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Abstract

Public perceptions of bouncers have been of thuggish, brutish men who like nothing better than to ‘pound people into the pavement’ or ‘heave people out onto the street’. Arguably, Neanderthal-like perceptions of bouncers have prevailed over time, both in the eyes of the public and the eyes of the news media. Incidents of bouncers being involved in violent encounters, including deaths, have been well documented in the news media; most notably, the death of the Australian cricketer David Hookes in 2004. Links between bouncers, biker gangs and organised crime have also been identified and may well influence public perceptions of bouncers. Alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy is a complex social, cultural and structural problem that has no simple solution. Bouncers occupy a precarious and contradictory position as the protectors and minders of persons and property within the night-time economy.

The news media is a powerful mechanism for influencing, producing and reproducing dominant ideological values and norms in relation to biases, discrimination and racism. This thesis employs a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective and seeks to determine, through an in-depth analysis of news reports and a categorical qualitative analysis, if negative portrayals and discrimination through rhetorical and discursive strategies in the news media contribute to the public perception of bouncers as thugs. CDA seeks to uncover the political and ideological meanings behind talk and text. The aim of this research is to expose the underlying sociopolitical factors that are contributing to the vilification of bouncers in the news media in Australia. A manual, ‘deep’ qualitative analysis was conducted on 10 randomly selected news reports and 80 reports were analysed using the NVivo 10 qualitative software program.

The manual analysis has indicated that rhetorical and discursive strategies are used in news reports to undermine bouncers’ credibility and portray the industry as staffed with violent, undertrained, criminal individuals. Under- and over-statements, metaphors, and metonymic concepts, together with lexical choice, styles and structures are used freely by the news media to vilify, discriminate against and discredit bouncers. Bouncer ‘voices’ were excluded in news reports and only the ‘voices’ of credible ‘experts’ were quoted or ‘heard’ to legitimate journalists’ claims of violent bouncers.

The NVivo analysis showed 809 references to violence in the 80 news reports, with 233 ‘experts’ cited or quoted in the text. There were 130 political abstractions and generalisations and 61 references to criminality. There were also 307 references to power being exerted over bouncers and 519 organisations mentioned in the text. Collectively, industry ‘experts’ distanced themselves from bouncers involved in violence and the bouncers responsible were ‘blamed’ for the violence, which supports the political ideology of responsibilisation. It is proposed that lack of state authority, low social status and working in an industry described as ‘dirty work’ contribute to social perceptions of bouncers as violent thugs.
Chapter 1
Introduction and Thesis Overview

1.1. Introduction

The public perceptions of bouncers, door staff, guards, crowd controllers, and security officers is of thuggish, brutish men who like nothing better than to ‘pound people into the pavement’ or ‘heave people out onto the street’. The satirist Dean Bertram (2011) quipped,

[w]ith sloping skull, vacant eyes and flattened nose, the misshapen thug looked like a specimen who, given the chance, Charles Darwin might have netted then hauled aboard the Beagle. Living proof of the missing link.

Perceptions of bouncers as Neanderthals have arguably prevailed over time, both in the eye of the public and the eye of the news media. Incidents of bouncers being involved in violent encounters, including deaths, have been well documented in the news media over time; most notably, the death of the Australian cricketer David Hookes in 2004 at the hands of a young bouncer. The research literature has cited such incidents of violence, and of bouncers being involved in activities such as drug dealing, fraud and extortion (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011). In response, in the past 20 years the private security industry has taken major steps in an attempt to professionalise the industry (Livingstone and Hart, 2003; Sarre and Prenzler, 2011).

However, these valuable attempts appear to be easily challenged by the involvement of some bouncers in violence against patrons. Purported links between bouncers, biker gangs and organised crime have also been identified in the news media (Prenzler et al., 2007/8, Australian Crime Commission, 2013) and may well influence public perceptions of nightclub bouncers. Bouncers have been the focus of a small body of research in the night-time economy, with studies conducted for many reasons. Researchers have argued for increased legislation and regulation of bouncers (Homel et al., 2004, Prenzler et al., 2010, Sarre and Prenzler, 2011). A few studies have looked at
the culture of bouncers within the night-time economy (Monaghan, 2002a, Hobbs et al., 2007, Roberts, 2007), while others investigated their work or involvement in the night-time economy (Graham et al., 2005, Roberts, 2007, Graham and Homel, 2008, Rigakos, 2008).


Alcohol-related violence and disorder has been at the forefront of regulation, legislation and community safety for many years, because of the law and order focus promoted by politicians and the mass media. Recent debates in New South Wales, Australia, about ‘one punch’, ‘king hit’ or ‘coward’s punches’ that resulted in deaths have again bought the issue of alcohol-related violence to the fore in political discourse. The Australian culture of alcohol consumption, binge drinking or ‘determined drunkenness’ (Measham and Brain, 2005) and the social harm this creates (Morgan and McAtamney, 2009), has evolved into a moral panic about drunken, out-of-control young people. The Queensland Parliamentary Report (2010) on alcohol-related violence in Queensland, for example, brought a contemporary focus to this area of research. The report focused heavily on licensed premises in inner city areas (among other areas of concern), with renewed calls for tighter legislation and regulation of licensed venues and the security providers (bouncers) who work in these venues.

A two-year trial of Drink Safe Precincts was initiated in December 2010 in the Gold Coast, Brisbane’s Fortitude Valley and Townsville under the amended Liquor Licensing Act Qld (2010). This was a government response to public concerns about alcohol-
related violence in Queensland by the then Queensland Labor Government (Queensland Government, 2013), a strategy devised to address the moral panic associated with such violence. The trial had been extended to 2013 and was funded by the Queensland Government. However, state-wide implementation would require funding from local governments in the towns and cities where they were located, which would be a costly burden for regional cities to shoulder in a struggling economy. Nonetheless, this indicates the perceived severity of alcohol-related violence and the seriousness of the government’s intentions to quell it. The Safe Night Out Strategy (Queensland Government, 2014) devised by the former Liberal–National Party government in Queensland was construed as a response to calls from the public and media to ‘do something’ about alcohol-related violence. However, the government pledged $8 million over four years to fund 15 Safe Night Out precincts across the state. These will replace the Drink Safe Precincts previously established by the Labor Government. Both the Drink Safe Precincts and the Safe Night Out Strategy involved designated late night entertainment precincts and the involvement of multiple organisations and local stakeholders to staunch alcohol-related violence in these nominated areas through implementing local controls and strategies.

Australia is not alone in its concerns about alcohol-related violence. A World Health Organization (2014) report shows that this issue stretches across the globe, including the United Kingdom (Winlow, 2006), United States of America (Bouchery et al., 2011) and almost every other Westernised country (Junger et al., 2007). Licensed venues, security (bouncers), bar staff and individual patrons have all been targeted for legislation, regulation and policing. In the past 10 years, there has been more rigorous legislation governing licensed venues and security personnel, but the zero-tolerance approach to alcohol-related violence has proved unsuccessful (Winlow, 2010).

Alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy is a complex social, cultural and structural problem that has no simple solution (Winlow, 2010). Bouncers are in the precarious and contradictory position of being the protectors and minders of persons and property within the night-time economy. Bouncers, like other front-line employees in the night-time economy, put their bodies on the line every shift they work in a...

---

1 At the time of writing, the LNP had only just lost the State election and the new Labor Government had taken over government.
physically high-risk industry. Bouncers suffer assaults, stabbings, shootings, spitting and sustained verbal abuse and it has been described as a highly victimised occupation (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2003). Injuries to bouncers range from facial scratches from female patrons to fatalities. Nonetheless, there has been a sustained focus on the behaviour of bouncers in their approach to patrons and some of their past behaviours have brought the security industry under increased scrutiny by legislators and enforcement bodies.

Assaults by bouncers on patrons have been reported by the news media over the years in many developed countries. This has arguably contributed to a sustained negative view of bouncers by the public and policy makers over time. It has been stated that regulation was primarily implemented to protect patrons from aggressive, overzealous bouncers (Winlow, 2010), but there has been little, if any, discussion in the literature about protecting bouncers from aggressive, alcohol-fuelled patrons.

There have been consistent calls for tougher laws for persons assaulting police officers (Ironside, 2009) but there have been no calls for penalties for persons who assault security personnel. Ironside (2009: 1) stated that ‘... offenders who assault police are putting officers at continued risk of attack ...’, but security staff also face similar situations every day. Bouncers in the night-time economy face similar difficulties as police from alcohol-related violence and civil disorder. However, unlike police officers, security personnel do not have the legitimisation of the state, hold no statutory powers and are at the lower end of the wage scale. Consequently, they are not afforded the same standards of organisational structure, authority and social power as the state authorised police.

1.2. Bouncers and Media Representations

Wadds (2010) argued that media discourses have added to the vilification of bouncers. The little research that is available presents a clear picture showing that bouncers who behave badly are represented in a vilified manner in the mass media (Monaghan, 2004, Hadfield, 2006). However, whether this picture is justified has not been examined in research. Wadds (2010) conducted a discourse analysis of news media representations of bouncers. Since the assault and death of former Australian cricket captain David Hookes, media representations of bouncers involved in violence have been consistently
‘... negatively-driven subject matter’ (Wadds, 2010: 4). The portrayal of bouncers as fundamentally ‘... heavily tattooed, hyper-masculine ... [men with] ... violent and criminal dispositions ... [who] ... recklessly injured patrons’ pervaded mass media representations (Wadds, 2010: 4). The saturation of negative media attention resulted in legislative changes to the industry (Wadds, 2010) that some argued was long overdue (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011). However, media representations of bouncers as violent thugs have not been explored to any degree by researchers to date.

1.3. Research Rationale

Research literature is critical of aggression in bouncers, with demands for more training and legislation in the industry (Clancy, 2011). However, one question must be asked. Is the training of bouncers deficient, or rather, is the portrayal of bouncers in the news media, especially about violence against the public, out of line with what is really happening? Are bouncers who behave badly just a few ‘bad apples’, or is the industry an orchard full of ‘bad apples’? (Punch, 2009: 2). How are bouncers being portrayed in the news media and is this leading to a societal view of bouncers as fundamentally violent thugs? These broad questions and others will be addressed in this thesis, using a critical discursive analysis of news reports involving bouncers to unpack the factors contributing to the thuggish view of bouncers held by the public and policy makers.

A review of the literature revealed only one study that was a discursive analysis of news reports of bouncers (see Wadds, 2010). This research will contribute to the dearth of literature around bouncers and licensed premises’ private security, specifically in relation to studies using discourse analysis. While there is a small but growing body of research around bouncers and licensed premises in relation to alcohol-related violence, there is no literature using discourse analysis to investigate the influence of the mass media in public portrayals of bouncers. Moreover, there is little or no critical discourse analysis of violence involving bouncers, alcohol-related violence or the media influences that contribute to the continued moral panics in these areas. This research will contribute substantially to demonstrating the influence of the news media in producing and reproducing discriminatory beliefs and attitudes towards public perceptions of bouncers as fundamentally violent thugs.
Moreover, the areas of patron-bouncer expectations and relationships are under-researched and the important area of perceptions of bouncers and their occupational work has also not been studied by researchers. That is, there are significant gaps in the current research into bouncers, their occupational roles, their relationships and their perceptions of themselves and others in the night-time economy. In my professional role as a research consultant and policy analyst to the Queensland Police Service, Cairns Regional Council and as an officer bearer in the Cairns City Licensees Safety Association and the Safe Night Cairns CBD Precinct Inc., I have heard over five years the stories of bouncers, their experiences and attitudes. This was one of the driving factors in my interest in their work and has granted me a unique perspective of their occupational roles.

1.4. Context of the Research

Bouncers work within the night-time economy, late night entertainment precincts or entertainment ‘strips’. These include late night hotels (pubs) and nightclubs (clubs) in cities and towns across the globe, not just in Queensland. Bouncers are the ‘watchers’ or the ‘protectors’ employed by privately owned licensed venues to manage patrons, protect staff and property and maintain the safety and good order of the venue (Victoria Police Licensing Services Division, 2007). Bouncers are the gatekeepers at the door of licensed venues, who may grant or refuse entry to the inside world of liminal experience and fun (Winlow and Hall, 2006). Bouncers must also maintain social or civil order inside the venue. Within this context of the night-time economy, this research will be framed by bouncers and their occupational role as security personnel or bouncers as ‘work’.

The night-time economy has its own characteristics, and behind the fun, dancing and partying lie the realities of alcohol-related violence and disorderly behaviour. Research

---

2 I have also published two journal articles around bouncers and their work. See Hayes-Jonkers et al., 2011a and 2011b and I have presented at three conferences on these topics – see Hayes-Jonkers et al., 2001c and 2011d and 2012. I have also been instrumental in assisting the Cairns Regional Council to set up and implement their new Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) open-space software system (VTAS) and developed training resources for CCTV Control Room Operator training, including how to operate the software system, major categories and subcategories resource booklets, local laws resource booklets and developed a competency training manual for the Control Room Operators. I have also conducted several training sessions with the Control Room Operators from 2011 to 2013 on the use of the old and new system and incident reporting. I also participated in an evaluation of the CCTV system during 2010, 2011 and 2012.
has shown that alcohol-related assault occurs in and around licensed premises at higher rates than other areas (Wells et al., 2005, Sarre and Prenzler, 2011). The reasons behind this will be documented because it is influential in defining sociocultural behaviours or norms within the night-time economy. Licensed premises themselves form enclaves for escapist play and behaviour and are of primary importance to the context. Licensed premises are also businesses that market and sell their commodities to paying patrons. The concept of fun as business will also be explored. There will be a discussion about the culture of alcohol in Australia, masculinity and violence and women and their night-time economy experiences. The gendered division of labour and its impact on bouncers as an occupational role will also be explored. The inclusion of the combat sports of Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) and the Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) in context allows a comparison to be drawn between violent occupations, masculinity, femininity and violence as ‘business’.

1.5. Purpose of the Research

The news media is a powerful mechanism for influencing, producing and reproducing dominant ideological values and norms in relation to prejudice, discrimination and racism (van Dijk, 2012). The critical discourse analysis will seek to determine, through an in-depth qualitative analysis of news reports and a categorical qualitative analysis using NVivo (version 10), whether negative portrayals and discrimination through rhetorical and discursive strategies by the news media are contributing to the public perception of bouncers as violent thugs. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) aims to uncover the political and ideological meanings behind talk and text. It focuses on social groups and social issues where social power, domination and inequality are produced and reproduced through talk and text (van Dijk, 1995). CDA seeks to expose the underlying meaning behind talk and text through elucidating the discursive strategies used through dominant ideological discourse (Fairclough, 2004).

The purpose of this research is to expose the underlying sociopolitical, economic and sociostructural factors that are contributing to the vilification of bouncers in the news media in Australia. The viewpoint taken in this research is that the news media discriminate against bouncers through discursive strategies designed to undermine their credibility and vilify them in the eyes of the public. It will be argued that media representations of bouncers as violent thugs are produced and reproduced through
media discourses and contributes substantially to the on-going public perception of bouncers as violent and brutish.

It is proposed, through ideological discourse, that bouncers’ lack of state authority contributes to their public vilification and that state authorities, including politicians and the industry itself, are contributing to the public discrimination and condemnation of bouncers. The industry in Australia that has tens of thousands of bouncers working in licensed premises, and it is further proposed that it is indeed a few ‘bad apples’ who are tainting the industry, not a whole rotten orchard. Moreover, because of past news media publicity relating to bouncers involved in violence, it is proposed the industry is now ‘risk averse’ to revelations of violence involving bouncers. Those involved in violence are publically condemned and the industry, politicians and those in positions of social power distance themselves from the news media fallout. Risk aversion strategies lead to the ‘blame game’ (Hood, 2002, Power, 2004), and bouncers, and often the industry itself, are further publically condemned by the news media.

The theoretical framework of bouncers and their work, as defined in this thesis, is an attempt to frame the occupational role of bouncers under a collective explanatory theoretical perspective. The theories offer sociocultural and socio-cognitive explanations about why bouncers conduct business the way they do. In an industry that is the ‘rump end of policing’ (Lister et al., 2000: 384), bouncers hold no legitimate statutory powers and are authorised only through the private venues that hire them. Consequently, this has a considerable impact on how they conduct business. The theoretical framework (as defined in Figure 2, p. 75) explores appropriate theories in relation to their work, occupational roles and social identities. The situational and environmental context of bouncers’ occupational roles is paramount in forming an understanding of their work. Therefore, the purpose of this complex theoretical framework is to provide an explanation of bouncers and their work in relation to the political, sociocultural and economic constraints that impinge on their work and further influence news media’s discrimination against them.

The analysis also includes the use of scripts or talk drawn from previous research. The scripts are used as an analytic tool to explore the attitudes and beliefs of bouncers and those involved in violent occupations. Scripts, as an exploratory tool, allow an examination of specific cognitive and social attitudes that contribute to the analysis of
bouncers’ occupational role as defined under ‘dirty work’. The inclusion of scripts (or talk) from previous research participants is used in this thesis both to explore and explain the theoretical concepts under discussion. This allows for a clear, common sense analysis of the theory or theories. Scripts are based on cultural learning and experiential knowledge and contribute significantly to an explanation of why bouncers undertake the work they do and how they maintain a positive sense of self in a socially undervalued occupation.

1.6. Research Questions

The following questions will be used as a basis for analysis in this research. Answers will be sought for the following:

1. Why are bouncers predominantly portrayed in negative terms in the news media?
2. What social or political functions does it serve to have bouncers portrayed as villains in the media?
3. How does the ‘moral panic’ around alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy in Queensland influence the media portrayal of bouncers involved in violence against patrons?

These three questions will be explored throughout the thesis and will be brought together and addressed in detail in Chapter 8.

1.7. Thesis Overview

Chapter 2 has an outline of the situational, environmental and historical factors that impact on the use of alcohol and the night-time economy. This forms the background to the night-time economy, alcohol-related violence and civil disorder in contemporary Australia. Historical factors include the historical and current Australian cultural practices in relation to alcohol. This chapter also includes a discussion of research into alcohol-related injury and death to establish the social harms caused by alcohol use or misuse, which impacts on political interventions and the news media representations of the issue.

Drinking establishments and their typologies in the night-time economy are then discussed with a focus on the financial nature of the night-time economy. This is
followed by a discussion on current research about young women, their behaviours, violence and alcohol in the night-time economy. Masculinity, anabolic–androgenic steroid use, males and alcohol are also documented in this chapter. This is followed by a review of the current literature on the night-time economy, the state of the private security industry in Australia at present and governance under the neoliberalist capitalist nation state. Collectively, this chapter provides the social, economic and political background of the night-time economy and alcohol-related violence and disorder in Australia.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology used in the thesis. It includes an overview of Discourse Analysis and a comprehensive explanation of CDA. This is followed by a discussion of linguistic categorisation and stereotypes, ideology and social power in discourse and news reports as discourse, which form a critical part of the CDA perspective. There is a brief discussion on the ‘outrage’ industry and gonzo rhetoric, which are demonstrated in the news articles analysed in Chapter 7. There is also a brief discussion relating to the reading public. The chapter concludes with the complete research methodology, including the methods, data selection process and documentation of the analysis process. Included in this section is a brief introduction to the eight theoretical perspectives being employed in this thesis. The theories are outlined and discussed in Chapter 4 and 5.

Chapter 4 is an account of the theoretical perspectives used in the analysis of news discourse from a CDA standpoint. The theories form a theoretical framework for analysis to explore the sociocultural and socio-cognitive aspects of bouncers and their work. The sociocultural theories include the concept of dirty work and stigmatisation, emotional labour, the new theory of emotional dirty work and the gendered division of labour. The analysis also includes the theory of hegemonic masculinity, which I have chosen to illustrate with the combat sports of Mixed Martial Arts and Ultimate Fighting Championship (cage fighting). The rationale for this is to offer an explanation for bouncers’ behaviours in the night-time economy.

Theories classified under social cognitions to be used in this theoretical framework include identity theory, social identity theory, role congruence theory and hostile and benevolent sexism. These perspectives are used in the research to form an understanding of the sociocultural attitudes and beliefs surrounding bouncers, their
occupational work and the social cognitions that underpin their masculinised occupation. All together, these theories are used in Chapter 5 to elucidate the cognitive beliefs and attitudes through the use of scripts (talk) that I have drawn from previous research.

Chapter 5, ‘Bouncers as work in the Night-time Economy’, is specifically focused on an analysis of bouncers and their occupational role. The chapter begins with a definition and origin of the word ‘bouncer’. This is followed by an account of the work of bouncers, or their ‘bodily’ work. This concept relates to bouncers, masculinity and violence, and includes a discussion on hegemonic masculinity. This section also includes a discussion on the use of legitimate force and the perceptions of bouncers as ‘tough guys’. The subsequent section introduces females as bouncers, and interactions between female bouncers and patrons, followed by female patrons’ involvement in violence in the night-time economy.

Although female bouncers have not been involved in public violence reported in the news media, it is prudent to include a discussion of their contribution to the private security industry. Women are contributing more to the role of bouncers in most Westernised countries, therefore an overview and an understanding of their work contributes to a fuller understanding of bouncers and their occupational role in the night-time economy. There is a brief discussion on patrons’ views of bouncers, but there are few studies relating to this area of research. Emotion labour, ‘dirty work’ and bouncers are discussed thereafter with a specific focus on bouncer discourses through the use of scripts or talk. This is followed by a discussion on occupational ‘risk’ and occupational violence and stress relating to bouncers and their work.

Eighty news reports were analysed with NVivo (version 10) qualitative analysis software and the findings are reported in Chapter 6. A categorical analysis was undertaken to determine which terms or category of terms journalists used most frequently in news reports. The reasoning behind this was to explore the use of discriminatory language, political abstractions and generalisations, the prevalence of language relating to violence, social ideological power and derogatory language. This section also includes the use of relevant ‘experts’ in the news reports, organisations or institutions mentioned in the news and terms relating to criminality and bouncers.
Chapter 7 presents results of the manual, deep qualitative analysis of 10 randomly selected news reports. This analysis involves an analysis of every line of text in each news report to expose the underlying ideologies in the text. This is achieved through a critique of lexical use, ordering and selection, the use of under- and over-statement, metaphors, disclaimers and concessions and the generic categorisations that imply social stereotyping. Generalisations and the use of implicit and explicit statements are also teased out, together with the use of social distancing and disidentification. Collectively, the deep qualitative analysis forms a more complex and nuanced analysis of news reports that exposes the often unseen and unrealised ideological discourses at work within the texts.

Chapter 8 presents a discussion and critique of the findings and conclusions relating to the analysis, together with recommendations, limitations and suggestions for future research. The three research questions are addressed in this chapter, based on the three chapters of analysis. Here the complexities of the research under discussion are woven together with conclusions drawn from the NVivo analysis, the deep qualitative analysis and the sociocultural and socio-cognitive analysis. This chapter finally draws together social issues of violence by bouncers, alcohol-related assault in the night-time economy and exposes the ideological social powers at work behind the text in the news reports. The theoretical perspectives are used to draw these findings together and form an explanation of why bouncers are vilified in news reports.
Chapter 2

Background of Alcohol-Related Violence and Disorder in the Night-Time Economy

This paper is positioned within Australia, during the early part of the 21st century. C. Wright Mills’ seminal concept of the sociological imagination (1959) is used as a theoretical lens with which to view the current research. Mills proposed that ‘... many great public issues as well as many private troubles are described in terms of “the psychiatric” ...’ thus effectively discounting the greater influence of the social, political and economic influences on the individual (Mills, 1959, cited in Kpohazounde, 2010: 6). Mills argued strongly that individuals cannot be studied in isolation from social structures, the biography of the era and the history of the nation and community in which they live. Mills postulated that ‘private troubles’ more often than not emanated from ‘public issues’ shaped by social structure and imbued social histories. Situating the current research within this ethos allows for a critical reflection of private security personnel (bouncers) in a capitalist economic and the recurring political arenas within the current climate of postmodern Australia under a neoliberal governance model.

Therefore, drawing on Mills’ (1959) philosophy, it is prudent to examine the history of alcohol or culture of alcohol use in Australia. Compared with other countries, Australia is a young nation, formed by Federation in 1901; however, alcohol has had a pervasive presence in Australia since the time of first settlement. This is an important consideration in the current climate of alcohol-related violence and disorder, because social histories frame and inform the culture of modern society. The issue of alcohol-related violence and disorder in and around licensed premise has been on the political and mass media agenda for many years. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the social, political and economic context of the night-time economy and the factors that influence and affect alcohol-related violence and bouncers’ occupational roles within the night-time economy.
This chapter outlines and discusses factors that are related to alcohol-related violence and civil disorder in the night-time economy. These include licensed premises within the night-time economy, the night-time economy as marketed fun and ‘escape’, women, alcohol and the night-time economy, and men, masculinity and alcohol-related violence. A discussion about anabolic–androgenic steroid use within the night-time economy is included because of research implicating bouncers and other men in their use. The use of anabolic–androgenic steroids also ties into the discussion of masculinity and violence. A description of the contemporary private security industry and neoliberal governance in Australia allows for an exploration of the political influences and pressures within these areas. The reasons for including these topics in the thesis are to establish context and show the political and economic environment in which bouncers conduct their business. Collectively, these areas of study are factors that influence and affect bouncers’ work in most developed countries and are implicated in the public perceptions of bouncers involved in violence.

It should be noted that the reason for taking a particular focus on Queensland in relation to legislative discussions concerning bouncers, even though news reports come from around Australia, is because each State and Territory has their own rules that govern bouncers and they, at this time, are all different. For example, in New South Wales, the police are responsible for overseeing the private security industry, whereas in Queensland, this is conducted by the Office of Fair Trading (OFT). Although moves are being made to develop a national framework for the industry across all States and Territories, this has not occurred as yet. To document all the States and Territories’ specific regulations and legislations is well beyond the scope of this thesis. Therefore, specific examples on bouncers and their legislations and regulations are restricted to Queensland as this is the home State of the research. A more inclusive study would include all States and Territories.

2.1. Australia’s Drinking Culture

Oh, thou demon Drink, thou fell destroyer;
Thou curse of society, and its greatest annoyer.
What hast thou done to society, let me think?
I answer thou hast caused the most of ills, thou demon Drink
The notion of ‘binge’ drinking or episodic heavy drinking is not a new phenomenon, having been around since history was first recorded (Herring et al., 2008). Alcoholic beverages have been consumed for thousands of years and often form a distinct and fundamental part of cultural identities (Room, 1997: S9–S10). Australia’s drinking culture began with the arrival of Captain Arthur Philip aboard the First Fleet in 1788 with a cargo of rum (Lewis, 2006). Britain’s Anglo–Celtic culture with its propensity to drink to excess was to become part of mainstream Australian culture (Lewis, 2006). Rum was used as a bartering tool and a form of money during the early years of settlement, with convicts being paid in part with rations of rum (Lewis, 2006: 1).

Times were difficult in early Australia and the country was perceived as stark and severe (as opposed to mother England). Rum was a source of escape for those enduring the harshness of their new Australian life (Drug and Alcohol Office, 2002). The ruggedness of life in the bush and the challenging conditions of existence produced a drinking culture that became an integral part of Australian male solidarity and ‘mateship’ that has endured (Lewis, 2006). It has been argued that the hallmarks of the Australian language, symbols and culture are intrinsically linked to heavy drinking. These include ‘shouting’ (where each person in turn buys a drink for all members of their drinking group), a ‘pub crawl’ (going from one public drinking house to the next consecutively), going on ‘a bender’ (associated with binge drinking, usually lasting two days or more), the ‘work hard, play hard’ ethic, and the Aussie pub (Shanahan et al., 2002, Kirkby, 2003, Lewis, 2006, Wright, 2014).

From its conception the Australian pub was traditionally a male-only domain. The pub was the centre of social life, a meeting place to relax and unwind, catch up with mates and meet new ones. It was a public meeting place based on sociability, egalitarianism, friendship and the male bonding experience, where conversations were around work, women, football and cricket (Pettigrew, 2006). Women were not allowed to drink in public bars (strictly men only), and until the late 1970s could only sit in the Ladies’ Lounge, or as one gentleman described it ‘[t]he ladies used to sit out the back, in the sow pen’ (Pettigrew, 2006: 163). For men, the traditional pub represented a separation between work, home and leisure, and stepping up to the bar at the local pub signified the end of work and the start of leisure (Pettigrew, 2006). The classic Australian identity
that had been carved out of the Australian bush and retold in Australian pubs underwent a conceptual change as small towns grew into large cities and rural life was overrun by suburbia (ABC Radio, 2008). This was further compounded by immigration from Europe and the United Kingdom, with immigrants bringing diverse cultural differences and varied ways of living and drinking (Kirkby, 2003).

As people moved from the bush into the industrialised and increasingly suburbanised cites, the classic nature of Australia’s drinking culture slowly began to evolve into a more socially acceptable standard of drinking, because ‘... society wasn’t prepared to tolerate the excesses that went with heavy alcohol consumption’ (ABC Radio, 2008: 2). Restaurants that served wine with food opened in suburbs and towns, and the introduction of the ‘Esky’ and smaller bottles of beer (stubbies) meant that beer could be taken to the cricket, the beach or a neighbour’s barbeque (Kirkby, 2003). The rise of the Women’s Liberation Movement in Australia during the 1970s profoundly affected the roles of men and women in society, and the Australian drinking culture (ABC Radio, 2008). Women were moving into the workforce and patronised pubs and clubs alongside their male counterparts (Kirkby, 2003). The winds of change were blowing through Australian’s drinking culture and its evolution had begun (ABC Radio, 2008).

However, the impact of alcohol-related harms on society has been considerable, and this has been seen as a political ‘problem’ needing solutions. From the earliest writing about the ‘demon drink’ to current discussions on ‘booze-fuelled’ violence, the negative impacts of alcohol on society have been sustained over time. The social harms caused by the ingestion of alcohol are arguably responsible for the mass media’s condemnation of alcohol-related violence and disorder in society. The following section explores the negative impact of alcohol on society and the reasons behind the continued moral panic about alcohol-related violence and disorder in Australia.

2.2. Alcohol Related Injury and Death

Research indicates that alcohol has significant effects, not solely on young people but on society as a whole. The violence, injuries and deaths resulting from the ingestion of alcohol, by way of road accidents, suicide and assault, are tragedies that society could

3 ‘Esky’ is an Australian trademark for an insulated portable container for keeping food and beverages cool (Oxford Dictionary, 2009).
well do without. The impact on people and their families from such trauma and tragedy is most certainly an avoidable consequence that social scientists and researchers are endeavouring to prevent, by way of contributing to theoretical knowledge, policies, education and harm prevention strategies. In Australia, the legal age to consume alcohol is 18 years. However, *The National Drug Strategy Household Survey* (2007) showed that children as young as 12 years were consuming alcohol and statistics indicate that 31% of persons receiving treatment at hospital Accident and Emergency Departments and who were aged 15–18 years had been consuming alcohol before their admission. It is illegal for anyone (i.e. adults) to supply minors (under 18 years of age) with alcohol, under the *Liquor Act Qld 1992* (Roche et al., 2007). This legislation stipulates that any adults (including parents) supplying minors with alcohol are liable for fines of up to $6,000 for a single offence (Roche et al., 2007).

Despite this, statistics have shown that 36% of minors are supplied with alcohol by their parents (National Health and Medical Research Council [NHMRC], 2009). This is deplorable given that around 264 young people die each year following inappropriate behaviour instigated by ingesting alcohol, and that alcohol consumption is implicated in more than half of road fatalities involving young people (NHMRC, 2009). Research has also indicated that people under the age of 18 are more likely to carry multiple passengers while drink driving, with statistics demonstrating that motor vehicle accidents involving young people result in multiple casualties (NHMRC, 2009). We can conclude that underage young people and children are consuming alcohol, and this is of major concern given the well-documented effects of alcohol-related harm on young brains and young bodies (NHMRC, 2009). Studies have revealed that the effects of alcohol on developing brains can be significant, with reported cognitive visuospatial impairment, loss of attention-based skills, loss of short-term memory and reduction in long-term memory recall (White and Swartzwelder, 2005).

However, the short-term consequences of reckless behaviour and risk taking often have far greater consequences. Alcohol-related violence in and around licensed premises is one such behaviour. However, over time the use of Australian hotels and licensed premises has changed considerably, especially since the rapid expansion in the night-time economy. It is therefore useful to define and outline the types of people who
frequent licensed premises in the night-time economy and to explore the polarity of masculinity and femininity within that economy.

2.3. Females, Alcohol and the Night-Time Economy

In 1973, a study that attempted to differentiate motivational factors for binge drinking in males and females found that both sexes commonly practised ‘escape’ drinking, with 13.6% and 13.3% respectively doing so (Edwards et al., 1973). However, behaviour patterns varied in response to specific, emotional triggers. Males were more inclined to drink heavily in response to stressors, whereas women rarely did so, and never heavily (Edwards et al., 1973). The authors proposed the idea of ‘cross-pressure’, which they defined as pressure exerted across a group to influence heavier drinking, although the study did not support these findings for women in London (Edwards et al., 1973). The authors argued that social roles and social controls were clearly at work in defining women’s role and their abstinence from drinking heavily and/or regularly (Edwards et al., 1973).

Twenty-four years later, researchers claimed that young women were abandoning traditional gender roles and this was transforming the way women operated within social, post-industrial society (Davey, 1997). Davey believed that the liberation of women over the past 50 years had loosened the control that society once held over women’s consumption of alcohol. The traditional role of women underwent considerable change during this time, with women considering themselves ‘equal’ to men, and this belief erased the boundaries that traditionally defined women’s roles in society (Davey, 1997). The ‘new’ concept of femininity resulted in women drinking openly and regularly in pubs, nightclubs and at home, leading to heavy episodic drinking at hazardous levels among young people (Davey, 1997, Measham and Ostergaard, 2009).

Research concerning women and alcohol use has traditionally focused on deviance and abuse; few studies have examined women’s drinking patterns, reasons and motivations for drinking (de Crespigny, 2002). Davey (1997) defined two types of women drinker: contemporary, liberal minded women and women with traditional feminine beliefs. The liberal minded women were more likely to indulge in regular binge drinking, with the traditionalist women drinking less and not as often because of their belief in traditional
role models (Davey, 1997). More recent studies have shown that young women made conscious and considered decisions about where, how and why they drink (Pettigrew, 2006, Guise and Gill, 2007). These measured and planned decisions were based almost exclusively on personal safety, with finances being the second consideration (de Crespigny, 2002, MacLean and Moore, 2014).

Young women in contemporary post-industrial societies place substantial value on their personal independence and freedom and their ability to enjoy themselves at licensed venues. However, the need for personal safety is intrinsically woven into their decision-making (Parks et al., 1998, de Crespigny, 2002). Young women stated that the level of perceived personal safety dictated the types of venues, selection of alcohol, and level of intoxication (de Crespigny, 2002, MacLean and Moore, 2014). That is, these young women would stay for shorter periods, drink weaker mixes of alcohol and consume less alcohol in venues that were perceived as ‘risky’ (MacLean and Moore, 2014). Women participants agreed that pubs, clubs and bars could be ‘risky’ places to frequent, because elements of antisocial behaviour were tolerated at these venues and placed women at increased risk of male aggression, harassment and violence (Parks et al., 1998, de Crespigny, 2002, MacLean and Moore, 2014).

Consequently, decisions by young women drinkers were based on the perceived level of safety at licensed venues. This determined the type and quantity of alcohol consumed. Women also practised ‘looking out’ for each other and had pre-arranged transport home (de Crespigny, 2002). The young women in de Crespigny’s study claimed that predatory males at some drinking venues deterred them from frequenting those establishments. Other studies reported that sexually provocative or ‘sluttish’ behaviour by some young women (as reported by female participants) was based on stereotypical constructions of socially appropriate behaviour which were counterintuitive to the independent, freedom seeking, liberated woman of contemporary society (Park et al., 1998, Day et al., 2003). In the Park et al. study, women reported a sense of protective responsibility surrounding their drinking habits and reported that binge drinking was associated with underage or teenage drinkers and not those aged over 18.

Women seen to be breaching the unwritten rules of acceptable social behaviour were deemed to be of lower status by their peers and thus deserving of victimisation (Day et al., 2003, MacLean and Moore, 2014). Women were critical of those who participated
in violent encounters in the night-time economy, especially those who entered this arena seemingly for the sole purpose of being involved in drunken violence (Winlow and Hall, 2006, MacLean and Moore, 2014). Women found themselves playing ‘peace keeper’ roles between men to avoid conflict and violence (Lindsay, 2012). However, women themselves are increasingly becoming involved in physical altercations in the night-time economy. Although physical contact between females was perceived to be less aggressive than males and the number of incidents much lower (Graham and Homel, 2008), the incidence of females fighting has risen by 49% in Australia since 1994 (Rowe, 2012) and fights are becoming more aggressive and more frequent (Forsyth, 2010).

Other research postulated that female patrons were as aggressive as male patrons in licensed premises and were equally represented in instances of aggression (Collins et al., 2007, Forsyth and Lennox, 2010). Fights involving females in licensed premises did not have the ‘build-up’ or pre-fight choreography of male fights (Forsyth and Lennox, 2010: 84), often erupting without warning, typically between strangers, with other women contributing to the fight, and with more aggression than male fights (Collins et al., 2007). Fights were initiated because of rowdy behaviours by the combatant/s, feelings of being disrespected and sexual jealousy over males (Collins et al., 2007, Spence et al., 2009, Forsyth and Lennox, 2010). Enraged young women were involved in spitting, slapping, punching and using their stiletto heels as weapons (Layton, 2014). Najman (cited in Layton, 2014: 1) stated ‘... women are increasingly engaging in violent behaviour and are turning to violence to resolve disputes’ with stiletto heels a weapon of choice.

The ‘ladette’ culture (Jackson and Tinkler, 2007, Forsyth and Lennox, 2010) or ‘macho’ female (Graham and Homel, 2008) is not a new phenomenon. Women have been transgressing the bounds of moral behaviour for decades and even centuries with aggressive acts of violence (Gilbert, 2002, Kruttschnitt and Gartner, 2008). However, laddytes and macho females are usually portrayed as working class. With dyed hair and a brash attitude, she is ‘... tough, loud, vulgar and unashamed ... she is anarchy on stilts’ (Gilbert, 2002: 967). However, the negative portrayal of such overt ‘masculine’ behaviours is underpinned by the dominant societal fear of women’s transgressions from traditional feminine behaviours (Gilbert, 2002, Skeggs, 2005, Jackson and Tinkler,
Overt aggression is seen as belonging to the domain of masculinity and is a source of social power and control. However, aggression in women is seen as ‘unnatural’ and is either pathologised or criminalised (Gilbert, 2002).

The capacity for ‘toughness’ and aggressive violence is aligned with masculinity, therefore, women who contravene the boundaries of expected feminine behaviours are either ‘mad’ or ‘bad’ (Gilbert, 2002). Aggression is not an attribute ascribed to male bodies but to the domain of masculinity, a defining differential trait between the two polarised genders (Gilbert, 2002). Women’s public displays of ‘masculine’ behaviour and heavy ‘binge’ drinking are seen as a threat to the moral fabric of society, a cracking of fragile social norms (Skeggs, 2005). Consequently, such immoral behaviours are subject to social controls through legislation to ‘stamp out’ the immoral, the unruly excesses and the atavism of such corrupt social actions (Gilbert, 2002, Skeggs, 2005). However, society’s ‘… reluctance to criminalise … [the behaviours of] … women betrays our fears of the falling apart of our social fabric’ (Gilbert, 2002: 1282).

Although the rate of females being involved in violence has increased, males are typically most implicated in participating in violence in the night-time economy.

Notions of masculinity have been linked to violence not only in the night-time economy but also during the day in the workplace, sport, and domestic situations. However, this does not explain those males who frequent the night-time economy and never become involved in violence. Nor does it address the many aspects of what could be called masculinity in contemporary Australia. It is to this topic we now turn.

2.4. Males, Alcohol, Violence and Masculinity

Masculinity is a complex notion of self-identify that is surrounded by sociocultural rules and norms and spatial contextual contributors (Carrington et al., 2010). The exhibition of masculinity in the context of the night-time economy is a double-edged sword. On one hand, there is the brash, brawling, working-class man and on the other is the more ‘gentrified’ young man who consciously avoids violent confrontations (Tomsen, 2005, Lindsay, 2012). Added to this dynamic mix of established masculinities there is the contemporary racial and sexual stratification of ‘gays’, ‘queers’, transgender and ‘unisex’ individuals (Farrer, 2011: 748). The globalisation of nightlife in many major cites has resulted from global mobility and the global tourism market (Farrer, 2011).
Different ethnic groups vie for the already contested space of localised areas and venues within the night-time economy.

Within this context of diverse sociocultural racial and sexual groups, alcohol-related violence has been traditionally associated with hyper-masculinity and the working class (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Hobbs et al., 2005, MacLean and Moore, 2014). The contested nature of nightlife spaces has been central in the issue of alcohol-related violence. This includes issues of territoriality between locals and visitors (MacLean and Moore, 2014), and ‘stupid things’ like spilling drinks, bumping into someone, ‘sexual jealously’ over women, men ‘wanting to make a name for themselves’ and ‘standing up for your mates’ (Monaghan, 2002b, Tomsen, 2005, Graham and Homel, 2008 Lindsay, 2012: 240). Pre-loading, or drinking before attending nightclubs, has also been cited as contributing to violence (Edwards, 2011, Labhart et al., 2012).

Masculinity, as a contributor to violence in the night-time economy, has been approached from many theoretical viewpoints. The notion of violence as intrinsic to males and the proposal of biological ‘naturalness’ has been challenged (Chatterton, 2002, Connell, 2005). Criminology has traditionally neglected the ‘... overwhelming maleness of violence’, and while work by feminist criminologists has countered this, it has led to an increasing ‘... universalisation of men as violent’ (Carrington et al., 2010: 2). The masculine–violence link is supported intuitively, given most violent incidents are perpetrated by males. However, this does not account for those men who do not become involved in violence or the increasing involvement of women in violence (Forsyth and Lennox, 2010). There are strong links between masculinity, violence and alcohol, but the contributing factors of context and public drinking are not well understood (Tomsen, 2005).

Tomsen (2005) explored the notion of individual, as opposed to collective, masculinities in relation to bouncers and young male patrons. Violence for patrons generally involved conflict over women, ‘bad drunks’, crowded spaces, territoriality of local nightclubs and ethnic groups. It was viewed by working-class young men as ‘... the natural consequences of belonging to the male sex’ (Tomsen, 2005: 290). However, urban young men were more considered in their approach to violence, preferring to avoid minor incidents and ‘picking their fights’ carefully. Risk management and evasion was apparent, with their involvement in violence occurring only when their honour was
under serious threat, or it was unavoidable (Tomsen, 2005: 294). Working-class young men were more likely to participate in violence to impress women or their mates and to improve their public status. Territoriality, as claimed by the young men in Tomsen’s study, was also cited by other research participants as a source of angst for young male, public drinkers.

Carrington et al. (2010) examined the socio-spatial and socio-geographical nature of masculine violence involving alcohol. Regional, rural and remote locations in Australia generally have higher rates of alcohol-related violence (Miller et al., 2010). The sociocultural context of the ‘pub’ has been implicated as a source of masculine ‘... performance, construction and evaluation’ in regional and rural areas of Australia (Carrington et al., 2010: 8). Alcohol-related violence was mainly caused by the ‘invasion’ of masculine ‘others’ into local rural towns, with locals feeling a sense of entitlement to territory and women. The resentment of locals towards fly-in fly-out (FIFO) workers was shown by their use of the term ‘Fit In or Fuck Off’ for these workers. Carrington et al. stated ‘... violence was a way of reinforcing boundaries, exercising power, asserting male honour and re-establishing the social status with other groups of ... [outsider]... men’ (2010: 10). Men valued the normalisation of excessive alcohol consumption and the associated risk-taking and violence as ‘markers of masculinity’ (2010: 12).

The Australian working class culture of ‘hard work, hard play’ still pervades many regional and rural areas. In the mining industry, masculinity was valorised as ‘... hard physical labour, copious and normalised excessive alcohol consumption and displays of aggression’ (Carrington et al., 2010: 12). Interestingly, some FIFO workers were married men with families from large urban centres. They participated in these behaviours when in the mining towns but not on their return to their homes in urban areas. Carrington et al. proposed this occurred because the ‘... lack of legal and moral normative restraints’ in rural areas meant that such behaviours were ‘permitted’ (2010: 17).

Drinking, fighting and brawling in these rural areas take on a different modus operandi than in urban centres. In FIFO industries, the worker Others often work alongside local workers. Therefore, when the fighting was over, they all went back to work. Carrington and Scott (2008) articulated the notion of ‘frontier’ masculinity based on lawlessness
and a disregard for urbanisation, which prevailed in rural areas. Masculinity as such is thus based on modes of doing, acting and action through sociocultural historical scripts (Carrington and Scott, 2008). Rural masculinity in FIFO areas is based on tough men, doing tough jobs under tough working conditions, thereby necessitating the ‘hard play’ ethic involving risk-taking behaviours. Although urban, regional and rural men use alcohol for ‘fun’ or leisure, their involvement in violence is mediated by influencing factors between the different areas.

Men in rural areas were involved in more risk-taking behaviour, alcohol consumption and violence (Carrington and Scott, 2008). The authors proposed that this was because ‘... the peculiar sociocultural dynamics of resource boom communities accentuate these already exaggerated characteristics of rural masculinities’ (Carrington and Scott, 2008: 13–14). I concur with Carrington and Scott that the lack of social and legal constraints perpetuates this behaviour. Men who do not behave in such a manner in urban areas become involved in this behaviour in rural settings, which is indicative of the loosened restraints. The notion of the outsider Other must also be considered as an influencing factor. Suburban young men and women participated in violence in late-night entertainment precincts in cities because of the anonymity the city centre conferred (MacLean and Moore, 2014). The suburban outsider Other in the inner city participated in violent behaviour that was not appropriate close to home where they were known (MacLean and Moore, 2014). This behaviour of urban young men discounts the argument about the lack of social and legal constraints, because they were participating in violent confrontations in urban settings, although not close to their places of residence.

The concept of risk taking in relation to alcohol, violence and masculinity supports Katz’s notion of ‘sneaky thrills’ in relation to crime (1988). The excitement and heightened emotionality of people in the night-time economy has been well established (Hobbs et al., 2000, Szmigin et al., 2008, MacLean and Moore, 2014). Risk-taking traits or factors have been established including levels of drunkenness, drug taking, violence, sexuality, licensed venue factors (Leonard et al., 2003, Forsyth and Lennox, 2010, Schnitzer et al., 2010,) and levels of aggression (Wells et al., 1998, Wells et al., 2007, Graham et al., 2011, Miller et al., 2014). Katz’s notion of ‘sneaky thrills’ or risk taking for fun or excitement has not received much theoretical attention in relation to the night-
time economy, alcohol-related violence and disorderly behaviours. However, when Hayward and Hobbs (2006: 439) wrote that the night-time economy told of a ‘... spectacle of public drunkenness as a cautionary, yet seductive tale’, they were defining the immoral, exciting nature of life in the night-time economy.

There are three typologies of alcohol, violence and expressions of masculinity within the night-time economy. There are those who actively look for fights during a night out (Graham and Wells, 2003, Graham and Homel, 2008), those who participate in fights under specific conditions (MacLean and Moore, 2014) and those who will avoid violence under any conditions (Lindsay, 2012). Research has indicated that working-class men were most likely to participate in violence and actively look for fights (Tomsen, 2005, Carrington and Scott, 2008). This is particularly relevant in large cities such as Melbourne (MacLean and Moore, 2014). The ‘mainstream’ young men were more likely to desist or avoid violence (MacLean and Moore, 2014) while some would only participate in violence if it were over a major issue or a threat to their honour (Tomsen, 2005). To some young men, perceived aggression or posturing and the ability to ‘talk your way out of trouble’ were valued assets (Tomsen, 2005).

Research has confirmed the role of alcohol in male-to-male aggression and violence (Tomsen, 2005, Graham and Homel, 2008, Forsyth and Lennox, 2010, Wells et al., 2011), and the role of masculinity as a contributing factor to violence and aggressive acts involving men is also well documented (Graham and Wells, 2003, Carrington and Scott, 2008, Anderson et al., 2009). However, I would argue this has been attenuated by the increased involvement of women in violence and aggression in the night-time economy. Recent research has concluded that trait aggression was more significant as a predictor of male violence than masculinity or social honour (Miller et al., 2014). Male violence also tended to follow a coded script, with posturing and verbal combat before a fight, which was typically conducted in front of an audience (Forsyth and Lennox, 2010). This raises the notion of positive reinforcement in the form of pride, honour and public approval that may outweigh the negative consequences such as injuries (Miller et al., 2014).

Thus, within the seductive realm of bright lights, loud music, unrestrained fun and carnival that is the night-time economy, it is not easy to tease out the relationships between masculinity, alcohol and violence. In this dynamic environment, masculinity is
enacted through sociocultural norms and values, styles of self-identity, and displays and collective expressions of masculinity (MacLean and Moore, 2014). The spatial context and emotion-charged atmosphere of the environment lends itself to collective expression where male solidarity is established and maintained through physical violence (Monaghan, 2002b, MacLean and Moore, 2014), or in some cases, the avoidance of violence (Tomsen, 2005, Lindsay, 2012, MacLean and Moore, 2014). However, there is another factor to be considered.

2.5. Males, Violence and Anabolic–Androgenic Steroid Use

Steroid drug use has been linked to violence in the night-time economy, particularly for males, and bouncers have been implicated in steroid use. The use of anabolic–androgenic steroids (AAS) or Performance and Image Enhancing Drugs (PIED)\(^4\) by young men has also been linked to assaults and violence. The Australian Crime Commission (2013) reported an increase of 751.6% in the number of PIED detected at Australian borders in 2012–13, with the rate of increase reported to be the highest ever for detection and arrest for the possession of PIED (Australian Crime Commission, 2013: 21). Queensland was one of the highest users of PIED, with 58% of the arrests for possession of illegal steroids (Australian Crime Commission, 2013). Recent research has supported findings that the increase in PIED usage by young men was for aesthetic purposes rather than physical performance enhancement (Iversen et al., 2013). Young men who are deemed high users of PIED began using them at an early age, participated in more risk-taking behaviour and were involved in more violence and aggressive acts, or ‘roid rage’ than those who used PIED less often (Larance et al., 2008).

The increase in PIED use is a consequence of the need to ‘look ripped’ with sculptured muscularity, which is underpinned by young men’s need to look hyper-masculine. The ultimate image of the ‘ripped’ body is linked to feelings of personal empowerment, the ability to attract (often multiple) sexual partners and extreme self-confidence (Wright et al., 2000, Petrocelli et al., 2008). The exemplary image of masculine physical perfection was encapsulated by Aziz ‘Zyzz’ Sergeyevich Shavershian, a Russian-born young man who died at the age of 22 in August 2011. Zyzz became a hero on social media, an

\(^4\) AAS have two properties. Anabolic components build muscle mass and androgenic refers to testosterone or masculinising properties. The terms AAS and PIED are used interchangeably for these drugs in the research. See Anderson and Bokor (2012) for a discussion on the properties of AAS.
online phenomena admired and worshiped by thousands because of his ‘ripped’
physical perfection (King, 2011). Zyzz was described as Adonis, the god of beauty and
desire in Greek mythology, and he flaunted his body as the self-appointed leader of
‘The Aesthetic Crew’, a group of young men committed to honing their bodies to
muscular aesthetic perfection (King, 2011). However, his physique was a result of PIED
use, while his hard partying and polydrug use were seen as an inspiration to others who
aspired to be Zyzz, both in physique and popularity (King, 2011).

Users of PIED consider illegal substances to be more effective than legal steroids and
these are freely available for purchase on the internet (Petrocelli et al., 2008). However,
the increase in cases of intramuscular abscesses in PIED users from injecting illegal
steroids has highlighted the risks of using contaminated illegal substances (Graham et
al., 2009). Users of PIED have argued abscesses are the result of user inexperience, not
the steroids per se (Petrocelli et al., 2008). Moreover, the perceived risks of using PIED
were outweighed by their considered use and the end result, a ‘ripped’ body (Petrocelli
et al., 2008, King, 2011). Links between PIED, violence and aggression have been
established, although they remain tenuous and the reasons are not well understood
(Anderson and Bokor, 2012, Pope and Kanayama, 2012). While some have claimed
informally that ‘roid rage’ is a characteristic of individual attributes rather than an
outcome of PIED use (King, 2011), research has shown that PIED lower the
psychological controls on aggressive tendencies (Anderson and Bokor, 2012). However,
aggression was more likely to be manifested as irritability and bad temper rather than
outright violence (Midgley et al., 2001).

Midgley et al. (2001) highlighted the use of PIED by bouncers, but could not determine
whether aggression was the result of PIED use or rather, that aggressive individuals
were attracted to using PIED. Males on high levels of PIED were found to be more
aggressive during bouts of steroid use compared with periods of abstinence (Choi et al.,
1990). Choi et al. also concluded that polydrug use or ‘stacking’ contributed to overt
hostility and aggression. Continued PIED use may contribute to violent outbursts and
aggressive behaviours in those who showed no aggressive tendencies before taking
PIED (Thiblin and Pärklö, 2002). PIED use has also been implicated in domestic
violence and violent crimes such as murder and stabbings. Violent criminality has been
linked to PIED use, although polydrug use in predisposed individuals does not
exacerbate violent behaviours (Klötz et al., 2007). That is, those predisposed to violent behaviours are as violent when taking PIED alone as other individuals who use PIED and other drugs simultaneously. The effects of PIED may be idiosyncratic and dependent on individual predisposing attributes. Individuals who exhibited low self-esteem and previous drug addictive tendencies, including alcohol, were more prone to experience violent hostility and aggression when using PIED (Pope and Kanayama, 2012). However, an extensive study in the United States has shown that male users of PIED were significantly more likely to be involved in violence than those who had never taken PIED (Beaver et al., 2008).

The disproportionate increase in recreational PIED usage in Queensland has drawn criticism from the police and the news media. Reports of PIED use, alcohol and violence in the night-time economy have pervaded the news in recent times. Table 1 is a brief example of the types of headline relating to this violence.

Table 1: Recent news headlines relating to PIED and violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experts call for violent offenders to have blood tests to see if steroids</td>
<td>Jane Hansen</td>
<td>News Corp Australia, 4 January,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drugs are fuelling the coward punch epidemic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muscling up: are steroids an emerging criminal threat?</td>
<td>Terry Goldsworthy</td>
<td>Brisbane Times, 10 January,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roid rage a concern as police keep a lid on violence</td>
<td>Scott Sawyer</td>
<td>Gladstone Observer, 13 January,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A new generation of gutless thugs</td>
<td>David Penberthy</td>
<td>The Advertiser (NT), 19 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Steroid stuffers to blame for violence</td>
<td>Conor Byrne</td>
<td>NT News, 21 January, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The news headlines demonstrate that the media are critical of PIED users and the corresponding violence, linking users to criminality (example 2) and defining them as ‘gutless thugs’, ‘super thugs’ and ‘steroid stuffers’. Shawn McNeil, the 25 year old
MMA fighter who was charged with the manslaughter of 21 year old Daniel Christie in Sydney on New Year’s Eve 2014, had reportedly ingested a mixture of PIED, party drugs and alcohol beforehand. This led to media outrage over PIED use by young males and the ‘epidemic’ (example 1) of coward punch assaults and manslaughter. ‘Roid rage’ (example 3) is the media-driven term for violence associated with steroid use, and it has become central in public discourses in discussions relating to steroid use and violence. Although steroid use has been in the news previously in relation to violent incidents, the manslaughter of Daniel Christie and Thomas Kelly (in July 2012) fuelled the outpouring of media outrage over violence, alcohol and PIED.

Although masculinity, violence and steroid use have been linked to people frequenting the night-time economy, nowhere has it been more publically pronounced than in connection with the private security industry. Because this thesis relates to the news media portrayal of bouncers and their involvement in violence against the public, it is necessary to elucidate the political and economic areas in which the private security industry operates. Bouncers are employed in the night-time economy and so in the next section I will explore the research and context of the night-time economy, its economic and political implications for bouncers and also the situational factors that influence their work. I begin by focusing on the night-time economy.

2.6. Hedonistic Pleasures and the Night-Time Economy

Two distinct types of urban nightlife establishment can be seen in contemporary inner city areas, niche venues and commercial pubs and clubs (Lindsay, 2006). Niche venues are small, discrete, subtle, stylised and alternative, specifically targeted toward up-and-coming young professionals with tertiary education and higher incomes ⁵ (Monaghan, 2002b, Hobbs et al., 2003, Lindsay, 2012). Patrons, usually couples, are aged in their early to mid-twenties, designer clad, smoothly cultured, single and childless (Lindsay, 2006). The music is alternative or classical and preferred drinks are top shelf spirits or expensive wines. Alcohol is traditionally accompanied by food and customers are seated (Monaghan, 2002b). Commercial pubs and clubs are large, highly visible locations with loud music, dim lights, ‘vertical drinking’ ⁶ and massive groups of people

⁵ Higher incomes refers to those over $55,000 per annum, usually earned by young professionals such as lawyers, doctors, bankers, etc.
⁶ ‘Vertical drinking’ refers to venues that do not supply seating and patrons stand up to drink.
crowded into the venue (Monaghan, 2002b). Patrons are individuals described as working class, tradespeople, and students aged 18–23 years, and often still living at home (Monaghan, 2002b, Lindsay, 2006). They customarily attend venues in large, single-sex groups. Commercial, popular music is played, with beer and ‘alcopops’ being the most popular drinks. Bouncers are employed to control the crowds (Monaghan, 2002b, Lindsay, 2006).

Niche venues have become popular with and backed by corporate business wanting to gain a foothold in the capitalist arena of the night-time economy (Chatterton, 2002). The growth in income generated by the night-time economy across the Western world has seen a change in corporate investment. Highly stylised and exclusive clubs have emerged where only the ‘rich and famous’ can afford to attend (Hae, 2011). This gentrification of licensed venues is a neoliberal response to alcohol-related violence in and around licensed premises, whereby owners establish control of their venues and patrons (Hae, 2011). This investment in venues was a response to the post-industrial era in the 1980s that resulted in the decline of manufacturing and a rise in consumerism (Roberts, 2006). The resulting shift from rule by governments to the neoliberal notion of ‘governance’ further influenced the emergence of a strong night-time economy (Chatterton, 2002). However, the contradictory discourse around up-market venues and commercialised clubs has resulted in a criminalisation of typically working-class behaviours (Chatterton, 2002) because of the rise in alcohol-related incidents in and around these venues.

Young people today have a preoccupation with leisure and freedom, generated by the current culture of consumerist capitalism (Winlow, 2010). This has led to an increasing loss of individual self-identity in a fluid and unstable labour market, and the search for alternative identities through consumption and leisure (Kivetz and Simonson, 2002). This is especially significant within the night-time economy, because it is a place for young people to ‘see’ and ‘be seen’ and to cultivate and strengthen social relationships and individualised consumerist identities (Monaghan, 2002b, Winlow and Hall, 2009b). The endless offerings of hedonistic pleasure and liminal release provide young people with an eagerly anticipated respite from work drudgery, debt, anxieties and stresses of the working week (Winlow, 2010). Winlow argues that the ‘big night out’ has increased

---

7 Alcopops are pre-mixed soft drinks with alcohol, such as vodka and lemon squash.
to several nights a week for these young people as they seek self-identity, relationships and emotional release through alcohol, friends and unrestrained enjoyment.

The commercial viability of businesses is the insidious master of the night-time economy and pleasure is only condoned if it is good for business. Behavioural constraints of social and cultural norms are abandoned in the night-time economy, with antisocial behaviour, overt sexual innuendo and loud, aggressive behaviours all becoming part of the seemingly accepted norm (Hobbs et al., 2003, Hall and Winlow, 2005). The temporary suspension of socially acceptable behaviour within the night-time economy exerts a magnetic allure to young people because the ‘anything goes’ culture of behaviour allows for explorations of (usually) unacceptable behaviours and the ability to contravene inflexible daytime social boundaries (Winlow, 2010). However, within this realm of unrestrained liminal gratification lie shifting rules and pliable boundaries that encourages unrestrained enjoyment, but under the rules of licensed premises (Hobbs et al., 2003, Winlow, 2010).

The gentrification and economic boom of the night-time economy has led to exclusivity and the marginalisation of some groups from inner city centres (Hall and Winlow, 2005, Hadfield, 2006, Tomsen, 2011). The central locations of commercial working class ‘vertical drinking’ venues and the exclusion of groups from niche venues has contributed to violent encounters between bouncers and those excluded (Hall and Winlow, 2005, Graham and Homel, 2008). The highest rates of violence have occurred at the entrances to licensed venues among those who have been refused entry or ejected from venues (Fitzgerald et al., 2010). With a neoliberal preoccupation with consumption, spending and leisure, the night-time economy exhibits a ‘... process of social cleansing ...commercial homogenisation and purification...’ by the gentrification of venues (Hadfield, 2006: 132). The lack of access based on geographical location and social capital contributes to nightlife violence (Hall and Winlow, 2005, Tomsen, 2011).

The emotion-charged atmosphere and uncertain ‘edginess’ of the night-time economy around crowded venues, milling streets and chaotic noise is part of the appeal for revellers (Hadfield, 2013). By locating late-night venues together in entertainment precincts, owners and agents are able to enhance profits. However, this introduced the practice of ‘... ‘circuit drinking’ ... with patrons progressing from venue to venue in the course of a night out’ (Hadfield, 2013: 130). This inevitably results in more people on
the streets moving between different venues as the night progresses, and it increases the potential for possible violence. Critically, the planning and expansion of entertainment precincts has been under-regulated, with a focus on generating economic gain while a ‘...market-led liberalization of the retailing of alcohol continued unabated’ (Hayward and Hobbs, 2007: 439). The rise of the media-driven discourse of the ‘binge drinker’ and the alcohol-fuelled violence that led to this term is a political ruse by governments to draw attention away from the root cause, the under-regulation of the expansion of the night-time economy (Hayward and Hobbs, 2007).

Consequently, the political focus for intervention has inevitably fallen on those who work in and frequent the night-time economy (Hayward and Hobbs, 2007), namely party-goers, bouncers and bar staff. There are no conclusive research findings about the root causes of such violence because it occurs within a complex mix of social, spatial, environmental and geographical factors (Cozens and Grieve, 2011). What is clearly evident is the plethora of interests held by corporate institutions and government bodies (Hayward and Hobbs, 2007). A contributing factor to violence in the night-time economy is a substantial relaxation of social expectations of behaviour, or as Hall and Winlow proposed, a ‘...breakdown of the pseudo-pacification process’ (2005: 376).

The marketing allure of alcohol consumption and the normalisation of party drugs as a path to altered cognitive states and liminal release have compounded this behaviour (Measham and Brain, 2005). Regular users of the night-time economy usually manage to negotiate the chaos and avoid physical hostility (Tomsen, 2005, 2011, Hadfield, 2006) and it is only a small percentage of patrons who partake in alcohol-fuelled violence (Winlow, 2010), traditionally young males between the ages of 18 and 25 years (Morgan and McAtamney, 2009).

2.7. Private Security and Contemporary Times

Public scandals involving bouncers in Australia resulted in an overhaul of some State and Territory policies, legislation and regulation and training in the private security industry in 2005 (Prenzler et al., 2007/8). A similar occurrence preceded the 2003

---

8 The discussions relating to the night-time economy, under-regulation and binge drinking is a complex social/political issue and is well beyond the limits of this thesis. See Hobbs et al (2005) or Chatterton (2002) for a further discussion around the factors that have led to this situation.
overhaul of legislation in the United Kingdom (Hobbs et al., 2003). However, it could be argued that in Australia, the precursor to this legislative change was the highly publicised death of the former Australian cricket captain, David Hookes, in 2004 at the hands of a young male bouncer. Hookes had been out celebrating with a group of friends and cricketers and became involved in an altercation with a 21 year old bouncer, Zdravko Micevic, outside a well-known Melbourne hotel. Hookes fell backwards, hit his head on the pavement and later died from his injuries. Consequently, Hookes was hailed a national hero by the news media while the bouncer, Micevic, was vilified and demonised (Wadds, 2010). The coverage of this event was unprecedented, making headlines around the world and bringing the Australian security industry under close political scrutiny.

The subsequent changes to State and Territory legislation and regulation resulted in a tougher stance towards private security licenses. For example, in Queensland, bouncers must now undergo a criminal history check before being licenced (Office of Fair Trading, 2014). Since 1 July 2011, they have also been required to undergo mandatory fingerprinting as part of the licensing requirements (Office of Fair Trading, 2011). These changes brought Queensland into line with other States and Territories as part of federal action to align legislation under a national standard (Office of Fair Trading, 2011). The legislative changes in the Security Providers Act 1993 (Qld) were designed to eliminate the criminal element formerly identified as infiltrating the private security industry (Australian Crime Commission, 2013). National enquires in 2012 (Independent Commission Against Corruption, 2012) and 2013 demonstrated the political pressure applied by State and Federal governments to the private security industry.

In Queensland in 2000⁹, there were approximately 32,000 people employed in the private security industry with 1,714 private security firms operating state wide (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2000). Fourteen years later, we can only assume that this number has increased. The private security industry in Australia is growing faster than the police service, with estimates in 2006 of a 41% growth in licenses (Prenzler et al., 2007/8). However, the ABS statistics only count the principal occupation and because many bouncers work part-time, security is their secondary occupation, which

---

⁹ No updated statistics were available on the private security industry on the Australian Bureau of Statistics website. The reasons for this are unknown.
may skew the statistics considerably (Prenzler et al., 2007/8). Unfortunately, governance structures and legislation concerning private security, and State and Territory legal frameworks to support private security operators, have not kept pace with the growth in the industry (Sarre, 2010). Bouncers especially are not protected by legislation relating to their use of force or restraint and removal of patrons from venues.

Bouncers operate under the guise of ‘agent’ for venue owners and are entitled to remove people under a common law right of trespass (Sarre, 2010). Bouncers have no formal powers and no formal protection from legislation in the conduct of their duties. This is a situation that is perceivably ludicrous by any standards, or as Sarre rightly stated

\[\text{the legal rights and powers of private security providers are determined by little more than a piecemeal array of common law principles, practical assumptions and ad hoc legislation that was designed principally for property owners and private citizens. The powers and immunities of private security personnel are thus unclear, inconsistent, change from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and differ markedly from those of the public police. (2010: 45)}\]

With no legal powers and no legal protection in a court of law, bouncers perceivably operate on the narrowest of legislative margins while conducting business. In the State of Queensland, use of ‘reasonable force’ is permitted under the *Criminal Code Act 1899 (Qld)*, (S 277, 1–3), but the onus is on bouncers to prove their actions were justified. ‘Force that is reasonable’ is permitted providing the person (bouncer) does not cause grievous bodily harm to another person (*Criminal Code Act 1899, Qld*: 167–168).

Police operate under a number of laws including the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 (Qld)*, but no such legislative frameworks exist for private security workers. The only guidelines are contained in the *Private Security Act 1993 (Qld)*, which outlines the roles of security officers and the licenses and training they require, but does not specify the use of powers of removal, restraint or arrest. Police have the protection of the state when undertaking their duties, bound up in their extensive governance structures and legal parameters, yet bouncers are left to defend themselves against litigation (Sarre, 2010). This is exacerbated by bouncers’ lack of statutory authority, with patrons often ignoring bouncer instructions while police are (usually) obeyed. This tenuous position contributes to the ‘watch your back’ attitude of bouncers and their
strong occupational solidarity. However, political pressures on the private security industry have been responsible for substantial changes to it over the past decade (Prenzler et al., 2007/8), mostly because of bouncers being involved in violence, and this has been a focus of negative media attention (Wadds, 2010).

Because of these political pressures on the private security industry, it is important to outline the political arena in Australia. All States and Territories in Australia operate under a neoliberal governance model, and are presided over by three levels of government. However the new public management approach (Gahan, 2007) taken under a capitalist neoliberal form of governance has profoundly affected not only the ways the levels of government and government institutions such as the police operate, but also the private sector including private security personnel and bouncers in particular.

Each State or Territory operates under three tiers of government in Australia; that is, federal, state and local government. Each level of government operates within a jurisdiction and defines the boundaries of operations and capabilities within the specific State or Territory. Giddens states ‘[t]he modern world has been shaped through the intersection of capitalism, industrialism and the nation-state system’ (1985: 5). Within this system, Giddens believes the phenomenon of the *dialectic of control* exists in social systems (1985: 11). Although this has been argued to be a critical and unbalanced view (Whittington, 1992), the notion of ‘power from above’ in constraining and directing social action is instrumental in defining the scope and ability of social actors to negotiate the capitalist system. Put simply, this translates to the ability of an individual to operate within a social system that is powered by ‘control from above’ under three levels of governance, while still holding the ability to operate autonomously. In relation to bouncers, this ability to operate under ‘power from above’ will be explored in this thesis.

The notion of ‘power from above’ relates to the ability of the social actor to manage their social and occupational roles under three levels of governmental control or power as well as within institutionalised confines. Fowler (2013) loosely proposed a conceptual ladder of social power, where those with less power sit at the bottom of the ladder and those with the most social power sit at the top, with all others in between. Consequently, the closer to the bottom of the ladder one is socially, the more power is exerted over them from above. The ability of social actors to manage their personal,
social and occupational roles under the pressures exerted from above are instrumental in defining the parameters within which those actors live, behave and exist in our society. However, the lower on the social ladder of power a social actor is situated, the less ‘flex’ they have in controlling their own lives or occupational roles. Social power, as defined by van Dijk (1996a) is heavily implicated in forming the parameters under which bouncers conduct their business. Legislation, regulation, rules of the security firm for which they work and the venue in which they work, as well as police and liquor licensing rules, constrain and shape what bouncers are or are not allowed to do. This is a crucial point in the discussion around bouncers and their occupational roles.

Therefore, positioning the private security industry within a particular State or Territory, within three tiers of government control and within the local political and economic climate is paramount in defining the parameters for social action. The capitalist nature of private security drives the security industry and this brings with it its own challenges and constraints. As a service provider industry, the private security industry is driven by consumer demand and supply and is dominated by those that use their services. That is, bouncers are hired by the security firms that employ them and are then outsourced to licensed premises through contracts between security firms and licensed premises. Security is a business that is conducted for financial gain both by bouncers and the security firms that employ them. The security industry is highly competitive and contracts with licensed premises are hard fought and driven by capitalist gain. However, the provision and direction of neoliberalist governance in the industry has been substantially influenced and directed by State and Federal government policies and global economic discourse.

### 2.8. Neoliberal Governance in Australia

The concept of globalisation is a contested one (Bislev, 2004). However, the demise of the Beveridge-type welfare system in favour of the new public management approach has substantially affected the roles of the state and of private security. The new public management approach saw an outsourcing of services from the public sector to the private sector (Gahan, 2007). The political move from government rule to ‘governance’ and from ‘welfare provider to service provider’ (Bislev, 2004: 286) was heralded by the
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10 The Beveridge-type welfare system proposed the state was financially responsible for the welfare of its citizens, especially children and the elderly, single mothers and the disadvantaged.
proposed impact of the globalised market economy. The neoliberalist approach to
governance included free market ideologies and international corporate investment that
resulted in an explosion of businesses in the night-time economy (Hobbs et al., 2003,
Tomsen, 2011). The rapid expansion of the night-time economy across Western cities
resulted in ‘... accelerating cycles of inner urban gentrification alongside decay and
marginalisation of specific locales’ (Tomsen, 2011: 155, Hobbs et al., 2003).

The post-industrial ad hoc development of cities around the gentrification of the night-
time economy led to exclusion zones, localised recessions and economic and social
disruption (Hall and Winlow, 2005: 379). The move from a production industry to a
consumerist industry had the unintended consequences of further marginalising the
lower end of the traditional working class by eroding the ‘... traditional male’s
predominance in politics, culture and the labour market’ (Hall, 2005: 36). The
subsequent conflicts of interest between crime control, law and order on one hand, and
the corporate driven investment in the booming night-time economy on the other has
created a crisis for government and policing (Hall and Winlow, 2005, Tomsen, 2011).
The boundless encouragement of neoliberal consumption and the attraction of young
people with disposal income to city centres (Hall, 2002, Tomsen, 2011) have led to a
seemingly political moral panic concerning alcohol-induced violence and disorder in the
night-time economy.

The neoliberalist notion of governance and new public management protocols based on
managerial processes of cost outputs and resource management have had profound
implications for policing, with a move from enforcement to policing under
managerialism (Bislev, 2004). Often called the ‘new penology’, this approach to crime
and crime prevention is based on managerial processes and economic gain (Bislev,
2004). Managerialism is based on economic inputs and outputs where operations are
defined and driven by fiscal costs and structures are arranged due to economic viability
(Munice, 2006). Managerialism is based on ‘... audit, market testing, performance
targets, productivity remits [and] cost-effectiveness’ (Munice, 2006: 8). The new
management of policing has resulted in fewer police walking the beat, a reliance on
community partnerships and citizen participation through media discourses and a boom
in the private security industry (Bislev, 2004, Tomsen, 2011). With topics such as social
inequality and economic development argued not to be legitimate matters of
government, crime prevention and continuing issues of alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy are firmly within the focus of the political firing range (Bislev, 2004).

The neoliberal concept of governance is demonstrated by the growing private security industry. The notion of governance, from a managerial perspective, emphasises the outsourcing of services by governments and the reliance on other organisations, both public and private, to fill the void of a ‘retreating state’ (Peeters, 2013: 2). However, the political concept of governance proposes that the state should rely on individual social actors to conform to state interventions, or as Peeters states, governance is a ‘…subtle way of “stepping into” society and managing citizen behaviour’ (2013: 3). Therefore, political governance is seen as a form of social control or intervention whereby citizens are cajoled or punished to conform to political ideals through voluntary compliance (Peeters, 2013). The managerial concept of governance has seen a steep rise in the outsourcing of private security with a resulting increase in private security in the night-time economy.

In America (Bislev, 2004), the United Kingdom (Hobbs et al., 2005) and Australia (Prenzler et al., 2007/8) private security officers outnumber police by up to five to one, and it is the private security industry that bears the brunt of responsibility for policing nightclubs and pubs in the night-time economy. For example, in Queensland, the political climate changed when the Liberal–National coalition replaced the Australian Labor Party as the State government in 2011 and Federal government in 2013. The focus shifted towards a hard-line approach to alcohol-related violence and disorder. The unfortunate deaths of two young men in Sydney, New South Wales in 2013, following ‘king hits’ in late-night entertainment precincts also cast a shadow over the security industry. Although no security personnel were involved in the incidents, the resulting media outcry led to the calls for governments to ‘do something’. The moral panic created by these adverse and continuing media claims of out-of-control drunken young people, usually men, in the night-time economy (Chatterton, 2002, Roberts, 2006) has resulted in political manoeuvring to ‘clean it up’ and once again the alcohol culture of Australians has been bought into question.
2.9. Conclusion

This chapter contextualised the growing trend in alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy in contemporary Australia. Unlike mainstream attitudes to understanding alcohol-related violence, this thesis positions the issue within the theoretical perspective of the sociological imagination. In rejecting the isolated, individualised perspective of alcohol-related violence, this thesis draws upon the wider influences of economic, political and social structures and practices and allows for a more inclusive exploration and understanding of the topic. Sociocultural influences such as masculinity and femininity are also implicated in this discussion because social histories influence contemporary behaviours and social practices. The current political philosophy of neoliberal governance also affects the private security industry and has a constraining effect on organisations and institutions within the night-time economy. Combined with the post-industrial era of a consumer society and the corresponding expansion in the night-time economy, the capitalist nature of the night-time economy appears to be at odds with the current political punitive approach to alcohol-related violence.

Neoliberal governance has also led to the implementation of managerialism which has resulted in a change in policing. The ‘retreating state’ has left a void that has resulted in private organisations stepping in and a stronger focus on citizen participation and responsibility. Consequently, there is now a reliance on bouncers to ‘police’ the night-time economy and for citizens to take responsibility for their actions or behaviours with political pressures exerted through changing legislation and regulation to support the move. The consequence of this form of governance has resulted in more attention being placed on bouncers’ and patron’s behaviours in the night-time economy. The moral panic over alcohol-related violence and bouncer violence is evidence of the strong public and political focus on these social issues, confirmed by continuing governmental policies to support the political ‘push’. Inevitably, the focus traditionally falls on the police and bouncers or those responsible for ‘policing’ the night-time economy.
Chapter 3
Methodology and Theoretical Perspectives

Theoretical underpinnings in the social sciences are essential for the successful and effective building of research methodologies and for directing meticulous, empirically-based outcomes (Donnelly and Briscoe, 2005, Månsdotter et al., 2007). ‘[A] ... theory is an organised, coherent, and systematic articulation of a set of issues that are communicated as a meaningful whole’ (Reeves et al., 2008: 6). Theoretical frameworks are a conceptual tool that enable researchers to decipher the complexities of designated social realities through methodological designs and practices (Reeves et al., 2008: 6; Willis et al., 2007). One of the great classical social theorists, Max Weber (1864–1920), proposed using both an objective and subjective approach to understanding social phenomena. He claimed that objective, empirically based ‘truths’ were subject to historical erosion and individual value-laden judgements (Turner and Factor, 1994: 30). Weber also believed that clear understandings of social phenomena cannot be empirically credible without the subjective experience of the ‘self-interested’ individual (Turner and Factor, 1994: 30). The profound intricacies of social phenomena have led some researchers to move away from a strictly positivist approach to embrace qualitative research (Curry et al., 2009). The use of qualitative methods is designed to gain insights into the causal mechanisms that influence complex social interactions and their outcomes (Curry et al., 2009: 1443).

Working within these parameters, the theories chosen for this research reflect the need to include the subjective experience of the self-interested individual when exploring the social world of bouncers and their work. Three distinct methods of analysis are undertaken: a sociocultural and socio-cognitive analysis of bouncers and their work through the inclusion of nine theoretical perspectives (Chapters 4 and 5), a categorical qualitative NVivo analysis of 80 news reports (Chapter 6), and a ‘deep’ qualitative manual analysis of 10 news reports (Chapter 7). This chapter introduces discourse analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and describes the qualitative analytic
methods used in the thesis. The chapter includes a discussion on stereotypes, categorisation, ideology and social power, and news reports as discourse. This is followed by a discussion on the ‘outrage’ industry, gonzo rhetoric and the reading public. The second part of the chapter includes the methodology in detail, describing the data methodologies and methods of analysis and briefly introducing the theories used in the research. The chapter begins with an overview of discourse analysis.

3.1 Discourse Analysis – An overview

Discourse analysis evolved from linguistics as a method of analysing talk and text. Language is intrinsically bound to the social fabric of people’s everyday lives and is the vehicle for learning, understanding, interacting and ‘being’ in the world. Language forms such as speaking (talk), writing and reading (text) are the fundamental symbolic processes for communication and building relationships and contribute to the structures of social culture within organisations and institutions (Burke and Stets, 2009, Gee, 2011). Language in all forms is part of social practices and ideological power structures and it contributes to building and maintaining divisions of labour, hegemonic control and White Westernised middle class sentimentalities. Discourse analysis was primarily developed through sociolinguistics to define meaning and correlations between grammatical or linguistic structures in talk and text as they related to the social world (Gee, 2011).

Discourse as a theoretical concept takes on two conceptual meanings in discourse analysis. Discourse as an abstract noun relates to different patterns of talk or text within specific social domains (Fairclough, 2004). Discourse as a count noun refers to a collective of differing discourses that make up the rules and norms of specific processes and practices within the social world (Fairclough, 2004). Discourses are generated through social actors’ relationships with the self and others, and the different domains they encounter in their daily lives, including family, friends, work and leisure (Abrams and Hogg, 2006). Different discourses project and promote specific ways of ‘doing’ and ‘being’, such as occupational roles, and are related to the relative position of the social actor. That is, discourses depend on social class, status or position, gender, personal and social identities and the way the social actor relates to others within the social realm (Fairclough, 2004, Burke and Stets, 2009).
Discourses, as generated by different views and ways of ‘doing’, are representative of the different relationships between social actors, social groups and social structures. Different social structures, processes, practices and identities are generated, maintained or transformed through discourses of talk and text (Fairclough, 2004, Abrams and Hogg, 2006). That is, social actors are not passive entities within their social world, but actively engage and interact within social domains, because ‘[h]uman beings are not built in silence, but in work, in action and reflection’ (Easley, 2002: 11). Through this active process of action and interaction, by the use of language forms, symbols and images, social actors construct their realities of the world. Social realities may be real or imagined but are actively produced and reproduced through semiotic systems of discourses (Fairclough, 2004) and are influenced by the sociocultural histories of social groups and societies.

3.1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) acknowledges the sociocultural and historical nature of discourse and the resulting social constructions of social realities (Loche, 2004). Realities are consequently seen as textually and intertextually contrived by semiotic systems that are inculcated and contested in the discourse (Loche, 2004: 11). Discourses are therefore a production and enactment of social histories and current ways of ‘being’ and ‘doing’. Central to the constructions of discourse are social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and meaning (Fairclough, 2004). CDA is socio-political in approach because it seeks to capture the dynamics of the social, political and economic forces produced in talk and text (van Dijk, 1991, Fairclough, 2004). That is, CDA seeks to uncover the wider forces at work behind what is embedded within talk and text, thereby linking micro-level talk and text to the macro-level of society structures.

CDA involves the order of discourse or ‘... networks of social practices’ (Fairclough, 2004: 33). Orders of discourse are the particular ways semiotic systems are actively constructed and used in a particular manner for a particular purpose. Orders of discourse are the culmination or the collective of the discourse types (discourse, genres and styles) that are used within a particular social setting or organisation. The order of discourse is ‘... the social organisation and control of linguistic variation’ (Fairclough, 2004: 33) or the selective ordering and manipulative use of semiotic variables. Semiotic systems
include social structure or the use of language, signs and symbols; social practices or the orders of discourse; and social events, defined as talk and text (Fairclough, 2004: 33). Orders of discourse may be socially inclusive or exclusionary depending on the discourse, styles and genres selected.

3.1.2 Social Structures in Discourse Analysis

Social structures in discourse analysis are not seen as concrete entities but as abstractions relating to the social. The notion of social structure was developed in an endeavour to combine theories of human action and institutional operation, with a view to explaining the reciprocal interactions and influences exerted between individuals and institutions (Cook and Whitmeyer, 1992). Social structure in discourse proposes that, although people may be influenced and directed by social structure, this structure is also influenced and directed by human actions (Burke and Stets, 2009). Social structures are governed by cultural schemas, or rules and procedures that are fundamentally unconscious (such as rules of normative behaviour) and generalisable to any given situation, which enables human activity to adapt to any problems or difficulties they may encounter (Sewell Jr, 1992). Social structures are also influenced by access to resources that initiate or inhibit the ability of individuals and organisations to transform their position within society (Burke and Stets, 2009).

3.1.3 Social Practices

Social practices involve the ordering of different activities and routinely normalised behaviours that define a particular social event. For example, the social practice of attending a lecture at university follows a particular script of behavioural expectation, such as that the lecture is held in a room arranged in a particular manner. Social practices are therefore not only based on language, but include a range of social practices, non-discoursal elements and behaviours that define a social event, including the use of space, rules of politeness and etiquette, social relations and personal beliefs (Fairclough, 2004). Social events are the culmination or production of talk and text generated by collectives of social procedures and practices. Discourse as social practice involves three main types, ‘...genres [or] ways of acting, discourses [or] ways of representing and styles [or] ways of being’ (Fairclough, 2004: 35). Genres are the
specific ways talk or texts interact to form a particular type of social practice. For example, news reports are a specific type of genre.

3.1.4 Genres in Discourse Analysis

Genres are inherently social in production and are formed and transformed through social practices and social production. Genres are particular processes and practices that are produced and reproduced through social action based on normative rules and procedures. Genre chains are different types of practical genres that are uniformly linked and used to transform social practices of one type or another (Fairclough, 2004). For example, journalists may use a combination of texts to produce a news report, such as reports, interviews, speeches or other news articles (van Dijk, 1985). Although the source material may be diverse, there are systematic relations between the sources and they are reproduced in a uniformly predictable manner as a consistently structured news article (Fairclough, 2004). However, journalists direct and manage the grammatical choices in the discourse and this is an important consideration in CDA (van Leeuwen, 2008).

Genre chains, or combinations of different genres, are important for transforming social practices and implementing social change (Fairclough, 2004). Genre chains are also a crucial tool for ‘action at a distance’, or regulating social practices from the local to regional, national and even global arenas (Fairclough, 2004). Genre chains as ‘action at a distance’ are used by the mass media as ‘... part of the apparatus of governance’ or as a means of connecting institutions to governance and hence the control of society (Fairclough, 2004: 41). Genres of governance are a specific form of recontextualisation, where genres of one social practice are imbued into another and thus transformed in the process (Fairclough, 2004). Through recontextualisation, new genres are formed and are produced in talk and text that ultimately affect social practices and, importantly, social actors’ everyday lives. Genres of governance are therefore influential in ways of ‘... doing things ... [as opposed to] ... the ways things are done’ (Fairclough, 2004: 41).

3.1.5 Discourses

Discourses, as ways of ‘doing’ and ways of ‘being’, are therefore implicated in the transformation of social life through genres of social practice and genres of governance. Through recontextualisation, discourses are inherently changed, and they are produced
and reproduced through social practices that consequently transform other social practices (Fairclough, 2004). That is, changes in the genre of a social practice will be transported and used by the social actor in other social practices. Therefore, discourses figure prominently in the formation and transformation of organisational identity and individual social identity. This includes the ‘style’ or physical presentation of the self through ways of acting, speaking, body language and presentation, such as modes of dress, styles of hair and personal presentation.

3.2 Critical Discourse Analysis – An Overview

CDA as a theoretical perspective and a methodology grew out of the study of linguistics. In the 1970s, there was recognition that the relationship between the structures and use of talk and text was directly related to power structures and social action (Wodak, 2002). Critical linguistics, as it came to be known, was based on Halliday’s model of systemic functional linguistics but evolved to include ideology in discourse and the role ideologies play in social action (van Dijk, 1993, Wodak, 2002). The ability to locate the macro-structures of society and power relations within the micro-structures of talk and text is central to the development of CDA. However, the aims of CDA are centred on the ability ‘... to provide a critical dimension in its theoretical and descriptive accounts of texts’ (Kress, 1990: 84, emphasis in original). In the 1990s, critical linguistics moved beyond linguistic analysis and became known as CDA (Kress, 1990, Wodak, 2002).

CDA provided a framework of enquiry that moved beyond the structure of talk or text. Unashamedly sociopolitical in its foundations, CDA is ‘... nonetheless properly scientific, perhaps all the more so for being aware of its own political, ideological, and ethical stance’ (Kress, 1990: 85). Halliday proposed that language served three interconnected metafunctions, namely ideational, interpersonal and textual functions (cited in Loche, 2004: 54). The ideational function was divided into experiential (social actors forming meaning through experiences) and logical, where relationships between processes form the basis of understanding because of the positioning in the text (Loche, 2004: 54). The interpersonal function ‘... defines the process of social interaction which is occurring’ and textual function is ‘... the interplay and relationship of linguistic elements which gives a text its coherence’ (Loche, 2004: 54).
Fairclough (2004) divided the interpersonal function into identity and relational functions. He proposed that the identity function contained the social construction of self and social identity, and the relational function involved the ways social relationships between social actors were created and maintained (Loche, 2004). Kress (1990) proposed a list of theoretical foundations that characterised CDA, and Fairclough and Wodak developed this in 1997 to form the 10 basic principles of CDA (Wodak, 2002: 13), outlined in Table 2. Underpinning the principles is the implicit understanding that talk and text are fundamentally a social practice, along with social representations such as symbols, signs, images and bodily gestures etc., or semiotic systems (Kress, 1990).

Table 2: Ten basic principles of Critical Discourse Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>The theory integrates perspectives from other disciplines because problems are too complex to be studied from a single perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problem-oriented</td>
<td>The approach is directed at social problems such as racism, identity and social change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eclectic theory and methodology</td>
<td>Theories and methods are integrated to enable an adequate understanding of the topic under investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fieldwork and ethnography</td>
<td>Uses a ‘study from the inside’ approach and both bottom-up and top-down approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adductive</td>
<td>Involves a constant movement back and forth between theory and data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Multiple genres, intertextual and interdiscursive relations</td>
<td>Recontextualisation is the most important process in connecting genres, and topics and arguments. Deals with hybrid and innovative genres and notions of ‘time’ ‘identity’ and ‘space’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Historical context</td>
<td>Is always analysed and integrated into the interpretation of discourse and texts. Notion of ‘change’ has become inherent in the study of text and discourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Categories and tools</td>
<td>The analysis is defined in accordance with the steps and procedures and the program under investigation. Different approaches use different grammatical theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grand theories/middle-range theories</td>
<td>Grand theories may form the foundation, but middle-range theories are used for the problem-oriented approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Practice and application</td>
<td>Is aimed at changing certain discursive and social practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

van Dijk argued that CDA specifically focuses on social groups and social issues, not the individual social actor, because the central purpose of CDA is to expose ‘... relations of power, dominance and inequality and the ways these are reproduced or resisted by social group members through text and talk’ (1995: 18, emphasis in original). Consequently, CDA is interested in the ideological grounding of social processes and practices that serve to sustain or challenge social inequalities or dominance (van Dijk, 1995a). van Dijk concluded that:

> amongst the descriptive, explanatory and practical aims of CDA studies is the attempt to uncover, reveal or disclose what is implicit, hidden or otherwise not immediately obvious in relations of discursively enacted dominance or their underlying ideologies. That is, CDA specifically focuses on the strategies of manipulation, legitimation, the manufacture of consent and other discursive ways to influence the minds (and indirectly the actions) of people in the interest of the powerful. (1995: 18, emphasis in original)

CDA does not subscribe to any particular discoursal theory because its primary purpose is to unpack the power relations at play that are embedded within the discourse of talk and text (van Dijk, 1993). However, CDA is based on sound theoretical frameworks of practice and application, for only through complex theoretical frameworks are social problems able to be exposed (van Dijk, 1993: 252). CDA seeks to expose the underlying causal factors that contribute to and sustain social problems. Specifically, CDA takes a multidisciplinary approach to explain the complexities of relationships between talk and text and the wider social, political and cultural forces at work in the discourse (van Dijk, 1993). As a result, CDA may involve the inclusion of multiple theoretical perspectives that are necessary to assess the social issue under examination.

The social issue under assessment may require different analytic methods and empirical procedures to tease out the relevant social and power structures at play within the discourse. The CDA perspective being used for this research is based on the work of Teun van Dijk. He has written extensively about the role of discourse in the news media (1985, 1996b, 2012) and the role of power and ideology in discursive practices such as racism and discrimination (1995b, 1995c, 1996a, 2000a, 2006a, 2006b). van Dijk saw CDA as ‘... focusing on the role of discourse in the (re)production of challenge of dominance’ (1993: 249, emphasis in original). Furthermore, van Dijk (2013) claimed
that CDA was not a method, but an ‘attitude of doing’ that was socially and politically committed to research. Therefore, the theoretical perspectives and analysis used in this thesis are constructed around the issue of bouncers involved in violence and all the aspects that influence this social issue.

3.3 Linguistics, Categorisation and Stereotypes

Language is the semiotic system by which human experiences, knowledge and events are formed, produced and reproduced. Linguistics is primarily an ‘... object of categorisation’ (Taylor, 2003: 13). Categorisation enables the social actor to process cognitively large amounts of information and classify that information into specific categories based on knowledge, information and experience (Taylor, 2003, Abrams and Hogg, 2006). Social actors also use categorisation to classify and interpret other people. People are placed according to categories of social belonging, such as prestige vs. non-prestige, and this process serves ‘... practical applications within social activity’ (Meadows, 2007: 4). Such categorisation is implicit in the manipulation of polarised attitudes into ‘us’ and ‘them’ categories and is often based on stereotypical beliefs (Leudar et al., 2004, Abrams and Hogg, 2006, Meadows, 2007). Fowler argued that stereotypes form the basis of ideological processes (1991: 95).

Political elites use language to define and classify social groups based on exaggerated dichotomies and often erroneous classifications (Meadows, 2007), such as describing immigrants as ‘terrorists’ or ‘threats’ to civil society (van Leeuwen, 2008). Hence, language plays a crucial role in political discourse by producing and reproducing discrimination and racism through polarised categorisation of social groups. Through appropriation of the Other, or the use of language to perpetuate polarised attitudes and beliefs, social groups are stigmatised and stereotypes are reinforced through political rhetoric and discourse (Meadows, 2007, also see Abrams and Hogg, 2006). The use of metaphors and metonyms are important components in language discourse for creating polarised views of ‘us’ and ‘them’, or attitudes and beliefs about the Other.

3.3.1 Metaphor in Discourse

Linguistic studies have proposed that social actors’ conceptual systems are fundamentally metaphorical, and that ‘[t]he essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 13–14,
emphasis in original). These authors argued that metaphorical language concepts underpin and primarily organise our socio-cognitive thinking and understanding. The analogy ARGUMENT IS WAR was used to show that terminologies of war, such as ‘defend’, ‘shot down’, ‘target’ and ‘won’ pervade both our language and our cognitive understanding of what an argument entails (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 13).

Metaphorical concepts are therefore closely aligned with metaphorical expression within language and cognitive scripts and frames\(^\text{11}\) in systematic and conceptually intuitive ways (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).

... metaphorical concepts can be extended beyond the range of ordinary literal ways of thinking and talking into the range of what is called figurative, poetic, colourful, or fanciful thought and language. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 22)

Use of metaphor and metonymy is closely associated with cultural knowledge and experience, and the beliefs and values imbued by society or subcultures within that society (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, Taylor, 2003). For example, there are subcultures whose beliefs and values may be at odds with mainstream society. However their ‘... value system is both internally coherent ... and coherent with the major orientational metaphors of the main culture’ (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 33). Therefore, fundamental understanding exists in sociocultural beliefs that are founded in metaphoric language and linguistic categorisation.

Political discourse is laden with metaphorical concepts designed, on one hand, to produce social solidarity and, on the other hand, to marginalise or Other particular social groups. Metaphorical concepts are used within political discourse to establish common ground knowledge and shared social beliefs (Meadows, 2007). Metonymic strategies enable the categorisation of social groups into a common category, based on its referring function (Taylor, 2003, van Leewen, 2008). Common metonymic examples in news reports include ‘enemy’, ‘foe’, ‘terrorist’ etc., where specific categories of people are described in broader (normally derogatory) terms based on selective criteria. This discursive strategy is designed to create political solidarity between parties and the

\(^{11}\) Frames or ‘global’ patterns of commonsense knowledge, as described by Taylor (2003: 168), are the same as Van Dijk’s (1985) ‘common ground’ knowledge.
public, and to establish shared cultural beliefs or common ground knowledge, including stereotypes (van Dijk, 1985, Meadows, 2007).

Synecdoche, a subcategory of metonym, is often used in news reports and discourse. The name of an institution may be used instead of an actual person or social group, such as referring to the government rather than a particular minister or political party (Taylor, 2003). Metonyms (and synecdoche) are among the most basic ‘... processes for meaning extension ... [as it allows for] ... the possibility of establishing connections between entities which co-occur within a given conceptual frame’ (Taylor, 2003: 405). Cognitively, this allows for polysemous or flexible meaning use in relation to linguistic constructs. Taylor proposed that linguistic diversity was enabled through contextually modulated meaning that was socioculturally acknowledged and understood as ‘taken for granted’ knowledge (2003: 410). Therefore, metaphoric and metonymic concepts are strongly influenced by sociocultural experiential knowledge and are produced and reproduced through talk and text.

3.3.2 Stereotypes in Discourse

Stereotypes are cognitive schemas are based on mental abstractions about social groups or their members (Hilton and von Hippel, 1996). Stereotypes are fundamental attributes assigned to out-groups, and are transmitted and maintained through ‘... subtle and systematic linguistic biases’ (Wigboldus et al., 2000: 5). Stereotypes are a form of cognitive categorisation that enable social actors to classify other people based on particular qualities of a particular group, and are often widely shared in society (Abrams and Hogg, 2006). Stereotypes are ‘... communicated, transmitted and maintained between individuals ... [through] ... interpersonal processes’ that are fundamentally social in nature (Wigboldus et al., 2000: 5). However, cognitive processes such as self-perpetuating biases are primarily unconscious and may be reinforced even without substantiation (Hilton and von Hippel, 1996). Linguistic Intergroup Bias proposes that cognitive accounts of typical in-group behaviours are held in memory as abstract representations (Wigboldus et al., 2000). Abstract representations assign more importance to the characteristics of a person than to the situation or event, so undesirable behaviour by the in-group can be excused in favour of the person’s characteristics despite the representation of a situation.
Abstract representations also allow for generalisations of other social groups, as with out-group members. Consequently, this allows for behaviours by the in-group being viewed as desirable and behaviours by out-groups being perceived as undesirable (Wigboldus et al., 2000, Abrams and Hogg, 2006). Linguistic Expectancy Bias also contributes to stereotypical beliefs, with expectancy-consistent behaviour that is consistent with in-group activities maintained as a more abstract formation than behaviour that is expectancy-inconsistent (Wigboldus et al., 2000: 6). Under these circumstances, linguistic biases have been shown to function at an implicit level and are produced and reproduced through social interaction. The implicitness of linguistic biases occurs because of the higher levels of abstraction and the need for social actors to ‘fill in the gaps’ with their own perceptual inferences. The subtle abstract inferences conveyed though linguistic information and choices are communicated and transferred through social actors and contribute to the maintenance and reproduction of stereotypes.

3.4 Ideology and Power in Discourse

Ideology as a concept and a theoretical stance has been debated for many years. Although the concept of ideology has been theorised in sociological circles, van Dijk (1995a) proposed a specific understanding of ideology in relation to discursive practices and social relations. He described ideologies as the socio-cognitive belief systems that individual social actors hold within a specific social group. Ideologies are the knowledge, beliefs and values held by a social group that ‘... control intra-group action and cooperation, as well [as the] inter-group perceptions and interaction of group members’ (van Dijk, 2000a: 94, emphasis in original). Ideologies therefore define the social practices, beliefs and generalised norms of a specific social group, and are learned through social interaction. Importantly, van Dijk proposed that internal structures were the crucial element within group ideologies, stating that socio-cognitive theory stressed the role of polarised attitudes or schemas, or the ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude to in- and out-groups (2000a: 94). The interface between group ideologies, social practices and talk and text was mediated by socio-cognitive mental models or schemas (van Dijk, 2000a: 94).
3.4.1 Mental Models or Schemas

Mental models, scripts, or schemas are the biographical formation of cognitive knowledge held in semantic memory about specific events and experiences shared by a social group (van Dijk, 1985). The mental models are representations of group behaviour and shared language that contribute to ‘... instantiations of shared social representations’ (van Dijk, 2000a: 95 emphasis in original). Mental models established by episodic memory are based on personal experiences and are actively constructed and reconstructed through social experience and knowledge. Episodic memory also includes the communicative situations or events in which social actors participate, and actors’ corresponding use of talk and text (van Dijk, 1991). Episodic memory consequently includes the practical notion of context, which may also be ideologically based (van Dijk, 2000a). This then allows for the theorising of contextualisation. Semantic and episodic memories are mediated by cognitive scripts or schema retained in long-term memory. The interaction of social and personal scripts is outlined in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The intersection of semantic, episodic and long-term memory
(Modified from van Dijk, 1985)

Long-term memory acts as the ‘control system’ that mediates between personal and social scripts or schemas and contributes to the interpretation, storage and retrieval of information (van Dijk, 1985). Social cognition was proposed as the ‘missing link’ in discourse analysis theory in relation to ideologies and social dominance (van Dijk, 1993). The inclusion of socio-cognitive theory in CDA has allowed for the bridging of
discursive analysis at the micro-level (talk and text) to the macro-structural level of wider social processes and practices. Social cognitions link the mental beliefs, interpretations, actions and social practices of a particular social group to the ‘... socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups and relations’ (van Dijk, 1993: 257).

3.4.2 Social Cognitions

Social cognitions are the mediator ‘... between micro- and macro-levels of society ... between discourse and action ... and between the individual and the group’ (van Dijk, 1993: 257). Social cognitions underpin all social action, because they are based on sociocultural norms and rules that govern social practices, behaviour and (inter)action. Social cognitions produce social schemas or systems of beliefs that contribute to social practices and social behaviours (van Dijk, 1993). For example, the social schemas that men hold about women may contribute to sexist behaviours and attitudes. Such beliefs are defined as evaluative beliefs or attitudes that are shared by a particular social group (such as men) (van Dijk, 1985). Evaluative beliefs are the ‘... general norms and values that in turn underlie such beliefs and may be further organised in more complex, abstract or basic ideologies’, such as beliefs about abortion or nuclear arms (van Dijk, 1985: 258). Ideologies therefore are the primary values and beliefs that organise and sustain social groups.

3.4.3 Ideologies in Discourse

Ideologies are learned socially through talk and text, social interactions, and genres of discourses such as political debates. They have the specific purpose of coaching social actors and groups (van Dijk, 2000b). However, social knowledge is distinct from ideologies. Ideologies are founded on basic beliefs or attitudes whereas social knowledge includes the norms and rules that everyone in society implicitly knows and agrees upon. Social knowledge contains the unquestioned, undisputed facts of social practice and interaction. van Dijk called social knowledge common ground, the presupposed knowledge that is shared by a society (2000b: 9). Common ground knowledge and ideologies may cut across boundaries, and what was once an ideology may become common ground knowledge and vice versa. For example, the common ground knowledge that the earth was flat was superseded by the reality that the earth
was round. Similarly, ideological beliefs such as feminist ideology have become accepted in society as common ground knowledge (van Dijk, 2000b).

The discursive production of dominance or power is intractably linked to ideologies and sociocultural cognitions. Power or the production of dominance in discourse is related to group interests and group practices that are designed to legitimise dominance by one group over another. Thus, social power is described as:

... the control exercised by one group or organisation (of its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies. (van Dijk, 1996a: 84, emphasis in original)

Ideologies form the basis of dominant group interests and are produced and reproduced through access to resources, education, income, status and privilege, and discursive genres of practice that serve to legitimise the social power of the dominant group/s (van Dijk, 2000b). Ideologies contribute to the formation of ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ groups, or the legitimate ownership of resources, etc. by the dominant social group and the designation of less powerful social groups as the Other or undeserving. Dominance can be defined as the illegitimate control of other social groups through restricted access to resources and privilege and it results in social inequality (van Dijk, 1996a).

Social power or power abuse is often institutionalised in specific domains of society. The institutionalisation of social control enables a centralised form of control and is reproduced through discursive practices. Social control or social power abuse does not represent coercive use of force, but rather the more subtle manipulation of the minds of social actors through the powerful use of talk and text (van Dijk, 1996a). Social control is therefore maintained through the manipulation of knowledge, communication, ideologies, values and norms that serve to benefit the dominant group while excluding or restricting other social groups. One of the more important aspects of dominance is the control of access to communicative events and discourse (van Dijk, 1996a, Fairclough, 2004, Loche, 2004). Access (or lack of) to discourse is seen in all areas of social and political life. For example, only politicians have access to matters of Cabinet and only departmental managers have access to corporate reports. Access to the mass media is
one of the more powerful instruments of social control through communicative events (van Dijk, 1996a).

3.4.4 Manipulation in Discourse

The notion of ‘manipulation’ is crucial to CDA because it is implicated in social power abuse, domination of less powerful social groups and political ideologies (van Dijk, 2006b). Manipulation in CDA takes three forms, social, cognitive, and discursive, in a triangulated approach. Social manipulation is defined as ‘…illegitimate domination confirming social inequality’ (van Dijk, 2006b: 359). Cognitive manipulation is ‘…the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies’ (van Dijk, 2006b: 359). Discursive manipulation is defined as ‘…the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good things, and emphasizing Their bad things’ (van Dijk, 2006b: 359). What is fundamental to the concept of manipulation in CDA is the belief that the manipulator has the deliberate intention to use manipulation, especially to service dominant ideological beliefs and practices of the power elites, while those being manipulated are (mostly) unaware of it (van Dijk, 2006b).

Manipulation may be multimodal, involving photographs, advertising, cartoons, or news reports in newspapers, internet news, news broadcasts and movies or other media representations (van Leeuwen, 2005). Manipulation within CDA is inherently social because it involves the cognitive manipulation of the mental models of social actors within social groups through talk and text or visual representations (van Dijk, 2006b). Social manipulation occurs through the domination of one social group, institution or organisation over another and typically involves abuse of social power. This is enabled through access and control of resources, including the mass news media, and the ability to influence and change social cognitions (van Dijk, 1996a). Social cognition, or the common ground knowledge shared by sociocultural actors, is implicated in social manipulation, as opposed to personal cognitions. Moreover, the deliberate manipulation of topics and semantics is also part of the manipulation of social cognitions (van Dijk, 2006b). The ‘war on terror’ discourse that inundated political philosophies and the news media after the World Trade Centre attack on 11September 2001 demonstrated these strategies.
The purpose of such discourses is to differentiate ‘us’ as good, humane people, and ‘them’ as bad, terrorist, bloodthirsty Others, to justify political actions and reactions (Kellner, 2007: 624). Therefore, ‘terrorism’ is a political ideology that supports political values, programs and policies against the violent terrorist Other, but which also serves social functions (Halliday, 2013: 71). That is, ‘terrorism’ is an ‘… orchestrated public anxiety …’ that serves the political purpose of the accusers, but also functions to suppress public ‘… political dissent’ (Halliday, 2013: 71). The consequences of such manipulative political discourse were seen in the widespread public condemnation of the Muslim Other for the purposes of legitimating military spending, passing legislation and justifying military interventions, which arguably did not serve the best interests of citizens (van Dijk, 2006b: 370).

Manipulation is undertaken discursively through omitting important facts, distorting information or by delivering biased opinions and beliefs (van Dijk, 2006b). For example, certain elements of a news report may be made salient by the use of big bold lettering or graphic photographs, by placing elements of the reports at the start and relegating other information to the end, or by omitting information (van Dijk, 1991, van Dijk, 2006b). News reports may be explicit, pointing out the bad things about the social Other in graphic detail; or implicit, leaving out details that may harm the dominant in-group or ‘us’ (van Dijk, 1996b). The purpose of such discursive strategies is to influence the abstract mental models that people hold in long-term memory about communicative events (van Dijk, 2006b). Manipulative discourse aims to influence or control the shared social representations that people hold about social events and social groups, and in turn, this influences future behaviours and actions (van Dijk, 2006: 369).

3.5 News Reports as Discourse

News articles or communicative events involve the structured and standardised use of text in a particular discourse genre. Communicative events are mediated in that the content of information being disseminated to the reader is controlled, as in news reports. These involve a one-way, virtually anonymous social interaction where the reader is the recipient of what has been written. News reports follow distinctive rules of text use, discursive and social practices (van Dijk, 1985, van Dijk, 1996b, Teo, 2000, Fairclough, 2004). There is a standard pattern of textual presentation including a prominent headline and often with a lead introduction followed by the body of the report. The format is
relatively concise and orientates the reader to the most salient information first (headlines) followed by information from the most to the least important and concluding with a ‘wrap-up’ of the story (van Dijk, 1996b, Fairclough, 2004). This manner of representation is referred to as the inverted pyramid, where the most important or salient information is at the top and the least important is at the bottom of the article (Teo, 2000: 13).

The overall meaning derived from the text is classified as the superstructure. This forms the global schematic structure of the news report and includes headlines, lead, body and wrap-up (van Dijk, 1991: 46). The surface structure of text, or the most visually prominent feature, such as ‘screaming’ headlines, refers

... to the variable forms of expression at the level of phonological and graphical ‘realization’ of underlying syntactic, semantic, pragmatic or other abstract discourse structures. (van Dijk, 1996b: 23)

Surface structures may be abstract with no definitive meaning, but relay implicit meanings that are understood at the cognitive level. They may relay biased, racist or sexist connotations embedded within the graphical or syntactic structures of the news report (van Dijk, 1991, van Dijk, 1996b). Surface structures must ‘... [be] out of the ordinary and violate communicative rules or principles’ (van Dijk, 1996b: 23) such as the very large bold print used in headlines. Surface structures convey the importance of the subject and draw the reader’s attention and thoughts in a definite direction. Surface structures at the textual level also include syntactical ordering, word formation and style of discourse (van Dijk, 1991).

Surface structures are the ‘expressions’ of the underlying meaning or semantics of the text. They form the meaning of the discourse through the analysis of word ordering, sentence structure and lexical choice (van Dijk, 1991). Communicative events such as news reports typically include ‘speech acts’ of assertion (van Dijk, 1991: 45). That is, the function of news reports is to inform readers of what is supposedly unknown to them. Collectively, the superstructure, surface structure and speech acts form the style of the discourse. In news reports, this will typically follow a standardised structure, format and layout specific to the particular newspaper. The style of discourse is typically shaped by the audience for whom the newspaper is intended.
3.5.1 News Headlines

Headlines in news reports are designed to give the reader a snapshot of the entire report. They operate at readers’ cognitive level, orienting their thoughts in a specific direction. Van Dijk (1996b) and others (Teo, 2000, Fairclough, 2004) proposed that headlines may serve to bias the reader in a particular direction depending on the discursive use of text. For example, a headline that includes the word ‘riot’ may activate mental models in the mind of the reader of what constitutes a ‘riot’. However, if the headlines had used the word ‘disturbance’, this would have activated entirely different mental models of social knowledge in the reader’s mind (van Dijk, 1991: 51). The recalled information will then influence the reader’s interpretation of the news article. Thus, headlines serve an important function in the formation and reproduction of dominant ideologies, prejudicial biases and stereotypical beliefs.

Headlines often express the ideologies and values of the journalist or news organisation, and the ideological foundations of the text can only be discerned through critical analysis of the lexical, semantic and syntactic structures in the report (Teo, 2000: 14). News headlines are designed to catch readers’ attention and induce them to read the article, but they also influence the understanding readers gain from it (van Dijk, 1991). News headlines are carefully crafted to gain maximum impact from a minimum of information and may manipulate readers into biased or derogatory thinking, depending on the choice of text (van Dijk, 1995b, Teo, 2000). Headlines, as the most salient feature of the news report, are typically the component that readers remember, and hence they influence the ways in which readers remember and reproduce the information.

3.5.2 Syntactic Ordering in Discourse

Syntactic variations and ordering are central in the conveyance of particular ideologies and underlying semantic reasoning (Van Dijk, 1996b, Teo, 2000, Fairclough, 2004). The polarised attitudes of the dominant ideologies (ours) and the less powerful ideologies of social groups (theirs or Other’s) are strategically managed through syntactic choice or ordering in the text. News reports may take an ‘us’ and ‘them’ or Other attitude to maintain the status quo of social power. This involves the strategic use of syntactic ordering that amplifies the positive attributes of the dominant ideologies.
and minimises or negates their negative attributes. Conversely, negative attributes of the social out-group will be emphasised in the text and their positive attributes discounted or ignored (Wodak and Matouschek, 1993, van Dijk, 1996b, Teo, 2000). Lexicalisation is widely used in relation to social Others and contributes to public perceptions of inequality, stigmatisation and marginalisation of certain social groups (Wodak and Matouschek, 1993, van Dijk, 1995b, Teo, 2000). Lexicons such as ‘terrorist’ were used to describe those who were involved in the Afghanistan conflict, while those who supported them referred to them as ‘fundamentalists’ (van Dijk, 1995b: 26).

Over-lexicalisation is used in news discourse as a pragmatic method of signalling biased or racist ideologies against the social out-group under enquiry (Teo, 2000, van Dijk, 1991). Over-lexicalisation ‘... results when a surfeit or repetitious, quasi-synonymous terms [are] woven into the fabric of news discourse’ (Teo, 2000: 20). Powerless social groups or individuals are habitually over-lexicalised, underscored by in-group beliefs and ideologies (van Dijk, 1995b, Teo, 2000). Teo gives the example of the over-lexicalisation of the word *extreme* in news reports relating to youth gangs, where the word *extreme* was used throughout the text in relation to gang members (2000: 22). This portrayed members as possessing negative, derogatory characteristics, describing them as animal-like and a threat to civil society. Teo also showed how the use of multiple epithets within the text contributed to the dehumanised, threatening perspective of the youth gang. Euphemisms were also sprinkled through news text, particularly in relation to race or ethnicity, where politically incorrect words were replaced with more placid, less offensive language (van Dijk, 1995b).

### 3.5.3 Generalisations in Discourse

Generalisation, or recontextualisation, is a textual strategy that relates social out-groups to wider categories of reference. Generalisation allows the writer to attribute key characteristics of a social group to a wider, more expansive or generalised category (Teo, 2000). For example, Vietnamese or Chinese people are referred to as Asians. Generalisation allows the writer to presume the reader already has pre-existing knowledge of ‘Asians’ and explanations are therefore unnecessary (Teo, 2000). However, socio-cognitive processes or mental models allow for stereotypical bias when such generalisations are used in text, when no other information is available to the reader (Van Dijk, 1991, Van Dijk, 1995b). Stereotypical attitudes such as the
fundamental attribution error\(^{12}\) (Johnson et al., 1984) and the ‘just world’ hypothesis may therefore be triggered in the reader because of the lack of information in the text to counter such beliefs (van Dijk, 1995b). Consequently, with generalisations, euphemisms, epithets and syntactic ordering, the writer manipulates the semantic structure of the discourse through implicit and explicit details.

### 3.5.4 Implicitness in News Discourse

Implicitness in news discourse commonly functions to enhance the ideologies of the dominant social group. The use of implicitness relies on readers’ socio-cognitive beliefs and attitudes to fill in gaps when no further information is given. This process serves two functions. First, it may result in stereotypical socio-cognitive beliefs (as discussed above) and negatively implicate the social Other. The second function operates to exclude the reader from the topic under discussion through intellectual superiority. The implicit assumption is of mutual knowledge shared by the writer and reader, even when this assumption does not hold true (van Dijk, 1995b). This can be exclusionary and is seen in the use of specific organisational jargon or acronyms. For example, the general reader may know common acronyms such as ANZAC or NASA, but specific acronyms such as ACCC, COAG or QCSS may not be well known. The use of such acronyms (or jargon) without explanation of their meaning serves to exclude the general reader.

### 3.5.5 Explicitness in News Discourse

Explicitness in syntactical structures and discursive ordering generate beliefs about the social Other. Explicit statements of the social Other’s exploits are detailed in precise and accurate descriptors while the mistakes and errors of the dominant social group are minimised through abstractions and euphemistic innuendo (van Dijk, 1991, van Dijk, 1995b). Information that is detrimental to the dominant social group often remains implicit while information about the social Other is explicit, detailed and descriptive (van Dijk, 1995b, Teo, 2000). Such a mode of discourse, or recontextualisation, controls the ideological values of the dominant social group by ‘... the management of self-serving and preferred models of social situations’ (van Dijk, 1995: 27). The use of

\(^{12}\) The fundamental attribution error functions to attribute the actions of an individual to their behaviour, not their situation. For example, if a person trips and falls it is attributed to the actions of the person, rather than the uneven footpath or broken pavers on which they were walking.
nominalisation and disclaimers also serve to promote dominant ideologies and preclude the negative actions of the in-group. Nominalisation diverts attention from or minimises the negative actions of the in-group. For example, ‘Mrs Groce was shot by police’ (passive sentence) may be reported as ‘the shooting of Mrs Groce’ (nominalisation) (van Dijk, 1991: 216).

The exclusion of ‘police’ from the second report diverts attention from the negative actions of the police. The ordering of the text can also promote or deny importance. For example, ‘Mrs Groce was shot by police’ places importance on Mrs Groce, but if the script had read ‘The police shot Mrs Groce’ the focus would have been on the actions of the police. The strategic manipulation of syntactical structure and ordering is used to maintain positive beliefs in the dominant status quo. In political speeches and political discourse disclaimers are widely used to deny possible racist or sexist beliefs. The strategies of apparent denial, apparent concession or blame transfer are discursive uses of positive semantics to assign positive impressions to the speaker or writer (van Dijk, 1995: 27). The use of disclaimers also contributes to dominant ideologies by denying social inequality, justifying stereotypical beliefs and transferring or attributing negative attention to other groups.

3.5.6 The Concept of Social Distance

The concept of social distance in discourse analysis is used to demonstrate inequality and social relations. Social distance or solidarity was purported to be one dimension of social relations, with power or social hierarchy being the other dimension (Brown and Gilman, 1960, cited in Fairclough, 2004). Fairclough posited social distance to indicate ‘action at a distance’ or the (dis)connection of the individual social actor from the spatial and temporal structural workings of organisations. However, within sociopolitical and sociocultural discourse, social distance is understood in different terms. Social distance in sociocultural discourse is described as the ‘distancing’ of the dominant social in-group from the deviant, stigmatised, often ethnic Other social group

---

13 Apparent denial is where a person will accept a statement but then rescind it. For example, ‘I have nothing against Blacks, but ...’ (van Dijk, 1995: 27).
14 Apparent concession is where a little is acknowledged but denied on a larger scale. For example ‘There are, of course, a few small racist groups in the Netherlands, but on the whole ...’ (van Dijk, 1995: 27).
15 Blame transfer is used when the blame is shifted to the wider population of another group. For example, ‘I have no problem with minorities in the shop, but my customers ...’ (van Dijk, 1995: 27).
Within socio-political discourse, verbal or textual ‘distancing’ separates the dominant social in-group from political subjects or matters that have the potential to taint or subvert dominant ideologies (Kurian and Munshi, 2012).

Social distancing, exclusion and/or the ‘silencing’ of the social Other are central to the production and reproduction of dominant ideologies in discourse. News reports typically do not contain the ‘voice’ of the social Other, as legitimacy is gained through the expert voice of dominant in-group members such as the police, medical professionals, the legal fraternity, university professors, etc. (van Dijk, 1993). The silent ‘voice’ of the social Other is excluded from discourse in favour of legitimate authorities (van Dijk, 1991, van Dijk, 2012). The silent ‘voice’ of the less powerful thus serves to maintain dominant ideologies within news discourses. The less powerful also have little or no access to news discourse. Access to discourse is a privilege of the dominant elite such as politicians, community and organisational leaders, police, and social, political and medical experts (van Dijk, 2006a, van Dijk, 2012).

Another news strategy that contributes to stigmatisation and social exclusion of social out-groups or individual Others is seen in the ways out-group behaviours are pathologised and problematised through strategic use of euphemisms, epithets and syntactic structure. This results in the demonisation and discrediting of such groups (Teo, 2000, Drury, 2002, van Dijk, 2006a). Whether writing about race riots (Leonardo, 2004, Schneider, 2008), football fan violence (Redhead, 1991), youth gangs (Bessant, 1991), or immigrant and ethnic ‘terrorist’ Others (Bredström, 2003, Nacos, 2003), the news media vilifies certain groups or group behaviours while simultaneously silencing and marginalising them. In comparison, the ‘voices’ of police, politicians and community leaders are loud in their condemnation of such (illegitimate) behaviours. By the exclusion of Other ‘voices’ from news text and stigmatisation through syntactical structure and ordering, the dominant ideologies remain intact and the social Other is ‘silenced’. News discourses are therefore heavily involved in the control of public opinion through dominant ideologies.

3.6 The ‘Outrage’ Industry and Gonzo Rhetoric

Critical linguistics and CDA research have generated critical reports of news articles, exposing the layers of dominant ideologies running through the discourse. News reports
may generate propaganda strategies designed to incite fear in the reader to benefit dominant ideological purposes (Simon, 2007, van Leeuwen, 2008, Maratea and Monahan, 2013). The concept of the ‘outrage industry’ has also been used to describe the propensity of the media to incite strong emotional reactions in readers, listeners or viewers (Berry and Sobieraj, 2008). Under a capitalist model of market commodification, the media industry has increasingly become more outspoken and outrageous in their engagement with the public. Examples of this type of media discourse include radio ‘shock jocks’ like John Laws and Alan Jones or the political name-calling and public verbal jousting by high-profile politicians and prominent business leaders.

News is not intended to reflect reality, but is rather an ‘… interpretation of outrage-voyeuristic content … [that reflects the] … shocking elements of reality, to evoke emotional response: fear, indignation, outrage, or sadness’ (Berry and Sobieraj, 2008: 17). Vilification is central to the outrage industry, and there appears to be few limits placed on the parameters of talk and text. Accusations of sexism and prejudice are pushed aside in favour of outspokenness, ridicule and polarisation (Berry and Sobieraj, 2008: 34). Within such an outrage industry, incidents of alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy, especially bouncer violence, receive widespread condemnation. Newspaper articles about bouncer violence range from outright disdain to judgemental name-calling. Some journalists are scathing in their attitudes to the security industry where others take a more reasoned approach.

Closely tied to the outrage industry is the method of news reporting called ‘gonzo rhetoric’. Gonzo rhetoric is a method of discourse ‘… that exaggerates the nature and extent of crime, while promoting quick fixes via get-tough policies to solve the violence crime problem’ (Maratea and Monahan, 2013: 5). Former Queensland Premier Campbell Newman’s get-tough-on-crime approach and his hard-line views on bikie gang laws align neatly with gonzo rhetoric. News headlines and State government reactions to bouncer violence in 2008 also demonstrated gonzo rhetoric. The headline ‘Bouncer thrown out Shine declares war on aggression’ (Gold Coast Bulletin, August 8, 2008) was followed up by the State government reportedly ‘… declaring war against violence … [and the] … Attorney-General Kerry Shine has fired the first shot in the crackdown on aggressive Coast security workers …’. Mr Shine was reported as stating
that rogue security workers were ‘… a threat to public safety’ and the government was implementing ‘… tough new laws … to enhance public safety’.

Gonzo rhetoric occurs when individuals in positions of social power construct a compelling narrative about ‘out-of-control’ violent crimes and offer quick-fix solutions in the name of public safety to solve the ‘problem’ (Maratea and Monahan, 2013: 5). Gonzo rhetoric typically includes harsh punitive solutions based on the get-tough-on-crime approach which defines all offenders as equally criminal and deserving of being ‘locked up’ (Maratea and Monahan, 2013). Metaphors of ‘war’ are commonplace in the discourse, with ‘war on violence’ and ‘war on crime’ dominating elitist ideologies of governance (Simon, 2007) that contribute and support the gonzo rhetoric. News media readily support and adopt the mediated spectacle of out-of-control crime and the need for a ‘war on crime’ (Maratea and Monahan, 2013). The populist appeal of such rhetoric is generated through the media and spread by political motives and appeals to the news media’s penchant for newsworthy, glorified and shocking accounts of crime and violence (Maratea and Monahan, 2013).

Fowler argued that ‘public disorder is highly newsworthy …’ because it produces ‘… saleable news …’ (2013: 241) while also serving the interests of the newspaper organisation. Fowler suggested that law and order issues were used as a political tool to attract votes and were often politically motivated (2013). The illusion of independent reporting and unbiased accounts of news reporting disguises the media’s economic imperatives and need for capitalist gain (Fowler, 2013). Fowler argued that newspapers must toe the political line, reproduce established dominant ideologies or contribute to constructive discussions in that arena. News reports generally assume a single premeditated position and generate a single point of view on a subject, a point of view that is deemed to be common knowledge, a ‘given’ or is unquestionable (van Dijk, 1991, Fowler, 2013).

The media hysteria (Fowler, 2013: 150) around ‘bouncer violence’ and criminality within the industry has pervaded the public consciousness for decades. I argue this is directed related to the propensity of the news media to construct, report and condemn the security industry through ideological discourses. Issues of law and order are newsworthy and, as Fowler observed, the press consider they have the relevant authority to criticise or ‘tell governments what to do’ (2013: 342) in relation to political,
social, economic and public disorder matters. The apparent self-proclaimed authority of the media enables their production and reproduction of critical, discriminatory and often blatantly hyperbolic accounts of social and public disorder incidents. The modes of discourse used by the news press in relation to bouncers behaving badly are, in my view, prejudicial, exaggerated and unashamedly derogatory and discriminatory. In reality, promotions by the news media in relation to bouncer violence could easily be classified as a moral panic.

3.7 Moral Panics and the News Media

Issues of crime and violence appear to be susceptible to fluctuating moral panics over time (Cohen, 2002). The concept of moral panic is traditionally defined as a social issue where ‘[a] condition, episode, person or group of persons emerge to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests’ (Cohen, 2002: 87). A moral crusade is then launched in a stereotypical manner by the mass news media and is taken up by politicians, interest groups, lobbyists and associated experts (Cohen, 2002). As Cohen proposed, a moral panic may appear abruptly as a new issue or may be slumbering, only to rise up into the limelight again. I would argue that alcohol-related violence and bouncer violence come under the ‘slumbering’ title due to the reoccurring spikes in moral panics over long periods of time. The length of time a moral panic lasts is contingent on the type of issue and the scope of the issue. For example, some moral panics are short in duration and fade away, only to be recalled in folklore while others last much longer and sometimes result in legislative and policy changes (Cohen, 2002: 88).

A moral panic is also identified by the irrational or hysterical public response, which is disproportionate to the event (Cohen, 2002, Garland, 2008, Hier, 2008). A moral panic requires specific criteria to be classified as a moral panic and not just a public outcry against an event or social act (Cohen, 2002). A genuine moral panic requires a suitable enemy, a suitable victim and there must be collective societal agreement that the folk devil is not a protected entity (such as the police) and they have the capability of being integrated successfully into a community (such as youth) (Cohen, 2002: 20-21). However contemporary theory has identified three differing types or models of moral panic. The grassroots model, the interest group model and the elite-engineered model of moral panic (Hier, 2008: 176-177). The rise of a grassroots model of moral panic may
emulate from interest groups or ‘the ruling elite’; however what ‘feeds’ the panic is collective, entrenched societal insecurities (Hier, 2008: 177). Hier proposed that, although the mass media were culpable in swaying public attitudes or beliefs in a particular ideological direction, they cannot create public insecurities where none exist. The interest group model of moral panic is described as ‘… the unanticipated and unintended outcome of moral crusades undertaken by particular interest groups’ (Hier, 2008: 176) to address a particular type of social action at a particular time (such as racial youth violence). The elite-engineered model of moral panic is ‘… a conscious and deliberate outcome of manufactured campaigns that are designed to divert attention away from real social crises’ (such as economic instability) (Hier, 2008: 176, also see Young, 2011).

Central to the rise and continuation of a moral panic is the mass news media. Theorists agree that the mass news media play a key role in the emergence of a moral panic (Cohen, 2002, Hier, 2008). However contemporary theorists have argued that the pivotal role of the mass media has been missing in recent times from fundamental studies of moral panic due to a stronger focus on its practical applications (Wright, 2015). Cohen (2002) stated that the mass news media were crucial to the invention, formation of narratives and the development and propagation of a moral panic. Wright (2015), in line with the work of Anker (2005), concurred and proposed that moral panics were ‘enacted melodramas’, where melodramatic narratives were constructed around an innocent, virtuous victim, an evil, predatory villain and an eventual moral hero. Melodramas are a time-honoured tradition of virtuous maidens (or victims) persecuted by evil villains and after much emotive suspense, the hero sweeps in to save and restore the virtue of the wronged maiden/victim. Wright argued that in relation to crime, moral panics were similarly constructed narratives by the mass news media.

Central to the discussion on news reporting discourses is the polarity of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ divide and the development by the news media of the evil social Other and their innocent victim/s (van Dijk, 1996b, Cohen, 2002, Wright, 2015). Berry and Sobieraj’s (2008) proposal of an ‘outrage industry’ also aligns with the emotive and suspense building ethos of the enacted melodramas through strong emotive text and visual symbolism that is designed to incite strong emotive reactions in the reading/viewing public. ‘Experts’ are consequently cited in news reports on what needs to be done and
how they are going to ‘fix’ the problem, which aligns with Wrights’ (2015) heroes in melodramas as well as with the parameters of gonzo rhetoric (Maratea and Monahan, 2013). Collectively, the three theories form a comprehensive understanding of how public ‘concerns’ are raised by the news media, propagated and delivered into public discourses. Moral panics are arguably a means of raising public awareness of current public social issues by the news media; however, it is the public or readers of the news discourse who are most affected by this style of news writing.

3.8 News Media and the Reading Public

Critical linguistics and CDA research have proposed the readers of news reports contribute to dominant ideologies. Fowler argued that ‘… readers are implicated in the discursive articulation of values and beliefs’ (2013: 230). Readers consume the news, often daily, in one form or another but they are not passive recipients. They will purchase newspapers that align somewhat with their own values and beliefs and which suit their social status or profession (van Dijk, 2000, Fowler, 2013). Newspapers also align themselves to address particular types of reader, an idealised recipient of their carefully crafted discourses. Although it has been argued that it is difficult to theorise a ‘… hypothetical ‘reader’ … [or] … a participant in the newspaper discourse’ (Scollon, 2014: 304), CDA constructs the imagined reader using ideologies and socio-cognitive concepts based on schemas or mental models.

3.9 Methodology

The methodology is based on CDA. A critical approach within discourse analysis allows for the exploration and exposure of the underlying dynamics of ideological power relations at work in the text. That is to say, CDA seeks to move beyond the ‘how’ and ‘why’ embedded within specific texts to elucidate the higher social structures within and behind the text that direct and reproduce the dominant ideological power within society (Kress, 1990, van Dijk, 1993, Teo, 2000, Wodak, 2002). Central to the process of CDA is the concept of ideologies produced and reproduced through socio-cognitive beliefs and values, social discourse and social practices (van Dijk, 1993, Van Dijk, 2000b). Socio-cognitive mental models thereby enable a linking of the micro-structure of talk and text to the macro-structures of organisations and social practices.
and assist in revealing the social dynamics that produce and reproduce legitimation, social power and dominance in the discourse.
Figure 2: Theory of ideologies and discourse: levels of analysis
The CDA model is based on the work of van Dijk (1985, 1991, 1996, 2012). Figure 2 shows diagrammatically the theory of ideology proposed by van Dijk (1995: 20), with intersections between the micro-level of talk and text, social cognitions, and the macro-level of social structures. The yellow box shows the theoretical perspectives involved in this discursive analysis that form the sociocultural context of the research and the socio-cognitive link between the sections under analysis (indicated by the red arrows). The purpose of this is to offer a sociocultural and socio-cognitive analysis of why bouncers conduct their work in the manner they do and why they are perceived by the news media and the general public as thugs and brutes. Although news discourse may contribute to the discrimination towards bouncers, it is proposed that their occupational role and the wider influences of socio-political, sociocultural and economic factors play a significant function in defining how they conduct business and how their work is publicly perceived. Using research on bouncers and their work by Rigatos (2008), Hobbs et al. (2003, 2007), Monaghan (2002, 2003, 2004) and Rickett and Roman (2013), it is proposed to build a sociocultural and socio-cognitive explanation of bouncers and their work.

Integration of theories of dirty work and stigmatisation, the gendered division of labour, emotional labour and emotional dirty work gives a sociocultural theoretical perspective of bouncers and their work. Theories of hegemonic masculinity, femininity and violence allow for a sociocultural explanation of gendered behaviours in the night-time economy. Collectively, these theories form the sociocultural explanations for ways of behaving and ways of ‘doing’, or the social rules that influence and shape behaviours. Theories of social identity, identity theory, role congruency and hostile and benevolent sexism form the socio-cognitive focus of this research, being the basis of socio-cognitive explanations for behaviour, attitudes and beliefs. This allows for an understanding, through the use of scripts or talk, of why bouncers behave the way they do when undertaking their work. The complete theoretical framework forms the basis of the sociocultural context of the research and the socio-cognitive explanatory link between the news discourse (micro level) and the wider social structures (macro level). Although the theoretical perspectives are diverse, they are necessary to explain social behaviours and to outline the attitudes and beliefs of bouncers as they undertake their occupational role in the night-time economy.
Figure 3: Context of the research

Note: MMA – Mixed Martial Arts; cage fighting is also called the Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC)

A deep understanding of the context and various dimensions of bouncers’ work and the social power of relevant social structures that contribute to it is needed for a successful analysis of news discourse. The structure of the intersection of areas under study (or context) is shown in Figure 3. The critical discourse analysis is centred on news reports at the micro level. The areas of study specific to this analysis are bouncers and their occupational role, the night-time economy, alcohol-related violence, the social construction of masculinity and femininity in the gendered division of labour, violence, Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) and the Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) or cage fighting and the social structures and social practices implicated in these areas. I have chosen to include MMA and cage fighting in this thesis because the world of combat sports is similar to the work of bouncers and this allows for a comparison of them. The comparison permits a more inclusive sociocultural view of bouncers and their work. The areas of study intersect with and are influenced by the sociocultural, economic,
occupational and political structures and organisations that hold hegemonic social power in relation to bouncers and their work, or the macro level of influence.

3.10 Data Selection Process

The data selection process involved a search of the NewsBank Access World News database on the James Cook University library website. The search terms entered included ‘bouncer’ and ‘violence’ but excluded ‘one-punch’ because of the number of these generated by patrons in the night-time economy. The selected articles were news reports about bouncers in the night-time economy being involved in violence with any other person during the course of their occupational work. The search involved Australian news reports listed as ‘> 12 grade level’ in the search selection criteria. In total, 217 articles were found from 853 search results, and were saved to a Word document.

The results were scanned manually and articles not suitable for inclusion in the analysis and duplicates were removed. Articles that did not directly relate to bouncers being involved in violence as part of their occupational role were deleted. Only 12 articles remained after this process, so a Google search was conducted using the same search terms. This yielded thousands of articles, many international. It was decided to use only Australian reports but two from the United Kingdom and one from New Zealand were included. The articles selected included 68 news reports dated from 2004 to 2014. The 12 NewsBank articles bought the total to 80 news reports. Ten reports from the original search on NewsBank were chosen for deep qualitative analysis (Appendix A). The full list of news reports is shown in Appendix B.

3.11 Methodology of NVivo10 Analysis

The study required a large qualitative analysis that focused on words or categories of words used in the 80 news reports. The analysis sought to document the categories of words relating to violence, criminality and discriminatory language use, and the power structures at work in the discourse. NVivo (version 10) qualitative analysis software was used for the analysis. The words or phrases most commonly used in news headlines and reports were extracted to identify the derogatory or discriminatory language in headlines and in the body of the news texts. After reviewing the most frequently used terms, the analysis was expanded to include ‘experts’, organisations, names most
frequently mentioned, political abstractions and generalisations. The purpose of the analysis was to give an overall view of the terms most commonly used in the news reports to discern if there was a pattern of lexical use by the news media authors and examine the discursive implications of this use.

The NVivo software is used mainly for thematic analysis but I chose to use its word frequency analysis function. CDA is an expansive approach to research; however, it is fundamentally about talk and text. Therefore, the frequency of words commonly used by the news media was critically important to this analysis. It was critical to know how many times news reports cited bouncers being involved in crime, or how many times news reports relied on political abstractions such as ‘growing problem’ or ‘rising crisis’. The ‘expert voice’ is commonly used within news discourse, therefore, it was important to discover which and how many experts were cited or quoted in the text. The news media also show a preference for using synecdoche terms such as ‘government’ or ‘industry’ in their writing, and it was important to determine how often these terms were mentioned in the text.

3.10.1 NVivo Method of Analysis

The news reports were read a number of times before the word parameters were defined in NVivo. An understanding of the discursive strategies used became clear only through this reading and rereading of the reports. The NVivo10 word frequency query was then used to search for words and/or phases that were used relating to violence and criminality, those that undermined legitimacy, or were discriminatory. The complete list of words in each category is listed below.

3.10.2 Words or phrases relating to violence

These words included physical acts or behaviours that were indicative of any forms of violence: violence, violent; punch(ed, ing); hit(ting); choke(d, ing); push(ed, ing); shove(d, ing); death, kill(ed, ing); assault(ed, ing); fight(s, ing); kneed, kick(ed, ing); pull(ed, ing); attack(ed, ing); bash(ed, ing); brutal; bash(ed); beaten; threatened; brawl; stuck; pinned; affray; threw, throwing; struck; strike(ing).
3.10.3  Words or phrases relating to power

These are words or phrases that hold suppositions or confirmation/support of ideological power or control by those in positions of authority: licensing; laws; regulation; enforce(d, ing, ment); reforms; crackdown; ban(ned; ning); legislation; responsible; policy; training.

3.10.4  Words or phrases relating to crime or criminality

These are words or phrases that indicate involvement in crime or criminal behaviour: corruption; infiltrated (ion); bikie gang; gangs; criminal(s); criminality; drugs.

3.10.5  Words or phrases relating to undermining of legitimacy

These are words or phrases that were explicitly or implicitly intended to undermine the authority or credibility of bouncers or the security industry: out of control; cowardly bouncers; redneck Rambos; dodge responsibly; cowboys; incompetent; pub violence; terrorising; power trips; culture of violence; above the law.

3.10.6  Words or phrased relating to political abstractions and generalisations

Abstractions and generalisations are discursive strategies used by the news media to exaggerate and overstate a particular social ‘problem’ or issue. This is particularly relevant to matters relating to law and order issues. These words were: problem; responsible; increased; concern; dangerous; risk; conflict; rise; terrorising; outcry; outrage; crisis; epidemic.

3.10.7  Words or phrases relating to organisations or institutions

News journalists have a preference for using generalised terms or synecdoche terms such as ‘government’ or ‘industry’ in their writing. This analysis was to determine the frequency of their use of such terms. These terms were: policing; courts; industry; government; magistrate; national.

3.10.8  Names of bouncers and victims appearing in news reports

The first reading showed David Hookes’ name appearing multiple times in the 80 news reports. This analysis was to determine how many times the names of bouncers and
their victims were mentioned in the news reports, to see if bouncers were mentioned more often than victims, or whether they mentioned equally.

3.10.9 Experts most cited in the news reports

Given the propensity of news journalists to cite and quote relevant ‘experts’ in the news, this analysis was to determine how many experts were mentioned in the news reports and what type of ‘expert’ was most commonly cited.

3.12 Manual Qualitative Analysis

van Dijk (cited in MacMillian, 2009) stated that large qualitative analyses that defined categories of words and text were not sufficiently rigorous to qualify as a method of analysis. Consequently, a second analysis was undertaken. The critical discursive analysis of news reports at the micro level of text involves deciphering the particular discursive strategies that are used in the text as particular modes of ideological practices. The analysis involved identifying discursive ideological strategies including rhetorical style, under- and over-statement, the use of euphemisms, litotes and repetition; lexical use or style, such as negative and positive opinions or statements; syntactical structure and ordering; metaphors and epithets, disclaimers and over-lexicalisation and assertions or denials (van Dijk, 1995b). This deep qualitative analysis contributed a more nuanced picture of ideological discourse practices in the texts (MacMillan, 2009).

News media discourses follow a particular way of writing and presenting information, or of writing in a particular genre. News media’s foremost purpose is to convey information to the reading public. However, the style of writing is intrinsic both to individual writers and the organisational beliefs or stance of the news organisations who hire them (van Dijk, 1991, 1996b). The lexical choices writers make, the way they structure their words and phrases and the messages they wish to convey are underpinned by ideological beliefs and attitudes (van Dijk, 1991, 1996b, Fowler, 2013). For example, there are always a number or options available in word texts when constructing a sentence. News writers may choose to use the word ‘killing’ instead of manslaughter, or they may choose to write ‘brutally bashed’ instead of ‘assaulted’. Therefore, word selection and phrase structure is important as a method of discourse analysis. Discursive strategies, such as over- and under-statement and implicitness or
explicitness are also important factors to extract from the discourse as they expose the underlying ideologies in the talk and text.

3.13 Conclusion

CDA, as a perspective or a way of conducting research, embarks on an exploration to uncover the dominant ideological beliefs behind social issues that are created by social inequality, marginalisation or social exclusion through discourse. Ideological beliefs, as proposed by van Dijk (1991, 1996b) result in the use of social power and domination to designate social groups as Other, such as ethnic minorities, immigrants and those who are socially deviant or deemed to be so. Access to the mass news media is one method by which dominant groups in society hold social power over others, with social outgroups having little or no access to the news media. CDA takes a socio-political perspective to expose the underlying dominant ideologies embedded within talk and text. The inclusion of social cognition into CDA allows for a critical link between the micro level of talk and text and the macro level of social structures and practices. Social cognition is a means of exposing the values, beliefs and attitudes that define and shape group behaviours within a socio-cultural context.

The methodology allows for three levels of data analysis of the text. Firstly, the sociocultural and socio-cognitive analysis of bouncers’ scripts (talk), as recorded in previous research, is reported in Chapter 4 and 5. The large-scale qualitative analysis of 80 news reports using the NVivo software program to expose the most commonly used words and groups of words in the news reports is reported in Chapter 6. Results of the manual qualitative analysis of 10 news reports are presented in Chapter 7, which provides a complex micro-analysis of them.
Chapter 4
Theoretical Underpinnings Relating to Bouncers and their Occupational Role in the Night-Time Economy

This chapter presents the theoretical perspectives used in the research from a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective. The purpose of these theories is to build an explanatory framework around bouncers and their work, using a sociocultural and socio-cognitive analysis. The sociocultural theories establish the social parameters of ‘work’ by bouncers and the socio-cognitive theories establish the attitudes and beliefs of bouncers. They are the cognitive analysis sections of the theoretical model as outline in Figure 2, p. 80. The complete analysis in relation to bouncers is discussed in Chapter 5.

The theoretical perspectives (as outlined in the yellow/orange boxes in Figure 2) form an explanatory link between the micro-level of news texts and the macro-levels of social structures and practices and political and economic forces that impact on bouncers and their work. This chapter also introduces scripts (or talk) recorded in previous research as an explanatory tool to elucidate the practical applications of the theories in use and to uncover the cognitive strategies used by men and women who undertake ‘dirty work’.

The review of sociocultural theoretical perspectives begins with a discussion of Hugh’s (1958) concept of dirty work and stigmatisation. This is followed by an overview of Hochchild’s (1983) emotional labour and the new theory of emotional dirty work (McMurray and Ward, 2014). These three theories form the social constraints and define social practices that direct and influence behaviour. The theoretical perspectives also include a discussion on violence, hegemonic masculinity and ‘macho’ feminism, which are reflected in the gendered division of labour and also define and constrain socially appropriate behaviours and social action. These five theories make up the social cognition element of the analysis (refer to Figure 2, p. 80).
The discussion of socio-cognitive theories first examines social identity theory, identity theory and role congruence theory (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999), before considering hostile and benevolent sexism and gender inequality, drawing on the work of Diekman and Goodfriend (2006), Glick and Fiske (2001) and Clow and Ricciardelli (2011) among others. These theories form the socio-cognitive aspects of behaviour that include beliefs, attitudes and values that social actors hold and ultimately influence behaviours. The three theories make up the personal cognition element of the analysis (see Figure 2). The inclusion of the combat sports of Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) and Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) or cage fighting is used to draw a comparison between violence as ‘sport’ and violence as ‘work’ in relation to bouncers. Drawing on masculinity and violence, the discussion of MMA and UFC shows the similarity between combatants’ views and the attitudes and beliefs held by bouncers, and the need for both groups to undertake emotional labour while engaged in what is socially viewed as ‘dirty work’.

Importantly, the use of scripts in this section is utilised as a method of analysis demonstrating the cognitive theories under discussion. That is, the scripts or talk are concrete examples of the real world application of the theories so that an understanding may be gained of bouncers’ attitudes and beliefs. Only through an analysis of their discourse (talk) is it possible to evaluate what cognitive strategies they are utilising to bolster their self-identity whilst conducting ‘dirty work’. Critically, there is little to no research on bouncers, social cognitions, ‘dirty work’ or emotional labour and little research on female bouncers. Because of this fact, examples of socio-cognitive scripts (or talk) have been borrowed from other research, namely the military, combative sports and the mining industry. The severe lack of research into both male and female bouncers and their occupational roles made it necessary to source other research examples to conduct the analysis. The rationale for using the military, combative sports and the mining industry is because these three activities are deemed ‘dirty work’, are male dominated occupations and are the closest to the perceptual role of bouncers in the night-time economy that I could find.

Although women bouncers have not been implicated in violence against patrons in the news media, it is inconceivable to leave them out of this discussion. More and more women are becoming bouncers (Hobbs et al, 2007) and in a male dominated industry,
their contributions and experiences are crucial to an understanding of the topic. The reality is, women bouncers are involved in violence in the night-time economy (Hobbs et al, 2007). Women are working in an occupational role that is socially stigmatised and they are utilising the same cognitive strategies as their male counterparts to deal with the role (Rickett and Roman, 2013) as the offered theoretic examples indicate. Within this chapter, the scripts are used to illustrate the cognitive strategies of coping with social disidentification through comparative and compensatory gender differentiation and how the gendered division in social roles strongly influences social cognitions and subsequently, cognitive scripts or talk.

4.1 Stigmatisation and ‘Dirty Work’

Hughes introduced the concept of ‘dirty work’ in 1958 in his discussions of Nazi treatment of Jews during World War II. Dirty work was conceptualised by Hughes as work that was ‘... physically, socially or morally tainted’ (1958: 122). In his view, society considered such work repugnant or distasteful, relegated it to a low status through moral consensus, and delegated it to other people. Society stigmatises and marginalises those who do the dirty work, labelling them as ‘dirty workers’ (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). The concept of dirty work has been used to analyse how those who do dirty work construct and maintain positive identities while conducting stigmatised work (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). One explanation concluded that it was not necessarily ‘dirty workers’ doing dirty work but was in fact good people doing dirty work (Davis, 1984).

The concept of dirty work arose from psychological comparisons between dirt and clean and the associated categories of dirtiness and cleanliness (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999), and drew on moral beliefs about cleanliness being close to Godliness and hence dirtiness was close to evil. Dirty was equated with ‘unclean’ in the social sense, so that those who did not do ‘unclean’ work considered themselves of higher social status than those who did so (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). Two types of dirty work can be discerned. Pure dirty work is perceived to be work that involves the truly offensive or repugnant, such as dealing directly with garbage, death or effluent. Such work is genuinely repulsive or is seen as contaminating by the general population (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). Occupations including undertakers, butchers, sewerage workers and
nurses perform such work (Meara, 1974, Thompson, 1991, Bolton, 2005, Snyder, 2005).

The second type of dirty work involves tasks or occupational roles that people generally are pleased they do not do. This work may involve exposure to dangerous conditions (Holli, 1982, Johnston and McIvor, 2004), contact with marginalised populations such as the mentally ill or criminals (Brown, 1989, Cullen et al., 1990), or it is morally offensive, such as prostitution or exotic dancing (Arnold and Barling, 2003, Mavin and Grandy, 2013). It also includes the work of domestic workers, cleaners, old age carers and immigrants (Zarembka, 2003, Bolton, 2005, Aguiar and Herod, 2006). Implicit to the understanding of dirty work is the societal stigmatisation of workers who undertake it. Kreiner et al. (2006) recognised these various understanding of stigmatisation and dirty work and believed that a more nuanced understanding of the topic was needed.

Although Hughes (1962) proposed the concept of physical, social and moral taint in relation to dirty work, Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) expanded and categorised the three taints into a specific measurable model. Their central purpose was to glean an understanding of how workers who undertook dirty work developed and maintained a positive self-identity. Stigmatisation and dirty work is a social construction and is defined by ‘... checks and balances of what we might call the social and moral constitution of society’ (Hughes, 1962: 11). Hence, those who do the dirty work are aware of the stigmatisation of themselves and their work (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999).

4.1.1 Social Inclusion or Exclusion

The awareness of stigmatising work is related to social inclusion and exclusion, or as Freud stated, the ‘us’ and ‘them’ divide, the in-group–out-group philosophy (cited in Hughes, 1962: 8). Hughes proposed that within an ‘in’ group there was, or could be, ‘inner circles’ of people making up smaller clusters or cohesive groups within the in-group. However, based on self-attitudes16 and attitudes to others17, the process of moral reasoning may lead to social isolation by stigmatised individuals (Davis, 1984), in which they self-exclude from like-minded others and become marginalised by society.

16 Self-attitude is defined as ‘perceptions of a person as lacking in moral worth as being unjustified and they are not what society claims them to be’ (Davis, 1984: 235).
17 Attitudes to others are defined as ‘... the attribution of stigma to the members of the group to which he [sic] belongs has at least some justification’ (Davis, 1984: 235).
This distancing from like-minded others is prompted by their belief that they are unjustly labelled as dirty workers, and hence they identify with general society in the hope of being seen worthy of inclusion (Davis, 1984).

The awareness of stigmatising work led researchers to explore how dirty workers gained and maintained a positive self-identity under marginalising conditions. It has long been recognised that social actors build and gain self-identity and self-worth partly through occupational roles (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999, Stets and Burke, 2000). Central to this proposal is the in- and out-group ethos, especially with regard to stigmatised occupations. In- and out-group categorisation results in a strong occupational culture based on ‘... deeply held systems of values, beliefs and norms with attendant ideologies and “societal weighted practices”’ (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999: 414). The imbued culture therefore serves to protect the social actor from threats to self-identity imposed by a stigmatising occupation (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999: 414). Crucial to this formation is that cultural practices and ideologies are generated at a group or institutional level, not at the individual level.

The inclusive in-group therefore acts as a buffer to the attitudes, disavowing remarks and psychological distance afforded by others in society, who view members as dirty workers (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999, Hughes, 1962). This cohesion or social solidarity is crucial to the self-worth and positive self-view of social actors who do dirty work. Identity theory proposes that individuals develop a positive sense of self through a collective of positive self-attributes and social identity within a given context, particularly occupational roles (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999: 417). Social identity formation is a perceptual cognitive construct whereby a person will align or identify themselves with a particular social group (Ashforth and Mael, 1989: 21). However, the internalisation of a group’s ideologies, values and norms is not implicit to social identity (Ashforth and Mael, 1989). An individual may identify with a particular social group but experience dissonance with their ideologies or practices (Ashforth and Mael, 1989).

### 4.1.2 Self-Identity and Social Identity

Self-identity and social identity are derived from a number of social identities, because social actors identify with multiple social groups and roles. Hogg and Terry (2000) proposed the concept of self-categorisation, which is the cognitive processes used by
social actors to classify themselves in terms of social groups and which forms the basis of group behaviours (Hogg and Terry, 2000: 133). Self-categorisation is based on cognitive prototypes or clusters of beliefs, rules, norms and modes of behaviour that form clear distinctions between in-group and out-group ideologies (Hogg and Terry, 2000, Stets and Burke, 2000). Critically, these prototypes or clusters of beliefs ‘... maximize similarities within and differences between groups, thus defining groups as distinct entities’ (Hogg and Terry, 2000: 124). Therefore, the internalisation of occupational ideologies and practices contributes to the formation of clear delineations between in-group and out-groups and further validates the in-group cognitive prototypes.

The internalisation of in-group ideologies and practices therefore serves to reduce uncertainty (Hogg and Terry, 2000). Uncertainty reduction within self-identity is a core human trait and is defined as ‘... a need to reduce subjective uncertainty about one’s perceptions, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors and, ultimately, one’s self-concept and place within the social world’ (Hogg and Terry, 2000: 124). Importantly, the validated perceptions, ideologies, beliefs and practices of a social group serve to strengthen self-identity through uncertainty reduction and self-enhancement (Hogg and Terry, 2000). This is achieved in part by a process of depersonalisation, defined as ‘... a change in self-conceptualization and the basis of perceptions of others’ (Hogg and Terry, 2000: 123). A person internalises changes in attitudes or beliefs to conform to social perceptions of the social norms and beliefs of the social group. This is can be seen in the ways newcomers to a social or organisational group change behaviours over time as their attitudes move towards the collective beliefs of the group (Ashforth and Mael, 1989).

However, there are clear distinctions between social identity and role identity, or in this case, occupational role identity. Social group identification does not necessary mean a social actor will actively engage and contribute to the group (Ashforth and Mael, 1989, Stets and Burke, 2000). Role identification is differentiated, in that social actors must physically or verbally engage in a reciprocal relationship with organisational group members as they perform their role (Stets and Burke, 2000). Within the organisational structure, micro social groups may form based on self-beliefs and practices in the negotiation of everyday work (Stets and Burke, 2000). Therefore, ‘[b]y maintaining the
meanings, expectations, and resources associated with a role, role identities maintain the complex interrelatedness of social structures’ (Stets and Burke, 2000: 227). However, the self or personal identity is always categorised last, because it is set aside in favour of role and social identity, depending on the social context of interaction (Stets and Burke, 2000).

Social actors place emphasis on a positive social identity, therefore they must be able to view themselves in a positive self-light. A sense of positive self-regard is essential to a positive sense of self and a positive view of one’s occupational role. Self-regard is generated by and through social interaction; it is shaped, defined, validated and internalised through interactions with others or, as Ashforth and Kreiner state, by ‘... internalising collective values, meanings and standards, people come to see themselves somewhat through the eyes of others’ (1999: 417). Consequently, dirty work, social stigmatisation and marginalisation may have a profound impact on a social actor’s positive self-regard or sense of self. However, research has shown that people who do dirty work are able to maintain a positive self-identity and positive self-regard (Ashforth et al., 2007).

4.1.3 Cognitive Processes to Overcome Stigmatisation

Occupational ideological methods related to in-group solidarity can be used to overcome the stigma of doing dirty work. These include reframing, recalibrating, refocusing and social weighting (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999, Ashforth et al., 2007), and the positive affirmations of group solidarity. Reframing is a method of narrative negotiation that upholds the socially positive aspects of dirty work and negates or plays down its negative aspects (Ashforth et al., 2007). Recalibrating involves modifying the ‘... standards used to evaluate the scale (how much) and/or valence (how good) of the tainted components’ of dirty work (Ashforth et al., 2007: 150). Refocusing is a method of drawing attention away from the tainted aspects of the dirty work and focusing on the non-tainted components (Ashforth et al., 2007: 150).

Social weighting is perhaps the most salient process used at the in-group level. It is a process of selective exclusion that strengthens in-group solidarity. Social weighting involves the in-group ‘condemning the condemners’ or criticising those outsiders who criticise them and lending support to those who support them (Ashforth et al., 2007: 150).
The in-group hold themselves in a positive light compared with those outsiders who criticise them (Ashforth et al., 2007). Occupational ideologies normalise the stigmatisation of dirty work through an active cognitive and conversational process within the in-group. This, in effect, creates what Ashforth et al. (2007: 160) called ‘social buffering’. The solidarity of the in-group insulates and protects individual social actors from the stigmatising effects of social stigmatisation. However, it may also contribute to social isolation in some instances.

Moral imagination and moral reasoning are also involved in the protection of self-identity in stigmatising occupations. Moral imagination ‘... refers to the emotional and critical components of moral deliberation’ that a person undertakes in decision-making (Roca, 2010: 137). Although dirty work becomes stigmatised through socially constructed and strongly held beliefs and norms, Roca has suggested that stigmatisation may be grounded in ethically based issues at the individual level (Roca, 2010). Thus, social actors are faced with complex ethical or moral controversies within their daily working lives that require concrete action (Roca, 2010). For example, there is a moral dimension in deciding to restrain or use force against a person as part of the occupational role. The moral dilemma may have a more profound impact on the positive sense of self than social stigma (Ashforth and Kreiner, 2014).

Morally dirty work is therefore potentially more damaging to individual self-identity than socially defined dirty work (Ashforth and Kreiner, 2014). The internal conflict created within social actors when they perceive that their work runs counter to their intrinsic moral beliefs is implicated in job dissatisfaction, absenteeism and quitting the job (Ashforth, 2000). Nonetheless, cognitive strategies also contribute to the ability of social actors to cope psychologically with morally dirty work. Cognitive dissonance theory posits that when incongruence exists between core value beliefs and behaviour, such as in dirty work, there is a level of psychological distress or discomfort that the individual is motivated to alleviate (Glasford et al., 2008). Intergroup dissonance is the state of distress or discomfort caused when the beliefs or values of the social actor are at odds with organisational or social group ideologies or practices (Glasford et al., 2008). This results in cognitive disidentification where the social actor distances him or herself

---

18 See Ashforth et al., 2007 for a full discussion of social buffering.
from the behaviour of the group to preserve a positive self-identity (Glasford et al., 2008).

Within organisational roles, disparities between personal views and dirty work may result in dissonance and occupational disidentification (Jost and Banaji, 1994). The social actor must differentiate him or herself from the occupational role to preserve self-identity and lower dissonance (Jost and Banaji, 1994). Although vicarious dissonance has been confirmed, others have has concluded that simply hearing about in-group adverse behaviours will generate dissonance (Elliot and Devine, 1994). False consciousness\(^\text{19}\) and the ‘just world’ hypothesis\(^\text{20}\) are other cognitive strategies used to preserve self-identity and positive self-regard (Furnham, 2003) and stereotyping\(^\text{21}\) (Greenwald and Banaji, 1995). Fundamentally, these three concepts propose, through hierarchical power, resource distribution, social status and occupational roles, that social actors are deserving of their class, role and position within society (Jost and Banaji, 1994: 3). These propositions are generated and substantiated through social beliefs and actions. They are reinforced and validated and remain implicit, even to those who are stigmatised or marginalised (Jost and Banaji, 1994, Glasford et al., 2008).

### 4.1.4 Coercive Use of Force and Dirty Work

Occupations such as police work, psychiatric nursing, corrections officers and bouncers involve the coercive use of force when dealing with people. Occupations involving coercive violence have been defined as dirty work, although it has been argued that what society views as dirty work is not the same as ascribed by workers themselves (Emerson and Pollner, 1976, Dick, 2005). For workers, dirty work is those aspects of their work that are menial, ‘rubbish’ or ‘shit work’ and which take them away from their primary role (Emerson and Pollner, 1976, Dick, 2005). By distinguishing ‘shit work’ from core business roles, workers are able to effect a moral distance from the ‘dirty’ aspects of their work as a trade-off against its positive and more defining aspects

\[^{19}\text{False consciousness is a process of ‘... holding ... beliefs that are contrary to one’s personal or group interest ... which thereby contribute to the maintenance of the disadvantaged position of the self or the group’ (Jost and Banaji, 1994: 3).}\]

\[^{20}\text{The ‘just world’ hypothesis proposes the world is just and fair and that people ‘get what they deserve’ rather than believe the world and the people in it are fundamentally bad or evil.}\]

\[^{21}\text{Stereotyping is the social production of erroneous categories of Other, normally sectioned by race, class, occupational role, gender, social status etc. These categories are oft taken to be implicitly understood and are social supported and maintained, often to the detriment of the Other.}\]
(Emerson and Pollner, 1976, Shaw, 2004), or refocus on other aspects of their work (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999). Coercive use of force in clinical settings and by police were rationalised by moral judgements about people being uncooperative and ‘difficult’ (Emerson and Pollner, 1976, Shaw, 2004, Dick, 2005). Cooperative people were seen to legitimise the professional role whereas uncooperative people were judged as denying legitimisation and therefore deserving of a more authoritarian approach to management (Shaw, 2004), a product of the ‘just world’ hypothesis.

The construction of positive self-identities of self-worth and positive regard while doing dirty work is managed through talk and conversation. Strategies implemented to maintain a moral sense of worth include active constructions of occupational role through refocusing, reframing and recalibrating (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999), the process of moral imagination (Roca, 2010), disidentification (Glasford et al., 2008) and professional legitimacy (Tracy and Scott, 2006). In occupations where there is coercive use of force, the legitimacy of state authorised authority is used against a backdrop of a moral and ‘just world’ rationale (Dick, 2005) and gendered constructions of ‘tough’ masculinity (Tracy and Scott, 2006). Corrections officers have been called the ‘scum of law enforcement’ (Tracey and Scott, 2006: 7) and bouncers the ‘rump end’ of private security (Lister et al., 2000: 384). However, as much as the two occupations are considered the lowest end of the occupational prestige scale, corrections officers are awarded the protection of state authority whereas bouncers are not.

4.2 Emotional Labour

There had been little research into or understanding of the role of emotion in terms of occupational roles until Hochschild (1983) proposed the concept of emotional labour, defined as the ‘... management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display’ (Hochschild, 1983: 7). The concept describes the control an individual must exert over the emotions to present a publicly or socially acceptable ‘face’ or demeanour. Hochschild’s work originally involved airline stewardess and bill collectors, but it has been extended to many other professions (Naqvi, 2013) including those professions involved in dirty work (McMurray and Ward, 2014). The process of enacting and negotiating occupational roles is governed by organisational standards of ‘display rules’ and behaviour (Hochschild, 1983). Organisational ‘display rules’ define
the parameters of what is said to clients/customers, how it is delivered, ‘expected’ facial displays and the accompanying bodily postures and behaviours (Hochschild, 1983).

Hochschild (1979) stressed that the key features of emotional labour were very distinct. It is an active cognitive process of consciously controlling or ‘labouring’ over socially conflicted feelings in the public arena. Emotional labour produces a socially expected and shaped response in any given situation; as Hochschild stated, it

... fosters attention to how people try to feel, not, as for Goffman, how people try to appear to feel ... and leads us to attend to how people consciously feel and not, as for Freud, how people feel unconsciously. (1979: 560)

Emotional labour involves the conscious cognitive effort of trying to regulate or shape emotions, rather than the outcome of the effort (Hochschild, 1979). The shaping or moulding of emotions to produce a socially acceptable demeanour is markedly different to simply controlling emotions. Emotional labour is the management of feeling to change emotions to a desired outcome, both in the person controlling the emotion and in the recipient of their labour.

Emotional labour or management involves two broad cognitive processes, evocation and suppression. Evocation is the ‘... cognitive focus ... on a desired feeling which is initially absent’ and suppression occurs when ‘... the cognitive focus is on an undesired feeling which is initially present’ (Hochschild, 1979: 561). Therefore, emotional labour involves attempts to change thoughts that produce desired or undesired feelings, and transforming those feelings to achieve the desired outcome (Hochschild, 1979).

Evocation and suppression are cognitive processes while display rules are the outward product of the emotional labour or the ‘bodily display’ that results from it (Hochschild, 1975). The third aspect of emotional labour is expressive emotional work, which is defined as ‘... trying to change expressive gestures in the service of changing inner feeling (e.g., trying to smile, or to cry)’ (Hochschild, 1979: 562). Crucially, expressive emotional work involves changing feelings to change behaviour, rather than simple display (Hochschild, 1979: 562).
4.2.1 Deep Acting and Surface Acting

Hochschild (1983) proposed that emotional labour contained two major strategies for bodily display rules, surface acting and deep acting, corresponding to the management of emotions at the surface level (faking it) and the deeper level (understanding and empathising). Deep acting involves the changing of feelings to change emotions, whereas surface acting does not. Hochschild proposed that incongruence between a social actor’s personal ‘feeling’ self and public ‘display’ could result in (dis)stress. A simple example is being expected (in Hochschild’s example) to smile and be pleasant when feeling angry or upset. Hochschild believed that this ability came back to the notion of behavioural or occupational role, as opposed to an individual or personal role.

Organisations encourage vocal and behavioural scripts that are based on good service and social expectations of normative behaviour (Hochschild, 1983, Steinberg and Figart, 1999). Good service may also include specific uniforms, standards of physical grooming and behavioural expectations (Hochschild, 1983). Emotional labour is also involved in the management of other people’s emotions in occupations such as service workers (Steinberg and Figart, 1999, Rupp et al., 2008), police officers (Schaible and Gecas, 2010), corrections officers (Tracy and Scott, 2006), and I would argue, bouncers. Emotional labour is bound by the social norms implicit in sociocultural rules and norms and it defines the boundaries of permissible emotional and bodily display. Although organisations demand and expect specific emotional and bodily displays, these are shaped by sociocultural rules (Hochschild, 1979).

4.2.2 ‘Feeling Rules’

Hochschild nominated sociocultural rules as feeling rules (1979: 564). Sociocultural rules define the displays that are appropriate in certain situations and those that are not permitted. Hochschild gives the example of laughing at a funeral, which is considered socially inappropriate because funerals implicitly are a time of sadness and often grief (1979). Society imposes verbal sanctions for inappropriate feelings at inappropriate times, such as ‘... having the right to feel angry at someone, ... [you] ... should feel more grateful, ... [you] ... shouldn’t feel so guilty’ (Hochschild, 1979: 564). Others remind us of what the appropriate feelings are, at a given time and in a given context. Feeling rules are governed by how one would ‘... expect to feel ... [and how one] ... should feel in any
given situation’ (Hochschild, 1979: 564, her emphasis). Thus, ideological notions of autonomous feelings are balanced between what one wants to feel, what one should feel and what one tries to feel (Hochschild, 1979: 565, my emphasis).

Feeling rules are intertwined reciprocally with framing rules, ‘... rules according to which we ascribe definitions or meanings to situations’ (Hochschild, 1979: 566). Framing rules govern or mediate feeling rules to ensure conformity to sociocultural norms of emotion and behaviour. Therefore, we may feel justifiably angry at the person who cuts in front of us at the bank teller, but framing rules decree it is not appropriate to yell at them in a bank. Occupational roles are governed by the same feeling and framing rules and are influenced and transformed by lived experiences and changes in ideological stances (Hochschild, 1979). Therefore, feeling and framing rules may change with occupational roles, social influences (such as feminism) and social status. Moreover, emotional labour and deep acting are more likely to involve occupational work than individual personal selves (Hochschild, 1979).

4.3 Emotional Dirty Work

The combination of emotional labour and dirty work is a recent theoretical development. Post-industrial society has evolved since Hughes (1958) developed the term dirty work, with a steep decline in manufacturing and the rapid rise of consumerism. The move to consumerism and a service delivery society under neoliberalist governance has changed the fundamental roles of occupational work. Post-industrial society based on a service delivery marketplace has led to the development of new forms of work and thereby new forms of dirty work. Although the parameters of social, physical and moral dirty work as proposed by Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) were considered inclusive, McMurray and Ward proposed the term ‘emotional dirty work’ as a new form of dirty work (2014: 2). Sanders (2010) believed it comprised a significant element of some occupational roles.

Emotional dirty work involves dealing with emotionally difficult situations, such as another person’s grief or loss, as a normal part of an occupational role (Sanders, 2010). Emotional dirty work entails dealing with ‘... the profoundly “sad” elements of an occupation’ and was stated to be more difficult to cope with than the normal taint of dirty work (Sanders, 2010: 246). Emotional dirty work was formally defined as ‘...
expressed feelings that threaten the solidarity, self-conception or preferred orders of any given individual or community’ (McMurray and Ward, 2014: 12). Put simply, it involves dealing with other people’s emotions when these run contrary to mainstream sociocultural norms. McMurray and Ward cited examples such as a young husband’s concern he may be gay or a young man’s concern about cross-dressing (2014). Such concerns run contrary to the social order and potentially are socially devastating.

Emotional dirty work therefore involves the contact with and management of emotions that are potentially polluting to the listener. It exposes workers to ‘... immoral acts, taboos and misplaced feelings of others that threaten social solidarity’ (McMurray and Ward, 2014: 12). Emotions that are ‘out of place’ threaten concepts of the self and social solidarity because they are deemed to be emotionally dirty or carry taint (McMurray and Ward, 2014). Sanders (2010) proposed that the notion of emotional dirty work should include the polluting work of veterinary technicians when consoling grief-stricken pet owners, but McMurray and Ward’s concept is much more specific and refers to dealing with emotions that are tainted. Funeral directors, veterinary technicians and nurses deal with grief and loss as part of their occupational role, but the emotions they deal with are customary and do not threaten social order.

4.4 Gender Inequality and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

The gendered division of labour is based on the notion of qualities ascribed through being male or female and the subsequent social roles. The division of labour was a consequence of the capitalist market system that ordained a division between working life and home life (Kreimer, 2004). The capitalist market created a divide which ‘... defined proper places for men (the world of commerce, the job) and women (the home)’ (Kreimer, 2004: 227). Women were deemed responsible for childbearing, breastfeeding, nurturing of children and caregiving because of their biological make-up, and they were therefore seen to hold societal attributes or qualities such as ‘... selflessness, concern with others, and a desire to be at one with others’ (Eagly and Steffen, 1984: 736). Men, on the other hand, were ascribed more agentic qualities such as ‘... self-assertion, self-expansion, and the urge to master’ (Eagly and Steffen, 1984: 736).

22 ‘Out of place’ is defined as emotions people have ‘... no other apparent space for being worked through, heard or managed’ (McMurray and Ward, 2014: 12), such as those who are excluded by their behaviour from normal services.
Although there have been changes, a consequence of the division of domestic and employment roles has been that women still hold lower status in relation to men, while gender stereotyping and the gendered division of labour still exist (Eagly and Steffen, 1984). Men, even in domestic roles, usually hold higher social status and authority than women, because of their employment ability and the history of patriarchal dominance in most postmodern countries (Eagly and Wood, 1999, Kreimer, 2004). Men traditionally held social positions of power and status, with women taking lower paid work and maintaining the homemaker role (Eagly and Wood, 1999, Kreimer, 2004). Positions of power and status are male dominated, with women at a lower status and occupying subordinate roles (Eagly and Wood, 1999).

As women increasingly move into male dominated occupations, the gendered division of labour is becoming progressively blurred (Diekman and Eagly, 2000). Role identity theory proposes that a social actor is assigned particular stereotypical characteristics based upon his or her occupational role within a given social group (Diekman and Eagly, 2000). Role-based activities generate gender stereotypes within designated occupations based on the characteristics central to the role (Diekman and Eagly, 2000). This is seen in the number of women in nursing and caregiving roles that are similar to the domestic role. Women’s entry into employment may therefore require a change in behaviours based on the role undertaken within the organisational group (Diekman and Eagly, 2000). Social expectations about gendered stereotypical roles assume women undertake caregiver, nurturing roles and men undertake leadership or power roles (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006).

### 4.4.1 Stereotypical Beliefs

Socially generated stereotypical beliefs or expectations are both descriptive and prescriptive. Descriptive social beliefs dictate ‘... what men and women are typically or usually like’ in relation to gender prescribed stereotypic characteristics (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006: 369). Prescriptive social beliefs or expectations define ‘... what men and women are ideally like or should be like’, supposing a prescriptive nature based on occupational role (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006: 369). Therefore ‘[d]escriptive beliefs designate the likelihood that groups will possess certain traits ... whereas prescriptive beliefs designate the value of those traits’ (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006: 369–370). Research has shown that social beliefs conforming to gender stereotypes are
based on perceptions of the stereotypical gendered division of labour (Diekman and Eagly, 2000, Diekman et al., 2004, Wilde and Diekman, 2005, Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006), thus determining that gendered stereotypical beliefs are subject to elements of flux and fluidity based on the occupational role.

4.4.2 Role Congruity theory

Role congruity theory is an extension of social role theory and explores the extent to which occupational roles influence and challenge gendered stereotypical beliefs (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006). Role congruity theory proposes the occupational role is more influential in defining a person’s characteristics than the gender stereotypical norm. That is, ‘... rewards accrue when the presumed characteristics of group members align with the demands of relevant social roles’ (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006: 370). Importantly, this research concluded that a more masculine physical appearance in women was not negatively valued. However ‘... masculine personality and cognitive characteristics ...’ within defined roles were positively valued in women (Diekman and Goodfriend, 2006: 370). The significant finding of this research was that attitudinal adaption of gendered roles for women (although not men) is malleable over time and subject to change based on the occupational role and the perceived level of role competency.

However, social actors who deviate from traditional gender roles often receive negative social sanctions, may be labelled as deviant, or are marginalised or discriminated against because of their behaviour (Becker, 1963). Some occupations remain male dominated or female dominated. Women performing ‘men’s’ work are seen by some to be socially deviant because they are deviating from the socially accepted normal standards or norms of conduct. Women entering a male dominated occupation may become masculinised or suffer discrimination because of their gender (Sasson-Levy, 2003). The military is one highly masculinised occupation, and women soldiers masculinise themselves though lower voice pitch tones, coarse language, strutting walks and brash behaviours (Sasson-Levy, 2003). Women stated that they needed to be more resilient and less emotional than their male counterparts, and were subjected to higher standards of performance than men (Riley, 2008).
Jeffreys (2007) has proposed that women soldiers face double jeopardy where they are in danger of physical attack from their male colleagues and from the enemy. The high incidence of rape and sexual assault within military ranks is evidence of the Othering of women (Riley, 2008) and hostile sexism (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011). Women are seen as sexual objects and men have feelings of superiority and believe in their entitlement to intimacy even when it is not wanted. Men have difficulty in accepting women as equals in hyper-masculine military roles (Riley, 2008). Traditionally, women were seen as objects of sexuality and procreation, the ‘weaker sex’ in need of masculine protection, what Clow and Ricciardelli (2011: 201) refer to as benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism (dominative paternalism) and benevolent sexism (protective paternalism) are gendered forms of negative heterosexual attitudes to women that serve to subordinate them and maintain the power status of men (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011: 201).

However, the notion of women as soldiers has critically challenged this patriarchal gendered assumption and created confusion in the minds of men (Riley, 2008). The challenge of women in violent occupations or working to gain acceptance in hyper-masculine roles is problematic (Riley, 2008, Jeffreys, 2007). Women are responding to gender subordination through ‘compensatory gender differentiation’ strategies (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011: 202) to breach the gender divide and define positive self-identity. Men’s perceptions of women have been described as ‘... the pedestal–gutter syndrome or the Madonna–whore dichotomy’ (Travis and Wade, 1984, cited in Glick and Fiske, 2001: 109, emphasis in original). The polarised views of women held by men, and of men held by women, date back centuries and underscore sexist attitudes and gender inequality (Glick and Fiske, 2001). These prejudicial views demonstrate hostile (gutter or whore) or benevolent (pedestal or Madonna) sexism.

4.4.3 Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Hostile sexism perceives women as attempting ‘... to control men, whether through sexuality or feminist ideology’ (Glick and Fiske, 2001: 109). Conversely, benevolent sexism perceives women as ‘... pure creatures who ought to be protected, supported, and adored and whose love is necessary to make a man complete’ (Glick and Fiske, 2001: 109). Hostile and benevolent sexism are opposing views of women that are underpinned by traditional patriarchal attitudes of dominance and authority and which serve to
substantiate male superiority and status (Glick and Fiske, 1996). However, although hostile sexism is a pure form of prejudice, benevolent sexism is also prejudicial in validating gender inequality. Benevolent sexism is a form of gender constraint that confines women to subservient roles of domesticity and patriarchal compliance (Glick and Fiske, 1996). Women who comply with traditional roles of femininity are rewarded by men’s adoration and protection, but those who do not are relegated to the *whore or gutter* category.

One female research participant observed of her male army comrades, ‘[y]ou’re either one of three things in the military...a bitch, a whore, or a dyke’ (Riley, 2008: 1202). Such descriptions are typical of hostile sexism. Hostile and benevolent sexism are ingrained beliefs and attitudes based on biological dispositions of reproduction that form a deep ambivalence to the opposite sex (Glick and Fiske, 1996). It is accepted that men and women must co-exist and work together in society and that they have deep innate, atavistic needs to find a mate and reproduce. The ambivalence is generated through dyadic need and social constructions of traditional gendered divisions. However, the desire for heterosexual intimacy and relationships generates ‘... a resource for which women act as the gatekeepers ... creating a vulnerability that men may resent’ (Glick and Fiske, 1996: 494), and this gives rise to the notion of women being capable of emasculating men through their sexual vulnerability to female wiles (Glick and Fiske, 1996).

Women demonstrate similar sexist attitudes towards men through hostile and benevolent heterosexual attitudes. Hostile heterosexual attitudes lead to negative, resentful attitudes towards men while benevolent heterosexual attitudes lead to protective, subjective positive attitudes towards men (Glick and Fiske, 2001). However, in all cases, at the root of both hostile (negative attitudes) and benevolent (positive attitudes) sexism is sexist prejudice derived from ‘... patriarchy, gender differentiation, and sexual reproduction’ (Glick and Fiske, 2001: 111). The subordination generated by men’s prejudicial ambivalence towards women may result in ‘compensatory gender differentiation’ (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011: 202) strategies. Hostile heterosexuality (resentment of dominative paternalism23) leads women to compare themselves with men

---

23 Paternalism is defined as ‘... attitudes of male superiority and dominance over women, but also a protectiveness toward women as “the weaker sex”’ (Fisk and Glick, 1995: 98).
in a positive superior light by the use of societal attributes (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011). Maternalism, or benevolent heterosexuality, is used in a negative, infantile portrayal of men as in need of care and nurturing by women (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011: 202).

Complementary gender differentiation through benevolent heterosexual beliefs or attitudes results in a positive view of men (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011). Men’s use of comparative gender differentiation results in negative beliefs towards women who do not conform to traditional gender roles of behaviour (Diekman et al., 2004). Therefore, women undertaking male dominated roles are perceived less favourably by men because they are deemed to be breaking the rules of socially gendered behaviour roles. Complementary gender differentiation attitudes to women who conform to gendered stereotypes result in positive, more benevolent perceptions of women (Diekman et al., 2004). Men who hold gendered sexist beliefs have a favourable view of women who undertake roles such as secretarial and nursing work. Compensatory and complementary gender differentiation strategies thereby enable both men and women to manage sexism within occupational roles and to maintain a positive sense of self within their role.

4.4.4 Social Disidentification

Social ‘distancing’ or disidentification may occur if social actors do not follow social constructions of traditional masculine or feminine occupational roles. Disidentification may also occur when women undertake occupational roles in a domain dominated by men. Although women in the military are a minority group, disidentification may occur if some women perceive that other women are not conforming to the hegemonic ideologies of the military (Sasson-Levy, 2003). A female soldier described other women in basic training in the army as follows:

Script 1 Like a kindergarten

It was like a kindergarten. Seven hundred thousand girls . . . My saying for the whole time of basic training was that a girl can’t see worse nightmares. Everyone had creams, lipsticks, all sorts of . . . disgusting . . . seven hundred thousand

---

24 Maternalism is defined as similar to paternalism but with a need for sexual intimacy and a need to protect and to nurture men (heterosexual intimacy) (Clow and Ricciardelli, 2011: 202).

Comparative gender differentiation attitudes may occur within or between genders, especially in marginalised gendered occupations. Hostile sexism, as shown above, is targeted at the women as Other because of their lack of perceived conformity to the masculinisation of the military. Therefore, by distancing herself or disidentifying with the women Other, the female soldier preserved her sense of occupational role and self-identity, probably in the hope of finding social validation from male soldiers.

As conceptualised by role congruity theory, the concept of ‘fit’ or gender appropriateness to a role is framed by a number of factors. The first is outward appearance or what one ‘looks like’ physically. Women soldiers and women miners may change their demeanour when donning a uniform or their work overalls. When women cloaked themselves in the ‘uniform of work’ and consequently the masculinised occupational role, they acted more boldly, walked more confidently, spoke and acted more brashly (Sasson-Levy, 2003, Benya, 2009). One participant in Benya’s study reported:

Script 2 Women in overalls

These overalls hide our women. Last week we were going to a funeral and they were all looking very smart, like real ladies, you know! I could not even recognise some of them; they looked absolutely beautiful and behaved like women. (Benya, 2009: 113)

The transformation of behaviour appropriate to the ‘uniform’ or occupational role is therefore a gendered adaption to the masculine nature of the role. The accompanying body language and overt boldness is the second role adaption strategy used by women in masculine dominated occupations.

The mimicry or mimicking of masculine behaviour by women may be unconscious in some instances.
Script 3 Mom says I talk dirty

Mom says I started to talk more dirty and much more abrasively and more aggressively [during the service]. That’s what she said. I didn’t even notice that it had happened. But she says I wasn’t like that before the army, that I was more delicate. (cited in Sasson-Levy, 2003: 448)

Script 4 Women carrying a rifle

They walk proud and upright, with big strides like they know where they’re going. You won’t see someone with a rifle wandering, looking around, unsure of the situation . . . she wants to get somewhere. (cited in Sasson-Levy, 2003: 449)

By downplaying feminine traits such as softness and gentleness and exaggerating masculine traits such as bold confidence and loud voices, women transform their gendered selves to suit the occupational role (Sasson-Levy, 2003). The unconsciousness of such behaviours, as cited in Script 3, is underpinned by the implicit need for social acceptance and social validation of the occupational role. It is a role dominated by male ideologies of toughness, strength and honour, backed and continually reinforced by the hegemonic masculinity of the military ethos.

4.5 Violence, Hegemonic Masculinity and Sport

In the early 1930s, sport as recreation was encouraged and legitimised to ‘... establish order and reduce class tensions’ (Kidd, 2013: 555). Sport was believed to toughen up young men and teach them courage, stamina and leadership, all valued parts of masculinity (Kidd, 2013). Women were excluded from sport because of their biology, needing to preserve their energy for childbearing (Kidd, 2013). By the 1950s, women were allowed to participate in competitive sports that were deemed ‘feminine’, such as swimming and tennis. The world of competitive sport was a ‘man’s world’ and was rigorously defended, with women who wanted to play ‘men’s’ sports relegated to female teams with modified, less aggressive rules (Kidd, 2013). However, such patriarchal segregation and feminising of traditional male sports contributed to supporting and perpetuating the gendered division of labour (Kidd, 2013).

Success in sport is the embodiment of strength, courage, resilience, competitiveness and aggression, all traits assigned to masculinity (Halbert, 1997, Birrell, 1981, Coles, 2009).
Strength and aggression are valorised and are deemed necessary attributes for succeeding in sport, while failure is viewed as emotionally destroying and emasculating (Hirose and Pih, 2010, Třebický et al., 2013). The concept of hegemonic masculinity has been particularly associated with sports such as Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) and Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) or cage fighting (Arxer, 2011). Cage fighting has been described as ‘... an insidious intrusion and expansion of violence into modern society’ and was initially marketed as a no-holds-barred (Abramson and Modzelewski, 2011: 158) exposé designed to thrill and excite the audience.

Hegemonic heterosexual masculinity reportedly shuns all forms and expressions of femininity and embraces the patriarchal attributes of aggression, leadership and bodily capital (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity in combat sports such as MMA and cage fighting exemplifies the aggressive violence of bodily combat (Hirose and Pih, 2010). This includes the control of emotional displays and feelings (Vaccaro et al., 2011). The valorisation of violence and aggression in sport has been linked to sexual assault and rape (Kidd, 2013) and feminine sexist slurs are used as ‘hold’ names in MMA, such as ‘... cuntbar, rapechoke and beaver trap’ (Weaving, 2014: 133). The heterosexual position of ‘man on top’ is articulated in wrestling as the dominant sexual penetration position, suggesting the man ‘on the bottom’ is the submitter, or the sexually penetrated (Hirose and Pih, 2010: 2000). Messner (cited in Vaccaro et al., 2011: 133) further contended, the ‘man on top’

... is a relational act of domination and subordination. The ‘men’ are the ones who are on top, in control, doing the penetrating and fucking. Women, or penetrated men, are subordinate, degraded, and dehumanised objects of sexual aggression.

In order to ‘submit’ in MMA or cage fighting, the opponent has to ‘tap out’ or indicate they submit or ‘give in’ (Hirose and Pih, 2010). Some fighters refuse to ‘tap out’, seeing it as humiliating, and prefer to endure considerable injury or loss of consciousness rather than submit or concede defeat (Hirose and Pih, 2010). The injuries received in training and during a fight are viewed as part of the job, to be dealt with stoically by just getting on with it (Vaccaro et al., 2011, Weaving, 2014). The art of fostering fear through intimidation is also a valued element of MMA and cage fighting (Vaccaro et al., 2011). Intimidation is practiced through ‘badass’ walks, the ‘stare down’ of the
opponent, through bodily displays of muscul arity and verbal ‘put-downs’ (Vaccaro et al., 2011: 429–430). Intimidation is thought to instil fear and uncertainty in opponents while simultaneously empowering the fighter.

The controversy raised by women entering sports such as MMA and UFC is based on the hegemonic masculine nature of the sports. Women’s entry into cage fighting was based on populist demand and validated by economic gain (Weaving, 2014). UFC is the most watched sport internationally, with nearly six million paying viewers in 2012 across Asia, Europe and Russia (Weaving, 2014). Rowdy Ronda Rousey was the first woman to sign with UFC and her entrance into the male-dominated sport drew international attention; however, Weaving argued that UFC is still a highly sexist sport and women are treated as Objects rather than subjects. Rousey was portrayed on the cover in a special Body Issue of the sports network ESPN in 2012 and was displayed naked in decidedly hyper-feminine terms including long blond hair, make-up and pink gloves cloaked against a pink mist.

The contrast between hyper-feminine and masculinised femininity is seen in the portrayal of Australian fighter Bec Hyatt. The ultra feminine look of Rousey is stark in comparison to Hyatt’s boyish short hair, facial piercings, heavy tattoos and masculinised appearance. Women in combat sports have been perceived as a threat not only to the patriarchal dominance of the sports but also to the underlying social order (Kidd, 2013). Masculinity is measured and differentiated against the oppositional characteristics of women. Physical pain is denied, along with anxiety and fear, and emotional displays are masked under the need to ‘be a man’ (Kidd, 2013: 556–557).

Women in combat sports threaten the very order of masculinity, because they close the gap between what is it to ‘be a man’ and the traditional passive softness of femininity. Kidd mused ‘[m]en also fear the loss of traditional nurturing that might result if women learned through sports to be as hard and unyielding as males’ (Kidd, 2013: 559).

The inclusion of women in combat sports threatens hegemonic heterosexual masculinity. Women have reported feelings of personal empowerment through participation and its challenge to the traditional ethos of physical weakness and socialised helplessness (Velija et al., 2012). However, studies show that women often do not internalise the concept of physicality and aggression and thus succumb to the gendered role of submissive Object that reinforces the gendered divide (Guérandel and
Mennesson, 2007, Velija et al., 2012). The socialisation of women as societal caregivers and protectors of harms is deeply imbedded within the psyche of women, even as combat fighters, and the notion of causing harm to others through fighting is viewed as morally and personally distasteful.

Script 5: I said sorry...

She came to sweep me and I swept her stationary leg and I said sorry and the coach heard me and said ‘What you playing at? That was a good move, don’t say sorry’. I think that it is an automatic thing and that’s why I think it is a male dominated sport without a doubt because men don’t have that emotion and men aren’t that emotional. (Catherine, Kick Boxing, cited in Velija et al., 2012: 533)

Catherine’s script confirms the socialised concept of men as tough and unemotional and suited to combat sports. A socialised feminine perspective leaves the notion of masculinity as a seemingly unchallenged given that contributes to the gendered division of society. For some women, their physicality was not seen as detracting from their feminine form but simply as enhancing their ‘natural’ bodies (Sisjord and Kristiansen, 2009). Women in combat sports were also fearful of receiving black eyes, symbols of violence that were seen as a mark of victimology, often attributed to the aggression of men or domestic violence (Velija et al., 2012). Women reported feelings of marginalisation and exclusion when attending male dominated gyms, receiving a clear message that women did not belong in combat sports or masculine domains (Halbert, 1997).

Script 6: I felt uncomfortable

I felt uncomfortable with them [men] there. Most of them just, when they did come [down to the gym], they’d just stare and watch the whole time, you know. And I couldn’t really concentrate. So I liked to work out by myself ... or with [my trainer]. (cited in Halbert, 1997: 19)

Script 7: I was in a gym

I was in a gym for a while, but then ... [my friend’s] coach told [him] that I was distracting the guys. You know, he let him know that I shouldn’t go in there. (cited in Halbert, 1997: 19)
Segregation occurs in many types of sport, with the sexes being seen as ‘separate-but-equal’ (Messner, 2011: 157). Male trainers practise inclusion and exclusion at the micro-level in gyms (Velija et al., 2012, Dortants and Knoppers, 2013) and at the macro-level by patriarchal lead sporting organisations (Messner, 2011, Kidd, 2013). Although women are entering combat sports in increasing numbers, the gendered division does not appear to be closing. It is perpetuated at the societal level through patriarchal masculine management and at the micro-level of socialised individual beliefs of gender values and attributes (Messner, 2011, Velija et al., 2012, Kidd, 2013). Conversely, the notion of hegemonic heterosexual masculinity has problematised combat sports in relation to men’s emotion management and display.

The attainment and preservation of respect is believed to be integral to the combat sports. Earning respect through hard work, dedication to training and ‘taking it like a man’ pervades the industry, for both male and female fighters (Halbert, 1997, Vaccaro et al., 2011, Velija et al., 2012, Dortants and Knoppers, 2013). Injuries are perceived as just a part of business, while public emotional displays of weakness and acting like a girl or a sissy are condemned, even at the micro-level. Success is contingent on being ‘tough’ enough and ‘man’ enough to succeed in industries that favour and valorise overt aggression and violence (Velija et al., 2012, Dortants and Knoppers, 2013). However, the extent to which men (and women) must manage emotional displays in hegemonic heterosexual environments has only recently been investigated in research (Vaccaro et al., 2011). The emotional labour of ‘doing’ combat sports or occupations that involve combative action therefore deserves further investigation by researchers.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined and discussed the theories used as part of the research framework. Each theory has a role to play in defining the sociocultural and socio-cognitive parameters for social behaviour and to expose the values, attitudes and beliefs of social groups and members. The analysis of scripts or talk of other research participants revealed the gendered divide that still exists in Western society, the role of hostile and benevolent sexism and the cognitive strategies employed by social actors when undertaking dirty work, managing emotional labour or working in gendered occupations. Cognitive strategies such as compensatory gender differentiation and complementary gender differentiation were identified in the scripts, along with social
‘distancing’ or disidentification strategies. The role of combat sports and the gendered divide was used to show how actions such as public displays of emotional are condemned in the sport and traits such as overt aggression are valued.

Violence is perceived to be ‘just a part of business’ and injuries are ‘part of the job’. Combat sports also use bodily displays and posturing such as the ‘stare down’, ‘badass’ walks, bodily displays of musculature and verbal ‘put-downs’. Bouncers also use these emotional and bodily displays in their occupational role as part of their repertoire for managing unruly bodies in the night-time economy. For bouncers, violence is also ‘just business’ and injuries are to be expected.
Chapter 5

Bouncers as Work in the Night-time Economy

This chapter focuses on bouncers and their occupation role, and draws on the theoretical perspectives outlined in Chapter 4. The research on bouncers and their work is explored and the theories provide explanations and understandings of how bouncers conduct business and why they behave as they do when undertaking their work. Therefore, this chapter is not only an outline of bouncers and their occupational role, but is also a theoretical analysis of their behaviours, their scripts or spoken dialogues as reported in other research. By using the theoretical perspectives, we are able to draw an understanding of not only their bodily work, but also their cognitive strategies for forming a positive sense of self in a socially stigmatised industry. This analysis draws on the cognitive and social analysis defined in van Dijk’s (1995) theory of ideologies (Figure 2, p. 80).

The chapter begins with a definition of the word ‘bouncer’. The origin of the term is relevant to this discussion because the word has had a tarnished history from its conception that appears to be resistant to public perceptual change. Although private security personnel are formally called crowd controllers or security guards, the generic term ‘bouncer’ is still widely used by the news media. An account of the work of bouncers or their ‘bodily’ work is included in this section, given that physicality and the ability to control other bodies is central to their occupational role. Bouncers, masculinity and violence are discussed, with a specific focus on hegemonic masculinity and the links between masculinity and violence. Masculinity was discussed in Chapter 2 in relation to patrons in the night-time economy, but this section looks exclusively at bouncers and their behaviours and perceptions.

The subsequent sections discuss women as bouncers, and interactions between female bouncers and patrons. Most people believe bouncers are male, but with women now also employed as bouncers in the night-time economy, the nature of how bouncers do business has changed. This perspective is illustrated by an examination of bouncers’
scripts or dialogue (talk) to discern their attitudes and beliefs relating to their work, followed by a critique of women involved in violence in the night-time economy, as described by male and female bouncers in research studies.

There is a brief discussion of the few studies of patrons’ views of bouncers, followed by a critique of emotional labour, dirty work and bouncers, with a specific focus on bouncer discourse or their scripts (talk) as expressed in other research. There is an examination of the perceptions of bouncers as ‘tough guys’, the methods they use to convey this image and the reasons for it. The chapter concludes with a discussion on occupational risk, violence and stress relating to bouncers. There is very little research around these topics, but it is crucial to understanding their occupational role and the possible dangers and personal difficulties they face while undertaking their work.

5.1 Origins of the word ‘bouncer’

The American novelist Horatio Alger Jr. introduced the term ‘bouncer’ in 1875\textsuperscript{25}. He described how a young lad was literally booted out of a restaurant by a waiter who was ordered to ‘bounce him’ for not paying for his meal. The \textit{London Daily News} on 26 July 1883 stated that ‘[t]he bouncer is merely the English “chucker out”’. When liberty verges on license and gaiety on wanton delirium, the Bouncer selects the gayest of the gay, and – “bounces them”’ (cited in the Online Etymology Dictionary, 2011).

However, in contemporary times, the term bouncer has been strongly condemned because of its negative stereotyping. Those in the industry argue that it is a draconian concept not suited to the professionalised industry of today (National Doorwatch UK, 2011, personal communication). Nonetheless, it is important to understand the work of

\footnote{\textsuperscript{25} During my search for the origins of the word bouncer, I came upon the following description of bouncers. It is a perfect example of how bouncers are portrayed as thugs in the media and, it would seem, on social media. ‘Have you ever wondered why we call those unreconstructed Neanderthals who work in the private security industry, generally loitering menacingly in the doorways of places you would never want to go into, bouncers? During the latter part of the nineteenth century, American saloon owners and those who ran houses of ill-repute began employing sheriffs and other security men to prevent rowdy and drunken customers from harassing the bar girls. In modern times, of course, customers are more likely to need protection from the bouncers themselves. The word was popularised by the prolific author Horatio Alger, Jr., whose novel \textit{The Young Outlaw; or, Adrift in the Streets} (1875) included a chapter entitled ‘Bounced’, in which Sam, the penniless young hero, is thrown out of a restaurant when it is discovered he does not have enough money to pay for his meal. The following passage inspired the name we now give to the hundreds of thousands of monosyllabic, neckless bullies who have been patrolling our pavements society ever since.’ Available: \url{http://albertjackchat.com/2012/12/03/bouncers/}}
bouncers, the environment in which they work and the social and political context under which the ply their trade.

5.2 Bouncers and Work

The context is critical to the understanding of micro-level actions (and reactions) because it situates and frames behaviour within spatial and temporal parameters (Lister, 2002). The work of bouncers is situated within a liminal, hedonistic nightlife where unrestrained behaviour is sanctioned and often encouraged (Winlow and Hall, 2006). Bouncers are the gatekeepers of the night-time economy (Hobbs et al., 2003) and hold the power of entry to these nightlife enclaves. Through their physical ‘bodies’ they are a commercial resource for licensed premises, holding the key to economic gain by the use of ‘bodily’ capital (Lister, 2002). Bouncers are involved in an active process of inclusion or exclusion by their presence on the door, and are charged with monitoring and filtering the clientele suitable for the nightclub (Hadfield, 2006, Graham and Homel, 2008).

The rise of niche or stylised venues led to the role of doormen or bouncers on the door. It is important that patrons reflect the particular style or presence represented and marketed by the nightclub or venue, (Monaghan, 2006, Winlow and Hall, 2006) and hence bouncers have a gatekeeper role to ‘filter’ potential clientele and determine their suitability (Hadfield, 2006). Inside the venue, bouncers are responsible for maintaining the social order of the crowd. Within the dimly lit depths of commercial clubs with loud music, vertical drinking or MVVD (Mass Volume Vertical Drinker) (Hadfield, 2006: 84), and endless access to alcohol by patrons, the bouncers’ task of maintaining social order is challenging (Monaghan, 2002). In the arena of decorative bodies where young people go to see and be seen (Monaghan, 2002), the work of bouncers in controlling social order in venues crowded with people pumped up on alcohol, party drugs and excitement is a true embodiment of ‘bodily’ work and emotional labour.

Bouncers operating within the secluded domains of privately owned clubs must control other bodies and manage their own in a high-emotion atmosphere where inhibitions are loosened by alcohol and/or drugs (Monaghan, 2006). Sociocultural rules of gender and propriety determine the need for and modes of bodily touching (Gimlin, 2007). The professional touch of the bouncer on patrons’ bodies must be managed under specific
norms and rules, especially the desexualised touch between males on females and females on males (Cohen et al., 2012). The need for bodily touch is more pronounced when loud music and dim lighting prevents verbal interaction, thus the guiding touch, the warning touch and the restraining touch are more necessary for social direction and control. Uniforms are one part of controlling other bodies (Cohen et al., 2012), with bouncers gaining authority through their uniforms, which give authenticity to their need for ‘bodily’ touch. However, there is a fine line between what constitutes ‘touch’ and what constitutes ‘force’.

The ‘bodily’ work of bouncers can be considered a stigmatised and vilified occupation (Monaghan, 2002b). Their role, by its very nature, is based on the maintenance of social order in a context of alcohol and disorderly bodies (Lister, 2002). Without the protection of the legitimacy of the state (as held by police), bouncers must rely on ‘bodily’ capital such as their size, demeanour and reputation (Lister, 2002: 247). Thus, the presentation of the hyper-masculine body as physically fit with large, visible muscles contributes to the notion of capable ‘bodily’ capital (Hobbs et al., 2003). Links between alcohol, violence and licensed premises have been established (Graham and Livingston, 2011) and it is within this social context that bouncers conduct business. The high level of personal risk to bouncers is arguably part of normal business but it also indicates the use of justified force as a means of social control (Lister, 2002).

The mix of alcohol and groups of young people, particularly young men, is a recipe for violence (Graham et al., 2006). The threat or possibility of violence in nightclubs is ‘... compounded by the nature of nightclub environments where senses are down-graded and distracted by audio and visual diversions’ (Lister et al., 2000: 396). With crowded rooms, strobe lights, loud music and smoke machines, the atmosphere is one of controlled chaos designed to highlight a carnival atmosphere (Lister et al., 2000). However, violence lurks within the enclaves of unrestrained liminality and is an occupational risk that has led to a tolerance of it by bouncers (Lister et al., 2000). Violence is just part of business and there is under-reporting and under-recording of violence both against and by bouncers (Lister et al., 2000). Physical force is a means of prevention and intervention and is viewed as a legitimate resource in controlling misbehaving patrons (Lister, 2002, Monaghan, 2002b). Although the continued push for
the professionalisation of the industry has placed an emphasis on the need for minimal force, the use of justifiable force is still prevalent (Monaghan, 2003, Winlow, 2010).

5.3 Bouncers, Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence

Violence by bouncers is a dynamic of their role or occupation (Lister, 2000), a part of their job and a product of their business rather than a characteristic of individual personality traits. Bouncers are traditionally working-class men and this has raised the question of masculinity as a predisposition for bouncers’ violence. The ideology of hegemonic masculinity has been linked with descriptions of bouncers, expounded in bodily capital and physicality (Hadfield, 2006). Central to this claim is the erosion of industry-based working class trades and the ‘... irreversible erosion of the traditional male’s predominance in politics, culture and the labour market’ (Hall, 2002: 36).

However, there are extensive and complex ideologies and theoretical explanations of masculinity and hegemonic masculinity as precursors to violence.

Connell proposed the concept of hegemonic masculinity in 1983. She developed a hierarchy of masculinity in terms of gender roles and their corresponding behaviours in ‘... a model of multiple masculinities and power relations’ (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 830). Hegemonic masculinity was articulated as an inferred way of behaving or enacting sets of practices that served to reinforce and continue social patriarchal domination (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity has been used in criminology to theorise the profound overrepresentation of men in white-collar crime, murder, rape and violent crimes (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). The concept has also been used to analyse representations of masculine imagery in the mass media, including physical contact sports, health practices (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005) and alcohol-related violence (Connell, 2014).

Hegemonic masculinity as a concept has been challenged, as has the very notion of a static masculinity26. Connell (2002) stressed the historical fluidity of both the concept of hegemonic masculinity and masculinity itself, arguing that the concept of masculinity, or a gender role, and the concept of hegemony were subject to historical, social, political, sexual and cultural change over time. Connell stressed the relational importance of the concept of hegemony and argued for its different forms as ‘...

26 See Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) for a critique of this argument.
marginalized, subordinated or complicit masculinities’ (2002: 90). Dominant patterns or representations of the ideological masculine man are seen in the mass media, in institutional culture, within families and in schools. These masculinities may be controlled, reinforced or even contested, but the fundamental concept of hegemonic masculinity is the domination of men over women\(^{27}\), whether by violence, threat, coercion or manipulation (Connell, 2002).

Connell (2002) argued that hegemonic masculinity and violence are not simply matters of power relations. Violence may be used ‘... in the construction of masculinities, as part of the practice by which particular men or groups of men claim respect, intimidate rivals, or try to gain material advantages’ (2002: 95, her emphasis). Concurring with Connell, Collier stated that ‘... masculinity is frequently pervaded by considerable ambivalence, ambiguity and paradox about what it means to be “masculine”’ (2000: 9).

The biological ‘maleness’ of violence is challenged; however the psychosocial implications and sociocultural contributors are still not well understood (Collier and Hall, 2000). Therefore, within the seemingly violent culture of bouncers, the reductionist approach of explaining violence solely by hegemonic masculinity is contested. The views of bouncers themselves present violence as a role or occupational hazard, not an identity, where implied force against patrons is part of an occupational role, yet is constrained and directed by emotional labour.

### 5.4 Bouncers, Patrons and Legitimate Force

Not surprisingly, bouncers’ perceptions of patrons are decidedly pessimistic. For example, Rigakos found that patrons lied to bouncers from the moment of first contact, using fake identity documents and coaxing tales to gain entry to venues (Rigakos, 2008). When combined with the persistent imminent threat of violence, this generated a code of suspicion of patrons amongst bouncers, with a sense of hyper-vigilance pervading their occupational work (Monaghan, 2002b, Rigakos, 2008). Bouncers were ‘cynical and suspicious’ of patrons and the potential for assault was real, resulting in ‘risk aversive behaviour’ by bouncers (Rigakos, 2008: 117). They had to remain constantly vigilant to impending danger and operated under a heightened state of assessment and surveillance (Rigakos, 2008). This resulted in an ‘us’ and ‘them’

---

\(^{27}\) This concept was extended to include children, homophobia, organisational violence and more. See Connell (2002) for a review.
attitude, played out in the strong sense of occupational solidarity among bouncers (Hadfield, 2006, Rigakos, 2008).

Occupational solidarity was born out of a strong reliance on trust and support by other bouncers and was strengthened by the adverse work required of them in an uncertain environment (Rigakos, 2008). Solidarity in adverse occupational roles has been described in the police (Bennett and Corrigan, 1980) and the military (Collins, 2004). The poor behaviour of patrons and the continued threat of violence and incivility constantly reinforced implicit trust in other bouncers (Tomsen, 2005, Hadfield, 2006, Rigatos, 2008). The need to use force or physical restraint was maintained and condoned by bouncers and further strengthened their occupational solidarity (Monaghan, 2004, Tomsen, 2005). Bouncers used physicality as a form of social control within nightclubs to re-establish boundaries and levels of respect(ability) (Monaghan, 2004).

Bouncers’ reputation as physically capable was measured by action. Bouncers distrusted new bouncers until they proved they were cool headed and capable in violent altercations (Hobbs et al., 2003). Reputation was earned through physical action, being capable and reliable when backing up other team members, and ‘watching their backs’ (Hobbs et al., 2003). Although some door supervisors preferred physical size, muscle mass took preference over physical bulk (Monaghan, 2002a). Bouncers who were large but physically unfit were deemed a hindrance, with physical fitness and muscle bulk being preferred (Monaghan, 2002a). Specialised fighting abilities were a source of competence capital, although some bouncers condemned lethal fighting skills (Hobbs et al., 2003).

Bouncers were critical of aggressive male patrons, citing ‘small man syndrome’ and claiming some patrons were blatantly disrespectful and openly hostile (Tomsen, 2005: 292). In Rigakos’ study, bouncers cited well-known or important people as the worst for disrespect, stating they were ‘... demanding, critical and condescending ... because they thought themselves to be “upper class”’. They were also ‘... offended if you ask for identification’ (2008: 147) even though it was a condition of entry. Bouncers were the victims of numerous false accusations of assault, claiming that it was ‘... easy to blame the bouncer’ (Lister et al., 2000: 393). They were also the targets of assaults, with patrons deliberately attacking them as a means of gaining social status amongst their
social group (Rigakos, 2008, MacLean and Moore, 2014). There was also the potential for victimisation through intimidation and violence if patrons perceived bouncers did not possess the suitable ‘bodily’ capital (Monaghan, 2002a).

Bouncers reported being threatened with knives, bats and guns, being hit with bottles and hammers, and being punched, spat on, kicked and glassed (slashed with broken glass) (Monaghan, 2003, Hadfield, 2006, Rigakos, 2008). Violence was an everyday risk and an accepted part of the occupation role (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2003, Rigakos, 2008) in this ‘... highly victimised social group’ (Lister, 2002: 247, Monaghan, 2002a). Bouncers viewed this risk as impossible to avoid and ensured that they and their team had the necessary attitude and physicality to deal with violence, if or when it arose (Hobbs et al., 2003). While it was critically important for bouncers to possess the potential to participate in violence (Hobbs et al., 2003), it was also important that they could ‘talk down’ and ‘take down’ patrons (Rigakos, 2008: 125).

Most bouncers considered possession of the social skills needed to ‘talk people down’ as a highly prized tool (Monaghan, 2002a, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). Bouncers were cognizant of the need to be able to communicate effectively and to defuse potential violence calmly (Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). They perceived a ‘... fine line between verbal negotiation and intimidation’, but the willingness to negotiate could easily be withdrawn if they deemed it necessary (Hobbs et al., 2003: 142). Bouncers used verbal skills, the ‘warning stare’ and diffusion techniques until a point was reached where negotiation was no longer a viable proposition (Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). Traditionally, warnings were given and negotiations were entered into, but the potential for violence was always a persuasive presence, although it was usually employed as a last resort (Lister, 2002, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008).

Physical force and the ‘... use of varying degrees of force ... [were seen as] ... the most efficient and expedient method of enforcing order’ when violent incidents broke out unexpectedly (Lister, 2002: 247). Lister described this as ‘situationally justified action’ (2002: 247). Incidents that erupted unexpectedly required an immediate response and physical intervention was the primary course of action. However, physical force was seen as a last resort and some bouncers were critical of overly aggressive bouncers (Monaghan, 2002b, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). Experienced bouncers were vocal in their criticism of overt violence, speaking of ‘power trips’, ‘hot heads’ and
younger bouncers trying to ‘prove themselves’ (Rigakos, 2008: 130). Older bouncers prided themselves on their social skills and their capacity to avoid violence, arguing that violent bouncers ‘did not last long’ on the door (Hobbs et al., 2003). Other bouncers and staff condemned unrestrained, overt violence and such displays would result in dismissal (Monaghan, 2002a).

5.5 Perceptions of Bouncers as ‘Tough Guys’

The presentation of ‘bodily’ capital by bouncers is imperative to doing business. This includes physical size, demeanour and presentation (Hobbs et al., 2003). Katz (1983) believed the perception of ‘toughness’ was conveyed through adornment, dress, speech and physical ‘presence’, including leather clothing and the pervasive use of sunglasses. Photographs on the covers of books about bouncers display their typical personal presentation. Photographs 1, 3 and 4 show the use of sunglasses, while men in photographs 1 and 2 are wearing leather jackets.
The use of leather or boots of specific types (cowboy, biker) and physical evidence such as scars or tattoos intimated ‘... publically recognisable ‘toughness’... [and] ... that unusual physical risk has been suffered and transcended’ (Katz, 1983: 81). Sunglasses acted as ‘... a one-way curtain in face-to-face interaction’ (Katz, 1983: 81), in which the wearer blocked their eyes from the viewer who could not discern where the wearer was looking. Conversely, the wearer was able to view everything about the viewer. The shielding of the eyes from others’ view has long been used as a public signature of toughness (Katz, 1983), and the demeanour of toughness was expressed further through speech and bodily movement.

Katz (1983) cited the use of symbolic silence as a sign of toughness. Bouncers used symbolic silence on the door when patrons were lining up to gain entry. Guttural grunts, cutting stares or a stern nod of the head often replaced verbal communication (Katz, 1983). These signified a ‘don’t mess with me’ persona. Polite conversation was restrained and kept to a minimum to preserve the mystic of toughness. The use of specific language was also symbolic of bouncers. In Queensland, bouncers often address fellow bouncers as ‘bro’, symbolising a cultural solidarity especially among Maori men. They also use non-traditional handshakes and physical ‘man’ hugs between themselves.

I would also argue that the swaggering walk of a bouncer is quite deliberate. With bulging lat muscles (*latissimus dorsi*, or back muscles) and straining biceps, they walk with a wide-armed gait that tells of muscular strength and extreme personal confidence.
Their movements are often slow and purposeful rather than rushed, giving the impression of restrained unleashed physical potential, or as Katz stated ‘... these styles transform walking ... into a deviant esthetic statement’ (1983: 88). The preferred stance of bouncers with arms folded and legs apart, as seen in photograph 2 above, also indicates a closing off to open communication and the occupation of social space. The stoic facial expressions seen in all four photographs are also symbolic of toughness, as is the direct ‘stony’ gaze (Katz, 1983). However, the growth in niche venues and the gentrification of up-market venues have created the need for bouncers to have minimal physical contact with patrons and to replace physical presence with emotional labour and communication skills.

5.6 Gentrification and Bouncers’ Work

The progressive gentrification of the night-time economy has not only heralded a more exclusive nightlife, but has also changed the role of the bouncer. Private, niche venues have replaced traditional bouncers with managers who control venues and the patrons within and this is considered essential for the effective running of a venue (Hadfield, 2006). In these venues, bouncers were seen as conveying the impression that the venue was unsafe, and managers who employed bouncers were seen as ineffectual at their job (Hadfield, 2006). However, managers were hired who had ‘... imposing physicality ... [and were] ... sufficiently intimidating to conduct ejections simply by laying on of hands’ (Hadfield, 2006: 110). Troublesome patrons were removed swiftly and efficiently with a minimum of disruption to the social atmosphere of those in the venue (Hadfield, 2006).

Niche venues controlled troublesome patrons by a process of natural exclusion. Patrons paid an entry fee, food was served in courses with fine wines, and up-market brands of beers and spirits were served (Hadfield, 2006, Chatterton, 2002). This selective exclusion establishes a ‘market’ for who may gain entry, because minority groups, people of lower class and those without disposable incomes cannot frequent such venues (Chatterton, 2002, Hall and Winlow, 2005, Tomsen, 2011). This deliberate selection process pushes the excluded into the commercial pubs and clubs where entry is free or minimal and behavioural standards are lower. Pretty, scantily clad women gained entry with a smile and were nodded through by bouncers, while others remained in long queues outside (Rigakos, 2008). Attractive single women in venues attract
single males and commercial venues rely on these groups to bolster trade. The high number of women frequenting pubs and clubs has therefore necessitated the need for female bouncers (Hobbs et al. 2007).

5.7 Women as Bouncers

Women working as bouncers have received very little attention in research literature. In a traditionally male dominated occupation, researchers have only recently taken an interest in females as bouncers and their involvement in violence in the night-time economy. Generally, women working in violent or dangerous occupations have received little attention in research, although there is a growing body of work on women in the military (Sasson-Levy, 2003, Riley, 2008), rural fire fighting (Maleta, 2009, Ainsworth et al., 2014), corrections officers (Jurik and Halemba, 1984, Zupan, 1986), mining (Benya, 2009) and police work (Dejong, 2005, Paoline and Terrill, 2005). Male bouncers often perceived females as contributing little to the physical social control of patrons because of their inferior size and strength (Hobbs et al., 2003). However, others valued female bouncers because they were more effective at verbal communication, talking people down and dealing with female patrons (Hobbs et al., 2005, Hobbs et al., 2007, Rigakos, 2008, Rickett and Roman, 2013).

The entry of female bouncers into a male dominated occupation has challenged the sociocultural norms of feminine behaviour. Although female patrons who fight are seen as transgressing the social standards of feminine behaviour (Hobbs et al., 2003), the role of female bouncers in violent altercations is transformed through their discourse. Male bouncers expressed some disregard for the value of female bouncers (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2003, Rigakos, 2008), but two recent studies presented different opinions. The view of women as ‘gendering the door’ has challenged the socially constructed role of passive, nurturing femininity and working class, hyper-masculine door work (Hobbs et al., 2007). Women door staff challenge the stereotypical gendered division of labour that traditionally ascribed social roles as ‘men’s work’ or ‘women’s work’.

Fundamental features such as ‘doing the job’ and ‘proving yourself’ have been cited as key characteristics for women to be accepted into male occupational domains (Erickson et al., 2000). Female bouncers expressed the importance of embodied toughness and
being able to handle physical violence (Hobbs et al., 2007). Female bouncers came from working-class backgrounds where their tough upbringing taught them the physical and emotional skills to ‘gender the door’ (Hobbs et al., 2007, Rickett and Roman, 2013). Often raised in hard families, female bouncers used social capital and social networks as a mechanism for dealing with violence and diffusing trouble. Although talking down and taking down were skills in the portfolio of female bouncers, they combined these with local knowledge and local connections to deal with trouble (Hobbs et al., 2007). Being ‘connected’ socially served as a mechanism of protection against possible threats and served to deter those who sought vindication through violence. One participant stated, ‘... if someone was to come and threaten me I have certain people that will deal with the situation’ (Hobbs et al., 2007: 28).

Female bouncers dealing with male violence and aggression also had to contend with the protective benevolence of their male counterparts. Working-class women, although proficient in dealing with violence themselves, were restrained and protected by male bouncers when violence erupted. Claire, a female bouncer, expressed how she was not allowed to deal with violent male patrons but was told to ‘... stop acting like a man and be more like a woman and get back inside’ (Hobbs et al., 2007: 30). Female bouncers therefore had to contend with negotiating order with male bouncers as well as violent patrons. The contention for Claire to ‘stop acting like a man’ was a dominative heterosexual assault on her lack of femininity, a suggestion that men deal with violence and women do not; a clear indication of hegemonic heterosexual masculine perceptions of gendered roles. Even though women bouncers ‘did’ violence just like men and were highly sought after for their communication and diffusion skills, the ‘gendering of the door’ still had to be negotiated and managed in the eyes of men (Hobbs et al., 2007).

5.8 Female Bouncers and their Discourses

Role congruity theory, social identity theory and hostile and benevolent sexism can be used to unpack the role of female bouncers. Women as bouncers have carved a niche because of their ability to communicate effectively and diffuse situations, traits that are consistent with attributions of femininity. Arguably, they diminish the tough masculinity of the bouncer’s role. The level of ‘fit’ within an occupational role is an essential part of role congruity theory, and recent research has shown that women are adapting to non-traditional roles through the reframing of gender within them. Women
working as bouncers in the United Kingdom came from the same traditionally working class backgrounds as male bouncers (Hobbs et al., 2007, Rickett and Roman, 2013). Growing up ‘tough’ for these women was seen as contributing to their ability to work as bouncers (Rickett and Roman, 2013).

The patriarchal divide was exemplified by perceptions that women could not conduct ejections alone (hostile sexism) while male bouncers were seen as being overprotective of female bouncers (benevolent sexism) (Rigakos, 2008). In an occupation where ‘bodily’ capital was valued and violence is just a part of normal business (Lister, 2002, Rigakos, 2008), women as bouncers developed a discourse that reinforced their stereotypic gender qualities (maternalism) yet also highlighted their masculine values of toughness (hostile heterosexuality). The discourse surrounding women as bouncers reveals the compensatory gender differentiation strategies the women used to establish positive identities within a male dominated domain. Research on female bouncers in the United Kingdom has led to the notion of the ‘hard matriarch’ (Rickett and Roman, 2013), a female bouncer who was harder and tougher than male bouncers. This is seen in Script 8:

Script 8 She’s harder than me

They [male customers] kind of look at women doormen as ‘oh dear’, urm you know, ‘I better behave myself ’cos otherwise she’s harder than me and bigger than me because she’s a female bouncer’. (Rickett and Roman, 2013: 8)

As Rickett and Roman (2013) suggest, the portrayal of ‘harder and bigger’ and being female conveys the notion that the female bouncer is tougher, simply because of her physical attributes and being a women. Tradition decrees bouncers are tough, thus intuitively, by being a female bouncer she must be tougher than the men, and this attributes superior status to the women over men.

Script 9 shows the use of maternalism or hostile heterosexuality as a compensatory differentiation strategy by the female bouncer. The woman demonstrated her feminine skills and attitudes by ‘sorting out the problems’ while denouncing her male colleagues for their pursuit of heterosexual intimacy in collecting the telephone numbers of female patrons. This script is critical of the men not doing their job, while she was left to do all the ‘real’ work inside, signified by her two black eyes.
Script 9 Two black eyes

Well, I mean, on Monday night we had three door staff on, usually we would have five. Urm, we had two on the front door, both men. Me on the inside, and err the end of the night he turned round, ‘I’ve got 8 numbers [telephone numbers from female customers] what have you got?’ ‘Oh, I’ve got two black eyes!’ So it’s like nice, thanks lads (laughs). You know they’ve had a great night chatting up all the girls and I’ve been inside sorting out all the problems. (Rickett and Roman, 2013: 9)

A female bouncer in Script 10 also demonstrates maternalism. She described the patrons as behaving like children and consequently took on the role of mother, minder and protector. Maternalism was reinforced by the script ‘What, are you my mother?’, where patrons supported and reinforced the heavily gendered role suggestion.

Script 10 They’re like children

They’re like children. All of them like little children. You know ‘for goodness sake children put him down’ and they are like ‘What are you my mother or something? (cited in Rickett and Roman, 2013: 10)

In Script 11, the bouncer shows maternalism by taking a somewhat cynical (hostile) maternal approach to male patrons. The script is heavily laced with gendered innuendo as the female bouncer threatened to ‘drag them out by the hair’ which would be an affront to their masculine pride. The fact of being beaten up by a woman was the veiled threat conveyed here, which the women acknowledged by saying she did not want to ‘embarrass’ them in front of their friends.

Script 11 Don’t want to embarrass you

If I’m dealing with males, you know I’ll have a laugh and a joke ‘so I don’t have to drag you out by your hair and embarrass you in front of your friends’ (cited in Rickett and Roman, 2013: 10)

Rickett and Roman (2013) claim the female bouncers in Scripts 10 and 11 attributed their actions to those of ‘mother’, portraying the male bouncers and patrons as subservient to her, little boys who needed rebuking for misbehaviour. Through
comparative gender differentiation attitudes, the women lifted their own social status above those of the male bouncers and patrons with ascribed superiority. Although the women used the feminine characteristics of societal concern and sanctioning of ‘children’, the scripts are examples of dominant maternalism that takes a condescending view of men by reducing them to infants and in need of motherly care and support (Eagly and Wood, 1999).

5.9 Violent Women and Bouncer Discourses

Male bouncers are critical of female patrons who behave badly. Men interviewed by Hobbs et al. (2003) expressed conflicted concern about dealing physically with female patrons. Strong gender sociocultural rules and norms apply to male/female physical interaction and male bouncers typically took a gentle, more considered approach to dealing with troublesome female patrons. They used strategies such as reasoned talking, coaxing and appealing to a woman’s friends to assist with female patrons before the social taboo of laying on hands occurred (Hobbs et al. 2003). The process of evicting female patrons was further complicated by the uncompromising actions of the women, or as Paul stated,

Script 12 Lasses fucking shout at you

Lasses fucking shout at you, like, ‘what do you think you’re doing? Get your hands off me’ ... You’ve just got to grab and arm and say, you know, ‘sorry but you’ll have to go out’. You don’t want to be grabbing them and that. One time this lass has a go at me, trying to slap me. The rest of the lads were just standing there pissing themselves. If a woman ever has a go at you all you’ve got to do is hold your hand above your head like that, lasses always punch downways. (cited in Hobbs et al., 2003: 133)

Paul’s comment ‘you don’t want to be grabbing them’ reinforced the sociocultural boundaries between male and female contact, even under adverse conditions such as ejecting the woman from a venue (also see Forsyth and Lennox, 2010). His description of ‘holding your hand above your head when they hit you’ suggests that bouncers did not view women as a potential physical threat to them. The deeply held masculine social construct of the potential shame in being attacked by a woman was shown in the words ‘lads standing around pissing themselves’ (Hobbs et al., 2003: 133).
Male bouncers in Rigatos’ (2008) study expressed similar sociocultural inhibitions when dealing with troublesome female patrons. However, their view of females was significantly more negative.

Script 13 They’re just crazy

They’re crazy. Like they are, they’re more dangerous. They’ve been more flippy. Like they’ll turn around and punch ya in the face a lot quicker than a guy would. Probably jump on the back and choke ya, or dig your eye out or something. Women are nuts. (White male door staff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 111)

Script 14 Potentially dangerous girls

... and the girlfriend’s, somehow cracked this guy and he kind of fell down. And she kicked him in the face with her high heels. And he needed over a hundred stitches to clean himself up. That was the end of him. The end of him. He never worked in a bar again, and he was very scared by this episode. It’s potentially very dangerous. (White male door staff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 112)

The masculine view of profane and violent women is authorised by the implicit attitude that women attending nightclubs are considered to be immoral, ‘... unchaste, unreliable and generally unfit for rescuing’ (Rigatos, 2008: 110) because ‘nice’ girls do not frequent pubs and clubs (Day et al., 2003: 150). The door staff quoted above expressed the view that women were ‘nuts’, ‘crazy’ and downright ‘dangerous’ because of their unpredictability and their perceivably ‘unmanly’ methods of fighting. A woman’s potential to ‘punch’, ‘choke’, ‘dig your eye out’ and ‘kick you in the face with high heels’ paints a picture of unethical fighting, of which door staff were perhaps fearful. Although bouncers reported males punching, bitting and spitting, these behaviours appeared to conform to rules of bouncer combat, whereas women appeared to violate this code.

Female bouncers enunciated similar views about dealing with troublesome female patrons.
Script 15 Catty females

If I were to talk to a female, it would usually turn into, the female would usually escalate the situation just because it’s a female–female thing, women are catty? I don’t know ... I find, they’re the ones who would give the snide remarks or dirty looks or what have you, more so than what males would. (Female door staff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 113)

Script 16 I’m really sorry, but ...

‘I’m really sorry, but it’s time for you to go.’ So she started up ... and I said okay, told the guy to follow me kind of thing. She wanted to go find a friend. I allowed her to go do that. She then threw some profanity at me. I said, ‘Well, you’ve got two options now. You can either go out nice and quiet, or I can take you out’. So I proceed to take her out because she started to go again ...She got a hold of me on this arm. And ... she then started telling me, ‘Let me go’ and I’m like ‘You let ME go and I’ll let YOU go’. And there is no way she was gonna let me go, so he tried to grab on to her and then there was a great big kafuffle and he had to carry her away and she was kickin’ and punchin’ and she head-butted him. (White female door staff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 113–114)

The female bouncer’s description of ‘catty’ women, ‘snide remarks’ and ‘dirty looks’, and the use of ‘profanities’ supported the ethos of unsavoury women in nightclubs, where respectable girls did not go (Day et al., 2003). The description of the woman patron ‘kicking, punching and head-butting’ the male bouncer also violates the sociocultural norms of the passive, moral female (Day et al., 2003). In script 16, the female worker also recalibrated the incident for the listen/reader by the use of social rules of politeness and civility. The words, ‘I’m really sorry ‘, ‘You can either go nice and quiet or ...’ gave the patron the option to comply with a polite formal request. ‘I allowed her to do that’ defined the line of authority between the bouncer and the patron, thereby showing the listen/reader that the removal of the patron was authorised. The view of female patrons as more verbally aggressive, quicker to fight and more difficult to deal with was expressed by door staff in both the Hobbs et al. (2003) and Rigatos (2008) studies.
5.10 Other’s Views of Bouncers

Patrons’ views of bouncers have received little attention in the research literature, and findings are inconsistent. There appear to be two opposed views, depending on the social position of patrons. Tomsen found that urban men believed security staff made nightclubs safer and suggested that, ‘... security hold stuff together’ (2005: 292). Conversely, working class young men were critical of bouncers as ‘... arrogant dickhead[s] on the steroids with dicks this big’ (Tomsen, 2005: 291). Some female research participants described bouncers as ‘... just so violent and just go crazy’ (Lindsay, 2012: 238), and also stated that bouncers did not do anything when women complained to them about being ‘groped’ by men within commercial establishments (Rigatos, 2008). However, other females felt bouncers kept venues safer and were very helpful (Rigatos, 2008).

I would therefore argue the gendered division of labour and the attitudes of traditional gender roles strongly influence patrons’ perceptions of bouncers. Working-class young men viewed bouncers as arrogant and a threat to their masculinity while the more gentrified young man viewed them as contributing to control and social order. Similarly, working-class young women viewed bouncers as aggressive and ‘crazy’ while the more gentrified young women saw them as helpful. I would further argue the class differences between attitudes contribute to stereotypical beliefs in both the young people and bouncers. Bouncers viewed women who transgressed traditional societal roles as ‘sluts’ and working-class men were viewed as ‘out to make a name for themselves’ by picking fights with bouncers (Rigakos, 2008), while women who maintained traditional gendered behaviours were ‘enjoyed’ by the bouncer gaze and treated differently (Hobbs et al., 2003).

5.11 Emotional Labour, Dirty Work and Bouncers

The theoretical perspectives of emotional labour and dirty work can be used to examine bouncers’ management of patrons’ bodies. Changes to legislation in the United Kingdom and Australia, closer scrutiny by legislative bodies, and the rise in niche venues have led to a more restrained approach to bouncer behaviour. The global economic crisis affected nightclubs in tourist destinations worldwide, leading to cost containment by clubs and staff retrenchments, most notably in security (Hadfield,
The need to retain employment and the increased focus by authorities on bouncers’ behaviour has led to an emphasis on verbal intervention and management of disruptive patrons rather than physical intervention (Monaghan, 2002b; Hobbs et al., 2005). Gentrified, up-market venues demand higher social skills and verbal deterrence from their security staff. Consequently, bouncers now have to use emotional labour in dealing with difficult, aggressive and/or violent patrons.

As discussed in Sections 2.11 and 2.12, emotional labour involves surface acting or deep acting. Interviews with bouncers showed they used surface acting only, because deep acting involved the active process of changing feelings and attitudes. The occupational risk of violence and injury places bouncers, like police, in imminent danger and their distrust of patrons was evident in their scripts. Rigatos stated ‘...bouncers harbour unflattering view of many patrons in nightclubs, viewing them as childish drunkards’ (2008: 149).

Script 17 Adult Babysitter

I’m an adult babysitter. Make sure the babies don’t fight. That’s about it. (White male door staff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 149)

The paternalistic view of taking on the role of ‘father’ to children is an example of dominative heterosexuality or hostile sexism where patrons were viewed as naughty children to be monitored and kept out of trouble. The negative view of patrons was further compounded by sarcastic and derogatory comments made to bouncers by patrons in the process of their work.

Script 18 Faggots

[Some of these] fuckers walk past ... the staff and as they’re walking past just kind of, under their breath, say things like ‘faggot’ to you, just things to irritate ... to see if they can get under your skin. (White male doorstaff, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 149)
Script 19 Poor dummy

They say to me, ‘Oh, poor dummy’, and ‘He’s not smart enough to be in school, so you’re doing this job’, whatever. ‘This is a nice career,’ all these kind of comments that come at ya .. (White male supervisor, cited in Rigatos, 2008: 149)

The work of bouncers includes emotional labour because they are forced to manage their reactions to aggressive, abusive, taunting and sometimes violent patrons (Monaghan, 2002b, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). The door is a site of constant abuse and physical assault, particularly when patrons are rejected and refused entry (Fitzgerald et al., 2010) and emotional responses must be contained in order to maintain employment (Monaghan, 2002b). Bouncers are subjected to verbal and physical abuse on a regular basis, yet demands are made for them to remain stoic and non-reactive in the face of such abuse (Monaghan, 2002b, Rigakos, 2008). The ability to ‘be nice’ and avert physical confrontation is nonetheless accompanied by physical or verbal ‘warning’ messages (Hobbs et al., 2003: 141) or facial displays (Rigakos, 2008). The strategic use of talk in the form of swearing is built into warnings to encourage compliance with requests (Hobbs et al., 2003).

Steve North discussed this strategy in Hobbs et al. (2003: 140).

Script 20 Excuse me sir

‘Excuse me sir can you just behave yourself, we don’t tolerate that sort of fucking business in here’. And you always put an F-word in or a strong language word in at the end. You’re very polite, very direct and at the end you just throw it in, as if to say ‘I’m not a fucking schmuck’. It’s a trick of the trade. ‘I’m basically being nice to you. Now if you don’t want to be fucking nice I can be fucking nasty, so please yourself’.

This strategy was seen as equivalent to the police version of ‘Fuck off or you’ll get nicked’ (Holdaway, cited in Hobbs et al., 2003: 140). The verbal warning establishes the line of authority and the person is expected to comply, otherwise responsibility for the ensuing conflict will be placed squarely on the person for lack of compliance (Hobbs et al., 2003, Dick, 2005).
Script 21 He takes a swing

... he takes a swing, catches me on the cheek. Now he’s hit a bouncer ... On another night with everybody on, he could have ended up in hospital ... I am going to fucking punish you if you raise your hands... (North, cited in Hobbs et al., 2003: 150)

Script 22 You forget it’s work

When stuff like that happens you forget it’s work, it’s not work, it’s you against some cunt who wants to do you over ... Everyone’s watching. If he can’t walk away after I’ve been polite, whatever happens [then] is his fault. This is where a lot of shit gets mixed up. Bouncers get in trouble for winning fights. (Mark, cited in Hobbs et al., 2003: 151)

Hobbs et al. (2003) described the excuses bouncers used to provide rationalisations for physical confrontations. They were defined under accident, defeasibility, biology and scapegoating. Bouncers saw these excuses as a defence mechanism to exonerate, valorise and distance themselves from their violent actions (Hobbs et al., 2003).

However, bouncer excuses can be reframed as a strategy of social identity in maintaining a sense of positive self while undertaking dirty work. The use of refocusing, reframing, recalibrating and disidentification (Ashforth and Kreiner, 1999) reshapes the excuses into strategies for legitimating a positive sense of self. Given that bouncers do not hold legitimate state authority for the use of coercive force, many of their scripts relate to legitimating, recalibrating and refocusing.

The scripts by North (Script 21) and Mark (Script 22) showed a refocusing of their actions to those of the patrons. Their statements of ‘I’m basically being nice to you [but] I can be fucking nasty’, ‘Now he’s hit a bouncer [and] if you raise your hands I’m going to fucking punish you’ and ‘If he can’t walk away, whatever happens then is his fault’ all transferred or recalibrated the altercation with the patron. In effect, the bouncers stated they were being humanely polite and giving the patron the option to comply, but if violence ensued, it was the actions of the patron, not the bouncer, which led to the altercation. Dick observed this was a ‘powerful tactic’ because the law of attribution (or the attribution error) attributes violence to the actor (in this case the patrons) (2005: 1380). Such actions placed the focus on the bouncer as being polite and conveyed the
image of the patron at fault, so those who were watching or listening saw the bouncer in a more positive light. Thus, recalibrating, where particular actions are made more salient (being polite; giving the patron the option; if he can’t walk away) are emphasised and the negative actions of the bouncer are played down or ignored.

Reframing, a form of neutralising or denying responsibility for a negative event, was demonstrated by statements such as ‘I was just doing my job’ (Dick, 2005: 1381), or ‘he could have ended up in hospital’ (Script 21) which legitimated and gave moral worth to the actions. North was saying, if one reads between the lines, that he saved the patron from ending up in hospital by being the one to intervene. The ‘just world hypothesis’ was also used in reframing here, in that the patron was seen to deserve the physical reaction from the bouncer because he or she did not comply with a polite formal request, or as Mark said, ‘it is not my fault if he chooses not to walk away’. By using the theoretical parameters of dirty work to frame the work and actions of bouncers, the cognitive and verbal strategies to negate ‘bad’ actions and preserve ‘good’ actions can be seen in the scripts. These discursive scripts contribute to a positive sense of self in the performance of dirty work.

The strong solidarity experienced by bouncers and the ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude to patrons also displays their cognitive management of collective positive identity formation. Correctional officers similarly use the positive and dangerous aspects of their work to valorise and legitimise their dirty work (Tracy and Scott, 2006). Just as Steve North saved the young man from hospital, a corrections officer stated of a prisoner who had overdosed on drugs in his cell, ‘... if he had been at home ... he would have died’ (Tracy and Scott, 2006: 29). The noble heroic person is thus held up and valorised, effectively playing down the negative aspects of the dirty work. However, the reality of impending violence is still very much a part of bouncers’ occupational role.

In my professional roles, over the five years of working with bouncers in the Cairns night-time precinct, I have heard the aforementioned scripts echoed by bouncers over and over again. Uncannily, the bouncers in Cairns echo the scripts of the bouncers in the Hobbs et al. (2003) study and also in Rigakos (2008) and Rickett and Roman (2013). Their beliefs and attitudes towards patrons are identical to those in these studies and they also classify themselves as ‘adult babysitters’ with a clear ‘us’ and ‘them’ divide. I have also heard firsthand bouncers in Cairns utilise the cognitive strategies of reframing
and recalibrating to moralise and valorise behaviours and to convey the civil importance of their work in exactly the same manner that Hobbs et al (2008) and Rigatos (2008) reported. I have been told that bouncers in Cairns often consider themselves ‘human punching’ bags and are well aware their work is socially undervalued and unappreciated by the general public and also the news media. Bouncers in Cairns are also mindful that the news media demonise them in the media and are very critical and suspicious of the news media for this very reason.

5.12 The Negative Side of Bouncers

The negative or ‘dark’ side of bouncers come under research scrutiny. Although authors such as Rigakos (2008), Hobbs and colleagues (2003), Tomsen (2005), Homel and Graham (2008) and Monaghan (2002b) reported that, overall, bouncers conducted themselves in an ethical and legal manner, the ‘darker’ side of bouncers was also seen. The under-reporting by licensed venues of assaults by bouncers on patrons and patrons on bouncers has been a contentious issue for many years. Bouncers perceived altercations as ‘just a part of business’ and kept the incident ‘in-house’ (Hobbs et al., 2002, Rigakos, 2008). Police were rarely contacted and the incidents were not reported unless someone was seriously injured.

Assaults involving bouncers were often unreported because of the intoxication of the patrons. Police required charges to be formalised when patrons were sober, meaning complainants had to go to the police station the next day to file a report. This process resulted in under-reporting because patrons often did not return when sober (Lister et al., 2000). Patrons were often involved in the altercations and did not want their own behaviour bought under scrutiny, thus contributing to under-reporting (Lister et al., 2000, Hobbs et al., 2003). There was also sympathetic understanding by the police that bouncers had to deal with the same drunken violence as they did themselves, and this was another factor in under-reporting and under-recording of incidents (Lister et al., 2000, Chatterton, 2002). False accusations of assault by patrons against bouncers also contributed to under-recording because the ‘it is easy to blame the bouncer’ mentality was rife among partygoers (Lister, 2000: 393).

The ‘code of silence’ that exists amongst bouncers also made investigations problematic (Lister, 2000: 396). Strong occupational solidarity and the need to protect each other
from external investigations pervaded the industry (Lister et al., 2000, Hobbs et al. 2003, Monaghan, 2003, Rigakos, 2008). The reporting of assaults was made more difficult by the nature of nightlife environments. The crowded venues, dim lights, loud music and confused atmosphere, together with drunken and possibly drug-affected patrons, did little to assist investigations into assaults (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Lister et al., 2002). Patrons were often unable to identify the bouncers responsible because most of them were similar in appearance with the same uniforms or mode of dress and the same general outward appearance (Lister et al., 2000).

The wider economic and political influences are crucial to an understanding of bouncers in the night-time economy. The inability of the police to keep pace with the booming night-time economy and the neoliberalist form of governance has seen a move to community-based ‘policing’ partnerships to deal with the chaos and disorder (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Hall and Winlow, 2005). This has led to growth in private policing or bouncers working in the night-time economy. The responsibility for maintaining civil order has therefore been pushed back onto pubs and clubs and the people who frequent them (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002). The economic benefits of the night-time economy are incompatible with the mass media’s portrayal of out-of-control drunken young people invading the streets and has resulted in a police ‘crack down’ to ‘clean it up’ (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002: 32).

One result has been the targeting of pubs and clubs for stronger legislation and policing. The conflict between commercial privatised interests and the regulation of social order has produced a state of incongruence between social regulation and the state’s need for economic capital generated by the night-time economy (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Tomsen, 2011). Corporate interests, the expanding night-time economy and the gentrification of up-market venues have led to traditional working-class activities being criminalised and demonised in the mass media (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Tomsen, 2011). Police support the operation of gentrified bars and clubs because these venues are self-regulating while working-class venues or commercialised clubs remain problematic (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002). It could be argued the police are also caught between the same parameters of economic growth and the demand for social order because of the predominance of corporate capitalist interests in the night-time economy. The neoliberal form of governance is also implicated in civil disorder and this
is managed by categorising perceivable ‘risks’, with resources distributed according to the highest area of ‘risk’.

5.13 Occupational ‘Risk’ and Bouncers

It is well documented that bouncers work in a ‘risky’ environment (Hobbs et al., 2002, Lister, 2002, Monaghan, 2003, Tomsen, 2005). The possibility of violence is real and almost inevitable in the liminal world of alcohol, drugs and excesses, perpetuated by behavioural transgressions and risk-taking (Hobbs et al., 2003). However, the concept of ‘risk’ or a ‘risk society’ is no more relevant than in the occupation of bouncers. Beck’s (1992) influential work on risk society paved the way for a plethora of works investigating risk in modern and postmodern Western society. The key concept underlying the theoretical notion of a risk society is the management by governments of perceived future risks to a society. Risk in this context is grounded in the historical milieu and in sequences of events that predict an estimated outcome (Reith, 2004).

‘Risk’ is based on a prediction of what ‘… might happen’ under possible circumstances (Reith, 2004: 386, emphasis in original). Governments make decisions and enforce legislation based on the perceived or predicted risk to their citizens, such as the AIDS virus or terrorist attacks (Isin, 2004). Possible threats or dangers to citizens must be anticipated, controlled for and managed. Interest groups and politically influential institutions also bring the potential of dangers to society to the political table (Reith, 2004), such as the risk of skin cancer, alcohol consumption or the danger of degradation of the Great Barrier Reef. Under post-industrial neoliberal governance, this inevitably means mobilising citizens to participate actively in managing the potential risks (Isin, 2004). An example is the saturation marketing of the sun-safe Slip, Slop, Slap campaign to protect citizens against skin cancer.

Widely proclaimed fears of potential risks may generate a ‘culture of fear’ within society (Isin, 2004: 219). This was evident after the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Centre with the demonising of the Muslim or Arabic Other. This led to what could arguably to called a ‘culture of fear’ of the Muslim Other in Western countries including Australia and has created a society of fear, rather than a society of ‘risk’ management. Social actors live their lives under the perceived ‘threat’ posed by terrorist attack to their very existence. Isin argued that such proclamations of risk may result in
‘... a society governed by risk disproportionate to actual dangers that these risks might constitute’ (2004: 219). Isin believes theorists in risk society have been considerably underestimated the resulting flow-on effects to citizens and the conduct of their daily lives (Isin, 2004).

Within the realm of alcohol, violence and men, theorists have taken a psychosocial approach to explaining and managing societal ‘risk’ (Collier and Hall, 2000). This places a micro-level focus on the notion of ‘risk’ and the propensity of governments to ‘manage’ alcohol-related violence. It does not imply that men’s responsibility for alcohol-related crimes is seen as a pathological reductionist approach to masculinity (Collier and Hall, 2000). The approach takes a more inclusive approach to alcohol-related crimes in that individual action and pathologies are included in a societal view of the issue. It has long been recognised that the notion of social actors as passive recipients of governmental control and management is erroneous (Isin, 2004). However, neoliberal forms of governance place more importance on the involvement of their citizens in managing their own risks, such as by contributing to a healthy lifestyle and a healthy environment (Taylor-Gooby and Zinn, 2006), or what has been called ‘responsibilisation’. The dominant paradigms of cultural influences also play a significant role in shaping the lives and daily rituals of social actors and this is evident in the current culture of ‘binge drinking’.

The notion of ‘risk’ is three-fold in the occupational role of bouncers. First, there is the personal risk to bouncers of being victims of physical attack by intoxicated patrons. Second, and I would argue more influentially, is the societal risk perpetuated through alcohol-related violence, and third is the risk to bouncers and licensed premises of litigation following regulatory or behavioural misconduct. A local economist recently estimated the cost of alcohol-related harm to the Cairns’ economy was $1.52 million per annum (Cummings, 2013). This is 1.52 million reasons why the governments of Queensland and Australia are confronting this issue so strongly. In the United Kingdom, the night-time economy generated £30 billion per annum (Hall and Winlow, 2005: 380). The real and potential economic benefits of the night-time economy must be weighed against the societal cost or ‘risk’ within this environment.

The ‘risk’ to licensed premises of bouncers behaving badly can be profound. The Ivy nightclub in Sydney was closed after several brawls at the venue, some involving
bouncers (Armitage, 2013). The venue was classified as a ‘high risk’ venue, which dictates specific licensing conditions, such as shots (short drinks) must not be served after midnight and patrons cannot enter the venue after 2am (Armitage, 2013). The risk to owners of venues being closed because of violence by bouncers is real, therefore it is paramount to their commercial interests to have properly trained and experienced bouncers. The employment of bouncers who do not carry the appropriate licenses also carries a substantial fine for licensed premises (Office of Fair Trading, 2010) which again affects their economic success. Violence by bouncers against patrons on licensed premises also brings unwanted media attention and further negative economic impact. Participants in research studies have clearly stated they will not attend venues that are perceived to be ‘dangerous’ or ‘unruly’ (Donkin and Birks, 2007, Hadfield, 2013). However, there is very little written about the ‘risk’ to bouncers or the impact of their work on their health.

5.14 Occupational Violence and Stress

Occupational stress in bouncers has received little attention from researchers. Although it has been consistently stated that bouncers work in a ‘risky’ environment and are regular victims of assault (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2003), very little research attention has been directed towards their physical safety and the occupational stresses they operate under (Hayes-Jonkers et al., 2011). Rigakos (2008) outlined some of the health-related issues of working as a bouncer. Research participants spoke of difficulties in dealing with long night shifts, and smoky and noisy environments, citing ‘ringing’ ears and ‘can’t breathe’ conditions (Rigakos, 2008: 125). Participants also expressed ongoing concerns about their work, future employment and their psychological health. The consistent hyper-vigilance required by bouncers in the course of a shift was stated to be ‘... bordering on paranoia’ (Rigakos, 2008: 117).

For the purposes of this research, workplace violence is defined as

... incidents where persons are abused, threatened or assaulted in circumstances related to their work, involving explicit or implicit challenge to their safety, well-being or health. (Hoel and Einarsen, 2003: 5)

Other than the police and military, few occupations place personnel in constant fear for their safety. As well as fear of assault, bouncers are exposed to bodily fluids such as
spittle and blood which carry a risk of blood-borne infection (Hayes-Jonkers et al., 2011) and suffer high rates of verbal abuse and intimidation (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011). A recent Australian study into private security found private security staff and police experienced similar rates of occupational violence over an eight-year period (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011: 133). Private security staff experienced more serious non-fatals injuries than police and crowd controllers (bouncers) experienced higher levels and rates of violent than any other security occupation (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011: 133).

The figures are alarming. Sarre and Prenzler stated that 58% of bouncers had suffered a major assault, 70% had suffered a minor assault, 92% had been subjected to verbal abuse, 87% had been verbally threatened and 88% had been physically intimidated or threatened (2011: 134). Not surprisingly, 30.7% of respondents suffered from anxiety relating to their work and 18.1% suffered from work-related depression (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011: 134). Bouncers also experienced the highest rates of time off work because of injuries sustained on the job (Sarre and Prenzler, 2011: 133). This is the only study of bouncers’ occupational work-related injuries and health in Australia to date, which is surprising given the environments and conditions under which bouncers work (Hoel and Einarsen, 2003). Internationally, hotel staff were also three times more likely to be victims of homicide and their stress levels were ‘... higher than the national average’ (Hoel and Einarsen, 2003: 10).

5.15 Conclusion

The sociological perspectives of dirty work, emotional labour, emotional dirty work, hegemonic masculinity and the gendered division of labour all contribute to a comprehensive sociocultural view of occupational roles and sociocultural attitudes and behaviours. It is proposed that bouncers’ work is deemed ‘dirty work’ and they, as with many other occupations, engage in emotional labour in the undertaking of their work. Bouncers are also involved in emotional dirty work because they are exposed to the more unconventional elements of society, such as transgender and cross-dressing individuals, the highly emotive reactions of intoxicated patrons and employment at strip clubs, all of which may be seen as morally dirty work (Demichele and Tewksbury, 2004).
The analysis of bouncers’ scripts in this section showed the use of hostile and benevolent sexism and elements of identity theory and role congruence theory. The script analysis further showed the cognitive strategies bouncers used to justify their behaviours, valorise their work and maintain a positive sense of self in a vilified and socially undervalued occupations. Given the combative nature of their work, physicality was considered essential for the job, violence was deemed to be ‘part of business’ and intimidation tactics such as the ‘stare down’, verbal warnings and facial displays were also used as control mechanisms for managing unruly bodies.
Chapter 6
Categorical Qualitative Analysis

In this chapter, I report the findings of the NVivo analysis to determine the most frequently used categories of words in 80 news headlines and reports. The purpose of the analysis was to tease out the most frequently occurring terms to determine the ideological tone of the reports. Specific terms relating to violence, delegitimation or the undermining of bouncer credibility, words indicative of ‘power from above’ and criminality were extracted, together the most commonly occurring names in the reports and the most frequently occurring ‘experts’. Findings from news headlines are presented first, followed by a detailed exposition of words found in the body of reports.

6.1 News Headlines

Discourse analysis studies argue that news headlines are paramount for gaining readers’ attention. Readers may simply scan the headlines and read the lead sentences, they may skim through the article or read the whole story (Scollon, 2014). However, headlines are the most important section of a news report because they may determine whether the reader purchases the newspaper or reads a particular story (van Dijk, 1991). Headlines are also designed to give the reader a snapshot of the news article in a few succinct words. Headlines may be sensational, boldly outrageous or cuttingly cruel. The analysis showed that headlines may be sensationalised in some instances, but they do not necessarily align fully with the news article itself. For example, ‘Bouncer thought only of revenge’ as a headline was not substantiated by the actual news report, while ‘Bouncer on kill charges’ was the headline to a story about a bouncer charged with manslaughter.
Table 3: Words most frequently used in headlines (n=80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bouncer</td>
<td>Bouncer, bouncers, bouncers’</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hookes</td>
<td>Hookes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross</td>
<td>Kings Cross</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightclub</td>
<td>Nightclub, nightclubs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricketer</td>
<td>Cricket, cricketer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>Kill, killing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopoate</td>
<td>Hopoate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Club, clubs, clubs’</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailed</td>
<td>Jail, jailed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>Attack, attacked</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bash</td>
<td>bash, bashed, bashing, bashings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawl</td>
<td>Brawl</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Duque Castillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td>Call, calls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>Charge, charged</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dies</td>
<td>Died, dies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the most commonly used words and the stem words in the 80 news reports, in descending order. ‘Bouncer’ was the most commonly used word in the headlines, appearing 37 times in the 80 headlines. ‘Death’ appeared 14 times and Hookes (the Australian cricketer) appeared 12 times. ‘Kings Cross’ (an area in Sydney, New South Wales) and ‘violence’ each appeared 11 times. ‘Nightclub’ appeared seven times in the headlines and ‘cricketer’ (as in David Hookes) appeared six times. ‘Fatal’,
‘kill’ or ‘killing’ and ‘security’ each appeared six times also. Three people’s names appeared multiple times in the news headlines. These were David Hookes, John Hopoate (ex-footballer and bouncer – six times) and Wilson Duque Castillo (victim – four times).

6.2 News Reports: Categorical Classification

CDA studies have shown the importance of how social actors are classified or nominated in news reports. Typically, the more social power or social status individuals hold, the more formally they are presented or nominated in texts. That is, they are individualised, not categorised generically. People categorise and label other people as a means of classifying them, so they can manage and cognitively process large amounts of information quickly. A person may be classified generically as male or a man, or by his activity, such as businessman. However, news journalists typically name those in positions of social power and classify generically those with less social power.

The analysis of 80 news reports showed that news journalists also categorised places generically or formally. For example, ‘hotel’ is a formal title for a licensed premise whereas ‘pub’ is the generic term for a hotel. Table 4 shows the most commonly used classifications or categorisations used by journalists in the 80 news reports. The categorisation was based on formal and generic categorisation. The purpose of the analysis was to explore how often bouncers were classified generically as ‘bouncers’ and how often they were referred to by their formal title, that of crowd controllers or security guards. The term ‘bouncer’ has been applied to crowd controllers at licensed premises for possibly over a century. However, the news press use the term in a derogatory manner and a stigma has built up around the term that has proved difficult to remove (National Door Watch, UK, personal communication, Oct 2011).

The analysis also included how often hotel and nightclubs were classified formally or generically. Typically, these types of licensed premises are classified generically when used in a derogatory manner in the text, as will be discussed in Chapter 7. The manual analysis showed that journalists referred to hotels as ‘pubs’ when condemning violence, but wrote of them as ‘hotels’ when writing in a positive manner. For example, in the case of David Hookes, the venue was described as a ‘hotel’, but when associated
Table 4: Types of categorisation most frequently used in the news reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic category</td>
<td>Bouncer</td>
<td>Bouncer, bouncers</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal category</td>
<td>Guards</td>
<td>Guard, guards</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal category</td>
<td>Crowd Controller</td>
<td>Crowd controller,</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal category</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Hotel, hotels</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic category</td>
<td>Pubs</td>
<td>Pub, pubs</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic category</td>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td>Club, clubs</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic category</td>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>Bar, bars</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic category</td>
<td>Venues</td>
<td>Venue, venues</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal category</td>
<td>Nightclub</td>
<td>Nightclub, nightclubs</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with bouncer violence it was referred to as a ‘pub’. The analysis showed that the term ‘bouncer’ was used 417 times in the news reports, whereas the formal classifications of ‘crowd controller’ or ‘guard’ were only used 143 times. The generic classification of hotels or nightclubs included ‘pub’, ‘club’, ‘venue’ or ‘bar’. Hotels and nightclubs were classified generically 291 times and formally 269 times.

6.3 Power From Above

In news reports concerning bouncers involved in violence against patrons, journalists typically cite the need for governments to ‘do something’ about the violence. Therefore, this part of the analysis explored how many times news reports contained references to regulation, licensing, security training, and related issues. Table 5 shows that in the 80 news reports there were 307 mentions of words relating to licensing, regulation, training etc. for crowd controllers. Licensing was mentioned most often (n=53), followed by training (n=51), laws (n=39), regulations (n=35), and bans (n=31). The word ‘responsible’ was mentioned 30 times, and it is included in this analysis because journalists often used the term in calling for security firms and licensed premises to take responsibility for their employees’ behaviour, or for bouncers to behave more responsibly. Most journalists, including cited and quoted ‘experts’, called on crowd controllers and licensed premises to behave more responsibly. This tactic is clearly in line with the neoliberalist notion of ‘responsibleisation’ where the individuals are held responsible and accountable for their own actions.
Table 5: Word frequency relating to ‘power from above’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>License, licensed, licenses, licensing</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Train, trained, training</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>Laws, lawful, law</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Regulate, regulated, regulating, regulation, regulations, regulatory</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bans</td>
<td>Ban, banned, banning, bans</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsibilities, responsibility, responsible</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>Warn, warned, warning</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules, ruling</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Enforce, enforced, enforcement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policies, policy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crackdown</td>
<td>Crackdown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforms</td>
<td>Reforms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In society, individual social power and status can be conceptualised hierarchically, such that those with the most social power sit at the top of the hierarchy while those at the bottom have the least social power or status. For example, many would consider that the Prime Minister of Australia sits near the top of the hierarchy and a homeless person at the very bottom. A person’s position in the hierarchy determines how much ‘power from above’ will be exerted upon them. I would argue that bouncers or crowd controllers sit towards the bottom of the hierarchy. Below them are the patrons they direct and protect, but above them they have their immediate employers, the venue owners or managers, the police, liquor compliance officers and licensing compliance officers. These people actively engage with crowd controllers on a daily or weekly basis. Even further up the hierarchy of social power are the media, members of government, and large regulatory bodies such as national security associations, councils of government etc. Thus, one could argue that bouncers hold little social power and are susceptible to extensive pressure from above. Table 5 shows the most frequently used terms relating to ‘power from above’ in the news reports.
Relevant ‘experts’ also have the social power to issues ‘warnings’ to those with less power. This is a discursive strategy that represents the ‘… presence of a threatening authority’ (Fowler, 2013: 109) who explicitly warns those who are not complying with implicit or implied behaviours. ‘Rules’ with which bouncers must comply are enacted by governments and enforced by the police or relevant statutory authorities. The inclusion of ‘warnings’ and ‘rules’ in discourses demonstrates the ‘power from above’ to which bouncers are subjected. As Fowler (2013) and van Dijk (1991) argued, groups who are discriminated against are subjected to threats of power and are marginalised and discriminated against for specific political attention. This is relevant when the group is a threat to civil order, because ‘… reactions are heightened because the behaviour is seen as “violent” but also “uncivilised”’ (Fowler, 2013: 114).

6.4 Bouncers and Criminality

Table 6: Frequency of words relating to criminality of bouncers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Stem words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Criminal, criminals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>Gang, gangs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikies</td>
<td>Bikie, bikies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Corrupt, corruption</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infiltrated</td>
<td>Infiltrated, infiltration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the most frequently used words in relation to criminality and bouncers in the 80 news reports. Overall, there were 61 references, with six references implying bouncers’ involvement in bikie gangs, 24 occasions where criminal were mentioned in the text and 20 references to drugs. The count of 61 is not high; however, it is significant in that these are references to bouncers involved in criminal activities. It does not include accounts in news reports of assault, accusations of theft or other offences. There are many claims made about criminal behaviour by bouncers, both implicit and explicit, but it should be stressed that journalists may make suppositions about criminality with no discernible evidence to prove their claims. Such inferences were apparent in the manual analysis where lexical ordering suggested bouncers were
involved in criminal activity, but with no concrete evidence was given to support their claims.

### 6.5 Violence in the News Reports

Table 7: Frequency of words relating to violence in the news reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Violence, violent, violently</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Assault, assaulted, assaulting, assaults</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punching</td>
<td>Punch, punched, punches, punching</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fights</td>
<td>Fight, fighting, fights</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>Hit, hits, hitting</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>Kill, killed, killing</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>Attack, attacked, attacking</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened, threatening, threat, threats</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashing</td>
<td>Bash, bashed, bashing, bashings</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Aggressive, aggression</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawl</td>
<td>Brawl</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td>Throw, throwing, throws, threw</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>Push, pushed, pushing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck</td>
<td>Struck</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbed</td>
<td>Grabbed, grabs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinned</td>
<td>Pinned, pinning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striking</td>
<td>Strike, strikes, striking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoving</td>
<td>Shoved, shoving</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affray</td>
<td>Affray</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>809</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency in news reports of words that refer to violence in one form or another is shown in Table 7. There were 809 references to violence. The word ‘violence’ was the most frequently used (n=195), followed by ‘assault’ (n=123), along with their stem words. Punching (n=91), fighting (n=65) and hitting (n=60) were also often mentioned in the texts. The words ‘kill’, ‘killed’ and ‘killing’ were mentioned 43 times, and it appears the media prefer to use ‘killing’ rather than ‘manslaughter’ or ‘murder’ when writing about bouncers. For example, in two cases of bouncers charged with manslaughter, the headlines read ‘Bouncer jailed over killing pub patron’ (ABC.net.au,
Feb 24, 2006) and ‘Bouncer on kill charge’ (Courier Mail, Jan 30, 2007). However, a man charged with killing a patron was presented in the news media as ‘Shaun McNeil charged with murder over Daniel Christie’s death’ (Illawarramercy.com.au, Jan 13, 2014).

In all three instances, a man was charged with murder or manslaughter and the journalists used specific words to describe the deaths. Bouncers are almost always accused of ‘killing’ while others are not. Journalists appear to choose the word ‘kill’ selectively in news headlines and reporting, based on the perceived level of moral heinousness of the crime. For example, terrorists are accused of ‘killing’ people or being ‘killed’, yet other people are murdered or brutally murdered and the offenders are accused of murder or manslaughter in the headlines. It would appear that bouncers who commit acts of murder or manslaughter are discursively placed in the same category as terrorists, as demonstrated by the headlines ‘Bouncers terrorising innocent pub-goers’.

However, as Fowler (2013) and Lakoff and Johnson (2003) observed, ideologies of violence, aggression and warfare are very prevalent in the news media. Nonetheless, 809 references to violence is a considerable number in only 80 news reports. As van Dijk (2012) stated, news journalists describe in graphic detail the offences committed by socially deviant Others to influence readers’ mental models and to shape perceptions and attitudes. I would argue the saturation of violent descriptors in the news reports is responsible for the public perception of bouncers as violent, when it is only a small percentage who commit violence acts. Moreover, as Hilton and Van Hippel (1996) stated, evaluative beliefs and self-perpetuating biases are primarily unconscious and may be reinforced even without substantiation. Therefore, the saturation of violence terms in the news media may serve to influence public perceptions of bouncers as violent thugs.

6.6 Delegitimation of Bouncers

Table 8 shows the frequency of terms used to undermine or delegitimise bouncer authority and integrity. The news reports specifically referred to bouncers. The analysis showed use of words that were blatantly derogatory, such as ‘Rambos’, ‘rednecks’, ‘yokels’, ‘terrorising’, ‘power trip’, ‘cowardly bouncers’ etc., while some phrases were
more restrained, such as ‘culture of violence’, ‘out-of-control’, ‘pub violence’ and ‘escape responsibility’. However, regardless of the nature of the text, the intent is the same. The reports were designed to undermine the credibility of bouncers in the security industry in the eyes of their readers.

Table 8: Terms used in reference to delegitimation of bouncers or the industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rednecks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouncers on a ‘power trip’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorising pub and club-goers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowardly bouncers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of violence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowboy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikies have infiltrated the industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug dealers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weasel out of their responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More responsibility for their actions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control the security industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up the industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-regulated cowboy industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law unto themselves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-control</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub violence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readers make decisions about incidents based on the information in news reports if no other information is available (van Dijk, 1991, Van Dijk, 1995b). To be precise, readers who have no first-hand experience of bouncers, nightclubbing or the security industry may base their beliefs and attitudes toward bouncers on what they read in newspapers.
and see on television news reports. Therefore, reading about out-of-control bouncers ‘terrorising pub-goers’ and a ‘cowboy industry’ may profoundly influence how readers perceive bouncers and the industry in general. Readers may also be influenced by the saturation of references to violence in the news reports, given the emotive language often used by journalists.

Bouncers in the studies by Rigakos (2008) and Hobbs et al. (2003) spoke of their frustration at the detrimental and negative media coverage the industry received. Although the research participants conceded a few bouncers did behave badly, nothing was ever reported about the thousands of other bouncers who did their job competently and professionally. A number of bouncers in both studies had worked extensively in the industry and had never assaulted a patron or behaved inappropriately. However, as with any type of violence or public disorder, crime news and its ‘voyeuristic content’ (Berry, 2008: 17) sells newspapers while stories about bouncers behaving professionally do not sell newspapers.

6.7 Political Abstractions and Generalisations

In this section, the use of terms related to political abstractions and generalisations is reported. The abstract notion of ‘problem’ is ‘... a euphemistic term often quoted from politicians and experts’ (Fowler, 2013: 180) in relation to social issues, such as alcohol-related violence or bouncer violence. The word ‘problem’ was used 31 times in the text (as displayed in Table 9) and is used as an abstraction to denote bouncer violence as a ‘bouncer-problem’, ‘increasing problem’, ‘inherent problem’, ‘patterns of these problems’, ‘cause more problems’, ‘problem with private security’ ‘rise in problems’ and ‘a growing crisis’ with ‘an epidemic of violence’. The term ‘problem’ was used widely by the news press, but Fowler observed that while it was used to indicate ‘rising’, ‘growing’ or ‘increasing’ problems, the nature and extent of the ‘problem’ was never truly quantified or defined. Moreover, the ‘problem’ was depicted as ‘dangerous’ with increasing ‘risks’ to public safety through bouncers ‘terrorising’ patrons, with calls for bouncers to be more ‘responsible’ or to behave more ‘responsibly’ which was mentioned 29 times in the texts.
Table 9: Terms relating to political abstractions and generalisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Problem, problems</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Responsibilities, responsibility</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increase, increasing, increasingly</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Concerned, concerning, concerns</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous</td>
<td>Danger, dangerous, dangers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risk, risks</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorising</td>
<td>Terrorising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcry</td>
<td>Outcry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outrage</td>
<td>Outrage, outraged</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic</td>
<td>Panic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemic</td>
<td>Epidemic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjective reactions of politicians, the security industry and the public were widely reported in the news press. The public and others were described as ‘concerned’ or ‘outraged’, with public ‘outcries’ and ‘panic’ about the violence. These subjective reactions were mentioned 23 times in the news reports. While it could be argued that these terms only indicated journalists’ subjective reactions, emotive subjectivity is often used to convey public ‘outrage’ or ‘concern’, and is designed to convey a ‘collective’ or ‘us’ notion of ‘concern’ to the reader, which signifies the ‘us’ and ‘them’ polarity of the issue (van Dijk, 1991, Fowler, 2013). That is, ‘we’ as a collective interested community are concerned about bouncer violence, therefore the astute reader should also be concerned.

Gonzo rhetoric is apparent in the discourse with exaggerations of subjective emotive public ‘outrage’ to the ‘epidemic’ and ‘crisis’ of bouncer violence. The hyperbolic discourse is further laced with ‘fears’ of public safety, the failure of licensed premises to ‘control’ their bouncers and the failure of the security industry to train them adequately. Governments have also come under fire from the news media for their ‘knee-jerk’ reactions to policy and legislation and for failing to curb the ‘epidemic’ of bouncers.
involved in violence. The government and dominant ideological response is to ‘blame the bouncer’, or as Fowler (2013: 184) proposed ‘… the newspaper discourse unconsciously accepts as common sense the imperative of individual responsibility’. However, Fowler goes on to state that ‘… the myth of individual responsibility is nothing other than an ideological practice’ (2013:184), a practice in this instance that condemns the industry for failing to take action to curtail or eliminate the violence, placing responsibility on the bouncers themselves, the licensed premises who employ them and the security industry overall. However, as the manual analysis showed, the security industry distanced itself from bouncers involved in violence and laid the blame squarely on the individual bouncers involved.

6.8 Names Commonly Found in the News Reports

The names of bouncers involved in violence and their victims were extracted from the 80 articles analysed, and are shown in Table 10. The purpose was to discern whether bouncers or victims received more mentions in the news. The list is ordered by the year the incident occurred. The 227 references to David Hookes are particularly salient. Twelve of the 80 news reports related directly to Hookes’ death or the Court case that followed, but the news media referred to his death on almost every subsequent occasion a bouncer was involved in violence. When the references to Hookes were removed, there were 221 references to victims, similar to the number of times bouncers (n=243) were mentioned. Micevic, the bouncer accused of Hookes’ death, was mentioned 64 times, well below the 227 times Hookes was mentioned. This could be attributed to Hookes’ social status as an Australian cricketer, which awards more social power to Hookes than any other victim of bouncer violence.

The death of Wilson Duque Castillo in 2011 also received extensive media attention. This was probably because of the involvement of John Hopoate, a former Australian football player, who was working as a bouncer and was involved in the mêlée that resulted in Castillo’s death. Lynn Matia, a bouncer working with Hopoate, was found guilty of manslaughter, while Hopoate was charged with the aggravated assault of Castillo’s brother Wilmer and fined. Castillo’s mother and wife organised many public ‘protests’ over bouncer violence and their ‘pack mentality’, which also received considerable news media attention. The Coddington–Hutchings case received widespread media coverage, with the fatal kick from Hutchings being described as a
‘martial-arts-type kick’. News reports referred to Hutchings as a ‘martial-arts expert’ and this may explain the unusually wide coverage of the incident and the Court case.

Table 10: Bouncers and victims most commonly named in the news reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Bouncer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Dalamangas</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>No one charged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Matenga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Decker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>Peachey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Coddington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Hutchings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Hookes</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Micevic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unknown (x 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>Hapeta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guilty of assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Trimble</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Kretschmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Bullock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>Nierop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guilty of assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Amaya</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Tapin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Wilmer Castillo</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Injured</td>
<td>Hopoate</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Guilty, fined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Wilson Duque Castillo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Matia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Namoa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>448</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Peter Dalamangas’ death in 1998 at the age of 23 made news again in 2006 when his parents and fiancée (at the time of his death) sued the Star City Casino in Sydney for damages.

*Brothers involved in the same incident. The incident occurred on December 18, 2010 and Wilson died on January 3, 2011.

*Peter John Carr was killed in a fuel-tanker accident in March 2014, one month after being acquitted of the manslaughter of Joel Namoa. Carr was the driver of the tanker, which burst into flames after crashing. Police described the accident as ‘suspicious’.

The news reports from 2002 to 2012 described only 13 cases of violence perpetrated by bouncers. Eight of the incidents involved deaths (excluding the 1998 death) and five of the victims were injured. Six of the bouncers were jailed, three were found guilty and fined and three were found not guilty. However, the cases were referred to repeatedly in news reports when new incidents occurred. This study only included 80 news reports,
and it is not claimed that these are the only incidents of bouncers being involved in violence in Queensland or Australia. However, what they demonstrate is the news media’s preference for reusing old news about bouncer violence in current news reports. Reports of these incidents appeared repeatedly in a number of the news articles and there was also a plethora of reporting after an incident. The level of reporting also appeared to be related to the social status of the person injured. For example, in addition to the unprecedented news media coverage of David Hookes’ death, when Sam Page, the ‘up-and-coming’ surfer was injured, there were 24 news reports of the incident on the internet.

### 6.9 Organisations or Institutions

Table 11 shows the organisations or institutions most frequently mentioned in the news reports. Not surprisingly, the police were mentioned 228 times, the courts 154 times, industry 68 times, generally in relation to the security industry, and magistrates 31 times.

Table 11: Organisations or institutions mentions in the news reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>Police, policing</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Court, courts</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industries, industry</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>Government, governments</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>Magistrate, magistrates, magistrates’</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Magistrate, magistrates, magistrates’</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the number of news reports related to violence, it is not surprising that police, courts and magistrates were mentioned so often. This shows the propensity of news journalists to rely on law enforcement agencies for information and support of their claims. Security and related industries were mentioned 68 times and this was usually in response to journalists’ calls for answers from the industry as to why violence by bouncers was occurring and what the industry was doing about it. Similarly, the number of references to government was a reflection of how often newspapers typically called on governments to ‘fix’ the ‘problem’ or criticised them for not addressing the issue.
When civil disorder occurs, the police are responsible for dealing with the issue. The police are the publically authorised body responsible for enforcing the law and therefore the news media nearly always turn to police for information relating to violence or public disorder. Journalists also cover court cases of bouncers involved in violence to report the outcome of charges. Journalists were critical of court processes if they believed that justice had not been served. Bouncers who received fines rather than jail sentences, and those who were given light sentences, were ridiculed in the news press and the courts were condemned for their acquiescent approach to bouncers involved in violence against patrons.

6.10 ‘Experts’ in the News

News journalists make extensive use of ‘experts’ when writing news reports. Table 12 shows the ‘experts’ cited in the news articles under analysis. The 80 news reports contained 233 references to ‘experts’. As the manual analysis in Chapter 7 reveals, journalists made extensive use of the ‘expert voice’, with some using up to eight ‘expert voices’ in one article. Violent crimes attract much news media attention and ‘experts’ such as police, politicians and others are called upon for their views and to back up journalists’ claims. This style of journalism places significant power in the hands of the ‘experts’ who are used to ‘… provide audiences with ‘agency accounts’ of social reality…’ that are offered as unquestionable fact (Maratea and Monahan, 2013: 8).

Judges were the ‘experts’ most commonly cited in the texts, with the citations almost exclusively comprised of comments made during hearings. Managers, lawyers, spokesmen, university professors, police and prosecutors, and government ministers were also cited in the news reports. No news reports included the ‘voices’ of bouncers involved in incidents unless they were victims of violence. The silence of bouncers’ ‘voices’ was a discursive exclusion that eliminated them from the discourse and from the reader. Hence, I would argue that reports were decidedly one-sided because journalists did not give bouncers the opportunity to present their side of a story. Of course, bouncers may have been reluctant to be interviewed because of the discriminatory coverage of such incidents by news journalists. However, the exclusion of the ‘voice’ of the social Other is a discursive strategy that eliminates bouncers from access to the mass media, one of the most powerful instruments of social control (van Dijk, 1996a).
Table 12: ‘Experts’ cited in the news reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Stem Words</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager, managers</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Lawyer, lawyers</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokesman</td>
<td>Spokesman</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Sergeant, Sgt</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Minister for</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>Prosecutor, prosecutors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union e.g. police union</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Inspector of police</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>Constable, as in police</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Detective, detectives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Expert, experts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathologist</td>
<td>Pathologist</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Leader, leaders</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedics</td>
<td>Paramedic, paramedics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroner</td>
<td>Coroner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 Year of publication and authors by sex

Table 13 shows the number of articles published each year and the sex of the authors of the 80 news reports. There were 14 articles published in 2004 and 2011, and 10 in 2013. There were 34 male authors and 32 female authors named, while the authors of 21 articles were not identified. The reports published in 2004 were mainly about the
assault on David Hookes and his subsequent death, while reports in 2005 covered his death and the Court case. All three reports in 2010 were about John Hopoate being charged with assault. The reports in 2011 covered the death of Wilson Castillo and the assault of his brother Wilmer by John Hopoate, and also Joel Namoa’s death. The court cases relating to these two deaths were reported in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014.

Table 13: Year of publications and authors by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male author</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female author</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most instances, reports were of single violent incidents involving a bouncer or bouncers that led to death or serious injury. News journalists or count reporters routinely covered the subsequent court cases in follow-up stories. There were only two news reports directly relating to the Coddington–Hutchings case, which occurred in June 2003. The trial did not occur until 2007, but Hutchings’ name appeared in 22 news reports. This supports the claim that news journalists repeatedly cite the same incidents, as shown by the prolific use of David Hookes’ name in the news reports.
6.12 Overview of the News Reports

In the news headlines, words relating to violence appeared 35 times (violence, hit, attack, bash, brawl, fight, assault), and words relating to death appeared 29 times (death, fatal, kill, dies). A similar pattern was seen in the body of the news reports, with the most frequently used terms also relating to violence (n=809). Organisations or institutions were the next most frequently mentioned words in the body of the reports (n=519), followed by words relating to ‘power from above’ (n=307). The next most frequently used words were the names of bouncers accused or found guilty of violence (n=237), followed by David Hookes (n=227), relevant ‘experts’ (n=223), victims of bouncer violence (n=221 – excluding Hookes), and political abstractions and generalisations (n=130). Criminality was one of the least used terms (n=61), with derogatory words or words relating to the discrediting of bouncers or the security industry being mentioned least (n=47) in the 80 news reports.

6.13 Conclusion

The NVivo analysis has shown the news media’s preference to use words relating to violence extensively in headlines and news reports about bouncers involved in violence. The news reports contained many references to the names of organisations or institutions, with the police and the courts most commonly cited together with people from those organisations, such as judges, lawyers and police officers. Although bouncers and victims were mentioned many times, the voices of bouncers were silent throughout the reports. Only two reports cited or quoted bouncers, and this was in relation to the bouncer being assaulted. No bouncers accused of violence were ever cited in the news reports. Political abstractions and generalisations were commonly used, a discursive strategy to overstate a social issue with no relevant facts to support the claim. Inferences of criminality were also used in the reports, along with blatantly derogatory terms, a discursive strategy that is reserved for the socially deviant Other.
As outlined in Chapter 3, the manual qualitative analysis was a ‘deep’ qualitative analysis of the text of 10 news articles. A deep qualitative analysis involves the critique of lexical use and structure, inclusion of rhetorical strategies, such as nominalisation, over- and under-statement and the ordering of words or phrases to create a dialogue of particular ways of discursive representation. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is primarily interested in the imbalance in social power, the role the news media play in producing and reproducing dominant ideologies through discourse, and the ways they contribute to the production of discriminatory and prejudicial attitudes, beliefs and practices. Fowler proposed that hysteria in the press is a construct of the discourse and requires ‘… a mode of discourse [that] when established, exists within the mode of discourse independent of empirical reality’ (2013: 150). I argue that ‘bouncer violence’ is a construct of media discourses that has been systematically produced and reproduced by the news media over many years to a point where it has become normalised or professed to be common knowledge.

The method and format for presenting the analysis was based on those used in a number of other research studies but is idiosyncratic in that I chose to disseminate the findings in the manner presented. The news reports are presented in chronological order starting from November 2004 and concluding in March 2007. Each news report is an exact ‘cut and paste’ from the article in NewsBank and all texts are presented as they were in the original news reports. Importantly, this includes any typographical errors, etc. that were in the original reports. Each ‘Line’ of the article matches the exact format of the original news report, which is why, in some instances, a ‘Line’ may include more than one sentence. In the paragraphs describing the analysis, bracketed descriptors have been included for clarity. For example, ‘Mr Elston [formal (surname and honorific) nomination] told the Court…’ and ‘… said to be a smart alec [metaphor]’. Lines taken directly from the news reports are italicised for ease of reading and the bracketed
information is designed to point out relevant discursive and rhetorical strategies used by authors.

As an example, the sentence ‘…Gold Coast businessmen [provenance and activity-based categorical classification] similarly bashed [nominalisation], with one hospitalised, by bouncers [generic categorical classification] outside a city club - in front of their wives - because of the exchange of a few sharp [metaphor] words [litotes]’ shows the use of the bracketed information relating to discursive strategies by the author/s. In the sentence, the businessmen are classified by where they live (the Gold Coast) and what they do (businessmen), whereas the bouncers are generically classified (a discursive strategy that lumps all bouncers into a selective category, just as women can be labelled as ‘mothers’). The sentence includes the use of nominalisation, metaphor and litotes, which are particular discursive strategies. The use of these strategies and the reasons for their inclusion are discussed in each news report as they occur.

7.1 Bouncer Kneed: Court

The following news report appeared in the Geelong Advertiser in November 2004. The city of Geelong is a popular tourist destination situated on the coast to the south of Melbourne, with a population of approximately 178,500. Belmont is a southern suburb of Geelong, mainly built during the post-war era and is home to a high percentage of low-income earners (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006). The report reads as follows:

**Bouncer Kneed: Court**

Author: Christine Antoniou

LINE 1: A BELMONT woman allegedly kneed a bouncer in the groin and punched a woman in the face because she queue jumped, a court heard yesterday.

LINE 2: Amanda White, 35, was in line outside Home House nightclub in June this year for 45 minutes when she allegedly pulled another woman's hair and punched her in the nose because 28 had waited longer.

LINE 3: Police Prosecutor Senior Constable Geoff Lamb told the Geelong Magistrates' Court that Ms White was approached by a bouncer and told to leave after she became verbally abusive towards the female but she struck the woman instead. Sen-Constable Lamb said a bouncer tried to walk Ms White away but she punched him.

28 The word ‘she’ was missing from the original text.
Ms White will contest 11 charges including intentionally causing injury, assaulting by kicking and being drunk.

Another bouncer allegedly pinned Ms White up against a car out of video camera sight but she struggled and kneed the bouncer in the groin and grabbed his testicles in what is described as a “squirrel grip”.

Sen-Constable Lamb said Ms White was drunk and continued to struggle and yell abuse when police patrolling the area arrested her.

The court heard Ms White started taking anti-depressants after she broke up with her husband and lost her job but stopped taking them cold turkey the day of the incident.

The court also heard Ms White reacted physically when the bouncer pinned her up against the car because she had previously been a victim of domestic violence.

Ms White, of Francis Street, was given an extended bail and will reappear in court for a contest mention on December 16.

Geelong Advertiser, November 3, 2004

What is immediately obvious in the headline is the play on phonemes. ‘Bouncer kneed: Court’ in effect may be read as ‘Bouncer need court’. Thus, the headline sets the thematic tone of the article as referring to a bouncer and Court. However, this is clarified in the first sentence by stating ‘[a] Belmont woman [provincial and generic categorisation] kneed a bouncer [generic categorisation] in the groin and punched a woman [generic categorisation] in the face because she queue jumped’. Note there is justification given for the action of punching the women in the face (she jumped the queue), whereas there was no justification given for kneeing the bouncer in the groin. This conveys to the reader that the second woman may have ‘deserved’ the punch in the face because there is no justification given for kneeling the bouncer.

In readers’ minds, the woman’s physical violence may activate socio-cognitive concepts relating to stereotypical mental models of violent women as transgressors of traditional feminine roles. The woman in question contravened stereotypical gendered behaviour by becoming violent. Women are socially expected to conform to societal norms and maintain control of their emotions, especially aggression, which is deemed to be an emotion that is associated exclusively with masculinity (Gilbert, 2002). In the article, descriptors of violence are mentioned 15 times in the nine lines of the text (underlined). Ms White’s aggressive acts of violence take prominence in the article with the behaviour of the bouncer/s taking less prominence, with their behaviour/s not mentioned until Line 5 of the article. As Fowler proposed, women are often portrayed...
as ‘… hysterical or irrational … [which] … is a discriminatory discourse … [that] … reinforces the stereotype’ of the female gender under sexist discourse (2013: 104–105).

Important information has been omitted from the report. For example, in Line 4 the author states that ‘Ms White [formal nomination] will contest 11 charges including intentionally causing injury, assaulting by kicking and being drunk’. The author does not make it clear why Ms White is facing 11 charges or who she actually injured, because there is nothing in the article about victims. The charges against Ms White include causing injury, but it is not clear who was injured (except possibly the unnamed woman who was punched), ‘assaulting by kicking’ but there was no report of Ms White kicking, only punching, kneeling and hair pulling and she is also charged with ‘being drunk’. The (female) journalist did not report that Ms White was being charged with ‘being under the influence of alcohol’ or ‘being intoxicated’, but rather with ‘being drunk’ which, for a woman, is culturally perceived to be morally taboo. It is also ‘said’ in a blunt, curt ‘tone’, signalling an element of disrespect or disapproval by the author. The tone of the article tries to convince the reader that Ms White is nothing more than a working-class bogan.

Line 5 reports ‘Another bouncer allegedly pinned [metaphor] Ms White up against a car out of video camera sight but she struggled and kneed the bouncer in the groin and grabbed his testicles in what is described as a ‘squirrel grip’. The bouncer’s behaviour is seen to be condemned here because it is mentioned first in the sentence, taking prominence over Ms White’s violent behaviour. Not only did the bouncer ‘pin’ Ms White up against a car, a metaphorical concept of holding or restraining, but the bouncer reportedly ‘pinned’ Ms White ‘out of video camera sight’, inferring intent by the bouncer to behave in a manner that was illegal and hence he did not want it captured on camera. However, Ms White’s character is again cast in a dubious light by describing her grip on the bouncer’s testicles (indicating for the first time the bouncer was male) as a ‘squirrel grip’, written in inverted commas, implying the words were a conscious choice by the female journalist. The depiction of Ms White with an animalistic talon-like grip of a squirrel suggests she is now using the actions of an

29 A bogan is the Australian equivalent of the British chav or American redneck.
animal, conveying a sharp, nasty assault on the bouncer’s testicles. ‘Animal’ metaphors are traditionally used by the news press as a means of dehumanising behaviours of the Other (Van Dijk, 1995b).

Line 6 stated ‘Sen-Constable Lamb [formal nomination] said Ms White was drunk and continued to struggle and yell abuse when police patrolling the area arrested her’. The expert ‘voice’ of the state authorised police, Lamb, describes how Ms White ‘was drunk’. However, it is unlikely a police prosecutor would use such terminology, preferring instead terms such as ‘unduly intoxicated’ or ‘under the influence of alcohol’. By using the term again, the author is showing disrespect and reinforcing Ms White’s transgression of socially acceptable feminine behaviour. The contention ‘Ms White continued to struggle and yell abuse at the police when they arrested her’ suggests that Ms White not only continued to behaviour violently but by resisting arrest she also did not submit to the authority of police, therefore conveying to the reader that Ms White possibly deserved to be arrested.

However, Line 7 goes on to report ‘The court heard Ms White started taking anti-depressants after she broke up with [idiom – separate from or leave] her husband and lost her job but stopped taking them cold turkey [idiom – to cease something abruptly] the day of the incident’. Here the author is problematising Ms White’s behaviours by pathologising her actions. Ms White was taking antidepressants to help her cope [BECAUSE] she had broken up with her husband and lost her job. The journalist also placed ‘Ms White started taking anti-depressants’ at the lead of the sentence, therefore making the clause more salient, and then reported why she was taking them (she broke up with her husband and lost her job). The journalist’s use of the metaphor ‘cold turkey’ to describe Ms White coming off her medication on the day of the incident imparts in the reader a perception of silliness in this action. The metaphor conveys the ‘cold turkey’ attitude of something being done without due consideration for its consequences and this further problematised Ms White’s actions.

Line 8 of the news report states ‘The court also heard Ms White reacted physically when the bouncer pinned [metaphor] her up against the car because she had previously

---

30 My knowledgeable proof-reader kindly pointed out that the origin of this term ‘squirrel grip’ was to indicate ‘a handful of nuts’. I thank her for that most relevant information. However, I believe the analogy of animalistic reference still stands.
been a victim of domestic violence’. Ms White’s actions are further pathologised and problematised by the admission that she was a victim of domestic violence, which in the mind of the reader identifies Ms White as a troubled woman. Note that Ms White’s reacting physically takes prominence in the sentence, with ‘victim of domestic violence’ being placed last, or as the least salient part of the text. The syntactical ordering places prominence on Ms White’s violence rather than her victimology. The wrap-up of the news report stated ‘Ms White, of Francis Street, was given an extended bail and will reappear in court for a contest mention on December 16’. It is unclear why Francis Street was included in the wrap-up, but a review of Francis Street on the internet shows the area to be an up-market, middle-class area.

Perhaps the reason for this reference to her address is to release Ms White from the ‘bogan’ label and leave the reader with the view that Ms White is a traumatised middle-class woman who had been ‘dealt a bad hand’ in life. The overall impression of the news report is of the violence perpetrated by Ms White and, to a lesser degree, the deviant behaviour of the bouncers. There is no impression given to the reader about what became of the woman victim, who remained anonymous throughout the report. The only ‘voices’ in the report were those of the police prosecutor, who was nominated and titled. The naming and titling of ‘experts’ is a discursive strategy undertaken by the media when drawing on ‘expert’ opinions to promote, validate and legitimate their claims (van Leeuwen, 2008). Conversely, the bouncers remained anonymous, mentioned only in the generic and generalised category of ‘bouncer’, while the victim was only identified as ‘a woman’, a generic categorical representation. In discourse, this is defined as indetermination, where the social actor’s identity remains unspecified and withheld from the reader (van Leeuwen, 2008). The reader is only able to draw the conclusion that the bouncer was male because Ms White grabbed his testicles, the only defining identifier of the bouncer, and references to ‘he’ in the text.

Consequently, the power of the discourse conveys the violence of Ms White as illegitimate and immoral while eventually pathologising and problematising her behaviours in Lines 7–9. The transgressions of the anonymous, objectified bouncer/s are played down or made less salient through indetermination, as is the ‘presence’ of victims in the report. The thematic structure of the news report has been managed to maximise Ms White’s violent actions. A different (male) journalist may have stressed
the importance of the bouncer’s actions and said less about the behaviours of Ms White. The lack of information in the report and the focus on Ms White’s violent behaviour leaves the reader with the impression that Ms White is a sick, troubled woman who needs medical assistance, while the bouncer’s behaviour was shown as subordinate to Ms White’s violence. The patriarchal domination of Western ideologies has clearly influenced the journalist’s writing, displaying censorship of violent female action and pathologising Ms White’s behaviour (Gilbert, 2002). The Western dominance of gendered divisions of behaviour is clearly evident in the female author’s account of the incident.

7.2 Drinking beyond their means

The second news report was published in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* in February 2005. The Gold Coast is a well-known tourist destination in Queensland and is very popular with international backpackers. The annual ‘schoolies’ week to celebrate the end of high school is held on the Gold Coast. The report is as follows:

**Drinking beyond their means**

Author: Ken Vernon

**LEAD:** A long cool drink after a long hot day has always been the birthright of Australians countrywide, but somehow the nature of our national pasttime has changed. Ken Vernon reports.

**LINE 2:** THE images are profoundly disturbing. A young night-clubber pursued through the streets of Surfers Paradise by two bouncers and brutally bashed because he said a word or two out of place.

**LINE 3:** A pair of mature and respectable Gold Coast businessmen similarly bashed, with one hospitalised, by bouncers outside a city club – in front of their wives – because of the exchange of a few sharp words.

**LINE 4:** One of Australia's most loved cricketers, David Hookes, allegedly bashed to death by a bouncer, also seemingly after what would normally have been a harmless argument.

**LINE 5:** A young Gold Coaster quietly sitting on a Brisbane bench beaten and killed – for a pair of shoes.

**LINE 6:** What do all of these entirely avoidable tragedies have in common?

**LINE 7:** If you answered bouncers you would be wrong. If you answered nightclubs you would also be wrong. The common factor is alcohol abuse.

*Gold Coast Bulletin*, February 22, 2005
The headline of the news report ‘drinking beyond their means’ is an abstract concept that does not tell the reader what the news article is about. The lead of the report contends that the ‘birthright of Australians’ to have a ‘long cool drink on a hot day’ is under threat [BECAUSE] it ‘has changed’. Here the author is drawing a clear categorical line between natural-born Australians and those who are not (that is, immigrants). By stating the ‘birthright of Australians’, the author is classifying and identifying that only those born in Australia are, in fact, Australians, or ‘us’. The author further contends through alliteration that having ‘a long cool drink after a long hot day’ is a ‘national pasttime’ and is under threat (has changed), although the suggestion that the drink is alcoholic remains implicit, an indication that ‘all Australians’ or ‘us’ understand the role alcohol plays in ‘our national past-time’. Here the author has used a possessivated relational identification by the use of ‘our’ national pastime and birthright ‘of’ and ‘all’ Australians. That is, the birthright and national pastime belong to ‘us’ or ‘Australians’ and not to immigrant ethnic Others. Possessivated relational identification is a discursive strategy intended to ‘... signify the “belonging together”, the relationality of the possessivated and possessing social actor’ (van Leeuwen, 2008: 87) or in this case, Australians.

The use of implicit understandings of sociocultural Australian norms would serve to exclude those who are non-Australian or ‘them’, thereby excluding immigrant cultures and non-Australians from an understanding of the text, or excluding the social Other (van Dijk, 1991). Line 2, the beginning of the article, starts with the imagery of doom, that the images – whatever they may be – are not just disturbing, but are profoundly disturbing. In the mind of the reader, this could activate cognitive schemas of what might challenge our national activity or pastime in Australia. Is it multiculturalism or immigration, or is it the price of beer? The second sentence of Line 2 presents the image the authors referred to as ‘profoundly disturbing’. ‘A young night-clubber [categorical classification by age and activity] pursued through the streets of Surfers Paradise [provenance categorical classification] by two bouncers [generic categorical classification] and brutally bashed because he [categorical indicator – i.e. male] said a word or two out of place [litotes]’. By using the term ‘young nightclubber’, the journalist is activating in the mind of the reader mental models of a carefree youngster out nightclubbing on the town. That is, a young man [indicated by ‘he’] out to have some fun. The person in question has been classified under four categorical identifiers.
He (sex) is young (age), a nightclubber (activity) and from Surfers Paradise (provenance).

Generic categorical identifiers are traditionally used in discourse to impersonalise the social actor through abstract representations (van Leeuwen, 2008). However, in this case the person in question has been personalised through categories that have attributed to him elements of ‘humanness’, thus personalising him to the reader. By the strategic use of ‘pursued’ following the ‘young night-clubber’, the journalist is framing the setting with the young man ‘running for his life’, for to be pursued means to be chased or hunted (Taylor, 2003). This is further compounded by the use of ‘through the streets of Surfers Paradise’, confirming to the reader that the young man was in fact ‘running for his life’. The pursuers are then identified as two bouncers; however they are not nominated or titled and are generically classified in the category of ‘bouncers’, a method of objectifying rather than defining them as subject, a discursive strategy used by the media to Otherise socially deviant actors (van Dijk, 1991, van Leeuwen, 2008). The bouncers then, reportedly, not just bashed the young man, but brutally bashed him. The choice of the word ‘brutal’ to describe the bashing instils in the reader the sense that the bashing was prolonged and savage.

The young man is presented as the innocent victim by the statement ‘he said a word or two out of place’. The use of litotes plays down the actions of the young man, thus signifying to the reader that he did nothing wrong and was innocent and undeserving of the ‘brutal bashing’. Line 3 goes on to state ‘A pair of mature and respectable Gold Coast businessmen [provenance and activity-based categorical classification] similarly bashed [nominalisation], with one hospitalised, by bouncers [generic categorical classification] outside a city club – in front of their wives – because of the exchange of a few sharp [metaphor] words [litotes]’. By stating at the beginning of the sentence, ‘a pair of mature and respectable businessmen’, the journalist is identifying and classifying the men and consequently activating a socio-cognitive model in the mind of the reader about what it means to be mature and respectable businessmen on the Gold Coast. The mental model would no doubt include imagery of well-dressed men in business suits, well groomed and with professional demeanour.

By stating ‘mature’ and ‘respectable’, the journalist is drawing in the mind of the reader mental models or categorical classifications of what mature age and respect are, as
opposed to, for example, a brash, young working-class man. The journalist then repeats that the businessmen were ‘similarly’ bashed. Through nominalisation, the author draws the reader’s mind back to the brutal bashing of the previous attack without having to state that this bashing was also ‘brutal’. In fact, the bashings were so brutal one man was hospitalised, as stated next in the sentence. The attackers are then generically nominated, ‘by bouncers’, although the journalist does not state how many, leaving it to the reader to concoct in their own minds exactly how many might have been involved. However, by leaving out the exact number of bouncers, the journalist allows the reader to imagine it must have been a ‘pack of bouncers’ to hospitalise one of the businessmen. The sex of the bouncers is not given, leaving them objectified or less than human in the text. However, it is also commonly assumed that bouncers are male. The journalist then states, in a phrase separated from the other words by dashes – in front of their wives. To be bashed in front of your wife in a patriarchal society is to emasculate the men in question, which perceivably makes the men ‘less than men’ (Rigakos, 2008) in the eyes of their wives.

At the end of the sentence, the journalist writes ‘because of the exchange of a few sharp words’. Note the use of the metaphor ‘sharp’ to qualify ‘words’. Sharp indicates something that cuts, penetrates or wounds. The journalist does not state who said these sharp words and this remains implicit, but given the semantic context of the rest of the sentence, the reader is left to assume that the bouncers probably said the ‘sharp’ words, because mature and respectable businessmen presumably would not do so. This also follows from Line 1, where the author wrote ‘said a word or two out of place’, indicating the senselessness of the ‘bashing’. Line 4 of the report stated ‘One of Australia's most loved cricketers David Hookes [nominated and titled, supposition], allegedly bashed to death [legitimate fact?] by a bouncer [generic categorical classification], also seemingly after what would normally have been a harmless argument [litotes]’. The mention of ‘Australia’s most loved cricketer’ invokes for the reader the (then recent) tragedy of Hookes’ death. In reality, Hookes was not bashed, he was punched once, fell and struck his head and died later of the injury. A moot point perhaps, although the journalist does not elaborate on Hookes’ death because he assumes any natural-born Australian would know every detail of how ‘one of Australia’s most loved cricketers’ died.
Arguably, the author has exaggerated here because it is debatable whether Hookes was, in fact, ‘one of Australia’s most loved cricketers’. However, by upgrading Hookes’ status to Australian sporting icon, the author has ideologically manipulated the text through rhetorical overstatement to emphasise the importance of the dominant in-group (Australian and cricketer) and condemn the social Other (van Dijk, 1991, van Dijk, 1995c), in this case, the bouncer. The news press often use similar positive appraisals (as in ‘much loved’) to promote social actors as worthy of the social ideological in-group (van Leeuman, 2008). However, negative appraisals such as redneck or thug appear more frequently.

The author’s use of ‘bashed to death’ in the text serves to sustain the image of ‘bashed’ throughout the report and shows the reader the frequency of bouncers bashing people. However, in this case it was a ‘bashing death’. In each line of the article, the writer increases the magnitude of the bashings by bouncers (bolded in the initial text). First, the young innocent man (brutally bashed); next, mature, respectable businessmen (brutally bashed and hospitalised); then a national cricketing hero who was ‘bashed to death’. Note also the strategic use of ‘alleged’ in the sentence. This is a term used by the police when talking about offenders who have been charged with an offence but not yet appeared in court. The use of the term ‘alleged’ serves to give the sentence legitimacy by the use of police terminology.

The writer then concludes through litotes that the argument between Hookes and the bouncer was ‘seemingly harmless’. Litotes is used in the media to downplay or downgrade the actions or behaviours of dominant in-groups and amplify the negative actions of the social Other (van Dijk, 1991). This is consistent with the previous lines where the action was stated, followed by a suggestion of futility. The following line, Line 5, states ‘A young Gold Coaster [provenance classification] quietly sitting on a Brisbane bench beaten and killed – for a pair of shoes’. At this point in the transcript, it is unclear who killed this young person or who the young person was. The reader may be momentarily puzzled because the transcript had led them through three bashings by bouncers. The syntactical ordering and semantic structure of the article might encourage the reader (possibly) to link this death with the previous incidents described. In this script, the journalist paints the scene of a young Gold Coaster sitting passively on a Brisbane bench, presumably minding his or her own business. The sex of the person is
not stated, only that he/she was young and in Brisbane, away from home, signifying perhaps that she/he was alone and vulnerable, perhaps a young lone female out late at night?

The use of the term ‘beaten and killed’ signifies to the reader the person was repeatedly bashed until dead. The writer does not say that the victim was ‘bashed’ or ‘beaten and died in hospital’, but uses beaten and killed, which indicates to the reader a repeated and brutal bashing causing death. This conforms to the pattern of escalation in the severity of ‘bashing’ through the text, a crescendo of increasing violence. The senselessness of the act is bought home to the reader by the concluding phase, separated with a dash – ‘for a pair of shoes’. The ‘tone’ of the phrase lowers, as with enunciation, and signifies the futility of such a senseless act, semantically aligning the words with the structure of the preceding text. Line 6 of the article is a question to the reader. ‘What do all of these entirely avoidable tragedies have in common?’ This strategy serves to engage the reader in what is perceived to be a two-way conversation. The journalist is drawing the reader in and asking for an opinion. By this time, the reader is presumably beginning to reach conclusions as to the point of the article, based on the socio-cognitive mental models the author has produced through the discourse.

The journalist has also stressed ‘avoidable’ in the text, not just ‘avoidable’, but entirely avoidable and not just events occurring, but tragedies. In the reader, ‘tragedies’ brings to the mind the senselessness that is often assumed in these acts, such as terrible tragedy or awful tragedy, assuming an unwritten understanding between writer and reader of the very depths of tragedy. The journalist then exposes (in Line 7) his justification for the article by metaphorically throwing off the covers of his secret to reveal it to the reader. The journalist has asked a question and he is responding to the ‘guesses’ of the reader. The journalist reveals ‘If you answered bouncers you would be wrong’. One can only assume readers would have been misled by the text. The next sentence, ‘If you answered nightclubs you would also be wrong’ also disproves readers’ guesses.

The reader may have reached the wrong conclusion because the semantic structure and syntactical ordering of the article led clearly to such conclusions. However, the final flourish of ‘The common factor is alcohol abuse’ could perhaps puzzle readers even more. The coverage of the article describes the brutal bashing of people in graphic terms, three of them by bouncers. With much information omitted or left implicit, the
reader must fill in the gaps to form an understanding of the article. What the journalist has tried to achieve by drawing on socio-cognitive models of senseless bashing deaths is a link between these deaths and alcohol abuse. However, whether this is achieved depends on the socio-cognitive mental models activated in the minds of readers and their knowledge and experience with bouncers, nightclubs and alcohol. The most likely outcome is that readers are left with a view of bouncers as violent individuals who bash people.

7.3 BOUNCER LAW REFORMS

The following news report appeared in an Adelaide (South Australia) newspaper in February 2005. David Hookes’ 2004 death preceded this announcement by the State government, and the bouncer charged with his assault was not cleared of all charges until November 2005. At present in Australia, States and Territories have their own laws and regulations governing private security industries. The news report reads as follows:

**BOUNCER LAW REFORMS**

Author: not stated

LINE 1: THE State Government wants to spend an extra $1 million a year to **crackdown on bouncer violence** and organised crime under the **first laws of their kind** in Australia.

LINE 2: Fingerprinting and random alcohol and drug testing of crowd controllers were among the proposed reforms approved by the Parliament's lower house last week in a bid to **weed out organised crime gangs** from the security and hospitality industries.

LINE 3: Attorney-General Michael Atkinson said the government would provide 15 more police to **check up on crowd controllers** and ‘**wannabe bouncers**’.

*Messenger–Leader*, Adelaide, February 23, 2005

The headline of the article ‘bouncer law reforms’ appears to suggest that the focus of law reform is not on the security industry in general, but solely on bouncers. The generic categorical classification of ‘bouncers’ is used rather than the legitimate name of crowd controllers or security providers. Just as governments may announce criminal justice law reform or child abuse law reforms, by stating ‘bouncer law reforms’ the journalist places bouncers into a category of ‘criminal’ in need of law reform. Line 1 of
the report states ‘[t]he State Government [impersonalisation – synecdoche] wants to spend an extra $1 million dollars a year’ to achieve this law reform. One million dollars is a lot of money in any budget, and this phrase suggests the problem with bouncers is so big it needs a lot of money to solve. The use of the term ‘extra’ also suggests the government is already spending a lot of money to address the ‘problem’ of bouncer violence and organised crime. This is followed by the statement that the State government is going ‘…to ‘crackdown’ [idiom – to severely enforce, metaphor] on bouncer violence and organised crime’, suggesting the government is ‘getting tough’ in their approach. As previously identified, the strategic use of metaphors is designed to Otherise the social group under scrutiny. The syntactical ordering of ‘bouncer violence’ and ‘organised crime’ is written so the two are paired, suggesting that bouncer violence and organised crime go hand-in-hand.

If ‘organised crime’ had been written first in the sentence, it may have activated a different mental model for the reader. In Australia, organised crime is attributed to gangs, ethnic gangs, biker gangs, etc. The reader may not have connected organised crime with bouncer violence except that their attention was directed towards bouncer violence first and was then linked to organised crime. Therefore, through syntactical ordering, the reader is led to believe bouncer violence is synonymous with organised crime. The sentence concludes with the statement that the law reforms are ‘the first laws of their kind in Australia’, suggesting to the reader the government is taking a new and revolutionary approach to ‘bouncer law reform’. This might further suggest the ‘problem’ of bouncer violence and organised crime is so out-of-control and widespread that its solution needs a revolutionary approach. The use of such discursive strategies is designed to emphasise the positive actions of the in-group, an ideological method of reinforcing dominant values and beliefs (van Dijk, 1995c).

Line 2 of the article states that the proposed law reforms will include ‘Fingerprinting and random alcohol and drug testing of crowd controllers ...’. The fact that fingerprinting is mentioned draws on the mental model that fingerprinting is only used for persons who have been charged with criminal offences. Fingerprinting is confined, by and large, to criminals, drawing on the suggestion that all bouncers need to be fingerprinted because they are criminal. Random alcohol and drug testing is also reserved for those on bail or probation, or for roadside tests for motorists. Again, this
imposed criminal element projects the image of bouncers as transgressors of the law who must be monitored continuously. Note the use of the formal term ‘crowd controllers’ for bouncers in this phrase. It brings a formal tone of legitimization and authority to the sentence. The sentence concludes with ‘... approved by the Parliament's lower house last week in a bid to weed out organised crime gangs from the security and hospitality industries’. The use of the authority of Parliament gives formal legitimation to the entire sentence.

However, the legitimate tone of the sentence is disrupted by the clause ‘in a bid to weed out organised crime gangs’. The use of the metaphor ‘weed out’ [idiom – to eradicate] suggests that organised crime gangs (bouncers) are noxious, out-of-control plants that need to be eradicated and exterminated. Note also that the journalist did not mention the word ‘bouncers’ in this clause but left it implicit, using the discursive strategy to imply that bouncers were, in fact, the organised crime gangs. The strategic use of ‘crowd controllers’ has kept the term separate and distinct from bouncers, who are involved in organised crime, signalling that the government wishes to uphold legitimate crowd controllers. The conclusion of the sentence again uses the accepted legitimate terminology of ‘security and hospitality industry’, indicating the legitimacy of these two industries while at the same time denoting and condemning organised crime (bouncers). The final sentence of the article draws in the legal nominated authority of the Attorney-General [formal nomination and title].

The Attorney-General stated ‘... the government would provide 15 more police to check up on [idiom – to monitor/examine] crowd controllers [functionalised classification] and ‘wannabe’ [idiom – someone trying to be like someone else] bouncers’. Here the government [synecdoche again] is drawing on their State authorised officers, the police, to monitor bouncers. As legitimate officers of the State, police are being tasked with metaphorically ‘checking up on’ or monitoring, just as a mother would ‘check up on’ her small child or a boss would ‘check up on’ a trainee. Thus the legal agents of the State, the police, are to watch over crowd controllers and ‘wannabe bouncers’. Again the journalist has separated the use of ‘crowd controllers’ and ‘bouncers’, suggesting one is legitimate (crowd controllers) and one is not (bouncers). The use of the idiom ‘wannabe’ is a slur on bouncers that contributes to the condemnatory tone of the term, which is used in a derogatory manner that undermines the credibility of bouncers.
Overall, the news article relied on the legitimate authority of the parliament, the Attorney-General and the police to press for the ‘cleaning up’ of criminal bouncer gangs. Generalisation and implicitness are used to suggest that bouncers are organised crime gangs and the government is using a lot of money to eradicate them (and bouncers) from the industry. The polarised view of ‘us’ (government, police and the law-abiding public) and ‘them’ (organised bouncer gangs) are made explicit in the discourse by the discursive strategies used in the text. The hard-line approach taken by the government (and police) is conveyed through explicit metaphorical references to ‘cracking down’, ‘weeding out’ ‘checking up on’ and ‘wannabe bouncers’ and by the use of elitist ideologies that are generated to create social inequality by undermining and demeaning bouncers, or Otherising them as the social out-group.

7.4 ASSAULT: Coach king-hit

The following article appeared as a brief report in the Courier Mail in March 2005. The headlines were exaggerated by the capitalisation of the word ‘assault’. This is followed by ‘coach king-hit’.

ASSAULT: Coach king-hit

Author: not stated

LINE 1: A BOUNCER who king-hit a rugby league coach at a Brisbane bayside hotel had a previous conviction for pub violence, a court heard yesterday.

LINE 2: The District Court in Brisbane was told Soane John Sevele had called last drinks at the Full Moon Hotel, Shorncliffe, when he punched the coach in the face after a discussion.

LINE 3: The coach was knocked out and suffered a fractured cheek bone. Sevele, 40, pleaded guilty to assault causing grievous bodily harm.

LINE 3: Judge Brian Hoath sentenced Sevele to 2 1/2 years' jail to be suspended after nine months.

Courier Mail, Brisbane, March 30, 2005

The synecdoche or activity-based classification of the use of the word ‘coach’ would activate in the mind of the reader what it is to be a ‘coach’ and what being a ‘coach’ entails. Readers may draw on their experiences of ‘coaches’ to form a picture of someone who trains a sports team in a particular sport, be that baseball, football, cricket, etc. Coaches are generally respected members of the community and may work
voluntarily, as with children’s sports, or be paid, such as the coach of an A-league football team. Either way, a coach is seen as a respectable occupation. A coach being ‘king hit’ may produce the mental model of a respected community member being savagely punched, given the nature of what constitutes a ‘king hit’.

If rephrased, the headline could read ‘respected member of sporting community assaulted by a savage punch to the head’. The first sentence of the report (Line 1) states a bouncer [generic categorical classification] was responsible, the coach was a rugby league coach [activity-based classification] and the bouncer had a previous conviction for ‘pub violence’. The word ‘bouncer’ is printed in capital letters to emphasise its salience and draw the reader’s attention to it by its prominence. The mention of ‘rugby league coach’ would activate in the reader’s mind knowledge and information relating to rugby league coaches. This would no doubt involve mental models of burly footballers with considerable physicality, depending on the reader’s knowledge and prior experience with rugby league coaches. It may also indicate to the reader that the coach himself possessed physicality, which meant the assault was even more disturbing.

Line 2 states the bouncer’s name [semiformal (name and surname) nominated but not titled] and reported the coach was ‘punched in the face after a discussion’. Note the author did not write that the bouncer had a discussion with the coach and then punched him in the face. The syntactical ordering of the clauses reported the punch first and the discussion second, therefore giving salience to the punch rather than the discussion.

Line 3 similarly reports the outcome of the violence, first in the sentence (knocked out with a fractured cheekbone) followed by the report, ‘Sevele pleaded guilty to assault causing grievous bodily harm’. The bouncer’s violence is therefore emphasised in the text, taking precedence over the last clause in the sentence.

Line 4 is the ‘wrap-up’ or outcome of the report. The coach is not nominated in the text, but is consistently referred to as ‘the coach’ (four times in the report). Omitting the person’s name and simply referring to him as ‘the coach’ gives the reader no information relating to the person. We presume he was male although there is no indication of this. The generalisation of the person into a broader category of ‘coach’

A ‘king hit’ is classified as a hit to the head by an attacker when the victim does not see the attack coming and it is generally a single, heavy punch. It has recently been dubbed by the media as a ‘coward punch’.
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serves the ideological purpose of leaving unsaid who the person was, therefore relying on sociocultural mental models of what constitutes ‘a coach’.

The coach in question may have been a volunteer Little League coach who trained five-year-old girls on the weekend. However, leaving the person in the expansive category of ‘coach’ gives the person more social prominence and more importance in the text. Similarly, the capitalisation of the word ‘bouncer’ in the first line places importance on the bouncer in relation to the text. The most salient messages in the report are the bouncer, with a previous history of pub violence, king hit a coach, knocked him out and fractured his cheekbone. The reference to ‘pub violence’ is an interesting choice of words by the author. A search of news reports found the term ‘pub violence’ has been used by the news media since 1995 to describe violence that occurs in and around hotels. ‘Pub violence’ is in itself a derogatory term based in dominant ideological discourse which refers to typically working-class hotels.

Table 14: News reports relating to pub violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2008</td>
<td>Police must target pub violence hot spots</td>
<td><em>The Australian</em>, QLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2010</td>
<td>Police sick of pub violence</td>
<td><em>Newcastle Herald</em>, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2012</td>
<td>Pub violence: Graphic footage they don’t want you to see</td>
<td><em>Daily Telegraph</em>, NSW (Wollongong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2012</td>
<td>The Face of Pub Violence</td>
<td><em>Newcastle Herald</em>, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2012</td>
<td>Call for action on Adelaide pub violence</td>
<td>news.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 2013</td>
<td>CBD hotspot Ivy most violent pub in NSW</td>
<td><em>Daily Telegraph</em>, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2013</td>
<td>Pub violence: high-risk venues face bans on glasses and shots before midnight</td>
<td><em>Sydney Morning Herald</em>, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 1995</td>
<td>Pub violence rises around pool table</td>
<td><em>The Independent</em>, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 2014</td>
<td>Six charged following pub violence</td>
<td><em>Country Times</em>, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 is a brief list of news articles found in the internet media\(^ {32} \) concerning ‘pub violence’. The concept of the Australian ‘pub’ refers to traditional hotels where hard drinking and hard fighting by working-class men were the norm (Lewis, 2006). The ‘pub’ is a working-class term that dates back to the early 1960s (Lewis, 2006), whereas middle- to upper-class people refer to them as hotels. Therefore, the use of the

\(^ {32} \) I entered the search term ‘pub violence’ and listed the first few news articles as outlined in Table 14.
historical–cultural term ‘pub’, paired with ‘violence’, suggests working-class pubs are a site of violence. The term ‘pub violence’ has been used in the news media for decades to condemn working-class hotels.

Media in the United Kingdom also refer to ‘pub violence’, because the ‘pub’ in the UK is also associated with working-class people. The apparent condemnation of working-class hotels indicates ideological discrimination by the authors as traditional working-class activities like drinking are increasingly becoming marginalised and criminalised (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002). The further pairing of the bouncer in the news text with pub violence also serves an ideological purpose because it suggests the bouncer habitually works at working-class (violent) pubs.

7.5 Bouncer ‘thought only of revenge’

The following news report relates to the Court trial of Zdavko Micevic who was charged with manslaughter over the death of the Australian cricketer David Hookes. The full news report reads as follows:

**Bouncer ‘thought only of revenge’**

Author: not stated

LINE 1: THE Supreme Court in Melbourne has been told that the bouncer accused of killing David Hookes threw a deliberate knockout punch at the former Test cricketer for revenge, not self-defence.

LINE 2: After hearing from almost 40 witnesses, the jury was given the prosecution's final account yesterday of the events on January 18 last year when a group of cricketers and their friends fell into a "vortex of aggression" outside the Beaconsfield Hotel in St Kilda.

LINE 3: The court has heard Hookes became involved in a verbal altercation with security staff and was ejected from the hotel following celebration of the Bushrangers' win over SA at the MCG.

LINE 4: Bouncer Zdavko Micevic, 23, punched the then Victorian coach who fell backwards and hit his head on the road, fracturing his skull.

LINE 5: He died the next day in the Alfred Hospital.

LINE 6: Micevic has pleaded not guilty to manslaughter and assault, arguing the punch was in self-defence.

LINE 7: But yesterday prosecutor Ray Elston, SC, said Micevic, a former boxer, knew exactly what he was doing when he moved back and delivered the knockout blow.
LINE 8: “The only focus for lawful justification is whether the accused acted in self-defence or was it an act of violence to pay back someone who was said to be a smart alec”, Mr Elston told the court.

LINE 9: The blow was struck to the head, the blow was struck by a person skilled and trained in throwing a punch. The blow was thrown by an angry, fit young man”.

LINE 10: During the trial, Micevic gave evidence that during the scuffle in the street Hookes punched him twice in the stomach, grabbed his shirt and was pulling his head towards his chest.

LINE 11: But Mr Elston questioned why Micevic did not mention this to police when giving his statement. Mr Elston said there was evidence from unbiased St Kilda residents and passers by that Hookes did not have any physical contact with Micevic prior to being punched and he was standing with his hands by his sides.

LINE 12: “You can reject his (Micevic's) assertion out of hand that he was acting in self-defence” Mr Elston said.

The Advertiser, Adelaide, September 6, 2005

The headline condemns from the start, with the author claiming to know what Micevic was thinking by stating he ‘only thought of revenge’. The claim suggests a subjective cognitive supposition by the author, because it is not stated in the article that the defence argued it was ‘revenge’. Mr Elston [formal (surname and honorific) nomination] told the Court [synecdoche] the assault may have been to ‘pay back someone who was said to be a smart alec’ [metaphor] (Line 8). However, the author has replaced the ‘pay back’ term to claim ‘revenge’ and has upgraded the statement to the headline and Line 1 of the report, thereby giving greater salience and meaning to the headline and the news report. Revenge suggests a preconceived and premeditated motive of violent action and is a much ‘stronger’ lexical choice than to ‘pay someone back’.

To ‘pay someone back’ may mean to return a favour, but the commonly understood notion of ‘revenge’ is based on violence and premeditated action. Line 1 of the report states the bouncer [generic categorical classification] was accused of ‘killing David Hookes’ [informal nomination]’, when in reality Micevic was charged with manslaughter and assault (stated in Line 6). However, by using the word ‘killing’ in place of the word ‘manslaughter’ the author is manipulating the semantic meaning of the text to read in a more violent graphic manner. Manslaughter does not bear the same social connotations as ‘killing’ and thus this contributes to the portrayal of Micevic in a more sinister light. The words ‘killing’, ‘killed’ or ‘kill’ are commonly used by the news media in headlines.
and in text when reporting on bouncers involved in violence. This is followed by the words ‘threw a deliberate knockout punch’. The use of the word ‘deliberate’ reinforces the notion of ‘revenge’ (premeditated and purposeful) and supports the graphic use of the verb ‘killing’.

The author draws on boxing terminology by describing the punch as a ‘knockout’ punch. A knockout in boxing refers to a punch that renders an opponent unconscious, resulting in a win for the boxer. This would appear to be a deliberate ploy by the author because Micevic was a former boxer (mentioned in Line 7). Therefore, by using sporting terminology in the text, the author is framing Micevic as a trained sportsperson. This sends the message to the reader that Micevic was a trained boxer who was competent at fighting and proficient at knockouts. The term ‘knockout’ is used again in Line 7 in reference to Micevic being a former boxer.

Line 2 describes the cricketers and their friends being involved in a ‘vortex of aggression’ in inverted commas. By using the metaphor ‘vortex’, the author is signifying something that is large and violent and which ‘sucks things into it’ as with a tornado or a whirlpool. However, in Line 10 the author reframes this ‘vortex of aggression’ by describing Micevic as being involved in a ‘scuffle’. The exaggeration of ‘vortex of aggression’ has thus been relegated to a ‘scuffle’ when referring to the bouncer, Micevic. This suggests the author projects a polarised view by taking an ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude to the reporting. By upgrading the aggression to a ‘vortex’ when referring to the cricketers and then downgrading it to a ‘scuffle’ in relation to Micevic, the author is showing clear ideological manipulation of the text. Line 3 of the report states Hookes was involved in a ‘verbal altercation with security staff and was ejected from the hotel’. It is noteworthy the author uses the term ‘hotel’ and not ‘pub’ in reference to the establishment. The Beaconsfield Hotel is an iconic landmark in Melbourne and this may be the reason for the formal use of the term hotel. It is also prudent to recall the words of the bouncers in Rigakos’ (2008: 147) study who stated celebrities were the most difficult patrons, citing them as condescending and difficult to manage. The bouncers stated celebrities thought they were socially superior to the door staff and treated them with disdain.

In Line 3, the author uses the term ‘verbal altercation’ in relation to Hookes, which would suggest a slight verbal disagreement, rather than a ‘verbal slanging match’ or an
‘aggressive disagreement’. Again, the author is downplaying the behaviour of Hookes by the choice of lexicons, revealing the ‘us’ and ‘them’ ideological attitude. Hookes was described as being ‘ejected’ from the hotel, not that ‘he was asked to leave’ (as other news reports stated). The term ‘ejected’ signifies an aggressive removal from the hotel. In reference to the behaviour of security staff, the author has signified a more aggressive stance by the use of the stronger term ‘ejected’. The author then states Hookes was celebrating ‘the Bushrangers win over SA at the MCG’. As stated previously, the use of abbreviations serves to distance readers from the text if they are not familiar with their meaning. In this instance, SA means South Australia and the MCG means the Melbourne Cricket Ground. However, a reader who was not familiar with Australian cricket may be unaware of this. The use of abbreviations therefore serves to exclude those readers who are not Australian cricket fans.

Line (4) in the text describes Hookes as the ‘Victorian coach’, rather than stating his name. This sentence has followed on from the ‘win by the Bushrangers’. Again, those readers unfamiliar with cricket would not know the Bushrangers were the Victorian cricket team. The use of ‘Victorian coach’ rather than Hookes’ name serves to highlight the social status of Hookes; that of a respected and celebrated Australian cricket coach. Line 4 states the name of the bouncer and that he ‘punched the then Victorian coach who fell backwards and hit his head on the road, fracturing his skull’. Recall that in Line 2 of the text the author stated the cricketers ‘fell into a “vortex of aggression”’. However, here the author states the cricketer was ejected from the hotel and that immediately afterwards Micevic punched Hookes. There is no mention of the ‘vortex of aggression’ between the ejection and the (fatal) punch.

The text reads as if the cricketer left the hotel and was punched immediately afterwards, suggesting lack of provocation by Hookes. Following this contention, the author stated ‘Hookes died the next day’ (Line 5) and ‘Micevic has pleaded not guilty to manslaughter and assault, arguing the punch was in self-defence’ (Line 6). Here the author uses the word ‘arguing’ in relation to Micevic. This suggests the bouncer is aggressively disagreeing and debating the issue. The author could have used the words ‘stating’ or ‘declaring’, but by the use of a strong word the author maintains the aggressive portrayal of the bouncer. Lines 7 to 9 bring in the ‘voice’ of the prosecutor [formally nominated and titled] who is directly quoted by the author. By giving
prominence to the names and titles of powerful members of organisations in the text, an author gives credence to dominant ideological discourses (van Leeuwen, 2008).

Micevic’s defence (Line 10) is written in the passive voice, and the author paraphrases the words rather than using direct quotes. This discursive strategy reduces the importance of information in the text by countering its meaning or importance (Van Dijk, 1991). Immediately after, in Line 11, the author again uses the ‘voice’ of the prosecutor, stating ‘there was evidence from unbiased St Kilda residents’. It is unclear why the author felt the need to state ‘unbiased’ in the text. Given the social and public status in the news of Hookes and the cricketers accompanying him, the likelihood of gaining an unbiased opinion appears highly unlikely. The fact the author stated this is interesting, to say the least.

The author goes on to state that (Mr Elston) said ‘Hookes did not have any physical contact with Micevic ... and he was standing with his hands by his side’. This portrays Hookes as the innocent, unsuspecting victim of a cowardly attack. The author supports this assertion with ‘Hookes did not have any physical contact with Micevic prior to being punched’. However, in an interview on the ABC TV program the 7.30 Report, an onlooker revealed Hookes was in a tight huddle of cricketers and bouncers ‘pushing and shoving’ at the time he was punched (Gearin, 2005). Thus, the author has specifically chosen texts to implicate Micevic as the aggressor. Line 12 (the wrap-up) defines the writer’s stance towards Micevic’s guilt by citing a direct quote from the prosecutor ‘you can reject Micevic’s assertion out of hand that he was acting in self-defence’.

Overall, the news report condemned Micevic in the headlines and text. From the headlines stating ‘revenge’ to the final wrap-up, the text has presented the social status of Hookes as innocent and undeserving through recontextualisation and minimised his behaviours through nominalisation. At the same time, the author has discounted the defence of Micevic and escalated his behaviours through explicit references, word selection, metaphors and syntactical ordering. Recontextualisation and nominalisation are discursive strategies that preserve dominant ideologies by minimising or negating the actions of the in-group (van Dijk, 1995b). The use of explicitness serves to define clearly the actions of the social Other and contributes to the preservation of dominant ideologies (van Dijk, 1991). By using the ‘voice’ and authority of the prosecutor
through direct quotes, the author is attempting to legitimate his/her construction of the story to implicate Micevic as the guilty party in the assault.

Micevic and his family were subjected to a ‘trial by media’ during the investigation into Hookes’ death and the court case. There was international attention because of Hookes’ social status, while Micevic and his family were publicly condemned and threats made on their lives (Gearin, 2005). The young man was vilified and condemned by the media before the trial was even completed (Wadds, 2010). Hookes himself was not without blame in the incident (Gearin, 2005), yet his public status took precedence over a single young bouncer. Although violence can never be condoned, the incident and resulting media attention demonstrates the power of the media in influencing, producing and reproducing public opinion.

7.6 Forcing the issue

The next news report appeared in The Australian in May 2006. The headline gives no indication as to what the news report is about, because it is an obscure abstract concept. The lead of the report is full of gloom, citing David Hookes’ death followed by ‘nothing has changed at our pubs and clubs’. This alone suggests that violence is still occurring in ‘pubs’ and ‘clubs’ in Australia by the pairing of Hookes with ‘nothing has changed’. The full report is as follows:

**Forcing the issue**

Authors: Padraic Murphy and Kevin Meade

LEAD: Two years after David Hookes’s death and nothing appears to have changed at our pubs and clubs, write Padraic Murphy and Kevin Meade

LINE 2: WILLIAM Amaya died on Saturday night on the footpath outside the rambling old Royal Exchange Hotel, a drinking hole popular with students in the inner-Brisbane suburb of Toowong. Most of what took place in the minutes before the 130kg Salvadoran immigrant died is in dispute, and three men employed as bouncers at the hotel have been charged with his murder.

LINE 3: Whatever the outcome of the police investigation and subsequent court case, Amaya's parents have one fact to contend with: he was dead by the time he arrived at Royal Brisbane Hospital. In a chilling detail that magnifies the pointlessness of Amaya's death, the Royal Exchange carried on business as usual for almost two hours before police were called in and closed the hotel.
LINE 4: While blame for Amaya's death will be apportioned by the courts, it has focused attention once again on the role of the tens of thousands of bouncers who patrol pubs and clubs across Australia.

LINE 5: Amaya's death comes more than two years after a wave of national outrage that followed the death of former Test cricketer David Hookes, 48, who died after a fight with a bouncer at a Melbourne pub in January 2004.

LINE 6: Fights involving bouncers and men, usually in their 20s, go vastly unreported, partly because in many cases the victims are hardly blameless. And despite increased surveillance and tightened regulations, Melbourne law firm Slater and Gordon says the number of inquiries it receives from people seeking to launch legal action against pubs and clubs has remained unchanged for a decade.

LINE 7: “We'd receive probably two approaches a week from people seeking advice after being assaulted on licensed premises,” says Barrie Woollacott, a partner with Slater and Gordon who specialises in personal injury claims.

LINE 8: “I wouldn't say there's been any noticeable change in reporting since the David Hookes death.”

LINE 9: The security industry has boomed since the early 1990s. In a 1998 report, Adam Graycar, head of the Australian Institute of Criminology, noted the number of security guards far outnumbered police. “There are twice as many private security operatives in Australia as there are police,” he said.

LINE 10: But despite the booming number of guards and bouncers, Australia's regulatory framework has remained piecemeal. No state appears to have got it right and the industry has been regulated partly by authorities' knee-jerk response to tragedy.

LINE 11: Hookes' death resulted in legislation being rushed through the Victorian parliament last year, forcing bouncers to undergo nationally recognised training. A Victorian government spokesman says there are about 30,000 registered bouncers in the state, although no one can say how many are operating at any one time. Assaults and injuries at nightspots remain common.

LINE 12: In South Australia, authorities last year moved to have the state's 6000 bouncers tested for drugs and alcohol, a move industry insiders said would force as many as 2000 out of the industry.

LINE 13: “We'll get one in three ... crowd controllers possibly leaving the industry because they don't want to get caught doing drugs or because they don't want to break their habit of drinking on the job,” Adelaide security industry boss Laury Bais said last year.

LINE 14: The death of Amaya at the Royal Exchange comes less than three months after a bouncer at another Brisbane pub was jailed for killing a drunk patron with a single kick.

LINE 15: Frank Hutchings, 29, an information technology specialist who worked part time at the Colmslie Hotel at Morningside in the eastern suburbs, was sentenced to seven years' jail for manslaughter. Hutchings worked for Queensland Hospitality and Security Staff, the same company that employed the three men charged with the murder of Amaya.
LINE 16: His trial was told that the victim, David John Coddington, 27, was upset about being ejected from the hotel in the early hours of June 14, 2003. As he walked past Hutchings and other security staff, he complained about his removal. Coddington, who had a blood-alcohol reading of 0.29 -- almost six times the legal driving limit -- was overhead to say to Hutchings: “I f---d your mother.”

LINE 17: A loud exchange ensued, ending with the bouncer giving Coddington a sharp kick to the head. The victim died a short time later. At Hutchings’s sentencing in the Brisbane Supreme Court, Justice Cate Holmes told him: “What you did was a stupid and brutal act on impulse and it changed your life forever and the lives of those who loved Coddington.”

LINE 18: One of Queensland’s leading security industry spokesmen says the state’s training regime for crowd controllers suffered through an attempt to standardise training across the country in the late ’90s.

LINE 19: “In Queensland in 1992 the industry sat down with the state government’s Fair Trading Office and designed a course of training that specifically homed in on psychology and aggression management,” says Bob Spreadborough, assistant Queensland secretary of the National Security Association.

LINE 20: But under the standardisation attempt in the late ’90s, the system was changed to a competency-based regime in which the emphasis was on how well a security officer could control patrons behaving badly.

LINE 21: Spreadborough believes the original Queensland system was much better as it taught crowd controllers to recognise signs of bad behaviour and intervene in a peaceful way before a patron got out of hand. “It was what we call problem identification,” he says. “The idea was to train people to a level where they could clearly see or identify a problem person who may be affected by drugs or alcohol or is acting in an inappropriate way”.

LINE 22: “We believe the emphasis should be more on early intervention to stop a patron’s behaviour getting out of hand.”

LINE 23: Spreadborough says Queensland police should be given stronger powers to deal with bouncers who overstep the mark.

LINE 24: “The police have no prosecutory powers under the Security Providers Act, which is absolutely ridiculous,” he says.

LINE 25: “If a police officer sees a crowd controller doing anything wrong, he can't do anything about it but report it to the Office of Fair Trading the next day. What should happen is that if a crowd controller is not wearing his identification, or cannot produce his licence, or he's not behaving in an appropriate manner, a police officer should be able to ‘breach him' straight away.”

LINE 26: Most bouncers patrolling suburban pubs and clubs get paid as little as $11 an hour, a rate that does not include superannuation or leave entitlements.

LINE 27: According to Tony Zalewski, who has trained as many as 40,000 crowd controllers since 1990 and is considered one of the industry’s foremost experts, pubs and clubs remain hamstrung by an inability to find suitable candidates. The work is challenging, sometimes dangerous, involves long hours and few applicants are properly trained in conflict resolution.

LINE 28: Moves to ban those with criminal convictions are widely disparaged.
LINE 29: Industry insiders recognise that drug dealers are attracted to the job because of the ready access it provides to partygoers, and rumours have long circulated in SA that bikies have infiltrated the security industry as it allows them to control the sale of drugs in popular nightspots.

LINE 30: In Melbourne, it is well known in police circles that in-house drug dealers in several nightspots popular with the city's cashed-up professionals are protected by bouncers, who are paid a pittance.

LINE 31: According to University of South Australia law school head Rick Sarre, the performance of bouncers boils down to a pay-peanuts-and-get-monkeys problem.

LINE 32: “The community really needs to recognise that the price of having well-trained crowd controllers skilled in conflict management is paying more for your drinks,” Sarre says. “Under the current system, you are necessarily attracting males who are not only prepared to put up with assaults but who might also have a propensity for doing so.”

LINE 33: Sarre has been calling for a national regulatory program to govern bouncers for almost a decade.

LINE 34: “The community really needs to come to terms with the fact that it might be necessary to pay a little more for their drinks if they expect to be protected by properly trained crowd controllers,” he says.

LINE 35: The industry peak body, the Australian Security Industry Association, says Saturday's death in Brisbane underlines the need for further regulation. “The Government must accelerate the finalisation of appropriate new licensing and security measures,” spokesman Bryan de Caires says.

VIOLENCE AT THE DOORSTEP

February 2002: Donald James Moore, 29, fell to the ground, hit his head and died after allegedly being punched by bouncer Stanley Roy Matenga in the Holland Park Hotel on Brisbane's southside. A jury acquitted Matenga of manslaughter.

March 2005: Bouncer Jeffrey Kretschmer, 30, is jailed for seven years after pleading guilty to manslaughter. He had pushed Daniel Trimble, 21, downstairs at a hotel in Bundaberg, Queensland.

September 2005: Bouncer Zdravko Micevic, 23, is acquitted of the manslaughter of former Test cricketer David Hookes, who died after a fight at the Beaconsfield Hotel in StKilda, Melbourne.

February 2006: Frank Hutchings, 29, a part-time bouncer at the Colmslie Hotel in Brisbane's eastern suburbs, is jailed for seven years for the manslaughter of David Coddington, 27, who died from a single kick to the head in June 2003.

May 21, 2006: Bouncers Dean Tappin, 40, Vaughn Thomas, 26, and Richard James, 38, are charged with the murder of William Armando Amaya, 25, who died on the footpath outside the Royal Exchange Hotel in Toowong, Brisbane.

RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

To be a bouncer in Queensland, applicants must:

* Be over 18.
* Have a Queensland security officer’s licence (cost: $284).
* Complete approved crowd controllers’ training course (minimum cost: $500).
* Have no criminal convictions for the previous 10 years.

_The Australian_, May 23, 2006

Line 2 of the news report announces the death of a Salvadoran immigrant on the
to the reader that the hotel was an older style traditional Australian
‘pub’, a meeting place for working-class men after a hard day’s work (Lewis, 2006).
The authors continue the cultural theme by describing the hotel as a ‘watering hole’, an
Australian slang term that describes a ‘pub’ or a venue where alcohol is served. The
Salvadoran immigrant is then described as ‘130kg\(^{33}\)’, a most unusual reference. The
reference to being an immigrant is used in this context in a negative manner, perhaps
inferring he was not Australian or one of ‘us’. In the context of Australian slang
terminology, the use of ‘Salvadoran immigrant’ is further amplified.

The second sentence concludes by stating that what occurred before Amaya died was in
dispute and three men employed as bouncers had been charged with murder. The
structure of the sentence is semantically ‘leading’, drawing the reader almost to
disregard the first part of the sentence because three bouncers had (already) been
charged with his murder. Line 3 includes a very stark, blunt and very explicit reference
to Amaya’s death. In relation to the deceased man’s parents, the authors state ‘he was
dead by the time he arrived at hospital’. The curtness of the ‘tone’ continues, with the
‘chilling detail that magnifies the pointlessness of Amaya’s death’ along with the use of
a cynical cliché by stating the hotel went back to ‘business as usual’ after the man’s
death ‘before the police were called in and closed the hotel’.

The structure of the sentence condemns the hotel owners and managers by stating the
police were forced (called in) to close the hotel, suggesting the owners should have
voluntarily closed the hotel. The use of the cliché adds to the sarcasm of the authors’
tone in the condemnation of the hotel. Line 4 introduces the major theme of the article,

---

\(^{33}\) I was puzzled by this reference because it is unusual to mention a person’s weight in this context. To
me it indicated a very tall robust man. However, with further investigation of the case I discovered that
Amaya was only 170 centimetres tall and he was morbidly obese. According to the coroner, this condition
contributed to his death. The bouncers charged were acquitted of his murder and any wrongdoing in the
case.
the role of bouncers in pubs and clubs in Australia. The following line (5) draws attention (once again) to the death of David Hookes two years previously, stating there had been a ‘wave of national outrage’ after his death. Here the rhetorical use of an ocean or water metaphor serves to exaggerate or overstate Australian reactions to Hookes’ death. The use of semantic rhetoric is an ideological, discursive technique designed to promote the interests of the in-group and marginalise or stigmatise the social out-group (van Dijk, 1995b). In this case, it refers to bouncers.

Line 6 of the report outlines the case against bouncers by stating ‘fights involving bouncers and men, usually in their 20s, go vastly unreported’. The authors again use hyperbole or exaggeration (vastly) in relation to unreported assaults because there is no statistical evidence to support such a claim. This is followed by a disclaimer stating ‘because in many cases the victims are hardly blameless’. Here the authors use litotes or understatement, a rhetorical tactic seen in the double negative ‘hardly blameless’. The use of litotes or double negatives serves to minimise the actions of those under discussion (van Dijk, 1995b), in this case the victims. In this instance, the actions of the victims are minimised and the actions of the bouncers are emphasised through the use of litotes and hyperbole.

The second sentence in Line 6 includes the ‘voice’ of a Melbourne lawyer from a named law firm, a member of the dominant in-group who has access to the mass media. The sentence is structured with the subordinate clause ‘despite increased surveillance and tightened regulations [apparent concession]’ followed by the lawyer stating in the main clause ‘legal action against pubs and clubs has remained unchanged for a decade’; a generalised statement that is stated as common knowledge or fact. Here the authors use an ‘expert voice’ to indicate to the reader that nothing has changed in pubs and clubs, and bouncers are still committing violence against people. The use of syntactical ordering and over- and under-statements presents a negative portrayal of bouncers and the pubs and clubs where they work.

Lines 7 and 8 are direct quotes from the lawyer, Barrie Woollacott, a partner with Slater and Gordon [formal nomination and classified identification], a rhetorical strategy by the authors to ‘back up’ their argument with an ‘expert voice’. Journalists use direct quotes to give the perception of factuality and legitimacy to a report (Teo, 2000: 18). Direct quotes operate as a ‘gate-keeping device’ because they allow only the credible,
legitimate ‘voices’ of those in positions of power and authority while excluding the powerless (Teo, 2000: 18). The identification method of classifying those in power through associations with organisations and institutions also plays a crucial role in media discourses (van Leeman, 2008). Line 7 quotes the lawyer as confirming his company receives ‘two approaches a week from people seeking advice after being assaulted on licensed premises’.

The next statement reveals that the lawyer deals in ‘personal injury claims’. Implicitness is used here, leaving out the involvement of bouncers but indicating ‘licensed premises’, thus leaving unsaid that bouncers are responsible. With the statement that the lawyer deals in ‘personal injury claims’, the authors are indicating to the reader that people seeking the lawyer’s services have been injured on licensed premises. However, people seeking the services of the lawyer may have been injured by other patrons, bar staff or in an accident, but by omitting this information, the authors indicate through implicitness that bouncers (or pubs?) are responsible.

Line 8 is another direct quote from the lawyer that involves litotes or double negatives. The statement ‘I wouldn’t say [litotes] there’s been any noticeable change in reporting since the David Hookes death’, minimises the incidence of reporting. The lawyer did not state ‘there is no change in reporting’, and his words suggest he may have been ‘hedging’ or deliberately downplaying the incidence through the use of double negatives. The reasons for this are unclear although the lawyer may also represent pubs and clubs and does not want to be seen as implicating them. Line 9 begins with an ‘explosive’ war metaphor, where the authors state the ‘security industry has boomed [metaphor] since the early 1990s’. The military metaphor is used to exaggerate the growth in the security industry by suggesting the industry ‘exploded’ in an out-of-control manner. The metaphor is used again in Line 11 to describe the number of guards and bouncers.

In the next sentence, the expert ‘voice’ of Adam Graycar, head of the Australian Institute of Criminology [informal naming and classified identification] is paraphrased from a report. The authors write ‘in a 1998 report ... the number of security guards far outnumbered police’. This is followed by a direct quote from Graycar stating ‘there are twice as many private security operatives in Australia as there are police’. Given this news report was published in 2006, the citation of numbers from a report published
eight years previously is puzzling. Perhaps this was intended to exaggerate the numbers of bouncers, because the reader may presume that if security outnumbered police in 1998, then they would most certainly have increased in numbers in the past eight years. The comparison of security guards with police also reveals to the reader that the legal authority of the State, the police, is ‘vastly’ outnumbered. These statements are followed up (in Line 10) with the ‘explosive’ metaphor ‘booming’ in relation to security numbers, impressing on the reader the out-of-control number of bouncers (who vastly outnumber police).

The authors go on to state ‘Australia’s regulatory framework is piecemeal [idiom – meaning little-by-little] ... no states have got it right [cliché] and the industry has been regulated partly by authorities’ knee-jerk [metaphor] response to tragedy’. In effect, the authors are condemning the Australian regulatory framework, the States and authorities, whoever they may be. The use of collective entities such as ‘Australian’, ‘States’ and ‘authorities’ through synecdoche does not single out a particular organisation or institution but generalises to ‘all’ authorities. The negative connotation of ‘piecemeal’, the cliché ‘got it right’ and the bodily metaphor ‘knee-jerk’ contribute to the slur generated by the collective and expansive use of Australian, States and authorities. The authors then back up their argument in Line 11 by stating ‘Hookes death resulted in legislation being rushed [metaphor] through the Victorian parliament last year, forcing bouncers to undergo nationally recognised training’. The lexical choice by the authors indicates their cynicism at this process. They did not state that ‘... legislation was passed and bouncers were required ...’.

The authors’ use of ‘rushed’ conveys to the reader it was an ad hoc ‘knee-jerk’ response to Hookes’ death, indicating the process was not planned or well thought out. The use of the word ‘forced’ in reference to bouncers also conveys the impression that bouncers were forced ‘against their will’ to ‘undergo nationally recognised training’. This also refers back to the headline ‘forcing the issue’. The second sentence in Line 11 brings in the ‘voice’ of a Victorian government spokesman [functional classification]. The media use functional classification to identify people by their activity or occupational role (van Leeuwen, 2008). The spokesman’s words are paraphrased in stating ‘there are 30,000 registered bouncers in the state’, but he did not know ‘how many were operating at one time’. This perhaps conveys to the reader there are 30,000 bouncers ‘on the loose’ in
Victoria and the final clause at the end of Line 11, ‘assaults and injuries in nightclubs remain common’, supports this proposal. The comment ‘assaults and injuries remain common’ uses the rhetorical strategy of implicitness, where the author implies something is a concrete fact or general knowledge when in reality it is not (van Dijk, 1991). This rhetorical strategy allows the writer to manipulate the socio-cognitive mental models of the reader in favour of biased dominant ideologies (van Dijk, 1995b).

Line 12 reads ‘[i]n South Australia, authorities last year moved to have the state’s 6,000 bouncers tested for drugs and alcohol, a move industry insiders said would force as many as 2,000 out of the industry’. If we were to paraphrase this sentence, it might read ‘authorities in South Australia last year brought in drug and alcohol testing which will force one-third of bouncers out of the industry’. There are two important points here: (1) South Australia brought in drug and alcohol testing, and (2) 2,000 bouncers would not pass the tests. The ‘industry insider’ is named in Line 13 as an Adelaide security industry boss, Laury Bais [informal nomination and classified identification] who is quoted directly as saying ‘one in three ... crowd controllers will possibly leave the industry because they don’t want to get caught doing drugs or because they don’t want to break their habit of drinking on the job’. These are condemnatory words from a ‘boss’ within the industry.

However, if we reframe Bais’ comment under role congruency theory, it is consistent with social distancing or disidentification. By distancing himself from those who are ‘criminal’ in the industry, he is aligning himself for acceptance by mainstream society. His comment of ‘don’t want to get caught’ suggests criminal behaviours and the subsequent comment ‘don’t want to break their habit’ suggests forms of addiction. Bais is therefore ‘siding’ with the dominant ideology of ‘criminal bouncer gangs’ by condemning those within his own industry. The following lines (14 to 16) outline the conviction of a bouncer in Brisbane for the manslaughter of a patron three months prior to Amaya’s death. The initial sentence of the story (Line 14) states ‘a bouncer at another Brisbane pub was jailed for killing a drunk patron with a single kick’. Note the authors have reverted to calling the hotel a ‘pub’ and stated the bouncer was jailed for ‘killing’ a ‘drunk’ patron with a ‘single’ kick.

This would suggest to the reader that the patron was heavily intoxicated and therefore perceivably defenceless and possibly on the ground because he was ‘killed’ with a
single kick\textsuperscript{34}. The authors have again used the negative verb ‘killed’ in relation to the bouncer, rather than ‘manslaughter’, which is mentioned in Line 15. Lines 15 to 17 outline the incident. Line 15 states, the bouncer [informal nomination and age] ‘\textit{worked part-time} ... [at a] ... \textit{hotel} ... [and] ... \textit{was sentenced to seven years jail for manslaughter}’; a statement of fact. The second sentence in Line 15 states ‘\textit{Hutchings worked for Queensland Hospitality and Security Staff} [statement of fact], \textit{the same company that employed the three men charged with the murder of Amaya} [supposition]’. The ordering of the sentences starts with the conviction of Hutchings, which is followed by a supposition. That is, the authors are claiming Hutchings and the bouncers accused of Amaya’s death worked for the same company. This strongly implies that the security company hires bouncers who ‘kill’ people.

Line 16 relays the victim [informal nomination and age] was ‘\textit{upset}’ at being ‘\textit{ejected}’ earlier from the hotel and he ‘\textit{complained}’ to the security staff as he ‘\textit{walked past}’ about his ‘\textit{removal}’. The lexical use of feeling or emotive words such as ‘\textit{upset}’ and ‘\textit{complained}’ in the text validates and humanises the victim to the reader. The authors did not state the victim was ‘furious’ or ‘verbally abusive’. The choice of noun and verb minimises the actions of the victim while at the same time escalating the actions of the bouncers through the use of ‘\textit{ejected}’ and ‘\textit{removal}’. Both these words suggest forcible behaviour by the bouncers. The third sentence in Line 16 then states that the victim, ‘\textit{had a blood-alcohol reading of 0.29 -- almost six times the legal driving limit --}’. Here the authors state in numerical terms how intoxicated the victim was at the time of the incident; a discursive strategy designed to relay the fact the victim was very ‘drunk’ and perhaps indicating he was not a threat to the bouncer.

The victim’s state of intoxication brings into question the authors’ use of ‘\textit{walked past}’, as one would assume the victim may have ‘staggered’ past, rather than walked. The sentence is completed by the authors stating that the victim ‘\textit{was overheard to say to Hutchings: ‘I f---ed your mother}’. Line 17 goes on to state ‘\textit{a loud exchange ensued, ending with the bouncer giving Coddington a sharp [metaphor] kick to the head}’. Note the lexical choice of the metaphor ‘sharp’ in this context, indicating something pointed or penetrating in relation to the kick. Line 17 concludes with a direct quote from the

\textsuperscript{34} This incident is discussed in the news report ‘Bouncer on kill charges’. The patron was in fact standing and was felled by a martial arts-style kick to the head.
Brisbane Supreme Court, Justice Cate Holmes [formal nomination and classified identification] at the trial stating Hutchings’ action was ‘… a stupid and brutal act on impulse and it changed your life forever’. Here the authors have selectively chosen a direct quote from Justice Holmes in relation to the violence, giving formal legitimation to the statement.

Line 18 is a disclaimer by a ‘leading security industry spokesmen’ [functionalised classification identification] from Queensland, who blames the violence on changes to training regimes. The line states ‘… the state’s training regime for crowd controllers suffered through an attempt to standardise training across the country in the late ‘90s’. Here the use of supposition indicates to the reader that the changes to training made the industry ‘suffer’ and the use of the word ‘attempt’ signals the training regime had failed. Lines 19 to 22 include direct quotes from the industry spokesman, Bob Spreadborough, assistant Queensland secretary of the National Security Association [informal nomination, classified identification] who elaborates on the changes to training and why they have not worked. The spokesman does not explicitly blame the new regime but this is indicated through supposition (the emphasis should be more on), the use of understatement (was much better) and the expansive generalisation of ‘we’, indicating the entire security industry.

The spokesman is then cited in paraphrase as stating (in Line 23) ‘Queensland Police should be given stronger powers to deal with bouncers who overstep the mark [metaphor]’. Lines 24 and 25 are direct quotes from the spokesman. ‘The police have no prosecutorial powers under the Security Providers Act, which is absolutely ridiculous [criticism]’ and Line 25 states ‘if a police officer sees a crowd controller doing something wrong, he (sic) can’t do anything about it’. The responsibility for monitoring bouncers has again been placed back on the State authority, the police. What remains implicit here is the supposition that bouncers behave badly or metaphorically ‘overstep the mark’ and what is explicit is the police cannot do anything about it. This represents bouncers as acting outside of the law and states clearly that even the police ‘cannot do anything’ about bouncers behaving badly.

However, what the spokesman was actually saying was police officers have no capacity to sanction bouncers who cannot produce their licenses or who are not displaying their identification as required by legislation. This authority rests with the Office of Fair
Trading, as stated in the text of his direct quote. However, those unfamiliar with the legislation would assume that police have no powers over bouncers at all, which is incorrect. Line 26 of the text states that ‘bouncers patrolling suburban pubs and clubs get paid as little as $11 an hour’. This line appears strange because it does not fit the context of the text. However, in Line 32 a university ‘law school head’ is reported as saying ‘you pay-peanuts-and-you-get-monkeys’. It is only now that Line 26 makes sense to the reader. The authors stated the low wage of bouncers earlier in the text and now make the statement about low pay (peanuts) attracting monkeys (bouncers).

Line 27 introduces the ‘voice’ of a security trainer [informal nomination and classified identification] who is ‘considered one of the industry’s foremost experts’. The expert is paraphrased as saying ‘pubs and clubs remain hamstrung [idiom – restrained by] by an inability to find suitable candidates [disclaimer – BECAUSE] the work is challenging, sometimes dangerous, involves long hours and few applicants are properly trained in conflict resolution’. This is followed immediately in Line 28 by ‘Moves to ban those with criminal convictions are widely disparaged’. Firstly, the lexical use of the word ‘disparaged’ in relation to criminal convictions may be confusing to readers who do not have a good understanding of vocabulary. If the reader does not understand what ‘disparaged’ means, the sentence makes little sense. Moreover, the authors do not state who is doing the disparaging and this remains implicit, therefore indicating the option of banning those with criminal convictions was not considered, which is untrue.

The expert ‘voice’ of the trainer could be considered critical of the industry, stating that pubs and clubs cannot ‘find suitable candidates’ and ‘few applicants are properly trained’. This would indicate to the reader that there are few properly trained bouncers in the industry. In Lines 29 and 30, the authors then paraphrase (unnamed) ‘industry insiders’ and those in ‘police circles’ who claim drug dealers and bikies have infiltrated the security industry in SA (South Australia), and that ‘cashed-up professionals’ attending clubs that ‘deal drugs in-house’ are protected by bouncers ‘who are paid a pittance’. Line 31 is the pay-peanuts-and-get-monkeys comment by the ‘law school head’ followed by direct quotes in Lines 32 and 34. The direct quotes use supposition and litotes in both instances. Line 32 quotes ‘you are necessarily attracting males [litotes] who are not only prepared [litotes] to put up with assaults but who might also
have [litotes] a propensity for doing so’. The structure of the sentence therefore conveys the supposition that bouncers are prepared to assault people.

Line 34 quotes ‘it might be necessary to pay a little more for their drinks if they expect to be protected by properly trained crowd controllers’. This supposes that, currently, bouncers are not properly trained. The wrap-up of the story in Line 35 quotes a spokesman for the industry peak body, the Australian Security Industry Association [functional classification identification], citing ‘[t]he Government must accelerate the finalisation of appropriate new licensing and security measures’. This indicates that current licensing and security measures are not ‘appropriate’ and the spokesman is blaming the government for not finalising these measures. This assumes the new licensing and security measures will fix the industry’s problems. The news report concludes with a list of five incidents between 2002 and 2006 where bouncers were charged and/or convicted of manslaughter. The final paragraph is titled ‘Rules of Engagement’ where the authors outline the current ‘rules’ for becoming a bouncer in Queensland. However, the use of the military term indicates military conflict or engagement in war rather than legislative rules governing licenses.

The lead sentence of the report set the thematic content of the article and the headline ‘forcing the issue’ appears to be the authors bemoaning that David Hookes’ death did nothing to change the violent behaviours of bouncers. The authors then appeared to outline and define all the issues that were still wrong with the security industry by drawing in numerous ‘experts’ to back up their claims in an attempt to ‘force the issue’ because nothing was being done to curb violence by bouncers. The main content of the report targeted the lack of training of bouncers as the central source of the ‘problem’ and indicated criminal drug-dealing bikies were also a well-known source of problems within the industry. Rhetorical strategies of metaphors, litotes, generalisation, implicit and explicit statements, disclaimers and supposition were used throughout the report to condemn untrained bouncers within the industry. The two male authors called on eight ‘experts’ to argue their case that something needs to be done about bouncer violence, with the result they have produced a (seemingly) damning piece of evidence against bouncers, legitimated by their ‘panel’ of experts.
7.7 Frightening trend in pub security

The following news report appeared in the Courier Mail newspaper in May 2006 and was written by two female journalists. The report reads as follows:

Frightening trend in pub security

Authors: Leanne Edmistone, Amanda Watt

LINE 1: Bouncers are required to protect the public -- but can often be the source of trouble.

LINE 2: Several crowd controllers have recently found themselves before Queensland courts charged with murder, manslaughter and serious assault charges after routine shifts at work went horribly wrong.

LINE 3: Last Sunday Dean Barry Christopher Tappin, 40, Vaughan Thomas, 26, and Richard James, 38, were charged with the murder of William Amaya, 25, at the Royal Exchange Hotel the night before. Thomas was also charged with assault occasioning bodily harm to a second man.

LINE 4: In the past year and a half, two Queensland bouncers have been found guilty of the manslaughter of a patron and a third has been charged with the same offence.

LINE 5: Most recently computer expert and casual bouncer Frank Nigel David Hutchings, 29, was jailed in February for seven years for the 2003 manslaughter of David Coddington, 27, at the Colmslie Hotel. Hutchings, who has launched an appeal, maintained he only kicked the man in the shoulder to subdue him but the Crown argued he had kicked the drunk man in the head once and knocked him to the ground.

LINE 6: While offenders can initially be charged with murder, it is often downgraded to manslaughter by the prosecution for a guilty plea, or a jury will acquit of murder and convict on the lesser charge. For a murder charge to succeed, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the offender intended to kill or cause grievous bodily harm to the victim.

LINE 7: For the past 12 months the State Government and industry groups have been working on a review of the Security Providers and Liquor Licensing Acts, with final submissions expected to go to Cabinet soon.

LINE 8: This will build on laws introduced last month requiring late-night licensed premises across southeast Queensland to install closed-circuit television cameras at all entries and exits, and to record all footage from these cameras.

LINE 9: All bar staff must complete training in the responsible service of alcohol, and there is an increased emphasis on better security training to improve patron care and harm minimisation.

LINE 10: Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union secretary Ron Monaghan said recent incidents painted the industry in a bad light and there had been long-standing efforts to get rid of “Rambos”, who see violence as a control method.
Mr Monaghan said while bouncers were targeted and provoked in some cases, that was no justification for taking extreme measures to control a situation.

“Most people don’t go out to get into a fight and be bashed up, and most crowd controllers do not want to be involved in a violent situation,” he said.

“There have been too many incidents to not make the effort to control the situation.”

Mr Monaghan said the union was pushing for intensive training, regular company audits, higher staff-to-patron ratios and placing more responsibility on the venues themselves.

He said all incidents should be independently investigated.

Queensland Hotels Association chief executive Justin O'Connor said hoteliers overwhelmingly supported the safety push, which had cost the average venue about $100,000 each to implement.

Mr O'Connor said it would take time to see the impact of the new regulations but he believed they would have the desired effect in the long-run.

He said society's standards had made crowd controllers necessary in a variety of situations, but the fall-out from recent court cases made it difficult for security companies to recruit and retain suitable staff.

Personal Injuries lawyer Jonathan Whiting warned clubs and pubs can be found legally responsible if a patron is assaulted by security staff and then claims for damages.

“You have a recipe for problems where bars are encouraging patrons to drink large amounts,” he said. “You then face possible altercations between patrons under the influence of alcohol and over-zealous security staff who are sober.”

Front door cases

May 2006 Three men charged with the murder of William Amaya, 25, at the Royal Exchange Hotel.

January 2004 Ian Alexander Peachey, 35, jailed after a charge of grievous bodily harm against patron at Mad Cow Tavern in Cairns.

June 2003 Frank Nigel David Hutchings, 29, guilty of manslaughter over the death of David Coddington, 27, at the Colmslie Hotel.


February 2005 Former Surfers Paradise bouncers Robin Wesley Hapeta, 25, and John Hong, 24, pleaded guilty to assault of two patrons.

May 2005 Philip Smith, 21, was charged with manslaughter after the death of Brett Leake, 19, in a fight outside a Townsville club. The matter is still before the courts.

March 2005 Bundaberg bouncer Jeffrey Kretschmer, 30, pleaded guilty to the manslaughter of Daniel Trimble and was jailed for seven years.

2002 Donald James Moore, 43, died after being punched by a bouncer, then hitting his head.

*Courier Mail*, Brisbane, May 27, 2006
The headlines ‘Frightening trend in pub security’ suggests there is some form of statistical indicator (trend) of alarming events in pub (as opposed to hotel) security. The suggestion that a trend is ‘frightening’ lends itself to activating sceptical mental models in the reader. The use of the term ‘pub’ is also consistent with other news reports that criticise ‘pub violence’ as opposed to hotels, a discursive criticism targeting working-class hotels. Line 1 is a disclaimer, citing ‘BOUNCERS (in capital letters) are required to protect the public -- [fact followed by an apparent denial] but can often be the source of trouble’. The use of a disclaimer contributes to the justification of bouncers as stereotypically violent people who are themselves a source of trouble rather than protectors of the public.

Line 2 states (paraphrased) several crowd controllers (functional classification) have appeared in Queensland courts charged with violent acts when ‘routine shifts at work went horribly [metaphor] wrong’. The factual statement is interrupted by the metaphor ‘horribly wrong’ in relation to routines shifts, suggesting a catastrophic incident. Lines 3 to 5 are statements of fact outlining incidents where bouncers were charged with manslaughter or violent assault. Line 5, although reporting a statement of fact, is made derogatory by the use of the clause, ‘he had kicked the drunk man in the head’. The descriptor ‘drunk man’ is out of place in this sentence because it does not read as a legitimate fact. Lawyers and police typically use a factual statement, ‘intoxicated’ or ‘under the influence of alcohol’. However, the (female) journalists’ use of the term ‘drunk man’ perhaps indicates common knowledge that a ‘drunk’ man is possibly defenceless and unable to defend himself, thus implicating the bouncer in the assault of a seemingly defenceless man.

Line 6 is a statement of fact relating to how charges may be reduced in a court of law. It reads ‘While offenders can initially be charged with murder, it is often downgraded to manslaughter by the prosecution for a guilty plea, or a jury will acquit of murder and convict on the lesser charge. For a murder charge to succeed, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the offender intended to kill or cause grievous bodily harm to the victim’. Although the journalists have conveyed factual information, the use of the terms ‘downgraded’, ‘acquit’ and ‘lesser charge’ give the message that murder charges are, more times than not, (often) reduced to less significant charges. This conveys to the reader that bouncers charged with murder in effect avoid paying for their
action in the courts. The choice of the term ‘kill’ as opposed to ‘murder’ is also a discursive strategy commonly used by the media when reporting on bouncers involved in violence.

Lines 7 to 9 are further statements of fact outlining changes to legislation, citing synecdoche terms such as State Government, industry groups and Cabinet, a discursive strategy that puts expert representations into selective categories that signal a union or consensus among them (van Leeuwen, 2008). However, Line 10 is a paraphrased quote from the Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers’ Union secretary, Ron Monaghan [informal nomination and classified identification]. Mr Monaghan is stated as having said ‘recent incidents painted [metaphor] the industry in a bad light [metaphor, apparent concession BUT] there had been long-standing [supposition] efforts to get rid of ‘Rambos’ [derogatory symbolisation] who see violence as a control method [supposition]’. The two metaphors are used as an acknowledgement that recent violence by bouncers has harmed the industry, but this is followed by a disclaimer where Mr Monaghan stated ‘long-standing efforts’, although it is not stated what efforts were or by whom. However, one can only assume it is by ‘the industry’. It could also be argued the ‘long-standing efforts’ are an exaggeration by the union secretary because there appears to be little evidence to support this claim.

As previously discussed, the propensity of the in-group to upgrade or overstate their actions is a discursive strategy designed to validate themselves and marginalise or Otherise the out-group. In this instance, the Other is described as ‘Rambos’, presumably bouncers, ‘who see violence as a control method’. The reference to the fictional movie character Rambo uses the symbolisation strategy of overdetermination. Overdetermination is a discursive strategy which is used to legitimate social practices (van Leeuwen, 2008). Symbolisation is a category of overdetermination where social actors are ascribed the attributes of a fictional character in a given social context (van Leeuwen, 2008). The fictional character Rambo is a solitary vigilante who operates under a code of extreme violence for social control and this image has been projected onto bouncers. This comment is also a prejudicial supposition by the union secretary because it appears to be based on personal opinion rather than factual evidence. One could argue that bouncers are certainly not military action figures like the character Rambo.
However, what the use of the name conveys to the reader is that bouncers are indeed violent mercenaries. The theme of mercenary violence is carried over into Line 7 where the union secretary is paraphrased as saying ‘while bouncers were targeted and provoked in some cases, [apparent concession BUT] that was no justification for taking extreme measures to control a situation’. Here the union secretary admits that bouncers were targeted and provoked, but then distances himself from bouncers involved in violence by stating it was no excuse for ‘extreme measures’. One can assume here the secretary is referring to extreme violence, with which the fictional character Rambo is clearly associated. Lines 12 and 13 are direct quotes from the union secretary where he is shown as saying ‘Most people don’t go out to get into a fight and be bashed up [litotes, concession], and most crowd controllers do not want to be involved in a violent situation [litotes, concession] (Line 12); and ‘There have been too many incidents [hyperbole] to not make the effort [litotes] to control the situation’ (Line 13). The reference to ‘most people’ is an indication of patrons who frequent pubs and clubs, an apparent concession on behalf of pub goers whom the union secretary is seen to be defending.

The secretary is also quoted as defending legitimate crowd controllers, stating they did not want to be involved in violence either. However, the secretary is then quoted as saying ‘there have been too many incidents’ which runs contrary to what the journalists stated at the beginning of the report. Line 4 states ‘[i]n the last year and a half, two Queensland bouncers have been found guilty of the manslaughter of a patron and a third has been charged with the same offence’. Perhaps three people being charged with manslaughter in 18 months is too many, but the separation of Line 4 from Line 12 leads the reader to assume that ‘too many incidents’ is a considerable number, not just three. The term ‘too many incidents’ is followed by a litotes (or understatement) ‘to not make the effort to control the situation’. This is a discursive strategy designed to play down the communicated message. Here the secretary is conceding there are ‘too many incidents’ but then counters the claim by playing down the incidents.

Lines 14 and 15 are paraphrased quotes from the union secretary where he has stated ‘... the union was pushing [metaphor] for intensive training, regular company audits, higher staff-to-patron ratios and placing more responsibility on the venues themselves’. This could be seen as ideological promotion, where the secretary is announcing the
union’s vigorous intentions to ‘change’ the industry. The secretary is also cited as saying that ‘venues themselves’ needed to take ‘more responsibility’, indicating perhaps that venues were currently not taking ‘enough’ responsibility. Line 15 goes on to state that ‘[h]e (the secretary) said all incidents should be independently investigated’. This line would mean very little to the public, who would assume that the police investigate all incidents of violence occurring at hotels. However, this does not occur unless the violence results in substantial injury. The venue and the security company involved often carry out investigations ‘in house’ and the police may not participate in this process in cases where no charges are laid.

Line 16 brings in the ‘expert’ voice of the Queensland Hotels Association chief executive, formally nominated and functionally classified in the text. The chief executive is paraphrased as saying ‘... hoteliers [synecdoche] overwhelmingly supported the safety push [metaphor], which had cost the average venue about $100,000 to implement’. Here the chief executive is lending support to the government’s ‘push’ for new regulatory changes to the industry. He then gives the association ideological promotion by stating how much it was costing venues to support the changes. Line 16 paraphrases the chief executive again, stating ‘... it would take time to see the impact [metaphor] of the new regulations but he believed they would have the desired effect in the long-run [idiom – eventually]’. This again shows the chief executive’s support for the government’s changes to the industry, although a disclaimer has been used. The chief executive stated the regulations would effect changes to the industry ‘eventually’, BUT it would take time to see the impact.

A disclaimer is also used in Line 18, where the chief executive is paraphrased again. The executive conceded that ‘... society’s standards had made crowd controllers necessary in a variety of situations’ [disclaimer BUT], and then goes on to say that ‘... the fall-out [military metaphor] from recent Court cases made it difficult for security companies to recruit and retain suitable staff’. That is, the executive is blaming the court cases for difficulties in the industry. The specific court cases are not named, so it remains implicit that they are cases relating to bouncers behaving badly, hence implying that bouncers are the reason for difficulties in the industry. Line 19 of the report introduces another ‘expert’ voice, that of a personal injury lawyer [formally nominated and functionally classified]. The lawyer is paraphrased as ‘warning’ ‘pubs and clubs
[they] can be found legally responsible if a patron is assaulted by security staff and then claims for damages’. This perceived ‘threat’ or show of power to pubs and clubs may be construed as a supposition that pubs and clubs currently are not taking responsibility for their security staff’s actions. That is, the lawyer is blaming the pubs and clubs for the violence because they are not making their security staff responsible or taking responsibility themselves.

This supposition is confirmed in Line 20 when the lawyer is directly quoted as saying ‘[y]ou have a recipe [metaphor] for problems where bars are encouraging patrons to drink large amounts’. This claim is reinforced by a further quote where the lawyer states ‘[y]ou then face possible altercations between patrons under the influence of alcohol and over-zealous [indicates doing something that causes a problem] security staff who are sober’. The lawyer is laying the blame for violence on licensed premises for ‘encouraging patrons to drink’ large amounts of alcohol [which remains implicit] and ‘over-zealous [violent] security staff’. What also remains implicit is the fact the lawyer is pointing out that sober security staff are seen to hold more responsibility than intoxicated patrons. In other words, intoxicated patrons are not responsible for their own behaviour, but security staff are responsible because they are sober. This is an interesting supposition wherein the lawyer is excusing patrons’ behaviour because they are intoxicated. What this sentence does is to problematise the bouncers’ behaviour while excusing the patrons’ behaviour.

The news report concludes with eight documented incidents of bouncers involved in violence dating from 2002 to 2006, under the heading ‘Front door cases’. One case occurred in each of 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2006, and four in 2005. Six cases are the same ones reported in the previous news report (Section 7.6). The central theme of the news report is of authorities voicing strong opinions about bouncer violence and the need for responsibility by bouncers, pubs and clubs. The female authors have also criticised the courts for downgrading charges against bouncers, perceivably allowing them to ‘get away with’ manslaughter and violence. Two ‘expert voices’ are quoted in the report, with both experts metaphorically criticising violent bouncers while using disclaimers and concessions to play down the effect on the security industry and to minimise patron behaviours. This has the effect of distancing themselves from violent bouncers and validating the industry and its patrons.
7.8 OUT OF CONTROL – SPECIAL REPORT: The cowardly king-hit bouncers terrorising innocent pub-goes

The following news report appeared in the Sydney Daily Telegraph in February 2007. It was a special report about violence perpetrated by bouncers in Sydney. The blaring headline condemns bouncers from the outset, declaring them to be out-of-control, cowardly and terrorising the innocent public. The reader is induced into thinking that bouncers are ‘terrorists’ who are king-hitting innocent people. As noted by Van Dijk ‘... tabloid are most outspoken with their negative headlines’ and show a preference for using constant references to violence, such as terror, attack and tackle when writing about minority groups (1991: 56). The report is as follows:

OUT OF CONTROL – SPECIAL REPORT: The cowardly king-hit bouncers terrorising innocent pub-goes

Authors: LUKE MCILVEEN, ANDREW CHESTERTON

LINE 1: COWARDLY bouncers are terrorising pub and club-goers by picking more fights than they stop.

LINE 2: As Manly surfer Sam Page showed the first signs of recovery yesterday from a brutal pub bashing, more cases emerged of an epidemic of violence sweeping hotels and clubs.

LINE 3: The NSW Council for Civil Liberties receives up to six complaints every month from people who have been assaulted by bouncers on a “power trip”.

LINE 4: The council's president Cameron Murphy said that most security bouncers were properly trained.

LINE 5: “But you are always going to have rednecks who think that it is a licence for them to commit a crime against someone,” he said.

LINE 6: And the Australian Hotels Association admitted a barrage of complaints from the public has prompted many licensed establishments to turn to in-house security led by former police, instead of hiring private firms.

LINE 7: Bashing victim Mark Thelander yesterday told how he was kicked unconscious outside the Narrabeen Sands Hotel, leaving him with permanent injuries. He now is suing the private security firm which had employed the bouncers involved. “I was there with my wife and a couple of mates,” he said.

LINE 8: “One of them was a bit loud on the dancefloor so bouncers started pushing him around,” he said of the attack six years ago.

LINE 9: “I was punched and kicked. I don't remember anything afterwards but my mates told me they were taking a run up and kicking my head like a football after that,” he said.
LINE 10: The law dictates that bouncers are put through background checks and personal skills training before working the doors, but the hotel industry is well aware of the barrage of complaints from the public.

LINE 11: “We are aware of the problem and publicans are turning to in-house security and people such as former police officers who know the law rather than private firms,” a spokesman for the AHA said yesterday.

LINE 12: Manly surfer Sam Page’s friends and family were given hope yesterday when he opened his eyes for the first time since he was allegedly bashed by bouncer Eugene White while celebrating his 21st birthday on Sunday night.

LINE 13: Page squeezed his mother’s hand and reached out to his father after being woken from an induced coma in Gold Coast Hospital just after dawn yesterday.

LINE 14: He had been under intensive care with a fractured skull and bleeding to the brain after he was allegedly punched outside Players Showgirls strip club on the Gold Coast.

LINE 15: The widespread pubs and clubs violence has become a growing concern.

LINE 16: Up for sentencing next month is Dirk Nierop, a bouncer from the Surf Rock Hotel in Collaroy, who was convicted last year of assaulting rugby league player Shane Bullock, breaking his nose and his eye socket.

LINE 17: In December 2001, Gregory Sprod was left brain damaged after being attacked by two bouncers in a lane near St Marys Band Club.

Daily Telegraph, Sydney, February 28, 2007

There are 17 lines of text in the report and the first half of the article is used to paint a picture of out-of-control violent bouncers through the use of metaphors, hyperbole (over-exaggeration) and euphemisms. Line 1 reads ‘COWARDLY (in capital letters) bouncers are terrorising pub and club-goers [BECAUSE they are] picking more fights than they stop’ and is an exaggeration by the male authors because the claims are unsubstantiated. The line is blatantly discriminatory and is stated in a generalised yet explicit manner that conveys shared, common knowledge to the reader. That is, it is common social knowledge that all bouncers are cowardly terrorists who pick fights with pub goers. The use of the metaphor ‘terrorising’ suggests bouncers are perhaps ‘terrorists’, lumping them into the same metonymic category of demonised Other, or ‘enemy’.

Line 2 of the text states a surfer is showing signs of recovery from ‘a brutal pub bashing [BECAUSE of] the epidemic of violence sweeping hotels and clubs’. The descriptive lexical use of ‘brutal pub bashings’ and the global generalisation, hyperbole and metaphorical statement of the ‘epidemic of violence sweeping ...’ further informs the reader that ‘pub bashings’ are in plague proportions in their community. The use of the
health-related term ‘epidemic’ suggests the violence is as widespread as an epidemic (such as SARS or AIDS), signalling unimaginable risk to the community. The metaphor ‘sweeping’ adds to the image of rampant plagues overtaking the community. The ‘voice’ of the head of the New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties is introduced in Line 3, paraphrased as stating they ‘received up to six complaints every month from people who have been assaulted by bouncers on a “power trip”’. The euphemism ‘power trip’ is placed immediately after the ‘epidemic of violence sweeping’ and suggests unprecedented, out-of-control behaviour by bouncers. Line 4 then directly quotes the Civil Liberties president [informal nomination and functional identification] as saying ‘bouncers were properly trained’. However, the Civil Liberties president is then quoted again, using an apparent concession or disclaimer in Line 5, to state ‘but you are always going to have rednecks [offensive derogatory term] who think that it is a licence for them to commit a crime against someone’.

The use of disclaimers is a ‘... local semantic move that combines positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation’ within the same context (van Dijk, 2012: 25). That is, the speaker or writer will acknowledge the discrediting of Others but preserve their own self-identity by socially distancing themselves from the social Other. The American slang term ‘redneck’ is a derogatory name for working-class White Americans who come from the South and who are bigoted and reactionary. The quotes ‘who think [subjective supposition] it is a licence for them to commit a crime against someone [accusation]’ suggests that bouncers are, in fact, committing crimes against people. The ‘voice’ of the Australian Hoteliers Association (AHA) (unnamed) is paraphrased in Line 5 stating ‘the association admitted a barrage [military metaphor] of complaints [hyperbole] from the public’. The lexical choices by the authors and the use of a military metaphor (barrage) suggest to the reader that complaints by the public are very numerous, a clear exaggeration when compared with the number quoted in Line 6 as ‘six complaints every month’, which is hardly a ‘barrage of complaints’.

The (unnamed) hotelier was cited in the same line as saying ‘many licensed establishments [are turning] to in-house security led by former police, instead of hiring private firms’. This is another apparent concession because the hotelier is saying (if paraphrased again) ‘we admit to a lot of complaints [apparent concession – BUT] pubs and clubs are turning to ex-police officers [supposition]’. As discussed in the previous
paragraph, this is a rhetorical technique that preserves the positive representation of the speaker/writer while giving a harmful representation of the Other. Within role congruency theory, this is known as social distancing or disidentification. Here, the hotelier is creating ‘social distance’ from bouncers and private security firms, thereby conveying to the reader that private security firms are unlawful, which is why hotels are turning to ex-police officers, or legitimate state authorities. This apparent concession serves to discredit the private security companies in favour of the legitimate (ex) police.

Lines 7 to 9 describe the ‘bashing’ of a victim by bouncers. The authors use the ‘voice’ of the victim, quoting him to relay in graphic detail how he was bashed by bouncers. To paraphrase the three lines, the texts read ‘the victim was there with his wife and mates, kicked unconscious (leaving him with permanent injuries) and the bouncers were kicking his head like a football. The victim is suing the private security firm who employed the bouncers’. The authors have used the ‘voice’ of the victim to convey to the reader the graphic details and severity of man’s attack and injuries. This is an ideological strategy designed to further condemn the social Other or ‘them’ (van Dijk, 1991). However, in Lines 10 and 11, the authors return to the topic discussed in Line 6, repeating the same terminologies (barrage of complaints and former police officers) and using supposition. The AHA spokesman is directly quoted (in Line 11) as saying ‘we are aware of the problem [apparent concession – BUT] publicans are turning to former police officers who know the law rather than private firms [supposition]’.

The use of supposition is a rhetorical tactic that suggests a statement is a truth or common knowledge. It is a discursive strategy that uses generalisations to present information as factual or information that cannot be questioned. Here the authors are presupposing that private security firms do not know the law BECAUSE they are turning to former police officers, who do know the law. Lines 12 to 14 revert to the surfer mentioned at the start of the report (in Line 2). The authors state the surfer’s ‘family and friends were given hope yesterday when he opened his eyes for the first time since he was allegedly bashed by bouncer (name of bouncer) ... while celebrating his 21st birthday35’. The surfer ‘squeezed his mother’s hand ... and reached out to his father

35 With further investigation, I discovered the young man was an up-and-coming professional surfer and there were 24 news reports on Google about the young man’s assault. He was in an induced coma for days but did make a full recovery. The AHA statements are also taken from another news report where
... after he was awoken from an induced coma ... and he was under intensive care with a fractured skull and bleeding to the brain after he was allegedly punched outside (name of strip club’). The emotive language used by the authors when writing about the surfer is a discursive strategy that appeals to the reader’s emotions rather than their cognitions (Kitis and Milapides, 1997). The emotive language also draws on the sympathy or empathy of the reader in such cases. The use of emotive language decreases as the social power and status of social actors increases (van Leeuwen, 2008).

The authors return to hyperbole and generalisation in Line 15. ‘The widespread pubs and clubs violence has become a growing concern [generalisation]’. Generalisation allows the authors make a claim that appears to be common sense and truthful, a natural conclusion, even though it may not be factual. The more natural a claim appears, the less potential there is for the reader to question the statement (Teo, 2000). Moreover, statements such as ‘widespread violence and growing concerns’ are abstract subjective reactions, because there is no indication of who is concerned or what the violence actually is in definitive terms. Therefore, sweeping statements such as ‘widespread violence and growing concerns’ cannot be challenged because they hold no factual evidence (Fowler, 2013).

The authors outline two previous assaults by bouncers in Lines 16 and 17 in the wrap-up. One assault was in 2004 on a rugby league player and the other in December 2001 when a man was left brain-damaged after an attack by two bouncers in a lane near a club36. Overall, the theme of the news report is concerned with the violent, cowardly, terrorist bouncer bashing pub and club patrons. The author’s use of hyperbole, supposition, disclaimers, generalisations and metaphors contribute to the view that bouncers are ‘terrorists’ and violence is ‘epidemic’ in the community. However, I would argue that with of tens of thousands of bouncers in the industry, the citing of three incidents does not make the whole industry ‘cowardly terrorists’.

36 The December 2001 incident left the victim with a massive legal bill because the security company went into liquidation and took no responsibility for the attack because it was away from licensed premises. The Supreme Court judge ruled the company was not liable and the victim was ordered to pay the security company’s court costs. The bouncers had not been located or charged.
7.9 Bouncer did this to Shane - Photo a jury didn’t see

The reference in the previous article to the assault on a rugby league player (Line 16) is the topic of this news report. I have included the photograph from the original news report published on the Daily Telegraph website. The photograph was placed directly under the large banner headline on the website and was the same size as that shown below. As van Dijk (1991, 2012) proposed, the negative attributes and behaviours of the social Other are expressed both in headlines and pictorial inclusions in the text. This is the case here. The headline reads as a statement (_bouncer did this to Shane_) followed by an admission (_photo a jury didn’t see_). The entire news report reads as follows:

**Bouncer did this to Shane – Photo a jury didn’t see**

Author: Justin Vallejo


**LINE 1:** THIS _sickening photo_ -- _kept secret_ by a Sydney court -- shows the _shocking injuries_ that can be inflicted by _brutal bouncers_.

**LINE 2:** It shows _bloodied and bruised_ Shane Bullock in hospital with a _broken nose and fractured eye socket_ after being _bashed_ by a security guard at the Surf Rock Hotel in Collaroy.

**LINE 3:** Other pictures of Mr Bullock's _mangled face_ are _too horrific_ to be published. They were _not allowed as evidence in a trial_ in case the _harrowing images_ _unduly influenced the jury_.

**LINE 4:** The photos, obtained by _The Daily Telegraph_ in a special investigation into _pub violence_, come amid revelations a Sydney man was _bashed_ at the same Gold Coast strip club as Manly surfer Samuel Page two weeks earlier.

**LINE 5:** Lea Jewell, a former Northern Beaches security guard, was allegedly _beaten unconscious_ outside Players Showgirls on February 10 in an allegedly _unprovoked attack_ by bouncers.
The attacks highlight the entrenched culture among security and crowd control guards to act above the law.

A District Court jury this month found bouncer Dirk Nierop, 45, guilty of assaulting Mr Bullock but not guilty of maliciously inflicting grievous bodily harm with intent. He will be sentenced on April 27.

Mr Bullock is now considering further legal action against the club and other bouncers involved in the April 2006 incident.

“It's about time something like this was put on the front page because bouncers need to pay for what they do,” he said.

“This guy nearly got off and the charges were even down-graded. I don't want to go out of the house any more because all the bouncers are connected to each other and who knows what could happen.”

Meanwhile, Gold Coast police are investigating the alleged assault that left Mr Jewell, 27, with six missing teeth, a crushed eye socket, a fractured cheek bone and a decompressed nerve in his face.

“I was a bouncer myself for two years so I know the rules. You don't fight or argue because you'll never win so it's best just to shut up and go away,” Mr Jewell said.

“I stepped outside for a cigarette and was told I was too drunk to be let back in”.

“I asked if I could get my friends out but without any arguing or words I was king-hit before a group of guys came out of the club and dragged me around the corner and kicked my head in.”

Mr Page remained in a serious but stable condition in the intensive care unit of a Gold Coast hospital yesterday.

Daily Telegraph, Sydney, March 1, 2007

The headline’s statement that the photograph was not shown to the jury is designed to catch the attention of the reader. Combined with the graphic photograph, the headlines are damning for the bouncer concerned. The (male) author uses graphic descriptive adjectives to describe the assault in Lines 1 to 3, to coincide with the ‘shocking’ photograph. The author’s use of ‘sickening’, ‘shocking’, ‘mangled’, ‘horrific’ and ‘harrowing’ to describe the photograph is a graphic attempt by the author to show the horror of the incident. This supports the headline that ‘the jury didn’t see’ combined with Line 3 ‘... some photographs [BECAUSE they] were too horrific to be published’. Moreover, the photographs were so ‘harrowing they were not allowed in evidence in a trail [BECAUSE they may have] unduly influenced the jury’ (Line 3). Here the author is attempting to shock the reader by the detailed and graphic descriptions of the photographs, a discursive strategy used to influence and prejudice the mental models.
and social perceptions of the reader (van Dijk, 2012: 26). It is a strategy of the ‘outrage industry’.

Line 4 states The Daily Telegraph ‘obtained the photos ... in a special investigation into pub violence’. The news media use investigative reports to expose significant social issues or political incompetence to their readers (Fowler, 2013). Here the special investigation is into bouncer violence and/or ‘pub violence’. The author’s use of the term ‘pub violence’ is in line with other news reports of ‘pub violence’. The generalisation assumes the statement is a commonly known fact to readers, therefore producing prejudicial mental models in their minds when no other information is available. Line 4 concludes with the subordinate clause ‘amid revelations a Sydney man was bashed at the same Gold Coast strip club as (name of rugby league player) two weeks earlier’. The lexical use of ‘revelations’ suggests the information is being ‘revealed’ by The Daily Telegraph which is a supposition that suggests the information was previously hidden or unknown.

The use of ‘bashed’ is also consistent with news reports that use the verb in place of ‘assaulted’ because it is a more graphic descriptor. The ‘revelations’ also strongly implicate the strip club and the bouncers in ‘bashings’, because another man was ‘bashed’ at the same club prior to the assault on the surfer (previous report). No news reports about the man ‘bashed’ in this incident were located on newspaper internet websites. Perhaps this was because the man was himself a former bouncer. Line 5 reports the (man’s name) ‘... a former Northern Beaches security guard, was allegedly beaten unconscious outside (name of club, date) in an alleged unprovoked attack by bouncers’. Note the author has used the police terminology of ‘alleged’ twice in this sentence. This lends semantic legitimation to the author’s claims the man was ‘beaten unconscious ... in an unprovoked attack by bouncers’. The use of ‘unprovoked attack’ condemns the actions of the bouncers because it implicates them in an unjustified and military ‘attack’ on the victim.

Line 6 contains metaphor, hyperbole and generalisation in relation to security and crowd control guards. The sentence reads ‘the attacks [military term] highlight the entrenched [metaphor] culture [hyperbole] among security and crowd control guards to act above the law [idiom – generalisation]’. The use of ‘entrenched’ suggests the culture of acting illegally (above the law) is so deeply ingrained or embedded in the
security industry that it cannot be changed. Line 7 is a statement of fact stating the bouncer was found guilty of assault on the rugby league player, but not guilty of grievous bodily harm with intent. Lines 8 to 10 brings in the ‘voice’ of the rugby league player who was assaulted. The author reports (Line 8) the rugby player ‘is now considering legal action against the club and other bouncers involved in the ... incident’. Lines 9 and 10 are direct quotes from the victim (rugby player). van Dijk (1991, 2012) proposed the ‘voices’ of the powerless are only used in news text to discriminate against those already less powerful and further condemn those already discriminated against. In this case, it is bouncers.

The rugby player is quoted (in Line 9) as saying ‘it’s about time something like this was put on the front page because bouncers need to pay for what they do’. Here the text is suggesting the news media can ‘do something about it’ [BECAUSE] bouncers are getting away with bashing people. This supposition is supported in Line 10 by the direct quote from the victim ‘this guy nearly got off and the charges were even down-graded’ suggesting the legal system is failing to make bouncers ‘pay for what they do’. The sentence is followed by an admission from the victim: ‘I don’t want to go out of the house any more because all the bouncers are connected to each other [supposition] and who knows what could happen [supposition]’. Here the text suggests the rugby player is fearful of leaving his house ‘because all the bouncers are connected’, implying there is an organised gang who would harm him. Thus, because of the organised gang of bouncers, the victim fears for his safety (who knows what could happen).

Line 11 returns to the assault of the bouncer mentioned in Line 5. The author writes that the ‘police are investigating the alleged assault’ and then gives a graphic description of the man’s injuries. Lines 12 to 14 include direct quotes from the victim where he tells ‘I was a bouncer myself for two years and I know the rules. You don’t fight or argue because you’ll never win so it’s best just to shut up and go away’. The quote ‘I know the rules’ suggests that bouncers have ‘rules’ when dealing with patrons, and they are ‘you’ll never win so ... shut up and go away’. The bouncer’s statement ‘you’ll never win’ suggests arguing or fighting is pointless, but also that bouncers will do ‘whatever it takes’ to win. This point is strongly condemnatory of bouncers because it implies bouncers will use excessive force or violence to ‘win’. Lines 13 and 14 are direct quotes from the bouncer, describing in detail his victimisation. Line 15 is a brief wrap-up
stating the surfer ‘remained in a serious but stable condition in the intensive care unit ... in hospital’.

The major theme of the report was to convey to the reader the ‘entrenched culture’ of bouncer violence. The ‘voices’ of two victims were used to support the author’s claims and their injuries or ‘bashings’ are described in graphic, gory detail. Lexical selection, metaphors, hyperbole, generalisation and supposition are used to manipulate the semantic content of the report. Overall, discursive strategies are used in the report to discriminate against bouncers, both as individuals and as an industry.

7.10 221 Bouncers Fired For Violence, Drugs – EXCLUSIVE

It should be noted at this point that the male journalists who wrote this report were also involved in writing the two previous reports. All three reports were published within a four-day period. This follows the death of a patron in Adelaide, described in Line 4 and the assault of a surfer (mentioned in previous reports), described in Line 5.

221 bouncers fired for violence, drugs – EXCLUSIVE

Authors: Justin Vallejo, Luke McIlveen

LINE 1: UP to six bouncers and security guards a week are having their licences revoked or reviewed for involvement in serious crimes -- including assault, theft and drug offences.

LINE 2: However the 43,513 bouncers, guards and crowd controllers responsible for public safety now more than double the total strength of NSW Police's 15,280 combined field and specialist officers.

LINE 3: Figures from the state's Security Industry Registry reveal 221 security guards had their licences disqualified last year after being found guilty of a criminal offence, with another 74 awaiting the outcomes of court cases.

LINE 4: The revelations come as a bouncer who killed a man by holding him in a headlock for eight minutes at an Adelaide pub was convicted of manslaughter and jailed for four years yesterday.

LINE 5: Manly surfer Sam Page was still recovering in a Gold Coast hospital yesterday after he was allegedly bashed by a bouncer last weekend while celebrating his 21st birthday.

LINE 6: Friends said Page had been moved from intensive care and had been talking despite his serious injuries, including a fractured skull and bleeding on the brain.

LINE 7: “It's looking pretty positive,” his coach Adam Hennessey said.
LINE 8: The Security Industry Registry figures raise serious questions about the backgrounds of those working the doors at NSW pubs and clubs.

LINE 9: A registry spokesman said licences were revoked for 10 years if the holder is convicted of offences involving weapons, drugs, assault, fraud, theft or robbery. The licence is revoked for five years if the offender is found guilty with no conviction recorded.

LINE 10: "The registry acts immediately to remove from the industry individuals who have been charged with an assault committed in the course of their employment in the security industry," the spokesman said.

LINE 11: The number of licences revoked by the registry -- run by NSW Police to license all security operators in the state -- has remained steady about the 300 mark for the past few years.

LINE 12: The registry refused a further 74 licence applications in 2006 because the applicant had been found guilty of a criminal offence in the past 10 years.

LINE 13: Another 526 people were denied approval to do the security industry training course because they would have been refused a licence on application.

LINE 14: More than 48,000 security licence applicants have been fingerprinted since new requirements were introduced in July 2003 to ensure convicted criminals could not get around police controls by assuming a new identity.

LINE 15: Australian Security Industry Association CEO Brian DeCaires said that although it seemed only a small portion of security workers who had been involved in criminal acts in NSW it was still an unacceptable number.

Daily Telegraph, Sydney, March 3, 2007

The news headlines ‘221 Bouncers Fired For Violence, Drugs – EXCLUSIVE’ sets the thematic and semantic tone of the news report. The media use ‘exclusive’ news reports to ‘expose’, ‘uncover’ and promote an issue that the news journalists have ‘exclusive’ information about, or in relation to a specific important issue. In this case, the exposé is about 221 ‘bouncers [being] fired for violence or drugs’. I would argue this statement is semantically misleading, because it assumes that bouncers are ‘fired’ when in fact they have their security licences revoked or cancelled. In stating ‘drugs’, the authors do not define the types of ‘drug’ offences involved, leaving it to readers to draw their own conclusions about what the single word ‘drugs’ means. It could mean drug use, drug dealing, drug making or drug distribution.

Line 1 of the text states ‘[u]p to six bouncers and security guards a week are having their licences revoked or reviewed for involvement in serious crimes -- including assault, theft and drug offences’. The inclusion of ‘bouncers’ and ‘security guards’ in this sentence is curious given that bouncers is a generic name applied to all security personnel who work in licensed premises. The news media traditionally use ‘bouncer’
in a derogatory manner when reporting about bouncers behaving badly, while referring to them as security guards or crowd controllers in legitimate discussions. The inclusion of both names is curious, to say the least. This is also evident in Line 2 where the authors similarly include ‘bouncers, guards and crowd controllers’. Perhaps this is, as Fowler proposed ‘...an example of what happens when the discursive machine runs automatically while the operator slumbers’ (2013: 176).

Nonetheless, Line 1 states ‘[u]p to six bouncers and security guards a week are having their licences revoked or reviewed for involvement in serious crimes’. Mathematically this is not consistent with the 221 cited in the headline. If 221 bouncers are being ‘fired’ per year (which is not stated), this does not equate with up to six a week but is 4.25 per week. Here the authors have correctly stated that licences may be revoked or reviewed. The text then reads ‘for involvement in serious crimes – including assault, theft and drug offences’. Although these offences may be serious crimes, this is not always true. Minor assault and petty theft, for example, are not ‘serious crimes’. However, by stating ‘serious crimes’ the reader is led to believe these offences are indeed serious when in fact they may not be.

Line 2 begins with the word ‘however’. This word is used in text to set one instance of something against another, such as ‘some bouncers behave badly; however not all bouncers commit crimes’. The authors state in Line 1 ‘six bouncers and security guards a week are having their licences revoked or reviewed’ and then in Line 2 ‘however the 43,513 bouncers, guards and crowd controllers ... now more than double the total strength of the NSW police’. Grammatically, the use of ‘however’ here does not make sense. It may have held more semantic meaning if Lines 1 and 2 had been reversed, therefore it can only be concluded that the operator was again slumbering. Nevertheless, the purpose of Line 2 is to tell the reader that bouncers far outnumber the police, the State’s legal enforcement authority. Note also the inclusion in Line 2 of ‘responsible for public safety’ in reference to ‘bouncers, guards and crowd controllers’. Arguably, this is to remind the reader that bouncers are tasked with keeping people safe in the community, not committing crimes against them.

Line 3 is (presumably) a statement of fact, citing ‘figures from the state’s Security Industry Registry reveal 221 security guards had their licences disqualified last year after being found guilty of a criminal offence, with another 74 awaiting the outcomes of
court cases’. Mathematically, 221 plus 74 divided by 52 weeks equals 5.69 bouncers per week, per year, closer to the ‘six bouncers a week’ claimed in Line 1. The authors have not cited what the criminal offences related to, leaving it implicit that they are related to ‘serious crimes – including assault, theft and drug offences’. The authors have also used the correct name for bouncers, ‘security guards’ which lends legitimacy to the sentence. It is also interesting to note that the ‘74 awaiting outcomes’ are referred to in terms of ‘court cases’. Although it may be cumbersome to write ‘74 security guards awaiting the outcomes’, what the authors have achieved by omitting the words from the sentence is to dehumanise the people concerned by referring to them as numbers (74) and court cases.

Line 4 begins with the declaration ‘[t]he revelations come as ...’ which signifies an exposure or disclose of something previously hidden or unknown. The term ‘revelations’ links back to the headline where the authors claimed their report was an ‘exclusive’. The ‘revelations’ – of 221 bouncers being disqualified for serious crimes – is followed by ‘... a bouncer who killed a man by holding him in a headlock for eight minutes at an Adelaide pub was convicted of manslaughter and jailed for four years yesterday’. Although this is reporting a tragic incident and the offender was convicted and jailed, it also supports the authors’ claims of bouncers being involved in ‘serious crimes’, as stated in Lines 1 and 3. It was probably not necessary to include ‘by holding him a headlock for eight minutes’ in the sentence, but it adds a sense of brutality to the description of how the bouncer ‘killed a man’, although the victim and bouncer in question are not named or identified.

Line 5 states ‘Manly surfer Sam Page [provincial categorisation and formal nomination] was still recovering in a Gold Coast hospital yesterday after he was allegedly bashed by a bouncer last weekend while celebrating his 21st birthday’. The legitimacy of the sentence is problematised by the informal use of the term ‘bashed’ in relation to the assault. News journalists show a clear preference for the term when writing about assaults by bouncers. The reference to ‘his 21st birthday’ is a strategic manoeuvre by the authors to convey to the reader the youthfulness of the surfer, although the bouncer in question remained unnominated and unclassified. Hence, the surfer is personalised or ‘humanised’ to the reader while the bouncer remains objectified and unknown. The surfer is further personalised to the reader in Lines 6 and 7. Line 6 reads ‘[f]riends said
Page had been moved from intensive care and had been talking despite his serious injuries, including a fractured skull and bleeding on the brain’, followed by Line 7, ‘It's looking pretty positive,’ his coach Adam Hennessey said.

Line 6 gives the reader further information about the surfer’s injuries, with unnamed ‘friends’ reporting the surfer had been ‘moved from intensive care’, indicating the injuries had been life-threatening, further confirmed by adding ‘a fractured skull and bleeding on the brain’. As previously stated, journalists show a preference for describing injuries in graphic details when targeting socially deviant Others. The four words directly quoted from the surfer’s coach, ‘it’s looking pretty positive’ barely seem worth the effort to include in the report. However, this further humanises the surfer to the reader and upgrades his social status to that of athlete. That is, the surfer has a professional coach, who is semi-formally nominated (surname and given name) and activity-based classified (coach). By including the surfer’s coach in the text, the authors have upgraded the social status of the victim, which further demean the bouncer who assaulted him.

Line 8 of the report states ‘[t]he Security Industry Registry figures raise serious questions about the backgrounds of those working the doors at NSW pubs and clubs’.

Note that the authors reported that ‘a bouncer killed a man’ and the surfer’s graphic assault before writing this line of text. This would appear to support their statement that ‘figures raise serious questions about the backgrounds’ of bouncers working in NSW pubs and clubs. However, it is not stated who is raising the serious questions. What remains implicit here is the notion that those ‘working the door’ have shady or questionable backgrounds, implying that bouncers have criminal, violent or deviant histories. This sentence therefore ties back to the violence reported in Lines 4 to 7, supporting the authors’ argument.

Line 9 is a paraphrased statement from a spokesman of the Security Industry Registry. The lines read the ‘... spokesman said licences were revoked for 10 years if the holder is convicted of offences involving weapons, drugs, assault, fraud, theft or robbery. The licence is revoked for five years if the offender is found guilty with no conviction recorded’. Although this may be giving facts, what is apparent is the reference to bouncers or crowd controllers as ‘licenses’, ‘the holder’ or ‘the offender’. This is a discursive strategy that objectifies rather than personalises the social marginalised or
deviant Others (van Leeuwen, 2008, Fowler, 2013). This objectification strategy is used throughout the rest of the news report with references to ‘individuals’ and ‘their’ (Line 10), ‘license application’ and ‘applicant’ (Line 11 & 13) ‘licence’ (Line 12), ‘applicant’ (Line 13 & 15), ‘people’ and ‘they’ (Line 14).

Objectification reduces social Others to generic categories, such as ‘applicants’ or ‘they’ which dehumanises social actors and renders them meaningless to the reader. Lines 12, 13, 14 and 15 also reduces bouncers to numbers or statistics, with reference to ‘the 300 mark’, ‘74 licence applications’, ‘526 people’ in relation to bouncers having their licenses revoked or refused and ‘48,000 security licence applicants’ in relation to fingerprinting. The news media typically use such reductionist strategies when writing about deviant or social Others, those who are discursively classified as ‘them’ and not worthy of individual mention (van Leeuen, 2008, Fowler, 2013). The habitual objectification and categorisation of social Others saturate news discourse and as Fowler argued ‘… discrimination in discourse helps maintain intellectual habits that promote discrimination in practice’ (2013: 107).

The main theme of the news report is to ‘expose’ to the reader the criminal nature of bouncers ‘working the door’. The word ‘crime’ and its stem words have been mentioned five times in the text; criminal offences such as assault, bashed, killed, manslaughter, theft, drug and weapons offences have been mentioned 13 times and ‘court’ and ‘jailed’ have been mentioned twice. Overall, in the 14 lines of the news report, there are 20 references to criminal offences in some form. Moreover, the authors have saturated the report with numerous references to refusal of or revocation of security licenses. The word ‘revoked’ is mentioned four times in the report, and words such as ‘denied’, ‘refused’, ‘removed’, ‘reviewed’ and ‘disqualified’ are mentioned a further five times. Overall, the news report paints a very bleak picture of the security industry and bouncers in particular, insinuating that most bouncers are criminals.

The reference to bouncers as criminals is further compounded by the authors’ statement in Line 13. They have written ‘… to ensure convicted criminals could not get around police controls by assuming a new identity’, which presupposes that criminals are using this ploy to gain entry to the security industry. This is damning statement yet it is unknown whether it is a fact or just the authors’ opinion. The wrap-up line of the report paraphrases the CEO of the Australian Security Industry Association. The abbreviation
CEO is used and not explained as Chief Executive Officer, which, as previously discussed, excludes readers who do not know what CEO stands for. The CEO is paraphrased as saying ‘… although it seemed only a small portion of security workers had been involved in criminal acts …’. The inclusion of the word ‘seemed’ subverts the statement made by the CEO by rendering is unsure or uncertain. That is, the CEO is cited as being unsure how many bouncers are involved in criminal acts.

What must be considered is the CEO was not directly quoted and instead the authors paraphrased his words, therefore the CEO may not have used the word. However, the authors have used the word ‘seemed’ to render the CEO’s comment ineffectual in support of their argument about criminal bouncers. The central message of the news report is to convey to the reading public that the security industry is heavily laden with criminals. The report is discriminatory in that it assumes a substantial number of bouncers are criminals, even though there are more than 48,000 security licenses approved in the state of New South Wales (Line 13) compared with 221 licenses revoked and 526 refused (Line 12). Although 526 is a high number of refusals, I would argue this is evidence that the fingerprinting and criminal history checks for security personnel are effective in screening out unsuitable applicants and this is a positive outcome which is not mentioned in the news report.

7.11 Conclusion

Despite the small number of violent incidents involving bouncers in Australia (13 over 10 years), there are numerous examples of content repetition in the 10 news reports. Many shared content in relation to discussions on violence by bouncers. What is immediately evident in the manual analysis is the repetition of rhetorical strategies and lexical choices and ordering of the text used by journalists. These discursive strategies have resulted in the news reports being saturated with concessions, disclaimers, abstract generalisations, nominalisations and extensive use of metaphors, litotes and idiom. Three reports made explicit and implicit reference to bouncer gangs or criminal drug gangs. Three also made explicit reference to bouncers terrorising patrons and bashing people. All reports claimed bouncers were violent, with some claiming the community was facing an ‘epidemic’ and ‘waves of bouncer violence’. In all instances, victims were portrayed as innocent and undeserving while bouncers were shown as being guilty of ‘bashings’, ‘brutal bashings’ and violence against patrons.
Chapter 8
Discussion and Conclusion

8.1. Overview

This critical discourse analysis sought to demonstrate how bouncers are portrayed in negative terms in news reports. Perceptions of bouncers as violent thugs have persisted over time and this research sought to investigate how news journalists used discursive and linguistic strategies to portray bouncers in negative terms and to determine whether the reporting was discriminatory or derogatory. The original stance in this research was that bouncers are discriminated against in the news media, and the news media, through their discourse, are contributing to the perceptions of bouncers as violent thugs. Through the use of multiple theoretical perspectives and by drawing on previous research around male and female bouncers, it was demonstrated that bouncers are aware of their stigmatisation of working in an occupation I have deemed ‘dirty work’. However the lack of research around female bouncers made it necessary to draw on other occupations that I perceived to be similar to evaluate the cognitive strategies and the gender divide in, not only ‘dirty work’, but work that is deemed a masculine dominated occupation.

The combative sports of Mixed Martial Arts (MMA) and the Ultimate Fighting Championship or cage fighting were also used as a comparison to bouncers’ occupational roles, as I perceived a high similarity between the two as was demonstrated in Chapter 4 and 5. The script analysis in these two chapters also demonstrated the use of hostile and benevolent sexism and compensatory and complementary gender differentiation strategies by both men and women as well as disidentification strategies. The cognitive strategies are consistent with role congruence theory and social identity theory as they are active cognitive strategies utilised by social actors to form a positive sense of self whilst undertaking work in a stigmatised or masculine dominated occupation. Scripts 1 to 7 revealed evidence of disidentification by female research participants as well as attitudes of social gender expectations.
Comments such as ‘they behaved like women’ (Script 2) and ‘men aren’t that emotional’ (Script 5) confirm the embedded cognitive attitudes of traditional gender role expectations.

Conversely, the scripts of bouncers in Chapter 5 revealed bouncers utilising hostile and benevolent sexism to elevate the importance of their work and to establish superiority over patrons. Both male and female bouncers utilised hostile sexism against their counterparts with comments such as ‘they’ve [male bouncers] had a great night chatting up all the girls while I sort out all the problems’ (Female bouncer, Script 9) and ‘stop acting like a man and be more like a woman’ (Male bouncer, p. 126). However, benevolent sexism was also evidenced by reports of male bouncers being overprotective of their female counterparts (Rigatos, 2008) and female bouncers expressing a maternalistic attitude towards their male colleagues (Rickett and Roman, 2013). Maternal and paternalistic attitudes were also expressed by bouncers in relation to misbehaving patrons with comments such as ‘they’re like little children’ (Female bouncer, Script 10) and ‘I’m an adult baby-sitter’ (Male bouncer, Script 17), a cognitive strategy that upgrades the importance of their work by infantiling patrons.

Interestingly, male and female bouncers utilised benevolent sexist attitudes when discussing the opposite sex in relation to violence. Female bouncers conveyed a maternalistic approach to male patrons, such as ‘I’ll have a laugh and a joke ‘so I don’t have to drag you out by your hair’ (Script 10), while a male bouncer relayed ‘You don’t want to be grabbing them [women] and that’ (Script 12). Script 12 also conveys the societal expectation of gender appropriate behaviour between males and females. Nevertheless, violent female patrons who caused physical harm to male bouncers were viewed negatively (hostile sexism) with comments such as ‘they’re crazy. They’re more dangerous’ (Male bouncer, Script 13) and ‘she kicked him in the head with her high heels’ (Male bouncer, Script 13). Female bouncers took a more feministic view of violent female patrons, stating ‘it’s a female-female thing, women are catty … they’re the ones who would give the snide remarks or dirty looks’ (Female bouncer, Script 15). Script 15 is also evidence of comparative gender differentiation attitudes by the female bouncer as defined by disidentification.
Collectively, the analysis of the scripts or talk of both male and female bouncers showed evidence of negative attitudes towards unruly patrons and evidence of cognitive strategies that are implemented as a means of valorising their work and elevating their status above those of the patrons they monitor. Establishing a positive sense of self in a stigmatised industry has arguably led to the evolution of such active cognitive strategies. Hadfield (2006) and Rigakos (2008) proposed there was a ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude by bouncers towards patrons and my own experiences with bouncers or crowd controllers has confirmed this attitude. Crowd controllers in Cairns, Queensland have previously held the same ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude to police; however in recent years, a collaborative working relationship has been built between venue security and local police and this attitude is dissipating. My professional experience suggests that this is based on the lack of State authority by crowd controllers and the lack of structural supports available for the workers.

The predominant feature of analysis was the fact that bouncer violence does not occur often, but when it does, previous accounts of violence by bouncers are reframed and reused to support journalists’ arguments against violent bouncers. Therefore, the same incidents were reproduced in different news reports over a number of years. For example, there are few news reports on bouncer violence that do not mention David Hookes’ death. The analysis therefore reveals the repetitious use of previous incidents by news journalists, or a ‘tag-on effect’ where they tag on previous incidents to support and fill out reports of the current incident. It appears to be a story telling technique used by journalists, an identified strategy when reporting particular social issues of law and order. I would argue that this happens because few incidents over the years relate to bouncer violence. Just as aeroplane crashes are few, yet are widely covered by the news media, so too are incidents of bouncer violence. Therefore, in order to ‘pad out’ the stories to convince the reading public of the dangers involved in violence by bouncers, the tag-on effect is used to bring together all previous incidents to support the current news story.

This was evident in the prolific use of David Hookes’ name in the news reports and the high number of times bouncers’ and victims’ names appeared in reports. What must be considered here is the magnitude of incidents of bouncers involved in violence, the rate of incidents and the unprecedented reporting that occurs in the news media when an
incident occurs. The analysis showed 13 incidents of bouncers involved in violence in 10 years, although it cannot be claimed these are the only incidents that occurred because this was not an exhaustive study. However, even two incidents a year does not qualify as an ‘epidemic’. This is an unusual method of journalism because no other social issue is reported in such a manner by using copious repetition of incidents over time.

There is a considerable difference between the number of incidents involving bouncers in alcohol-related assaults with the number of incidents involving patrons. For example, a study by Moffatt and Weatherburn (2011) showed an average of between 300 and 600 assaults per year for alcohol-related violence in and around licensed premises. These numbers far outweigh incidents of bouncers being involved in violence. Although there may be underreporting of assaults by bouncers, so too assaults perpetuated by patrons on bouncers go underreported (Lister et al., 2000). Bouncers rarely report incidents of assault against them because it is viewed as ‘just a part of business’ or part of the job (Lister et al., 2000, Hobbs et al. 2003). Given the difference in magnitude between the two rates, we can conclude that the frequency of incidents is not the reason why the news media condemn bouncers.

Of the news reports manually analysed, three were written by women, five by men and the authors of three were not stated. Two male authors wrote two articles each. The first news article, ‘Bouncer kneed Court’, was written by a female journalist and she played down the role of the bouncers while expanding and making very explicit the violent behaviour of the woman, Ms White. This was a discursive strategy that placed the behaviour of the bouncers in the background and emphasised Ms White’s violent behaviour. However, the second news report written by two female authors, ‘Frightening Trend in Pub Security’, targeted bouncers ‘getting away with’ murder and criticised court processes, while using experts to back up their claims.

Male authors were outspoken, disdainful, assertive and blatantly critical of bouncers involved in violence. Female authors were as critical, but they tended to convey information factually rather than using exposé or emotive language. However, female authors used the ‘expert voice’ to present their ideologies and back up their claims, rather than making explicit claims themselves. Male and female journalists were both critical of bouncers involved in violence, their lack of training, leniency by courts in
‘letting bouncers get off’, and the security industry and licensed premises for not ‘controlling’ bouncers. Male authors consistently used hyperbole, supposition, metaphors, generalisations and disclaimers within the text. A number of ‘experts’ were cited or quoted as using blatantly derogatory terms, such as ‘yokels’, ‘rednecks’, ‘pay-peanuts-and-get-monkeys’ etc. in relation to bouncers. In fact, ‘experts’ within the analysis were cited or quoted numerous times in the 80 news reports, indicating that news journalists use a large number of ‘expert voices’ in their writing to support their claims. Organisations were mentioned many times in the news reports, indicating a proliferation of groups involved in social power structures. These groups were the police, courts, magistrates, government and industries (such as the security industry). This finding supports van Dijk’s (1991, 2006b) claim that those with social power have access to the news media and, as such, are able to facilitate discourses which support their interests.

The manual analysis showed that security industry experts used litotes or double negatives, disclaimers, apparent concessions and supposition to distance themselves from bouncers involved in violence and align themselves with the ideological in-group, a form of social distancing. Both male and female authors objectified bouncers in news reports while relevant ‘experts’ were nominated and classified according to their occupational role and social status. Almost every news report in the manual analysis contained clear polarisation between ‘us’ and ‘them’. In all instances, the government, police, industry officials and leaders were aligned with common beliefs, with violent bouncers delegated to ‘them’. That is, ‘we’, the government, industry officials and relevant experts are against ‘them’, the bouncers involved in violence or ‘organised bouncer gangs’. Moreover, ‘we’ as a government and industry leaders are ‘concerned’ about the bouncer violence ‘problem’, therefore ‘you’ as a community should be also concerned about the ‘growing epidemic’ and ‘flood of complaints’ about bouncer violence. Male and female journalists all wrote from this perspective and there were few differences between the sexes in their approach.

Authors gave greater support in news reports to victims who held higher social status in the community, with their actions downplayed and the incident blown up or exaggerated. For example, David Hookes was described as being involved in a ‘vortex of aggression’, while the bouncer Micevic was described as being involved in a
‘scuffle’. Lexical choices were systematically used to emphasise the actions of bouncers and downplay the actions of victims. For example, ‘… Hookes became involved in a verbal altercation (as opposed to verbal abuse, which Ms White was accused of being involved in) with security staff and was ejected’; when in fact Hookes and his colleagues were ‘escorted’ from the premises, not physically ejected. In all instances, the actions or behaviours of the victims were downplayed or they were shown as passive, while the violence of the bouncers’ actions and behaviour were emphasised. In most but not all instances, graphic descriptions were given of the injuries suffered by victims, which is a discursive strategy designed to draw an emotive reaction from the reader.

There were several examples of discursive generalisations, such as ‘The widespread pubs and clubs violence has become a growing concern’ and ‘Cowardly bouncers are terrorising pub and club-goes by picking more fights than they stop’. Authors used military, water and disease metaphors in news reports. Military metaphors were the most favoured by journalists, with words such as ‘barrage’, ‘fall-out’, ‘crackdown’ and ‘boomed’ commonly used. Water metaphors such as ‘flood’ and disease metaphors such as ‘epidemic’ were used to exaggerate the number of complaints or incidents of bouncers being involved in violence. Authors also made use of both generic and functionalised categorisation to separate those in the security industry who were involved in violence and those who were not. ‘Bouncers’ (generic categorisation) were involved in violence and ‘crowd controllers’ or ‘security guards’ (functionalised categorisation) were not. This semantic separation appears to be used to legitimate ‘crowd controllers’ and delegitimate (violent) ‘bouncers’.

The analysis showed that the term ‘bouncer’ was used four times more often than their formal categorical nomination of ‘security guard’ or ‘crowd controller’ within the text of the 80 news reports. This finding indicates that news journalists have a clear preference for the stereotypical term ‘bouncer’. News journalists also used the formal categorisations of ‘hotels’ and nightclubs’ more sparingly than the generic or stereotypical terms ‘pubs’ and ‘clubs’. This finding supports earlier claims that the socially deviant or out-group Other is often classified in generic terms, while those who hold social power are formally nominated and classified (van Leeuwen, 2008). The notion of ‘power from above’ or instances of power being exerted over those less
powerful was also demonstrated in the analysis. There were many instances where ‘power from above’ was identified in the 80 news reports. Factors such as licensing, training, laws, regulation and bans were continually raised in the texts. There were also ‘warnings’ issued by the news media with further indicators of legislation, power, crackdowns and reforms to be exerted over bouncers and the industry.

The study has shown the extent to which news media use violent terminologies when reporting incidents involving bouncers. The analysis showed a plethora of violent terms in the 80 news reports and in the headlines. News journalists used graphic, ‘shocking’, explicit descriptors of victims’ injuries, which is a discourse strategy designed to elicit emotive reactions and influence mental models of readers (van Dijk, 2012). The prolific use of so many violent descriptors in the 80 news reports was striking. It could be described as an overuse of such terms, demonstrating that news journalists showed a preference for emphasising the violence in the news reports or giving it prominence when reporting about bouncers. This finding supports previous research that news reports dramatise and portray negatively those who hold less social power or are involved in violence or deviance (van Dijk, 1988).

**8.2. Why are bouncers predominantly portrayed in negative terms in the news media?**

The first research question asked why bouncers were portrayed in predominantly negative terms in the news media. Fairclough (2004) proposed that discourses depend on social class, status, gender, personal and social identities and the ways in which social actors relates to others in the social realm. Throughout this thesis, it has been argued that bouncers are near the bottom of the social power hierarchy, being traditionally from working-class backgrounds and performing ‘dirty work’ (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2003). It has also been established that bouncers manage business through ‘bodily’ capital and reputation and that it is a highly stigmatised and vilified occupation (Lister, 2002, Monaghan, 2002b). Moreover, bouncers hold no statutory powers, hold no more legal powers than an ordinary citizen and are offered no legal protection from litigation (Sarre, 2010).

Bouncers are responsible for managing and controlling crowds in an economy that has grown significantly in the past twenty years. The night-time economy is marketed as
liminal fun and unrestrained excitement in dimly lit enclaves that are private businesses (Hobbs et al., 2003). The mix of young people, alcohol and drugs sometimes leads to physical violence and bouncers are tasked with controlling unruly bodies and managing social order. In an occupation that is deemed ‘dirty work’, bouncers maintain strong occupational solidarity and may socialise exclusively with their team members (Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008). In section 5.11 of this thesis, the ‘excuses’ for violence given by bouncers (Hobbs et al., 2003) were explored and elucidated by examining scripts, using the cognitive strategies of legitimating, recalibrating and refocusing. Bouncers use these cognitive strategies to maintain a positive sense of self in a stigmatised occupation. Bouncers are aware that society vilifies, stigmatises and undervalues their occupation (Hobbs et al., 2003) and take active cognitive steps to present their work as positive and worthwhile. They are also aware the news media portray them in a negative, vilified manner yet are powerless to do anything about the media discourse (Hobbs et al., 2003, Monaghan, 2004, Hadfield, 2006) because they are excluded from the news media because of their lack of social power.

In Section 5.11 of this thesis, emotional labour and hostile sexism or dominative heterosexuality were discussed in relation to bouncers and their occupational role. Research has concluded there is a clear ‘us’ and ‘them’ attitude by bouncers towards aggressive male patrons and female patrons who behave badly (Day et al., 2003, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigatos, 2008). This is consistent with others who undertake dirty work as an occupational role (see Section 4.1 for a discussion). Benevolent sexism is afforded to female patrons who behave and act within the confines of socially accepted behaviours and hostile sexism is afforded those who transgress the culturally defined boundaries. Hostile sexism towards patrons is also prevalent among bouncers, or as one male door staff member in Rigakos’ study paternalistically proposed, ‘I’m an adult babysitter. Make sure the babies don’t fight’ (2008: 149). This arguably sums up the attitudes of some bouncers. A strong culture of protectiveness towards other bouncers and their work is only initiated if bouncers do not behave badly, because bouncers themselves condemn those involved in violence that is deemed ‘excessive’ or ‘unnecessary’ (Monaghan, 2002a, Hobbs et al., 2003, Rigakos, 2008).

Given the aforementioned conditions, the bouncers’ occupational role is a challenging and socially undervalued one. As an occupation placed near the bottom of the hierarchy
of social status and power, they are subjected to harsh criticism when something goes ‘horribly’ wrong. The private security industry and others with social power use the ‘blame game’ to distance themselves socially from the resulting negative media attention. By diverting the ‘blame’ onto individual bouncers, or blaming a political governance strategy, legislation or inadequate training regimes, the industry and relevant others effectively distance themselves from being associated with bouncers involved in violence. Moreover, relevant experts and ‘governments’ proclaim what needs to be done to solve the ‘problem’, a discursive strategy that promotes the dominant ideological in-group (van Dijk, 2006b).

Bouncers or crowd controllers hold no social power and have no access to resources, such as the news media. Moreover, the social power of news media to influence and shape public perceptions has resulted in the discursive production of bouncers as fundamentally violent individuals, an image that is reproduced time and time again in news reports through discursive strategies and saturation use of violent terminologies in the discourse. The tendency of journalists to refer back to previous incidents also adds to perceptions that bouncer violence is in ‘epidemic’ proportions. The metaphors, political abstractions, hyperbolic and glorified language used by news journalists also contribute to this perception, together with their extensive use of ‘expert voices’ and organisations. The numerous references to power being exerted over bouncers is also indicative of lack of social power and their marginalised social status within society. This clearly indicates why bouncers are vilified in the news media by those who hold social power.

8.3. What social or political function does it serve to have bouncers portrayed as villains in the media?

The second research question considered the social or political functions served by having bouncers portrayed as villains in the media. The security industry and relevant experts distance themselves from bouncers involved in violence and blame it on ‘Rambos’, ‘rednecks’, ‘yokels’ and ‘a cowboy industry’. The blatant use of such derogatory appellations is common in the press when describing socially marginalised groups (Fowler, 2013: 119). Fowler also proposed that blaming the offender is a discursive strategy designed to keep the ‘… lid of Pandora’s Box … firmly shut’ because it does not require factual proof (2013: 182). The responsibility for action then
lies with the offender and the ideology is produced and reproduced in the news discourse (Fowler, 2013). The neoliberal concept of responsibilisation is therefore consistent with political ideologies where personal responsibility takes precedence over government responsibilities (Peeters, 2013). The ‘blame the bouncer’ approach therefore absolves the security industry, the government and relevant government ministers of any ‘wrong-doing’ and places responsibility for action with the bouncer.

The ‘blame the bouncer’ strategy therefore serves to preserve the dominant ideologies of those who hold social power in two ways. First, responsibility is moved away from the dominant in-group, such as the media, magistrates, the police and security ‘experts’ and placed with the bouncers, the social out-group or deviant Other. Second, the dominant in-group is loud in their condemnation, with self-proposed changes and recommendations about how to ‘fix’ the ‘problem’ and keep the community safe from violent bouncers. This type of gonzo rhetoric (Maratea and Monahan, 2013) preserves the dominant in-group ideologies and makes deviant the bouncer, social Other. In the analysis, journalists continually over-stated the behaviours of bouncers and downplayed the actions of victims or in-group others, such as the police. This is consistent with news media discourses which support dominant ideologies of socially deviant Others, thus preserving the good ‘us’ and the evil ‘them’, especially when conflict or violence is involved (van Dijk, 2006b).

The concepts of ‘bouncer violence’ or ‘violent bouncers’ are multifaceted stereotypes that have pervaded news discourse in Westernised countries for decades. The news media have perpetuated the stereotypes through discursive strategies that present bouncer violence or violent bouncers as common knowledge or a factual ‘given’. Bouncer violence or violent bouncers are ‘… basic stereotypical ideological processes at work’ (Fowler, 2013: 95) and are media constructed discourses that are sustained by the news media. News media discourse has constructed the stereotype and their continued discrimination reinforces the categorisation by the repeated use of specific expressions. The specific use of the generic categorisation of ‘bouncer’ is always paired with acts of violent behaviour in news texts. The formal categorisation of ‘crowd controller’ or ‘security guard’ is rarely paired with violent acts but is kept separate as a group that is approved of or is politically valued.
Bouncers were often objectificated or reduced to ‘they’ or statistics in news reports. The discursive strategy of objectification depersonalises the group under enquiry and renders them meaningless to the reader. It is typically reserved for socially deviant Others or marginalised groups in society, such as immigrants or deviant youths (van Dijk, 1995, van Leeuwen, 2008) or, in this case, bouncers. In some instances in news reports, the bouncer involved was identified as ‘a bouncer’ with no other information offered. This nomination relies on the reader to construct a mental model of what ‘a bouncer’ is, or what a bouncer stereotypically is. Presumably, this would be a male, muscle-bound, tattooed Rambo-type person that the media are so fond of presenting. Highly emotive language is also reserved for the behaviours of bouncers, and for victims and their families. As Fowler (2013) and van Dijk (1991) noted, the less social power a group holds the more emotive is the language used by the news media.

Conversely, politicians, police or relevant experts are formally nominated and titled, and their views and attitudes are fully covered in the news reports. Relevant experts are cited in abstract or generalised terms with no emotive language used. Experts are typically ‘concerned’ about the ‘problem’ and offer solutions such as more licensing measures, more training or tougher laws, with calls for bouncers, licensed premises and the security industry to be more responsible. This research has also shown the critical comments made by relevant experts in relation to bouncers involved in violence. For example, the President of the New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties claimed bouncers were on ‘power trips’ and was quoted as saying ‘redneck’ bouncers were in the industry (McIlveen and Chestertone, Daily Telegraph, February 28, 2007). The Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union secretary, Ron Monaghan, stated ‘… there were long-standing efforts to get rid of Rambos, who see violence as a control method’ (Edmistone and Watt, Courier Mail, May 27, 2006).

Discriminatory remarks like these by ‘experts’ do little to foster confidence in the security industry. News journalists use such remarks to support their claims of ‘widespread epidemics of bouncer violence’, fuelling public attitudes and perceptions of bouncers as fundamentally violent individuals. Moreover, such derogatory comments make it easy for journalists to discriminate against bouncers and discursively condemn them. With relevant experts and industry experts criticising bouncers, it is little wonder the public have a biased view of bouncers. If a police officer inadvertently causes the
death of a person, the police service, union representatives and high-ranking police are quick to leap to the officer’s defence. However, bouncers have no such support and no organisational structure to support them when they are involved in violence.

The security industry in Australia has a peak body, the Australian Security Industry Association Ltd (ASIAL) but the industry itself does not support bouncers involved in violence. For example, in the analysis, the following quotes by industry leaders were identified:

‘The Government must accelerate the finalisation of appropriate new licensing and security measures’ (ASIAL chairman);

‘Industry insiders recognise that drug dealers are attracted to the job’; ‘one of the industry's foremost experts [stated] pubs and clubs remain hamstrung by an inability to find suitable candidates’; ‘One of Queensland's leading security industry spokesmen says the state's training regime for crowd controllers suffered through an attempt to standardise training across the country in the late '90s’ (Murphy and Meade, The Australian, May 23, 2006);

and

‘… recent incidents painted the industry in a bad light and there had been long-standing efforts to get rid of ‘Rambos’, who see violence as a control method’ (Edmistone and Watt, Courier Mail, May 27, 2006).

Therefore, in relation to bouncers involved in violence, two industry experts cited training as the problem, one cited the inability to find suitable people for the job, one stated drug dealers were attracted to the job, one cited licensing problems and the last quote cited recent incidents and Rambos as being responsible for the problem. These reasons show the industry itself is finding ‘blame’ for the violence. Although the issues cited may be genuine, and I would argue some are valid, nowhere in the news reports are industry experts supporting bouncers accused of violence. What the experts are doing, in effect, is directing attention away from violent bouncers to problems in the system (training, licensing etc.) or blaming specific types of bouncers (Rambos, yokels). Consequently, the industry identifies the issue of bouncers involved in violence as a
systemic or individualised problem, depending on the semantic slant of the news report. It could be argued that this absolves those in the industry from blame, instead placing it on violence within the system or individual bouncers. This then allows those in the industry to distance themselves from the violence and news media criticisms.

8.4. **How does the ‘moral panic’ around alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy in Queensland influence the media portrayal of bouncers involved in violence against patrons?**

The final research question asked whether the moral panic around alcohol-related violence in the night-time economy in Queensland influenced the media portrayal of bouncers involved in violence against patrons. The political and news media have focused on alcohol-related violence for many decades. The boom in the night-time economy and the corresponding influx of people into late-night precincts has resulted in a corresponding rise in alcohol-related violence. Up-market clubs and bars ‘filter’ the clientele to suit their venues, thereby excluding working-class and lower wage earners, who must frequent the more affordable commercial venues. However, the gentrification of venues in the night-time economy and the corresponding increase in commercial clubs has resulted in a criminalisation of working-class activities by the mass news media (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002, Tomsen, 2011), and a corresponding rise in the moral panic around out-of-control drunken young people on the streets.

Headlines relating to ‘alcohol-fuelled violence’ pervade news reports, ‘king hits’ and ‘coward punch’ assaults are condemned and the offenders vilified in the news. The concept of ‘pub violence’ was created by the news media, with the term frequently used in the news discourse to describe violence around working-class hotels and venues. For example, the then Premier of Queensland, Campbell Newman, launched a new *Safe Night Out Strategy* that was reported in the *Courier Mail*. The opening line of the news report\(^\text{37}\) stated:

> LIQUOR licensing officers will have their powers supersized and be able to conduct **covert** operations to keep **rogue pubs** and clubs **in check** under a new

The female author used military metaphors (covert, crack down), a derogatory term (rogue), idiom (in check) and issued a warning (put on notice). This style of writing supports the analysis developed in this thesis. The supposed ‘war’ on rogue pubs and clubs and alcohol and drug-related violence is similar to the ‘war’ on violent bouncers. Both the public and politicians view violence by bouncers and violence by patrons as unacceptable and newsworthy, while ‘rogue pubs’ are also worthy of journalists’ criticism. News media appear to view the working-class pub as a threat to civil society because it tips heavily intoxicated people out into the streets to fight in drunken brawls that litter our streets with blood. This has resulted in a moral panic about such behaviours.

News reports are loud in their support of ‘crackdowns’ and are bold in issuing ‘warnings’ to pubs, clubs, violent patrons and violent bouncers. However, when violence does occur, the ‘government’, government ministers, police and local government are quick to be cited in news reports about the measures they are taking to curb alcohol-related violence or ‘booze-fuelled bashings’. Alcohol-related violence is graphic, real and often bloody and so it is supremely newsworthy. Graphic photographs accompany such stories of young men fighting, ambulance officers attending blood-splattered people and images of the police retraining or arresting (usually) a man or young men. To reiterate Berry and Sobieraj, the content shows ‘… shocking elements of reality, to evoke emotional responses: fear, indignation, outrage or sadness’ (2008: 17), all strategies that support the ‘outrage’ industry and gonzo rhetoric. Carefully woven into the network of reasons for the violence are hegemonic masculinity, alcohol and drugs (see Connell, 2014 for a discussion on this topic).

As outlined in this research, alcohol-related violence and bouncer violence are considered to be the fault of ‘men’ or hegemonic masculinity. That is, men are seen as violent individuals by nature of their sex. This concept has been challenged; however, in

the political and social arenas violence is still regarded as a product of ‘men’. For example, the quote from a prosecutor cited Micevic as being ‘an angry fit young man’; indicating Micevic was young, strong, capable and enraged, all attributes associated with masculinity. To my knowledge, no female bouncers have been charged with assaults on patrons in Queensland. Young men are the perpetrators of most alcohol-related violence in the world, not just Queensland, and culturally appropriate roles and behaviours allow ‘men’ to show anger and aggression. Aggression in sport is valorised and encouraged, yet it is condemned if it spills onto our streets. The word ‘aggression’ was mentioned many times in the 80 news reports. Displays of reputation, intimidation and ‘bodily’ capital are also valued in sports, especially MMA and UFC, just as bouncers value these attributes, but when it comes to public violence, offenders are publically condemned and vilified in the news media. This indicates that there is a fine line, culturally and morally, between when aggression is appropriate and when it is not. Some people, for instance, view cage fighting as fundamentally barbaric (Abramson and Modzelewski, 2011).

It is not a major step, therefore, to link the moral panic around alcohol-related violence with the violence perpetuated by bouncers. The violence is alcohol-related, it occurs in the night-time economy, it is committed by men and it attracts considerable news media attention. Moreover, the neoliberal notion of political governance is implicated in the resulting moral panics around such violence. Individual social actors are expected to manage their own behavior and behave ‘responsibly’, and the numerous mentions in the categorical analysis showed that the news media and consequently, the public, are critical of those involved in alcohol-related violence. Under neoliberal governance regimes, policing has been outsourced to private organizations and this has led to an increase in the number of private security personnel. These are the private ‘police’ within the night-time economy and hold certain responsibilities for patron and staff safety. Therefore, it could be argued that bouncer violence is further condemned because they are responsible for protecting people, not harming them.

Bouncers are in an occupational role that is designed to keep the public safe, so those who do commit violence against patrons receive greater criticism from the news media. For example, one bouncer was accused of ‘killing a drunk patron’ and a lawyer claimed ‘you then face altercations between patrons who are intoxicated and overzealous
security staff who are sober’. Not only are bouncers tasked with maintaining the safety of the public, but they are also sober whereas patrons are intoxicated. However, this runs counter to an industry insider who claimed crowd controllers would be ‘leaving the industry because they don’t want to get caught doing drugs or because they don’t want to break their habit of drinking [implicit reference to alcohol] on the job’.

Consequently, the responsibility of bouncers to protect people and remain sober in environments of intoxication is often implied in the media’s criticisms of their (violent) behaviours.

The news media focus on these two social issues is also class-based. It is working-class people (or men) who are mainly responsible for alcohol-related violence, and bouncers also come from working-class backgrounds. Although social class was not the focus of this research to any great degree, it must be included in the discussion because of this fact. The research has established that working-class people attend commercial hotels and nightclubs, and the moral panic around alcohol-related violence is associated with these venues, not the niche or up-market venues. Bouncers are also typically employed at these commercial venues. Therefore is could be argued that alcohol-related violence and bouncer violence can be attributed to the working class, not the middle or upper classes. This again brings into question the issues of access to media discourses. The working class generally does not have access to the news media, because this is reserved for those in positions of social power and influence, hence excluding the working class from the discourse.

8.5. Conclusion

There would seem to be culturally appropriate rules as to when and where violence should occur. On the football field, in a fighting ‘cage’ and the boxing ring, aggression, intimidation and violence are not only valorised but expected. It is a part of the sport and spectators expect to see aggression and even violence. However, in the night-time economy where fun, excitement and sneaky thrills are marketed to bring people through the door, violence lurks in dimly lit corners and is ever present, a threat to bouncers working the door or the dance floor. It may erupt in a heartbeat and bouncers are responsible for keeping civil order and maintaining the peace within and around licensed premises. It is an occupation that is undervalued, underpaid, publically
misunderstood and deemed ‘dirty work’, but bouncers require considerable skills to conduct business efficiently and effectively.

The findings from this research support the belief that the news media discriminate against bouncers or crowd controllers involved in violence against patrons. In a neoliberal political climate of responsibilisation and with policing outsourced to private security firms, the burden of managing civil order in the night-time economy has fallen on bouncers or crowd controllers. The punitive political approach to alcohol-related violence and the condemning of those involved has arguably placed more responsibility on crowd controllers in the night-time economy. However, in an occupation that is vilified and deemed ‘dirty work’, bouncers or crowd controllers hold little social power. They are subjected to considerable forces by the ‘powers from above’ and their actions have come under close scrutiny for many years because of random acts of violence against patrons.

I would argue that the news media’s vilification of bouncers stems from their lack of state authority, their lack of organisational structure and the lack of organisational support and social power. The Queensland Police Service are state authorised officers who enforce the law and keep citizens safe in their community. Bouncers have the unenviable task of dealing with intoxicated individuals on a nightly basis with little pay and, sometimes, minimal training. They are not afforded the same structure, training and support as police. Any individual can set up a security firm with the appropriate applications and criminal history checks. This means that security firms are individualised capitalist organisations with few connections to other organisations, which operate independently and train their staff idiosyncratically under loose guidelines. Unlike police in Australian states and territories, security guards and crowd controllers operate independently for economic gain and this is fundamentally detrimental to the industry.

Most crowd controllers and security guards behave professionally, operating within the law and security guidelines. There are a few bad apples tainting the industry, but not a whole orchard full. I would also argue that little will change until crowd controllers and security guards come under similar national and state organisational structures to the police. The diversity of police in the United States of America has shown that multiple services can work effectively together under state monitoring. There is no reason why
security guards and crowd controllers cannot come under the same banner in Australia. If the security industry in Queensland were under government control, as are the police, issues with individual bouncers involved in violence possibly may not occur. With a governance structure, bureaucratic hierarchical organisation, intensive training and quality trainers, bouncers would be as competent and efficient as the police and command higher wages, which may alleviate the current high turnover of staff in the security industry. Currently, individual capitalist businesses operate for financial gain and guards are low paid and often under-trained. A government model would alleviate this situation and bring the industry in line with other government agencies, and give authority to security guards and crowd controllers to do their jobs competently. Perhaps only then would bouncers or crowd controllers earn more social power and be subject to less vilification by the news media.

8.6. Limitations

A number of limitations of this study must be acknowledged. First, there were 21 news reports with no author stated among those in the NVivo analysis and three in the manual analysis. This prevented a comprehensive comparison of male and female authors to discern their writing styles and determine whether gender affected the level of criticism of bouncers involved in violence. The analysis showed little difference between male and female writing styles, but the manual analysis included only 10 news reports and a larger sample is needed to discern specific gender-based differences in writing styles. A second limitation is the lack of reader involvement in the research. The articles under analysis, specifically the manual analysis, were published before social media became widely used. However, future research in critical discourse analysis involving bouncers should also examine comments left on social media by the public, for example on FaceBook, Twitter and news feeds. Although it is paramount to understand the dominant ideologies of the news media, it would be prudent to include an analysis of social media comments to discern if the public’s view of bouncers is as discriminatory as the media’s.

8.7. Future Research

Given the dearth of discourse analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis research around bouncers, alcohol-related violence and the night-time economy, future research should
include these areas of study. The news media are typically hyperbolic and discriminatory in relation to these areas of study; however little critical discourse analysis has been conducted. It is concerning that so little research has been conducted in Australia around bouncers and their occupational roles, given the important part they play in the night-time economy. In-depth studies into bouncers, their work and their occupation would contribute to this area of study. There is also no research into the best practice models for training in the security industry, such as their content, modes of delivery or evaluation. Given the fractured nature of the private security industry across Australia, more research is needed in this area to identify gaps and the needs of the industry in relation to training and compliance, with a view to developing a uniform model of operations, perhaps under a government model or framework. Combat sports, such as MMA and cage fighting also require further research as this is currently an under-researched area of study, particularly in relation to emotional labour. There is also little research around ‘dirty work’ and emotional labour in the area of private security in the night-time economy.
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Appendix A List of news reports used in the manual qualitative analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Newspaper Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bouncer Kneed: Court</td>
<td>Christine Antoniou</td>
<td>Geelong Advertiser, Victoria, November 3, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drinking beyond their means</td>
<td>Ken Vernon</td>
<td>Gold Coast Bulletin, Queensland, February 22, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BOUNCER LAW REFORMS</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Messenger–Leader, Adelaide, February 23, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ASSAULT: Coach king-hit</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Courier Mail, Brisbane, March 30, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bouncer ‘thought only of revenge’</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>The Advertiser, Adelaide, September 6, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Forcing the issue</td>
<td>Padraic Murphy &amp; Kevin Meade</td>
<td>The Australian, Brisbane, May 23, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Frightening trend in pub security</td>
<td>Leanne Edmistone &amp; Amanda Watt</td>
<td>Courier Mail, Brisbane, May 27, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bouncer did this to Shane – Photo a jury didn’t see</td>
<td>Justin Vallejo</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph, Sydney, March 1, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B List of news reports used for NVivo analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Article</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Title of Article</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$83k for king hit by a bouncer</td>
<td>Bruce Mckean</td>
<td>6 April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All losers in Hookes death</td>
<td>Mike Hedge</td>
<td>12 September, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>RE bouncers cleared of killing patron</td>
<td>Amelia Bentley</td>
<td>30 April, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Royal Exchange Hotel bouncers not guilty of killing drinker</td>
<td>Tony Keim</td>
<td>30 April, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ASSAULT Coach King Hit</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>30 March, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Australia mourns death of Test man Hookes Jan 2004 UK</td>
<td>Simon Briggs</td>
<td>20 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Australian cricketer Hookes hit accused first in fatal fight</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>No date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Bouncer jailed for minimum of 18 months for killing painter with one punch</td>
<td>Louise Hall</td>
<td>15 February, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Bouncers in spotlight</td>
<td>Sue Gardiner</td>
<td>12 April, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Bouncer Kneed Court</td>
<td>Christine Antoniou</td>
<td>3 November, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. <strong>BOUNCER LAW REFORMS</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>23 February, 2005</td>
<td><em>Messenger–Leader</em>, Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Bouncer on kill charge</td>
<td>Mark Oberhardt</td>
<td>January 30, 2007</td>
<td><em>Courier Mail</em>, Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Bouncer thrown out of NSW nightclub</td>
<td>Geoff Chambers</td>
<td>8 August, 2008</td>
<td><em>Gold Coast Bulletin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Bouncer claims Hookes hit first</td>
<td>Nelson Clare</td>
<td>16 November, 2004</td>
<td>telegraph.co.uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Clubs hide bouncer bashings to avoid listing</td>
<td>Michelle Harris</td>
<td>22 January, 2014</td>
<td>theheraldsun.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Guards hit back at club druggies</td>
<td>Annelies Gleeson</td>
<td>27 February, 2008</td>
<td><em>Gold Coast Sun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Cricketer dies after assault</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>20 January, 2004</td>
<td>tvnz.co.nz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Cricketer tells court he saw blow that took down Hookes</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>17 November, 2004</td>
<td>nzherald.co.nz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Crown Casino security guards failed to report clash which left man dead to Victorian police</td>
<td>Belinda Smith</td>
<td>8 July, 2011</td>
<td>theaustralian.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Drinking beyond their means</td>
<td>Ken Vernon</td>
<td>22 February, 2005</td>
<td>Gold Coast Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Family 'devastated' by death at casino</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>17 October, 2006</td>
<td>theage.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Family's all-consuming grief revealed in casino death case</td>
<td>Leonie Lamont</td>
<td>18 October, 2006</td>
<td>smh.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Fight Clubbing</td>
<td>Vanda Carson</td>
<td>3 September, 2011</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Forcing the issue</td>
<td>Pdraic Murphy, Kevin Meade</td>
<td>23 May, 2006</td>
<td>The Australian, Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Former rugby league international John Hopoate pleads guilty to assault occasioning actual bodily harm</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>19 April, 2011</td>
<td>foxsports.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Frightening trend in pub security</td>
<td>Leanne Edmistone, Amanda Watt</td>
<td>27 May, 2006</td>
<td>Courier Mail, Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. <strong>Girlfriend heard final, fatal moment of Hookes</strong></td>
<td>John Elder</td>
<td>21 November, 2004</td>
<td>theage.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. <strong>Hookes ‘threw two punches’ at bouncer</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>15 November, 2004</td>
<td>smh.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. <strong>Hookes was heading home before fatal fight</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>16 November, 2004</td>
<td>thats cricket.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. <strong>Hookes's death prompts call for security review</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>20 January, 2004</td>
<td>abc.net.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. <strong>Hopoate, Judge banned from Kings Cross club</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>10 December, 2013</td>
<td>ninemsn.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. <strong>John Hopoate and Mark Judge banned from Kings Cross nightclubs under new rules</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>10 December, 2013</td>
<td>abc.net.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. <strong>Judge calls bouncer's attack on patrons 'vicious and cowardly'</strong></td>
<td>Paul Anderson</td>
<td>April 24, 2013</td>
<td>Herald Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. <strong>Kings Cross bouncer Lynn Matia found guilty of Wilson Duque Castillo</strong></td>
<td>Amy Dale</td>
<td>17 September, 2013</td>
<td>dailytelegraph.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. <strong>Kings Cross brawl life support tragedy</strong></td>
<td>Malcolm Brown</td>
<td>14 February, 2011</td>
<td>dailyadvertiser.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. <strong>Kings Cross fight turned deadly</strong></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>22 August, 2013</td>
<td>smh.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. <strong>Late-night violence just part of revelling in city centre</strong></td>
<td>Christoper Knaus</td>
<td>19 February, 2012</td>
<td>canberratimes.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. <strong>Memories of the night Joel Namoa died at Andergrove Tavern</strong></td>
<td>Janessa Ekert</td>
<td>3 December, 2012</td>
<td>dailymercury.com.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. <strong>Micevic cleared of killing cricketer David Hookes</strong></td>
<td>Mary Gearin</td>
<td>12 September, 2005</td>
<td>abc.net.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Number</td>
<td>Article Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Street protest tonight over Kings Cross bouncers</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>14 January, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Nightclub under scrutiny after alleged bouncer attack</td>
<td>Lexi Metherell</td>
<td>30 August, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>NSW police seize control of private security industry</td>
<td>Barbara Miller</td>
<td>1 September, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Pub death bouncer appeal confusion</td>
<td>Andrew Dowdell</td>
<td>15 January, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>The Courier-Mail captures images of alcohol-fuelled violence on Brisbane streets in the lead-up to Christmas</td>
<td>Ellen-Maree Elliot, Thomas Chamberlin</td>
<td>9 December, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Transcript: Father speaks out after son's death in casino brawl</td>
<td>Emma Alberici</td>
<td>17 October, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Veteran of SA nightclub scene says 3am lockout will cause more violence and problems for guards</td>
<td>Sean Fewster</td>
<td>25 November, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Violence against bouncers won't be tolerated says Bendigo Police</td>
<td>Eloise Johnstone</td>
<td>29 April, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Violent scuffle with bouncers</td>
<td>Melissa Grant</td>
<td>19 August, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Joel Namoa farewelled</td>
<td>Kate Bastable</td>
<td>25 June, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Witness says pub bouncer was too rough in fatal brawl</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>19 November, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Years jail for rupturing artery in mans skull</td>
<td>Peter Martinelli</td>
<td>31 January, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Death ‘suspicious’ police</td>
<td>Bruce McKean</td>
<td>13 June, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>