NEW ZEALAND’S ANZAC NURSES: MARKETIZING THE GREAT WAR FOR A 21ST CENTURY FIT

Abstract

Purpose: - The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how a historical event packaged as an iconic heritage cultural brand can be marketized and modified overtime to ensure brand longevity and continued emotional commitment and loyalty through the leverage of stories and associations more closely aligned with modern day audiences. We do this through examining the marketization of the New Zealand World War 1 (WWI) nurse to today’s audiences. The periods of study are WWI (1914 - 1918) and then the modern day. The New Zealand Army Nursing Service (NZANS) during WWI has previously had little attention as a key actor in the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC), held as pivotal in the birth of New Zealand’s perception of nationhood and an iconic heritage cultural brand. The history and legend of the ANZAC plays an important role in New Zealand culture and is fundamental to the ‘Anzac Spirit’, a signifier of what it means to be a New Zealander.

Design: - A historical case study method is used. The primary source of data is 1914 - 1918 and includes contemporaneous articles, personal writings: diaries, letters and published memoirs. More contemporary works form the basis for discussion of marketization as it relates to the NZANS. The article first presents conceptual framing, then the development of the Anzac brand and the history of the NZANS and its role in WWI before turning to discussion on the marketization of this nursing service to today’s audiences and as part of the ANZAC/Anzac brand.

Findings: - Today the story of the WWI NZANS nurse, previously seldom heard, has been co-opted and is becoming increasingly merged as an integral part of the Anzac story. The history of the NZANS during WWI has a great deal of agency today as part of that story, serving many functions within it and providing a valuable lever for marketization.

Originality/value: - To date, there is a scarcity of marketing analysis that examines the marketization of history. By focusing on New Zealand WWI nursing as a contributor to the Anzac story we contribute to the understanding of how marketers package and contemporize history for appeal to audiences through both sustaining and reworking cultural branding.
Keywords: - marketization, World War 1, nurses, New Zealand Army Nursing Service, ANZAC, Anzac brand, gender portrayal, cultural brands
Introduction

War and armed conflict, invariably marked as a key event in the history of a nation, provide fertile ground for historians and heritage makers. Marketers leverage this opportunity to provide audiences with a rich assortment of consumption products that enable memory, whether it be in the form of history, legend, or myth. The products of war can become powerful brands with equity built on their ability to evoke strong emotions and capture collective symbolic meanings for a nation or group (Holt, 2004). Memory and myth, whether based purely on factual account or repurposed for a better ‘fit’ can be profitably wrapped into products (Hawkins, 2015). such as books, commemorative events, children’s toys and stories, films, and touristic structures and landscapes (for example, museums and dark tourism offerings). War also produces heroes and occasionally, heroines. The Western World’s best known and arguably most influential nurse, Florence Nightingale, came out of the Crimean War (1853-1856). Nightingale’s personal war effort and leadership resulted in a turning point for the care of those injured in battle and ultimately radical changes to the delivery of nursing in general (Bostridge, 2015; Tye, 2020). Memory awarded to her in history and legend as the ‘lady with a lamp’ prevails today, providing a rich historical backdrop for stories that offer hope and comfort for fighting men caught up in the horrors of war (Bostridge, 2015; Gill and Gill, 2005). Nightingale’s legacy also provides a sentinel moment where women proved that they could in fact be useful on or near the battlefield and not merely a nuisance, as was the thinking of the day. Today Nightingale, far from being relegated to the lesser-known chapters of Victorian history, retains her iconic status. Despite some scholarship calling for a reappraisal of her work (e.g., Smith, 1982), continued sentimentalization and romanticism of memory and legacy abound (Bostridge, 2008; Williams, 2008). Even today Nightingale’s legacy remains as an influential branding tool, with seven United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS)

This paper also focuses on the history of nurses in war by examining the story of the New Zealand nurses within World War I (WWI). Nurses from the New Zealand Army Nursing Service (NZANS) served in WWI, on medical ships positioned offshore in conflict zones, tented casualty clearing stations and military hospitals in the Eastern Mediterranean, France, Flanders and England. It is only more recently that their story and the part they played has become contributory to the Anzac narrative, an iconic and deeply symbolic brand for both Australian and New Zealand nationhood. The key aim of our work is to demonstrate how a historical event packaged as an iconic heritage brand can be marketized and modified overtime to ensure brand longevity and continued emotional commitment and loyalty through the leverage of stories and associations more closely aligned with modern day audiences.

In order to do this, we shed light on how the WWI NZANS story, once relegated to the lesser-known part of New Zealand WWI history is becoming an increasingly integral part of the collective Anzac heritage brand. With the Anzac brand positioned on sacrifice, enduring values and young nationhood, NZANS history has now been co-opted into the story for the benefits it offers the marketization of the overall Anzac brand. In doing so, we also draw attention to some of the current gender-stereotypes and feminine tropes that, themselves, reach back into the past, replicating the gendered perceptions of war service that were prevalent one hundred years ago. The enduring ‘myths’ of First World War nursing are powerful, and this is what makes them such highly marketable commodities. We question the ethics of the mobilisation of these stereotypes, even as we acknowledge their influence and ‘commercial pull’ (Hallett, 2014).
Our article proceeds as follows: we begin with explanation of the two time periods (historical and contemporary) focused on, and data sources used. Next we present the underpinning conceptual frames: first, marketization of history and then development of iconic heritage brands. Following this, the contextual background: the historical development of the Anzac brand and then an account of the role of the NZANS in WWI is given. We then move to discussion of contemporary marketization of the Anzac story, first briefly as it pertains to the fighting men and then turning our focus to the nursing service deployed to attend the causalities. Specifically, we highlight the ways in which recently the nurses’ story has been marketized to add intensified and expanded meaning to the Anzac brand and appeal to the tastes of contemporary audiences and Anzac brand stakeholders. Our discussion focuses on why, one hundred years from the end of WWI, the NZANS nurse is now being given due attention, and what purpose this fulfils in the creation and sustaining of the Anzac story overall. The paper ends in the present, as we conclude how the Anzac brand is being revitalized through the marketization of the NZANS.

Time periods and sources

The paper examines the early years of the 20th century and particularly the years of WWI (1914-1918). Analysis examining current marketization is attributed to the context of the present day. Sources include contemporaneous documents from digitised copies of Kai Tiaki (the Journal of the New Zealand Nurses Association) and newspapers on the Papers Past website. There are also several available published memoirs, diaries and letters by nurses of the time (which, fortunately, survived censorship at the time of writing). These include published memoirs (e.g. Pengelly, 1956; Willis, 1968) and both manuscript materials (e.g. Chalmers, MS-Papers-8058; Commons, MS-Papers-1582-09; Speedy, MS-Papers-1703) and
oral history recordings (e.g. Copeland, Hodges, Le Gallais) available at the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Recent articles and books detailing the work, organisation and experiences of First World War nurses have provided interpretations and analysis that are invaluable (Hallett, 2009; Hallett 2014; Kendall and Corbett, 1990; Rogers, 2003, Rogers, 2018), given that much of the contemporaneous media accounts of the day were highly mediated by censorship and the crafting of news that was more positive than necessarily accurate for audiences at home in New Zealand and Australia. Information drawn from a fragment of a vast volume of material and ephemera released in preparation for the centenary celebration programme ‘WWI00’ that ran in New Zealand 2014-2018, and available on the ‘WWI00’website has also been a valuable resource.

Conceptual framing

Marketization of history

The process of marketization pertains to the opening up of an industry to market forces whereby the adoption of market or quasi-market practices ideally results in greater efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness (Grafton et al., 2016; Hall et al., 2012). As a process, it is most often discussed in the context of religion, public services such as education, and economics. Giesler and Thompson (2016) have suggested marketization as an ‘institutional disruption’, that brings about a new way of thinking or doing things. Hence, Brunk et al. (2017) regard consumer identity narratives as “precipitated by a new institutional order, created by multiple social and market actors and set off by a preceding historical discontinuity” (p. 1329). Memory influences marketization over time and acts as a social process (Brunk et al., 2017). Thompson and Tian (2008) describe marketization as a “mythologized representation of popular memory that serves the competitive and ideological agenda of one commercial
producer that can function as a contradictory, and identity devaluing, counter memory for another” (p. 597). Marketization also has the capacity to silence other alternatives (Halbwachs, 1992; Lipsitz, 1990), where the past may be refashioned iteratively to challenge or displace history as understood into a competitive product for the market (Brunk et al. 2017). Like nostalgia as a commodified product, history can evolve around a “symbolic sphere maintained by people not only in real activities held in the public sphere but by the domain of emotional introspective meanings in the first place” (Jeziński and Wojtkowski, 2016, p. 103). The use of storytelling can also be used in the process of marketization, where previously little-known histories can be politicised successfully. New or altered thinking may be raised within an audience, whereby the new narrative strengthens the position of the communicator (Brunk et al., 2017).

History can be constructed and stored for dissemination in a way that serves a predominant world view or preferred way of thinking (Beaumont, 2015). Historical events can be told directly as they were recorded by sources at the time, or sometimes, while kept essentially correct, may be used to achieve other goals, either through a process of distortion or reframing. In that way, a historical event may be packaged to support a prevailing belief, or a new position given. The increased access and capabilities of media makes history more accessible to multiple audiences. History invariably offers many interpretations of an event, where ‘truth’ might be found where one has looked, or ‘not looked’. McNeill says of myth and history:

Myth and history are close kin inasmuch as both explain how things got to be the way they are by telling some sort of story. But our common parlance reckons myth to be false while history is, or aspires to be, true” (1986, p. 2).

A number of public historians have observed that the drive for dissemination of democratization of history, as the public history movement, can be seen as an effect of the
increasing demands on academics for evidence of audience/stakeholder ‘impact’ and ‘engagement’ derived from their academic outputs. Historians look for new ways of framing their work as more than just an ivory tower pursuit. However, one consequence of this is a relative loss of control over one’s own research, and a distortion of one’s findings through engagement with the hidden agendas of others (De Groot, 2016; Pinto and Taithe, 2015).

Witkowski (2020) clarifies history and heritage as terms that although often used interchangeably, are essentially different. Historical research attempts to construct and authentically recount events and interpret meaning from the past. Heritage in contrast more often treats recalled past events in a different manner, where meaning may be constructed and used for other purposes. Heritage can through its construction process mythologize aspects of the past as some contents are removed and the remainder built upon to create a meaning considered more fit for purpose or congenial to its current audience (Witkowski, 2020). Although history and heritage both exist in a transitional present, heritage commodifies and constructs selectively and subjectively (Tivers, 2002; Witkowski, 2020). As heritage develops through time, generational cohorts or collectives may play with and invest in emotional meanings that previous cohorts did not (Belk, 1991). Likewise, the legacy of narratives and stories told of war passed down through generations can be as much an integral part of any nation’s identity, as the controlled exploration of historical data. The way in which they are recorded and retold through time will determine the ‘truth’ around them. The narrative of the event can even be shaped to make a negative outcome palatable to an audience. In war history, for the conquered, stories of courage under fire, endurance and patriotism can be just as prone to myth and legend as those of the conqueror’s strength and stealth (Beaumont, 2015; Ubayasiri, 2015). The marketization of war history through public contribution and participation, along with the work of amateur historians and special interest history groups, serve an important function to engage audiences through the co-creation of knowledge. Today
multiple sources of funding can also lead to organisational partnerships with academic historians, where the organisation’s own interest serves and/or controls an important part of the knowledge creation. Likewise, the advent of digitalised archives and local historians appointed to record local history have been a boom for historical research and historians eager to deliver outcomes to public audiences (McCarthy, 2016; Winter, 2006).

The recounting of history also lends itself to entertainment through spectacle (Phillips and Podmore, 2020) and mediums such as cinema (Kelly, 1997). The ability of war history to entertain and educate at the same time is compelling, especially if the conflict involves a good dose of suspense, tragedy or humans pushed to their limits. Savagery and cowardice can be just as watchable and appealing to audiences as bravery and heroism if the storyline is engaging. The extent to which the story remains authentic or reinterpreted is thus dependent on many factors, not least whether scripts need to be modified to suit the appetites of the audience or overall aims of the budget holder.

Branding of a historical event is thus closely tied to the marketization of history. Historical events that become ‘branded’, particularly those that reach an iconic status (Holt, 2004) have great capacity as vessels for narrative and myth, symbolism and tangible commercial products that reinforce cultural meanings drawn or emerging over time of the historical event.

**Development of iconic heritage cultural brands**

Brand, a mainstay of modern marketing (Gaski, 2020) is defined as a “name, term, design, or symbol […] that identifies one seller’s good or service as distinct from those of other sellers” (Armstrong and Kotler, 2011, p. 215). Successful brands represent deeply held socio-cultural values and relations in a community, thereby helping to sustain and reinforce a sense of belonging, unity and continuity (Kravets and Örge, 2010). Strong association with dense
cultural and symbolic values open to exploitation along with consumption products and commercial artifacts enables a brand to assume value beyond its nominal exchange value (Brown et al., 2003; Holt, 2004). Myths, as stories that are passed down from one generation to the next, are an integral part of any nation-state and “not judged on their veracity but rather their metaphorical and symbolic meaning” (Rose, 2003, p, 154). By performing myths, brands feed cultural desires and through complex interactions and high symbolic content meet society’s desires and address cultural contradictions and ambiguities (Holt, 2004, 2006; Urde and Greyer, 2015), thus providing a lever for marketization.

Embodiment of cultural values can lead to brand iconization, which also allows for culturally driven branding, use of imaginative resources and myth creation through a “complex interaction among businesses, consumers, influential actors (e.g., connoisseurs) and popular culture (e.g., movies)” (Kravets and Örge, 2010, p. 208). Brand icons are powerful because they deliver myths in a tangible form, thereby making them more accessible. Cultural brands do not always incorporate a tangible product or indicate a producer but are “symbolic forms that stand for dominant ideals, ideas and values in a given society” (Kravets and Örge, 2010, p. 205). As an event, a war that significantly changes a nation’s image or circumstance has the capacity to become a brand, just like tangible goods, people, or ideas. War history that is shaped into an iconic cultural brand becomes an efficient repository then for stories and myths that can radically transform society (Berdahl, 2001; Kravets and Örge, 2010; Manning and Uplisashvili, 2007), and become embedded in national and collective identity.

A heritage brand is one from which its owner can leverage off brand associations through consumer trust and goodwill that have been built over time (usually several decades). A heritage brand is one with a positioning and a value proposition based on its heritage (Urde et al (2007). Cultural heritage, within the brand management context, has been described as “a composite of the history and coherence and continuity” of defining characteristics (Hakala et
al., 2011, p. 450), for example, of a culture, an object, a people, or a nation. In other words, a
cultural heritage brand is not primarily ‘about’ a corporation and its history. For heritage brands
to remain relevant, they must continue to reinforce their values through new avenues,
revitalised for a contemporary market. Many brands have a heritage, but few can be classified
as heritage brands (Urde et al., 2007; Urde and Greyser, 2015).

Study Context

The ANZACS and making of the Anzac brand

In 1914 at the onset of WWI (also known as ‘The Great War’), New Zealand was a young
nation within which permanent European settlement had only taken place since the 1840s.
Under the now-controversial Treaty of Waitangi (1840), signed between the indigenous Māori
population and the British Crown, British rule was established, and New Zealand made a
dominion of the British Empire. Still reliant and proud of its close ties with the ‘mother country’
Britain, New Zealand took the call to arms in August 1914 seriously, as too did other parts of
the Empire, such as Canada, Australia, Africa, India and the West Indies. A verse of a patriotic
song penned by a H. Claughton that appeared in New Zealand newspapers reflects the
sentiment:

The call from dear old England - Is bravely answered here:

The far domain raise staunchest hands - As troopers volunteer.

When danger threatens Motherland - Our civic breaches healed.

That jealous foes may understand - To none but God we yield. (Wairarapa Daily
Times, 7 November 1914, p. 6).

Young New Zealand men did not hesitate to enlist and offer themselves for service. A collective
enthusiasm to serve meant that at the outset of war New Zealand could offer Britain an
expeditionary force made up of volunteers, through till 1916, when conscription commenced (Archives New Zealand, 2019). For most, generosity to a country (Britain) that few had any direct experience of, was spurred by nationwide loyalty to it as the motherland, with 80% of New Zealand men who fought, volunteers (Defence Department, 1924). Additionally, the prospect of a great adventure abroad, away from a very much geographically isolated New Zealand was compelling. The general feeling was that any conflict would be “all over by Christmas” (Colonist, 19 September 1914, p. 5), meaning that a trip abroad with free passage balanced out any perception of risk. Thus, 51% of men of military age enlisted in the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, a total of 100,000 men from a fledgling population of 1.1 million (Phillips and Baird, 2020).

In December 1914, troops from the First Australian Imperial Force and First New Zealand Expeditionary Force, joined forces in Egypt to become the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps, soon becoming known by the acronym ANZAC. ANZAC troops fought collectively and separately in some of the most inhospitable landscapes and brutal battles of WWI. The group first saw military action on the Gallipoli Peninsula on 25th April 1915, with an amphibious landing at Gaba Tepe beach, now known as ANZAC Cove. Following Gallipoli, from 1916 troops were deployed to the Western Front, where several further now infamous battles saw the same mass casualties and loss of life as the failed Gallipoli venture. For New Zealand, overall losses in WWI were high: 16,697 killed and 41,317 wounded, amounting to a 58% casualty rate, along with another 1,000 deaths of servicemen once returned to New Zealand (Defence Department, 1924; Fox, 2016). Given New Zealand’s population of just over a million at the time, such a loss of the young male population was felt deeply.

The impact of this event had a profound effect on both the Australian and New Zealand psyche. In New Zealand, the early years after WWI saw commemorative monuments erected throughout the country and events, such as annual dawn services and marches commenced to
pay homage to the ANZAC forces and to show the depth of appreciation felt for returning soldiers by the New Zealand population. Soon after the earliest battles in which ANZACs fought, in both Australia and New Zealand it became very apparent that the term ANZAC/Anzac had significant symbolic and ‘commercial pull’ and that the Anzac legend and associated signs and symbols could be commercialised to benefit manufactured products (Hawkins, 2015). In Australia, by mid-1915 the words ANZAC/Anzac was increasingly used to brand a range of consumer products including tea, soap, toys, beer and other goods with traders seizing opportunities to incorporate the word ‘Anzac’ in businesses through trademarks, even enlisting returned soldiers to endorse their products in advertising (Hawkins, 2015). In both Australia and New Zealand, governments moved quickly to prevent commodification (Hawkins, 2015, p 8).

The ANZAC effort is today remembered not only for the sacrifice paid to the motherland but ardently regarded as a symbol of the dawning of nationhood for Australia and New Zealand (McCreanor, et al. 2019; McGibbon, 2018). The recording and retelling of the Anzac story in history recounts the sacrifice of Australia and New Zealand’s young at the behest of British military hierarchy and what is regarded now as poor British strategic decisions during the Gallipoli conflict (Chasseaud and Doyle, 2015; Hart, 2011). This part of Australian and New Zealand history is now encapsulated as the Anzac story, identifiable as a bona fide brand in itself, evolving over time and reflecting the collective identity and young nation symbolism that today exists as a “prominent and enduring cultural symbol” (Holt, 2006, p. 357). Although much of the Anzac narrative is about the battles, especially the Gallipoli campaign, the strongest meanings are attached to the Australian and NZ troops who fought. It is the feelings and associations around them that have led to the brand attributes Anzac portrays. The heritage and attributes of Anzac endow it with iconic cultural heritage brand status.
Today the term ANZAC/Anzac has a shared and emotional meaning for Australians and New Zealanders, where for New Zealand the:

Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection Act 1981 (the Act) prohibits the use of the word ‘Anzac’ in trade or business (Manatū Taonga, Ministry for Culture and Heritage website).

The New Zealand Ministry of Culture and Heritage website further elaborates:

The importance of ‘Anzac’ to New Zealand is enshrined in law with the use of the term 'Anzac' protected since 1916. Section 17 of the Act states that, “The Governor-General may... prohibit, regulate, or control the use in connection with any business, trade, or occupation of the word 'Anzac' or of any other word that so closely resembles the word 'Anzac' as to be likely to deceive or mislead any person” (ibid).

Several expressions convey the meaning and emotional attachment to the Anzac brand in Australia and New Zealand, such as the ‘Anzac spirit’—a shorthand for the qualities of an ANZAC (endurance, courage, ingenuity, good humour, and mateship), ‘Anzac Day’ a national commemoration day each year on the 25th April to mark the Gallipoli landing, and even the ‘Anzac Biscuit’—a biscuit sent to WWI forces overseas and now produced in Australia and New Zealand from a recipe closely guarded and highly respected for its authenticity. Cedro (2019) even suggests the cultural and historical associations of the Anzac Biscuit and its mythology are reflected in Australian cookbooks through concepts of baking practice and ritual that have “entangled concepts of Australian femininity” (p. 232).

The WWI New Zealand Army Nursing Service

The wave of patriotism that inspired young Australian and New Zealand men to enlist was equally felt by nurses, who rushed to offer their services to the war effort. However, New
Zealand nurses’ enthusiasm was at first met with resistance from both their Government and military leadership (Maclean, 1932). Despite some campaigning for a place for a New Zealand Army Nursing Service and with a Matron-in-Chief installed since 1911, there had been no staff of nurses enrolled into it, mainly due to apparent stalling and bureaucratic wrangling (Hallett, 2014; Rodgers, 1996; Rogers, 2018). The role of readying a professional and organized body of nurses for military service was taken on by Hester Maclean as Matron-in-Chief (Image 1), a senior New Zealand nurse of “indomitable force”, who at the time served as Assistant Inspector of Hospitals and was a leading figure behind the New Zealand Trained Nurses Association (Roger, 2018, p. 19). In 1914, there was no intention from the New Zealand Government or military leadership to send nurses overseas to support the efforts of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, a job believed best undertaken by male medical doctors and medical orderlies, with battlefields considered no place for women (who would be, if anything, a distraction). Maclean, upon petitioning the New Zealand Government was informed it would be presumptuous to send nurses until the mother country has requested them (Maclean, 1932; Rogers, 2018). Eventually a small contingent of nursing staff were sent to replace German nurses in Samoa with the occupation of German Samoa by New Zealand troops. Shortly after, finally the first contingent of fifty nurses handpicked by Maclean and offered by Lord Liverpool (New Zealand Governor General) for service with British troops travelled on the SS Rotorua (under the supervision of Maclean) to Plymouth in England and then directly on to Egypt to serve in British military hospitals (Image 2). Nursing Sisters were not given army rank and status, and their situation was often difficult because they were, at times, resented by male medical orderlies. On hospital and transport ships, although they were of similar social class to doctors, they found themselves consigned to second class accommodation.

The Christchurch Sun, quoted from the British Journal of Nursing which had congratulated the New Zealand Nurses Association on the result of organized effort to induce
the Government to give nurses in the Dominion the opportunity of serving their country and
the motherland:

Our sisters from the Antipodes will prove how close is the tie which, binds them
to, the Mother Country when they serve shoulder to shoulder with our own nurses
among the wounded in France (Sun, 5 June 1915, p.7).

Recognising the benefits of Australian and New Zealand nurses being present to tend to their
own, most of the New Zealand nursing contingent went first to Egypt and then on to Gallipoli.
Five hundred and fifty New Zealand nurses served overseas (Studholme, 1928), working under
conditions that would previously have been unimagined. Soldiers with extensive wounds
needed to be received, transported, triaged, given any acute life preserving medical treatment
and then convalesced for return to the field or dispatch home. The nurses were involved in all
these procedures, as well as providing comfort whenever possible for soldiers during death,
and then often spending their own time writing letters home to loved ones to reassure families
that they had not been without comfort as they were dying. In many situations, nursing care
was delivered while waiting on promised supplies to arrive that sometimes never eventuated.
If supplies were present, they were scarce resources. Many nurses watched men die of infection
or gangrene because of a lack of disinfectant or sterile dressings. Prior to the posting of female
nurses to hospital ships, the care had been inadequate, and many wounds had worsened enroute
to military hospitals.

Nurses worked under a significant amount of risk to themselves, especially if working
on hospital ships anchored offshore in close distance to enemy fire (Rogers, 2018). One
incident that carried the greatest loss of life for New Zealand nurses was the 1915 sinking of
the supply ship Marquette torpedoed in the Aegean Sea which at the time was transporting
nurses, along with troops and supplies of ammunition resulting in the loss of 10 New Zealand
nurses through drowning. Under the title of ‘‘Take the fighting men first!’’ heroic nurses’
splendid sacrifice”, the Dominion (12 November 1915, p.5), reported how surviving nurses, who by the time help arrived had been in the water for several hours, appealed to rescuers that ‘fighting men’ were saved first! (Image 3). The loss of 10 skilled nurses at one time on a transport vessel (so without hospital markings) was felt keenly in New Zealand, with blame placed squarely on the enemy and no opportunity was lost to use it for propaganda to enlist (Image 4).

Life for nurses left to staff hospitals on home shores was not easy either. The exodus of 550 nurses in all over the war period from across as small a country as New Zealand, particularly those with theatre experience, left civilian hospitals depleted of nursing staff. This, combined with the corresponding movement of doctors to war service and redirection of medical supplies to furnish hospital ships, was felt keenly. Several reports in newspapers of the day reported the difficulties experienced by hospitals requiring that ‘senior’ nursing students were used for tasks senior to their status and younger women encouraged to join as probationer nurses, if only for the course of the war. Christchurch Hospital reported that with staff “doing its full share in responding to the Empire’s call”:

Several of the senior nurses are acting as sisters and are doing their very best, and we are taking on a lot of new probationers. It is very difficult to secure outside nurses to fill up the vacancies, but one of the sisters who had left the institution has come back and assumed the position of acting matron.” (Press, 20 May 1915, p. 8).

It is worth noting that all nurses recruited into NZANS met the criteria of fully trained registered nurses, with at least six years’ hospital experience, between the ages of 25 and 40 and of single marital status (essential for fulltime nursing employment at the time). Although most New Zealand nurses served within the NZANS, some were also employed within British and French nursing ranks. New Zealand did not send any Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD)
‘nurses’. Those who joined the VAD service, known for being made up of mainly wealthy educated women who worked in a voluntary capacity (and with some level of training in nursing type duties), were New Zealand women already in Britain at the start of the war or who paid their own passage from New Zealand. New Zealand nurses certainly worked with VADs, particularly in military hospitals in England. The popular image of the VAD nurse is one of young romantic heroine, often unappreciated and oppressed by the registered nurses they worked under (Hallett, 2014). However, it is the image of the VAD nurse that had become ingrained in the minds of the public as a somewhat iconic representation of a nurse. Biedermann (2017) explains:

Much of what the general population accepts about nurses from World War 1 (WWI) and glamorized in the popular media centers on the ministering angel at the bedside, providing soldiers with a touch of the humane world of family and home. In other words, whilst the act of war is masculine, the presence of women on or near the battlefield serves to remind the war fighter what they are fighting for. Notwithstanding this may have been the case for some of the sick and wounded, when we delve into the nature of work undertaken by Australian military nurses in any war or conflict (Biedermann, 2001, 2004; Fleming, 2010; Fletcher, 2011; McCullagh, 2010), we quickly see that their role was and is much more profound and significant than that (p. 66).

Upon demobilisation and return home in 1919, several months after Armistice, NZANS nurses attempted to pick up their normal lives back in New Zealand. Sixteen had perished during their war service. Of the 550 nurses who saw overseas service, 84 received decoration (Kai Tiaki, 1 April, 1920, p. 95). Unlike their male counterparts, nurses were not offered land or subsidies made by the Government in recognition of service. While some married and left nursing, those that remained were often physically exhausted and living with similar psychological traumas.
soldiers did. Many went straight into caring for returned servicemen or nursing those sick from the influenza pandemic of 1918. Others left nursing to provide care for disabled brothers. Settling back into less adventurous lives at home and re-employment back into old jobs (if they had been held over) was not always easy. Returning nurses were celebrated by appearances at more often than not women’s groups, where they were given a platform from which to talk about their services and experience. This is in contrast to male counterparts of similar rank, who were more likely to be invited to address more noble or influential individuals or organizations.

Much of the contemporaneous historical record of the nursing effort after the war ended was recorded by Hester Maclean in her own memoir (Maclean, 1932) and in Kai Tiaki, the nursing journal she edited and owned in its early years. Tolerton (2017) also points out of much of the pre-eminent WWI writers and historians were men who chose to write about men. One might ask why relatively few dedicated published ANZAC nursing histories have been written by nurses themselves, given not only the contribution made to the care of ANZAC troops but also the advancements in nursing knowledge and technical skills warfare invariably brings. It may be that nursing ‘training’ programmes offered little opportunity for education in the humanities, where opportunities for historical research and writing by nurses themselves may have been undertaken. It is also likely that female nurses were more diffident about their wartime contributions, doubting whether potential audiences would want to hear their stories.

**Marketization of the Anzac brand and the ANZAC nurse**

*Contemporary meanings of the Anzac brand*

Today the meaning of Anzac conjures up deeply held emotions for Australians and New Zealanders alike, particularly as it pertains to the April 25th, 1915 landing at Gallipoli. This date
is commemorated each year across New Zealand as a public holiday and with ever-increasing attendance at dawn services. With all veterans of the Great War now deceased, it is their descendants who continue to mark the occasion, along with other military engagements ANZAC troops were involved in. Descendants pay their respects through the wearing of a deceased family member’s services medals at dawn services. Travel to Gallipoli by young Australians and New Zealanders, especially to be present at the services at Anzac Cove on 25th April is almost regarded as a rite of passage for the young (Ozer et al., 2012; Scates, 2006).

Although at times seen as something of a cliché today the Anzac brand embodies the meaning of ‘nationhood’. The marketization of the Anzac story and its emotive culturally embodied message has ensured the continuance of meaning into the conscience of new generations of New Zealanders, packaged in a way that is both memorable, relevant and appealing. Indeed, commercial efforts to memorialize the Anzac legend are capitalizing on an eagerness amongst the general population and whereupon marketers are effectively ‘pushing against an open door’. Hawkins (2018) in the abstract to her book “Consuming Anzac: The History of Australia's Most Powerful Brand” asks, in the context of Australians:

Australians have been consuming Anzac for a century. While commemoration and commerce have never been entirely separate, they have become increasingly intertwined. How does the Anzac Industry shape the way we remember war? And why do marketers seek to align their brands with a failed military campaign?” (https://research-repository.uwa.edu.au/en/publications/consuming-anzac-the-history-of-australias-most-powerful-brand/fingerprints/).

As one of the largest voluntary welfare organisations in New Zealand, The Royal New Zealand Returned and Services Association (RSA) is one of the oldest ex-service organisations in the world. The annual Poppy Day street collection, where a coin donation is given in return for an artificial lapel poppy is the primary source of funds for the RSA.
(https://www.rsa.org.nz/support/poppy-appeal). In 2020, the COVID-19 lockdown across New Zealand meant the 25th April could not be celebrated as it normally would have been. This resulted in neighbourhood displays of Anzac poppies in windows and driveways. In many areas temporary homemade Anzac installations provided a group of neighbours a common area where they could meet, albeit ‘socially distanced’, to mark Anzac Day. (Image 5). The New Zealand Government website ‘ANZAC DAY 2020’ offered on its landing page:

> The Anzac spirit has taught Kiwis many things; endurance, courage, ingenuity, good humour and mateship. In unprecedented times like these, we look to these qualities to unite us all. (https://www.nzstory.govt.nz/stories/anzac-day-2020/).

It would seem that the Anzac spirit can also be a guide for New Zealanders to defend themselves from a global pandemic!

The occasion of one hundred years since WWI saw a programme, ‘NZ WWI00’ that ran through 2014-2018. As part of that remembrance, a proliferation of country-wide initiatives took place: commemoration services, documentaries, histories, displays, children story books and entertainment films. The NZWWI00 website provides a rich repository of history and information, including the NZANS.

**Marketization of the ANZAC nurse**

The image of the nurse has long been highly marketable in various guises, for example, the villain, menace, temptress, girl next door, sex object. angel of mercy and hopeless romantic (Hallam, 2012). The mythologised image of the WWI nurse as a young beautiful heroine sacrificing her youth to care for her ‘boys’ in brutal situations is unfortunately often confused with the untrained voluntary Red Cross nurse or VAD. Indeed, the portrayal of a professionalised service of experienced (and older) nurses constrained by the regimented hierarchical structures and regulations of the day avails itself less to such a romanticized image.
Very early in the post-war period however it became obvious that nurses were not considered part of the emerging Anzac legend, a product of the times, where women were still considered dependent on men and the role of nurses secondary to that of the soldier (Rees, 2008). Although early Anzac celebrations in Australia and New Zealand saw nurses marching in processions, by the late 1920s in Australia nurses were either absent or marched with the boy scouts (Harris, 2017). Papas (2014) in a story for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation writes:

Upon their return to Australia, the nurses of WWI did not receive the same post-service financial benefits as their soldier counterparts, nor did they receive any kind of recognition of their work. “They were treated quite badly in Australia and New Zealand in that sense,” says Mr Rees. The women were not asked to march in yearly commemoration events, nor were they invited to be part of local RSLs around the nation. The women just got politely swept aside, and they became a footnote of this amazing story. [https://www.abc.net.au/local/stories](https://www.abc.net.au/local/stories)

Members of the NZANS as a newly formed nursing service, or brand, collectively and individually worked heroically and skilfully to care for servicemen, who often presented with potentially lethal injuries the like of which had not been seen before in warfare (e.g. trench warfare, shrapnel shells and mustard gas), whilst upholding the values of their profession and expectations of gender. However, it is claimed by many authors that this work, until more recently, was more or less set aside. First, nurses working within a war zone did not portray the desired imagery or place relegated for women in the WWI Anzac story. Mayes (2018) in an opinion piece for the Australian popular press on Anzac Day 2018 entitled “Women have been neglected by the Anzac tradition, and it’s time that changed”, remarks:
The Anzac legend remains firmly centred on the ill-fated Gallipoli campaign of 1915, and the sacrifice of “sons and fathers” in frontline combat. The place of women in this foundational story is also made clear – that of onlookers and supporters.

Mayes continues:

In concluding her 2017 dawn service address at Gallipoli, Foreign Minister Julie Bishop told a story about Len Hall, one of the original “diggers” who fought at Gallipoli. He is said to have noticed a girl in the crowd who had gathered to farewell departing soldiers and given her an emu feather that he plucked from his slouch hat. When he returned to Australia at the close of the war, this girl — who later became his wife — was waiting in the crowd to return the feather.

This is a story of hope, and of an ongoing fascination with and idealisation of the “digger”. It is also a story about the passive role of women as waiting mothers, wives and sisters. But women’s contributions are more complicated, varied and controversial than these stories allow (http://theconversation.com/women-have-been-neglected-by-the-anzac-tradition-and-its-time-that-changed-92580).

Although this quote is strongly embedded in iconic Australian cultural artifact and written for its Australian audience, it is just as true of how the role of New Zealand women in the war was regarded (Rowbotham, 1999). Despite the significance of commemoration tourism to WWI battle sites for Australian and New Zealanders, it has only, however, been in the last twenty years that the sacrifices of nurses have been officially recognised at wreath-laying ceremonies. At the ANZAC Memorial on the Somme, a wreath to nurses was laid for the first time in April 2015.

The changing and increasingly marketable and marketized Anzac nursing narrative challenges the widely held view that in WWI New Zealand women remained at home and wept
or spent their days writing letters, busying themselves making functional objects and trinkets to send overseas to soldiers. In an alternative reality, the new narrative markets an image of women as active players, who fought alongside men, albeit in different roles. Tolerton (2017) points out the irony of a country, first to give women the vote but staunch in its refusal to allow its women to provide service for New Zealand by serving abroad in the war. The women were expected to remain at home, supporting the war effort and importantly, maintain hearth and home for men to return to. That the treatment of fever and shock was almost solely the realm of nurses (Harris, 2011) and that New Zealand nurses even performed anaesthetist duties for a period in field hospitals (Nolte and Hallett, 2019; Rawstron, 2005) is not compatible with this kind of women. At the start of WWI New Zealand had a professionalized nursing workforce, was first in the world to achieve registration of nurses in 1908, applied a standardized ‘training’ programme that required external registration examinations, yet met such resistance when offering itself for service says much about the way nursing and women in general were regarded at the start of WWI. In particular, the contribution of working women, who were not wealthy and therefore could not attain voluntary roles abroad through wealth or connection (such as in the case of VADs), were even more harshly refused entry into the war (Hallett, 2014).

For decades the role of the NZANS and its Australian equivalent, the Australian Army Nursing Service (AANS), was left undisturbed and silenced against the more masculine contributions to the Anzac narrative. Jones (2004), in reviewing the process of compilation of the eleven volumes of *The Official History of Australians in the War 1914-1918* (Bean (ed), 1920 -1942), analyses how a selective narrative can be published, with censuring of writing that in earlier proofs would have shaped the Anzac story differently, rather than its published masculinization based on the ANZAC troops at Gallipoli. With access to documentation of the day and earlier drafts of the first six volumes of *History of Australians in the War 1914-1918*
written and edited by Charles Bean, Jones (2004) determined that publisher George Robertson of Angus & Robertson heavily manipulated the writing to edit out women. By Robertson insisting that Bean’s Volume 1 record of Australian women’s home-front efforts be removed and confined to Volume XI, women missed being part of the Anzac grand narrative that was presented and shaped in Volume 1, and thus censuring and shaping national mythology and moulding national cultural identity into a masculinized form. Robertson also compounded the problem for nurses Jones (2004, p. 115) contends, for example, by removing Bean’s description of AANS nurses’ courage under fire in France from final proofs. The shaping of cultural memory and heritage can also be as simple as indexing (Jones, 2004). As the volumes of The Official History of Australians in the War 1914-1918 were contemporaneously consulted rather than read, the lack of the word ‘nurse’ and their services in The Official History of Australians in the War 1914-1918 indexing decisions meant it was categorised under references such as ‘hospital ships’, reinforcing McNeill’s (1986) argument that truth might be found where one has ‘looked’, or ‘not looked’.

The question is raised as to why now these nurses are being profiled and foregrounded within the traditional well-established Anzac cultural landscape. We suggest that the role New Zealand nurses played in WWI is now recognized for its marketability to further bolster the Anzac story and meet public demand for popular consumption of history. However, we would also contend that a newly aware audience wants a more nuanced story, and that younger women, in particular, crave more active and assertive role-models as part of the Anzac legend. Female nurses meet this need, and have, for this reason been incorporated and reworked into key commercial heritage outputs, such as the First World War commemorative exhibition at Te Papa Museum, Wellington and in the ANZAC Girls TV series. Christie (2016) discusses the reworking of the sinking of the Marquette narrative from one of maternal sacrifice to one more attractive to contemporary audiences:
New generations have reclaimed the story of the Marquette. While values of bravery and sacrifice remain evident in the reworked narratives, they are re-inscribed with new meaning to reflect changes in national identity and gender relationships. The nurses are now celebrated as national and professional exemplars and used to provide access for women into the Anzac narrative. (p. 30).

The popular 2014 Australian television drama series ‘ANZAC Girls’, also screened around the time of the ‘WWI00’ celebrations. Although ‘ANZAC Girls’ is focused on Rees (2008) book ‘The Other ANZACs’, a written account of the Australian Army Nursing Service (AANS) at Gallipoli and The Western Front, it was well received in New Zealand. The storyline drew upon the real-life experiences of AANS nurses. In this TV series, New Zealand nurse, Sister Hilda Steele was played by popular New Zealand actress, Antonia Prebble, who also later joined the ‘Anzac Nurses Cruise to the Mediterranean’ a commercial tour organised by nurse-historian, Clare Ashton, which commemorated the work of Australian and New Zealand nurses. ANZAC Girls comprises an authentic, albeit ‘cherry picked’ storyline. Actress Caroline Craig points out the detail given to authenticity and that the part she played as real-life matron Grace Wilson (Principal Matron of the 3rd Australian General Hospital 1915-1919) is “her toughest cookie yet” (Dale, 2014). For the New Zealand nurses portrayed in modern media entertainment, the five-pointed star of the registration medal nurses wore in WWI would surely resonate, as this is the medal New Zealand nurses still wear today. The quality and framing of ANZAC Girls imagery contribute significantly to ensuring TV audiences’ attention is captured. Indeed, the level of embellishment this new branding provides for audiences, who until now have only had access to the grainy but more authentic contemporaneous sepia and black and white photography, is very effective and further enhances the marketability of the story of young, adventurous and courageous Antipodean nurses. A title end frame from ANZAC Girls foregrounds a solitary nurse gazing out from the deck of a hospital ship over the bleakness of
military ships at anchor. The brilliant contrast of her uniform against the grey seascape provides an evocative image, with an emphasized and stylised ‘Girls’ hinting at an incongruity to her presence there (Image 6). Another scene image from an ANZAC Girls episode showcases the nurses tending to their wounded on the ground in extraordinarily well-laundered white veils and aprons. Juxtaposed against the stretchered soldiers’ khaki and the barren landscape portrayed, the nurses seem poised as creations of almost impossible beauty amidst the chaos.

Both the NZANS and the AANS, although working closely with ANZACs, were never considered part of the ANZAC force per se, which was born in Gallipoli as a gendered male fighting concept. Today however they have been co-opted into the Anzac story and spirit, becoming increasingly merged as an integral part of the ANZAC forces. In popular media products, such as ANZAC Girls audiences happily merge reality with myth. On the value of this form of entertainment, Ashton (2015) states:

If the television drama ANZAC Girls has done nothing else, it has firmly attached the word Anzac to a group of women, marginally shifting the public perception of the Anzac identity from being totally male (p. 2).

Putting aside the significant contribution through technical nursing knowledge and skill applied to soldiers’ physical injuries, the softer and more feminine side of nursing care (albeit strongly held as within the scope of what nursing care is today), and at the time regarded by patients themselves as a great comfort, did little to solidify the contribution of nurses in the decades following the war. For many of the men, nurses from their homeland, whether Australia or New Zealand were often the last female they interacted with before death. Therefore, these women served not only in the role of “Angel of Mercy”, but also mother, sister, and girlfriend (Hallett, 2009). As raised previously, the many hours nurses spent voluntarily writing letters to a deceased soldier’s loved ones at home demonstrates their own connection with family and home and identity as New Zealanders. However, it is this side of the nurses’ empathy for
patients and perhaps awareness of their own vulnerability and mortality that responds so well to marketization and saleability by Anzac brand stakeholders and commercial mythmakers for public consumption. Arguably, it also too helps buffer some of the emotion felt by modern day New Zealanders, as they reflect on the horror and suffering young New Zealand men faced, particularly at the hands of British military and increasingly documented lack of regard for the value of ‘colonial’ troops (Chasseaud and Doyle, 2015; Hart, 2011). That the nurses also suffered in similar ways to the women at home through their own losses reassures today’s public that they also understood the nature of suffering women at home experienced.

The oversized size sculpture of nurse Charlotte (Lottie) Le Gallais in the Wellington Te Papa museum by Sir Richard Taylor provides true to life imagery of how this would have been encountered. Lottie travelled on the New Zealand hospital ship Maheno (His Majesty's New Zealand Hospital Ship No. 1) to Gallipoli, in part to track the whereabouts of her soldier brother. The sculpture shows her despair and raw emotion at receiving her letter to him returned and thereby acknowledging his death (Image 8). There are two ways of interpreting this image: as a gendered image of the woman as emotional and weak, or as evidence that women also suffered during the war- as well as making a significant contribution. The exhibition organisers were meticulous in searching out the original authentic sources relating to Charlotte Le Gallais’ contributions to the war – her diary and her letters – but then they chose to portray her as an emotional rather than a professional being. Whilst we acknowledge the emotional side to Le Gallais’ experiences, we would also argue that the image of a mourning, weeping woman – redolent of passivity and victimhood – reproduces one of the most entrenched tropes of the war.

Conclusion
The NZANS has now become a critical actor within the Anzac story and in so doing, been co-opted into the Anzac brand, providing another layer of social capital to complement what has until recently been held tightly around the Australian and New Zealand men who fought in the conflicts as the core essence of the brand. The individual lives of many of the nurses and their experience can be drawn from historical sources of the time and from the personal diaries they kept. For example, Lottie Le Gallais, who travelled to Gallipoli to be near her brother fighting on the Gallipoli Peninsula has been immortalised in children’s books as well as her over-life size model at the Te Papa museum in Wellington. The nurses, as now critical actors in the Anzac story, experienced situations so extreme that the storyline requires no fictionalization to enthrall. Their stories, told through modern media, create vivid memory markers and are indeed more interesting than any dry historical account of, for instance, development of the WWI nursing service, that would previously been the most desired medium for dissemination of history. Nevertheless, the ways in which these stories have been told perpetuate some of the myths of women as victims or objects of love-interest. There is much romance in *ANZAC Girls* – and less professional, clinical work, whilst the image of Charlotte Le Gallais depicts her crying – in sharp contrast to a portrait photograph she had taken of herself during the war, in which the image is one of a strong, professional woman and of which is probably more authentic of her self-identity and pride as a nurse. (See Image 8). We would question whether, when the heritage industry is marketizing its ‘outputs’ it may sometimes pander to its audiences’ desire for memories to be ‘easy’, ‘simple’ and to meet with some – though not all of their existing expectations. We would ask: Does the heritage industry have to be careful not to challenge its audiences too much?

Packaging the Anzac nursing story within the marketization of the overall public Anzac brand and its narrative is valid. It has appeal to many audiences and demonstrates that women played a vital role at and just behind the front line and were not all passive actors waiting at
home for the end of the war. The brand creation of the nursing service through media, public interest in history, and narratives arising from the stories of heroism and loss adds another layer of richness to the wider Anzac brand story. Today, across Australia and New Zealand recognition of the annual Anzac Day Dawn Service is far from dwindling. Continued marketization, which keeps brand associations and attachment high serves to ensure that the Anzac story is retained. The history of the ANZAC nursing service, arguably worthy of elevation to an iconic service brand itself, has a great deal of agency today as part of that story, serving many functions within it. Mayes (2018) suggests in a popular press piece that it is women who will be the traditional guardians and keepers of the Anzac tradition and rituals going forward. Furthermore, returning to the notion that whatever history and heritage takes precedence can be a function of whatever lens or focus is put over it, Mayes’ (2018) remark about Australian women as formative in the nation’s story is just as apt for New Zealand women:

The role of women in the Anzac tradition is not just about the ‘one day’ and fair recognition of women’s sacrifice and service; it’s also about how we understand quintessential “Australian” characteristics and the formation of the nation as the preserve of not just men but also women, and not just those who support but also those who challenge.

As an endnote, there were many other New Zealand women who contributed to the Great War away from New Zealand. It would be erroneous to suggest nurses as the only ones who broke with expectations of women’s work and served overseas. Tolerton (2017) points out in biographies of several women the bravery and entrepreneurship they practiced that allowed them a role in the war. Likewise, despite a focus mainly on the New Zealand nurse within the NZANS, this article does not want to diminish in anyway the contribution of the Australian nurses within the AANS or the continuing friendship between the two nations that enshrines
the meaning of Anzac. This work also in no way claims to present a detailed history of WWI nursing, except to draw on those factors that highlight its marketization and contemporary co-optation into the Anzac brand. For detailed history of WWI nursing see for example. Hallet (2009, 2014, 2016, 2017) and for New Zealand specific, Rogers (2018).
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Response to R2 Review of
NEW ZEALAND’S ANZAC NURSES: MARKETIZING THE GREAT WAR FOR A 21ST CENTURY FIT

Please find below the revisions we have made. In response to R2 reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1 Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, brand phrasing is more prominent in the revision.</td>
<td>We agree that brand phrasing has become prominent in this version of the manuscript in response to R2. We feel it does explain further the nature of the branding associated with Anzac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If WWI can be a brand, then can any armed conflict be so described?</td>
<td>We had reconsidered our branding discussion vis a vis Anzac in light of your comments. Although the Anzac brand arose from the historic events of WW1, the term Anzac brand is founded on the qualities and transferred meaning attached to the Australian and NZ troops who fought. It is the feelings and associations they inspire that have led to the brand attributes Anzac portrays. To make this clearer we have added on p. 13 “Although much of the Anzac narrative is about the battles, especially the Gallipoli campaign, the strongest meanings are attached to the Australian and NZ troops who fought. It is the feelings and associations they inspire that have led to the brand attributes Anzac portrays.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add apostrophe to “nation’s image”</td>
<td>Many thanks for alerting us to these typos. We have now fixed them and done a further proofread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 15, line 34:  I would write “The Christchurch Sun quoted from the British Journal of Nursing, which had . . .” The Sun is not a person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 16, line 53:  Delete “in all”. The phrasing is repetitive having been used in the previous paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witkowski (2020) should now include the volume (12), issue (4), and page numbers (421-447).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the paragraph that starts with “History can be constructed and stored for dissemination in a way that serves a predominant world view or preferred way of thinking” references are missing. The second part of p.8 is also concerned. We have added the following references to these statements: History can be constructed and stored for dissemination in a way that serves a predominant world view or preferred way of thinking” (Beaumont, 2015) (page 7).

And

In war history, for the conquered, stories of courage under fire, endurance and patriotism can be just as prone to myth and legend as those of the conqueror’s strength and stealth (Beaumont, 2015; Ubayasiri, 2015). (page 8)

Giesler and Thompson (2016) have recently suggested marketization as an “institutional disruption”. Hence, Brunk et al. (2017) regard consumer identity narratives as a “precitated by a new institutional order, created by multiple social and market actors…”. Paragraph linked with

Giesler and Thompson (2016) have suggested marketization as an ‘institutional disruption’, that brings about a new way of doing things or thinking. Hence, Brunk et al. (2017) regard consumer identity narratives as “precipitated by a new institutional order, created by multiple social and market actors and set off by a preceding historical discontinuity” (p. 1329).