaining an outlook of reverence towards the child (Hunter, 1927). Some good may have derived from the early clinics simply from the common sense interventions and well meaning advice. However, as stated, records were not well kept, Hunter (1927) explained: “As far as possible we have endeavoured to keep in touch with cases” however “all of our people engaged in this work have other duties of a heavy nature and under the circumstances the work cannot be thoroughly done” (p. 33). While Hunter wrote about ‘special treatments’ in general terms it is not clear what the treatments were, and with the poor record keeping and limited follow up of cases there could have been little, if any, evaluation of the effectiveness of these
‘treatments’. Whether there was any basis to the claim of expertise in these early forays into what may be termed clinical and educational psychology is open to debate. The clinics continued and by 1950 there were five in existence operating either as education and diagnostic services with the Department of Education, with the Mental Hospitals Department or in conjunction with District Vocational Guidance Centres (Beaglehole, 1950).

The increased interest in children and delinquency reflected the wider societal interests at the time in mental hygiene and the eugenics movement. This movement was an upshot of the widely held nineteenth century belief in biological determinism. Instead of evolving, this mind set was bolstered by a sense of moral panic at what was perceived to be a rapidly expanding underclass of the feeble minded, morally deficient and substandard human beings. One unfortunate outcome of the failure to expedite a psychological approach to shell shock and the failure of the somatic approaches of the psychiatrists was the entrenchment evidenced when their methods failed too. Increasingly shell shock was explained as a combination of environmental triggers and poor character or hereditary taint (Stone, 1985). The end result of this belief for the shell-shocked serviceman was that he was labelled a poor mental specimen and hence incurable. Figures maintained by the New Zealand Official Year Book, of admissions to the seven psychiatric hospitals show a steady annual increase in admissions for ‘problems of heredity’ throughout the 1920’s and outnumbering all other individual diagnosis. In the ten year period from 1919 to 1928 admissions due to heredity more than doubled to make up approximately 20% of admissions in 1928. In comparison, admissions due to prolonged stress, syphilis, epilepsy and alcohol remained relatively constant. Interestingly, looking forward to 1938, several years after the eugenics issue had been debated through the Mental Defectives Bill,
admissions for hereditary problems dropped to less than 3% of the annual intake (NZ Official Year Book, 1919 – 1938).

Unfortunately, in the 1920’s, psychiatrists were ratifying the views of eugenics with science and the authority of medicine in their attempts to explain away their own professional limitations (Stone, 1985). The growth of theory and practice of mental testing further linked psychology with eugenics. In 1927 a series of public lectures on social adjustment by Otago University College addressed the issue of eugenics. The beginnings of the Great Depression were already evident and the losses of the war and influenza were keenly felt. A lecture by Fisher, an economist, was brutal. Although, said Fisher, there was no need to panic (yet), it would be better for the nation if all human failures, absolute or relative and all of their carers, were somehow wiped out. Fisher believed that one answer lay with Industrial Psychology, which should tackle the psychological problems of mechanisation worker alienation. Economic concerns dominated the eugenics arguments. Lawson (1927) lectured that production not reproduction was needed and that massive state intervention was justified in enforcing methods to prevent reproduction in the unworthy groups. Some balanced views were evident. Moore (1927), for example, argued for an Otago chair in psychology to tackle the issue without being at the whim of social opinion and panic. The war had exacerbated views on heredity and the official inquiry into the influenza outbreak unearthed the previously unnoticed social squalor that New Zealand’s poor lived in and further hardened the prevalent eugenicist views. A very typical comment made by a well known school master when speaking of children needing foster care serves as an example.
“With rare exceptions, the boarded-out children are of a lower standard, both mentally and physically, than the other children and they need special care and teaching..... Many of the children are of doubtful parentage and show inherited traits that should be most carefully watched and corrected if they are ever to become worthy citizens” (New Zealand Herald, 1922, August 26, pp. 11-13).

The early Child Guidance Clinic in Otago had categories on its assessment documentation which included fathers who were ‘shiftless, immoral, weak or mentally defective’ and mothers who were ‘slovenly, working, dominant, or mentally defective’ (Mitchell, 1956).

Extreme measures including segregation, sterilisation and even castration were mooted by many ‘experts’ and medical professionals during a long Commission of Inquiry into the proposed Mental Defectives Bill. When several New Zealand psychologists, educationalists and philosophers became involved in the debate, a note of reason was sounded. Professors Fitt, Anderson and Sutherland joined in the fray, Shelley in particular debated heatedly about the professional abilities of the board and their efforts to keep psychologists out of the inquiry (Taylor, 2005). Finally Hunter joined in, arguing in the tactical, persistent style for which he was known (De La Mare, 1946). The Mental Defectives Bill was eventually passed in parliament, but contained none of the extreme measures mooted by the eugenicists. Hunter was singled out by the Minister of Health for his assistance (Taylor, 2005). It was a small but highly significant move. For possibly the first time the weight of psychology as a science was being used to affect legislation and shape the development of society on a large scale and the social responsibility of the scientist was acknowledged. There are examples in history, such as Nazi Germany where academics and scientists failed to speak out publicly.
New Zealand escaped the more radical legislation introduced in other places, including the United States, and this small episode is a stand-out moment in New Zealand’s academic and psychological history.

**Conclusion**

At the end of 1929, Ivan Sutherland reported in the AJPP, on the Ninth International Congress of Psychology, held in America at Yale University. It was termed a “psychfest” by local press, over a thousand international psychologists attended including famous names such as Terman, Piaget, Cattell and Spearman. A special celebrity guest was the commander of the famous German Zeppelin, Dr. Eckener, who had taken his doctorate thesis under Wundt at Leipzig. Internationally, psychology was now firmly established, debating and researching issues such as race, statistical method, the nature of general intelligence, child development, drugs and theoretical psychology to name a few. While very little in the way of theory or research had yet come from New Zealand, which had adopted and adapted psychological theory from other nations, the groundwork had been laid and New Zealand had largely kept up with international advances. When Sutherland attended the Congress, he was representative of sixty years of formidable pioneering effort.

To summarise, the first sixty years of psychology in New Zealand mainly consisted of many small advances, made by a few determined people. The foundations of psychology naturally coincided with the foundations of the country, and with the building of the colleges which made up the University of New Zealand. The discipline started from the departments of philosophy and in character with each individual university college, developed psychology as a subject worthy of individual attention. A key participant in this history was Sir Thomas Hunter, who not only enthusiastically promoted the subject at every
opportunity, but pioneered experimental psychology in the UNZ, drawing on his time with E. B. Titchener. Hunter also tackled the institutional barriers that made developing the discipline a difficult task, established a research scholarship and laid the groundwork for others to succeed.

World War One, its aftermath, and a deadly disease outbreak had brought turmoil to Zealand, highlighting some previously neglected areas of social need. However, in the wake of these events, changes in attitudes towards health and social management and increased public interest in psychology meant opportunities for a professional role in applied psychology. Another post-war development was a reduction in isolation, as nations sought to work more closely on an international level and psychological ideas developed rapidly and quickly spread to New Zealand. The education sector was quick to see the benefits of psychological knowledge and helped develop the discipline within the university colleges. Roles also developed in the community setting.

In conclusion, the scope of this thesis has entailed some limitations. The development of Industrial psychology has been neglected here, although it has been discussed elsewhere (for example Winterbourne, 1953). The place of industrial psychology and the growth of mental testing, within the rapid expansion of applied psychology in the 1920’s is an interesting subject mentioned only briefly in this thesis. There would be merit in conducting further research into the WEA lectures given by psychologists, particularly as these lectures provided such an important means of introducing psychology to the public. It would also be worthwhile conducting a deeper examination of the early child guidance clinics and examining the original records, such as they were, could be very interesting.

Adding to the existing body of work on the history of psychology in New Zealand has
been the aim of this thesis. The gap in the literature that I believe exists, for more detailed, contextual discussion has, I hope, been partially filled by the addition of this paper. Some slightly obscure details have been highlighted against a backdrop of major world events, including World War One, and the better known elements of New Zealand history such as the establishments of the University of New Zealand. These events were part of New Zealand’s institutional, political and social context, helping to shape the story of New Zealand psychology and its relatively rapid development despite the limitations of its British imported institutional structures.
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Appendix A

"EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY."

THE NEW SCIENCE OF PSYCHOPHYSICS.

Psychology—the study of mind—in one sense the oldest, but in the modern acceptance of the term the youngest, of the sciences, has had to pass at its initiation through a phase similar to that which preceded what might well be called modern chemistry, biology, and astronomy—alchemy, vitalism, and astrology. The modern scientific view is one that takes the facts for what they are worth in themselves, and endeavours to find laws or uniformities of action among them. In the popular mind modern science is inevitably associated with laboratories and experiment even so far as believing that wherever there is a laboratory there must be science. It is thus common to find a sharp line drawn between what have been called the experimental sciences and those that are purely observational. But observation is fundamental, and experiment differs from it only in the greater control that the observer has over the conditions under which his observations are made. The numerous advantages of experiment over simple observation are the result of this greater control of the conditions. But there is, however, no antagonism between the two methods, and therefore in experimental psychology

Continued...
we are not dealing with a new science, but with the application of an accepted method to an old problem. Like all other sciences, psychology tends to become empirical. The psychologist who takes this view is not concerned with what mind is ultimately any more than the physicist is with what matter is absolutely. These questions belong to metaphysics. Both physicists and psychologists examine the ways in which matter and mind respectively manifest themselves under certain conditions, and endeavour by the ordinary logical scientific methods to establish uniformities therein.

The pioneers in the other positive sciences did not find their ideas accepted by those who termed themselves conservative—who were prepared to accept the dicta of their predecessors not only without criticism but without enquiry—not have the leaders in modern psychology found this type of person extinct. Fortunately, however, man is mortal.

The aim of any positive science is to enquire into the facts that come within its scope, and to endeavour to find general principles therein. Experiment is the chief aid in this direction, because it enables us to isolate the phenomenon and to repeat the observation under similar conditions, or under conditions that vary in a definitely known way.

Continued...
Why should not experiment then be applied to mental phenomena—to the hearing of sounds, to the distinguishing of colours and brightnesses, to facts of memory and of imagination, to esthetics, and to that wide group of facts classed under abnormal psychology: dreams, the mental life of the insane, and of defectives generally? Prejudice has been the main obstacle. Older enquirers, endeavouring to solve the mystery of what mind is ultimately, have overlooked what science is mainly concerned to know, viz.: the ways in which the ultimate principles manifest themselves. From this point of view science is utilitarian; when once man has grasped the general principles that underlie the manifestations of any natural force he is in a position to use that power. That the application of experiment to mental facts has not been barren on its practical side, improvements in the methods of education, and in the treatment of defectives—the deaf, dumb, blind, insane, and criminal—clearly testify.

The method had its origin and development at Leipsic University, and dates from Weber's experiments in 1834. The results, embodied in his now celebrated work, "Touch and the Organic Sense," showed that there was a definite relation between increase of stimulus and increase of accompanying sensation. Briefly, his

Continued...
of accompanying sensation. Briefly, his result was that "in observing the difference between compared objects we perceive not the absolute difference between the objects, but the proportion which the difference bears to their magnitude." Fechner, who followed Weber, and endeavoured to formulate the latter's results with mathematical accuracy, may truly be called the founder of scientific psychology, and experimental methods in mental facts date back to the publication of his work on the Elements of Psychophysics. Wundt, who succeeded Fechner, developed the method of experiment in its application to mental life, and in 1876 established at Leipzig the first psychological laboratory. With the establishment of this laboratory means were provided for the testing and improving of methods, and for the training of those who were to direct laboratory work elsewhere. The rapid extension of the method has been remarkable. No American university of repute is without its psychological laboratory, and in the larger universities the staffing and equipment is on a most extensive scale. Here, too, as elsewhere, we find its application to pedagogies. At Teachers' College (Columbia University), probably one of the most advanced training colleges in the world, is to be found a laboratory, in which the old accepted principles of mental development are...
tal development are rapidly tested, and either confirmed or discarded. The leaders in this movement are by no means unknown in the educational and academic world; suffice it to mention Professors Titchener, James, Judd, Stanley Hall, Sanford, Stratton, Munslerberg, and Cattell.

On the Continent the movement has also spread rapidly. Besides the original laboratory at Leipsic, still under the direction of Professor Wundt, celebrated laboratories are to be found at Berlin, Halle, Gottingen, and Wurzburg, under such men as Professors Stumpf, Ebbingham, Muller, and Kulpe. In France—under men like Mm. Ribot and Binet—and elsewhere on the Continent the movement has made rapid progress, and has produced a radical change in the attitude of enquirers towards mental facts.

England, controlled by the traditions and prejudices of the past, has been late in accepting this new departure, but is now hastening to make good her lack of foresight. Psychological laboratories are now to be found at Cambridge, Oxford, London University, King’s College, London, Edinburgh, Liverpool, and elsewhere, under the direction of the younger school of English psychologists, e.g., Drs. MacDougall, Rivers, and Myers.

Both the results attained by the method and the opinions of those who have used it clearly show that the trial stages are past, and that the value of the application of experiment to mental facts has been amply demonstrated.