

Danyelle Sturdivant

EH102-801

Professor Morrow

12/1/2020

Power and Authority in a Strip Club: An Ethnography of a Discourse Community

This project is an analysis of a local exotic dance club by the pseudonym Pony as a discourse community. Exotic dance is described by anthropologist Katherine Frank (502) as “a form of adult entertainment involving varying states of nudity, physical contact, and constellations of erotic and personal services such as talk, fantasy, and companionship.” These “erotic and personal services” entail emotional labor, or altering of one’s internal state to influence others, (Mirabelli 538). The emotional labor of dancers necessitates understanding, communicating, and meaning-making in varied modalities in addition to different contextual situations; in other words, it requires dancers to utilize multiliteracies (Wardle and Downs 676). Despite the complex emotional labor and multiliteracies dancers must enact in their jobs, their work is highly stigmatized and seen as skillless. By studying Pony as a discourse community, I aim to demonstrate that the labor of exotic dancers is indeed a valuable skill.

Discourse, Authority, and Exotic Dance: A Brief Review of the Literature

The following presents a critical overview of the research on exotic dance and discourse communities that is relevant to issues of power and authority. Very much attention has been paid to which gender possesses power in strip clubs, but very little has been afforded to how legitimate authority is constituted. I aim to contribute to the extensive body of academic literature concerning the stripping industry by borrowing theories of multiliteracies and belonging from writing studies to unveil and analyze how power and authority --specifically those of female dancers-- are constructed and enacted within an exotic dance club called Pony.

As a workplace, Pony displays all of the six characteristics that John Swales gives us by which to identify discourse communities. Community members at Pony possess shared goals, Swales' (471) first characteristic, of profiting through the services of the club and its dancers. Through in-person mechanisms, including nightly shifts and remote mechanisms, including a Facebook group, there is intercommunication, the second characteristic of discourse communities (Swales 471). Thirdly, there are participatory mechanisms (Swales 472) wherein members provide feedback including posting and commenting on Facebook posts as well as texting each other. The prominence of texts, such as the message board outside the club enticing patrons and the menu at the bar listing a selection of offered drinks, illustrate the fourth characteristic, the utilization and possession of conventional tools or genres (Swales 472).

Pony's use of the term "cutthroating" to refer to the act of stealing another dancer's customer is an example of discourse communities developing a special language or lexis, the fifth characteristic (Swales 473). Finally, there different positions within the club arranged largely in a hierarchy based on industry experience -- from "baby strippers" to veteran dancers, floor staff, bartenders, VIP hostesses, DJs, and managers-- indicate the last characteristic levels

of membership from beginner to expert (Swales 473). This last one is very significant within exotic dance communities because expertise can be seen as one aspect of power in which experiential knowledge and privilege is wielded over newcomers.

The biggest question plaguing exotic dance research for the past five decades has been whether or not exotic dancers experience exploitation. Who possesses the power in a strip club: the dancers or the customers? Who is oppressed, and who is liberated? Research has focused so much on these questions that it has failed to ask one more fundamental: what does it mean to possess legitimate power in a strip club?

Research on exotic dance has a long, interdisciplinary history. In their 1974 analysis of dancer-customer interactions, Boles and Garbin (112) discuss a status hierarchy within clubs, attributing a different level of power to managers, feature dancers, and house dancers, but they do not explicate the legitimacy of the power possessed by each group. Barton (585) pushes back against polarized conceptions of exotic dance as either empowering or exploitative, but she fails to define those terms and identify the difference between the two experiences. Deshotels and Forsyth (226) argue that gendered power is reproduced through emotional labor, and although they don't explicitly define it, it can be inferred from their exploration that their understanding of gendered power is based on oppositional positions of dominance and subordination. Lewis (301) examines the power relations of strip club employees and indicates that power involves decision-making ability and influence over other employees.

For all the researchers who've asked about dancers' experiences of power, shockingly few of them have attempted to precisely define the concept they're attempting to study. What is power? According to the Open Education Sociology Dictionary, power refers to "the ability of an individual, group, or institution to influence or exercise control over other people and achieve

their goals despite possible opposition or resistance,” (“Power”). As many social theorists have shown, power exists in many forms and operates through a variety of mediums. Weber (1922) chose to distinguish authority as a specific form of power marked by perceived legitimacy and acceptance of those subjugated; in other words, this type of power is consensual. Power and authority are two very closely related ideas, and the lines between them can be quite blurred in practice: it can be difficult to distinguish between legitimate and coercive power. Rather than question what power within a strip club is deemed legitimate, researchers have had a tendency to focus their inquiries on exploitative power, which is exercised in a context of inequality and unfairness, (Boles and Garbin; Barton; Deshotels and Forsyth).

This presents a challenge, as drawing a line between voluntary and involuntary subjugation is not an exact science. In failing to state that they are examining only coercive power, researchers open themselves to several gaps in knowledge and understanding. For instance, we often see that they are specifically investigating experiences of exploitation; however, by failing to define exploitation and relate it to the differences in volition between power and authority, researchers are able to identify exercises of seemingly coercive power in interactions but can't develop complex theories of authority that take into account the possibility that acts of domination may be perceived as legitimate by those dominated in the interaction. These nuances of power are obscured by the prevalence of questions about exploitation and empowerment and the lack of definitions for those terms.

These questions were undoubtedly fueled by the 1980s feminist “Sex Wars” debates concerning the social and political implications of women’s sexuality (Barton 585-7). Barton (585) discusses the two diametrically opposed views: the radical, anti-porn feminists contend that all sex, within the contexts of our oppressively patriarchal political and social institutions, is

an act of domination, and therefore further oppresses women; on the other hand, the opposing sex radical feminists refute this notion, arguing that expressions of female sexuality are subversive of the patriarchy and therefore liberating. With feminist theories underscoring much research on exotic dance (Wahab 62), it's no surprise that these works are often laced with polarized conceptions of sex work, and stripping accordingly, as either the pinnacle of subversion, liberation, and empowerment or the emphatic demonstration of domination, subjugation, and oppression. These opposing views were influential, guiding researchers to some of the same questions for decades.

In 1974 some of the earliest research on exotic dance addressed the question of gendered power and exploitation. Boles and Garbin (118) coined the term “counterfeiting of intimacy” to describe the inauthenticity they perceived in interactions between female exotic dancers and their male customers. They concluded that exploitation was mutual, occurring on part of both the dancers and the patrons (Boles and Garbin 118). Their concept of counterfeit intimacy was foundational, as in indicating that both dancers and customers were exploiters, the toppled views that only one person holds power in a strip club. One might think this would end the Sex Wars, but neither side backed down.

The debate persisted nearly 3 decades later when Barton (585) conducted her research to “[challenge] the sex wars paradigm” that continued to polarize research at the time. She discusses both the aforementioned views on sexuality, concluding that they could both be right (Barton 586). Her results, indeed, find that dancers experience both exploitation and empowerment; but her research is crucial to our understanding of exotic dance because she identifies temporal trends in dancers’ experiences of power (Barton 587). Early on in their career, many find their work liberating, but over the course of their career, this empowered

feeling declines. This is partially because dancers frequently have to cope with disrespect (Barton 591). This coping is one aspect of their emotional labor.

Mirabelli (526) discusses how the emotional labor of service workers --waiters in his study-- is often discounted and their occupations, stigmatized as low skilled work. In revealing the knowledge and communication skills that the waiters needed to possess and utilize in order to be successful, he explains the concept of multiliteracy, the ability to make meaning and communicate in varied contextual situations and modalities (Mirabelli 528) Multiliteracies must be enacted for service workers to read people, the way exotic dancers do nearly constantly during a shift. In addition to coping with disrespect, reading people and enacting multiliteracies to communicate with them is an aspect of dancers' emotional labor.

Deshotels and Forsyth (224) coined the term strategic flirting to conceptualize the emotional labor of exotic dancers. Their understanding was groundbreaking because it not only precisely described the sense of coercing the dancers in their study identified, but they also relate it to the very similar concept of strategic friendliness practices by male lawyers (Deshotels and Forsyth 224). While many argue that dancers' conforming to what men want is oppression, no one has the same opinion of men when they do the same; in fact, many argue the opposite: these men are exercising power in their strategically planned niceness (Forsyth and Deshotels 226-7) They posit that because of the traditionally subjugated role of women, womens' emotional labor often places them in a subjugated position (Forsyth and Deshotels 226). Thus, emotional labor has unequal consequences for men and women.

Lewis (297) also discusses gendered forms of power in the strip club context, but instead of analyzing interactions between dancers and patrons, she looks at interactions among dancers and their fellow strip club employees. She confirms that, on the surface level, authority seems

divided along gendered lines (Lewis 301); but when she explores the environment more in-depth, she uncovers many different forms of power operating simultaneously and cooperatively including the obvious managerial authority, but also the more discrete economic and autonomous forms of power (Lewis 301-2). The different employees of the club --managers, bartenders, DJs, bouncers, waitresses, etc-- all typically possess different levels and types of power. But this is a dynamic power matrix, and in a constant striving to elevate themselves, employees of the club exchange favors with each other to gain more autonomy (302-3).

For example, through tipping out the DJ, a dancer can encourage him to pump up the crowd during her set, thus increasing her tips; additionally, a DJ may do more to support the stage set of a dancer who typically tips him well (Lewis 304-5). Such interactions amongst strip club employees regulate power within the club by creating an “informal economy of favors,” (Lewis 310). The concept of an informal economy of favors is one that is crucial to studying exotic dance communities because it reveals the complex exchanges of power that occur almost universally in strip clubs between the employees.

Writing studies provides a new perspective with which to examine exotic dance. Lewis (2006) gave us an excellent understanding of power as multifaceted, and one of those facets is authority deemed legitimate. In understanding workplace authority, Wardle (643) discusses some challenges a graduate faces with belonging to his new job and maintaining a position of authority. In this context, authority was initially bestowed upon individuals by the institution, but that authority needed to be maintained by identifying with and following the established conventions of the institution (Wardle 645). Authority, then, is an achievement that is stripped away from those who do not belong.

The stripping literature focuses on power rather than authority, and accordingly, issues of how new members come to belong in the workplace have largely been ignored; while Boles and Garbin studied interactions, they gave no attention to which strategies of interaction are deemed legitimate; while Barton looked at temporal dimensions of empowerment, she did not explore how authority in the community was legitimately achieved; while Deshotels and Forsyth explored dancers perceptions, they did not examine where the line of legitimacy was drawn; and while Lewis detailed the dynamics of power relations and forms of power, she did not sufficiently relate this to belonging within the community. With a concern for authority in addition to power, we can examine the role of choice in experiences of exploitation and empowerment, as well as the role of identity and belonging in constructing authority in this community.

The Discourse of an Exotic Dance Community: Methods of Study

My site was selected for ease of access, as I began working there approximately one year prior to conducting research. Participants were selected via convenience sampling, a common method for research on such stigmatized communities. I asked all dancers and other club employees with whom I had built rapport and with whom I came into contact during my data collection process to participate in the study; no one was intentionally excluded from the selection process. Participants were chosen based solely on their permission and availability, and thus the formal participants who I conducted interviews with include the nine workers who were willing and had time to participate.

While my observations are of various members of the staff, all nine formally interviewed participants were dancers. Dancers are in a unique position to provide insights into this discourse community because they are the most prominent and numerous types of employees and the main attraction of the club. It is important to note that while dancers are workers who profit from the club, they are not salaried or hourly employees like the rest of the staff but are instead independent contractors who pay a fee to participate in this community every night. Their perspective as earners in a workplace that does not pay them gives them an unparalleled understanding of the way the club operates. They ranged in age from 23-44. The number of clubs they had danced in ranged from one to over thirty.

Initial data was collected prior to this assignment for another product, and that data was supplemented by additional inquiries following my acquaintance with discourse community literature. I conducted eighteen tape-recorded interviews with nine dancers over the course of a 10-week research period sponsored by the Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship (SURF). My aim was to conduct two formal interviews followed by an informal conversation to discuss

preliminary conclusions after my initial analysis, but I was unable to complete this process with all participants who began the study. The interviews and conversations took place largely over the phone, with a few being conducted over FaceTime or at the club during downtime. As conducting and recording these interviews and conversations was contingent on dancers' ongoing availability and permission and on the conditions of the environment where the interviews took place, I was not able to record all of them.

Since my SURF project concerned the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on exotic dancers, my interview questions were written with that direction in mind. Based on an adaptation of Bevan's phenomenological interviewing method (Bevan 136), my first interview was primarily to gain contextualizing background knowledge on each dancer and their experience dancing. I asked questions such as how long they had been dancing, what prompted their entrance into the occupation, what they specifically liked about the club. This round of interviews took an average of 15-30 minutes. The second interview was intended to gain understanding of their specific experience in relation to the pandemic and took an average of 20-45 minutes. The final conversation was a loose discussion in which participants were given the opportunity to read my SURF paper and provide feedback; the only questions asked were "what do you think?" and "what would you add?"

During the 10-week SURF period, I also conducted discovery-based observations. I had little theoretical guidance for this outside of the ethnographic principle of discovery which prioritizes inductive methods (Eriksson and Kovalainen 153). Rather than attempting to look for something in specific, I watched and observed the occurrences in the club and noted the things that seemed prominent to me, representative of dancers' statements, or relevant to the academic works I've read. I noted factors such as the number of dancers working and customers

patronizing the club, the new rules enacted, and specific interactions -- both between myself and other participants and amongst other participants-- that seemed meaningful.

After reading literature on discourse communities, I developed a research question to aid in the analysis of my previously collected data and the collection and analysis of further observations: how is authority constructed and enacted at Pony? Following the development of this research question, I conducted further observations, looking more closely at gendered power and issues of authority within the club and at the function of texts in the community. My genre analysis of the community's texts was mostly limited to discovery-based observations of texts thus far. Rather than a structured inquiry into form and function, I simply looked at the texts for prominent features that stood out to me. More in-depth analysis occurred as I gathered more textual evidence.

I analyzed my interviews and observations, along with the initial texts I found inductively rather than attempting to enforce particular theories upon them. I transcribed my recorded interviews and thematized them along with the observations by noting prominent and repetitive words, actions, and implications. I selected and organized these themes based on their relevance to the question of how authority is constructed and enacted within the community.

Results and Discussion: Constructing and Regulating Authority

The question of who possesses power in a strip club has been prevalent in exotic dance research; however, the questions of what it means to have power and how authority is constructed and maintained have not been explored in this context. Using participant observation and semi-structured interviews, I found the following: that management derives its authority to operate a strip club from an authority external to the club; that power in a strip club can be viewed in terms of choice and autonomy; that dancers can leverage their economic power toward the managerial authorities in order to gain autonomy; and that when an individual's autonomous power goes further than managerial authorities would like, both economic and autonomous power can be withdrawn in the form of being fired.

At the top of the power hierarchy within a strip club are the owners and management with the ability to regulate the operation of the club and to hire and fire dancers. At Pony, managers often communicate with dancers and other employees through the management-run Facebook page. The Facebook page for Pony contains a multitude of updates about business operations, advertisements for drink specials, and memes with scantily clad women. Two posts in particular are relevant. On March 17th, 2020, a picture was posted with the words: "Will be open tonight and every night until they shut us down..." and the following day, March 18th, there was a post stating "Will reopen in one week." This announcement was abrupt and surprising to both customers and dancers; based on the previous day's post, it appears management was not given forewarning either.

The updates on the closure status of the club during the COVID-19 pandemic and quarantine on the Pony Facebook page stand out as an instance of management having the authority to control a situation. These posts illustrate that the meso-organizational level

--consisting of the club, its owners, and its management-- doesn't possess infinite power to make decisions, even those directly regarding the operation of the club. The club's power to operate is instead granted by the authority of larger, macro-level institutions and policies. "Until *they* shut us down," references such a higher authority at the state level.

Boles and Garbin (112) discussed a hierarchy within strip clubs stating that "At the top of the status hierarchy is the owner and/ or manager who has the overall responsibility of directing the club's affairs; the hiring and firing of personnel and establishing the club's entertainment policy are among the functions performed." Though Boles and Garbin described the actual abilities possessed by owners and managers within strip clubs, they fail to indicate that external forces granted the operators of the club with these managerial powers. My finding was therefore valuable, as it indicated a connection between power within the club and macro-level authority. Staying open was ultimately not the choice of the club, but the choice of larger forces, such as statewide and national policies, that have been deemed more legitimate.

It is clear that outside forces grant managers and owners the authority to run a strip club, but it is less clear where authority stems from within the club. I didn't ask all of my participants direct questions about their feelings on power and authority in the exotic dance industry, but in one interview, a dancer that I'll name by the pseudonym Cassius brought up the topic of manipulation. She indicated that she intended to manipulate her way into owning a business. I told her that her statement was interesting, because it's a prevalent question in exotic dance literature whether dancers are the exploited or the exploiters. She explained:

"I think it's all up to you... It's your perspective and it's what you allow. Ya know, you can either use or be used. What's it gonna be? I know what it's gonna be for me. I can't make that decision for everyone... Maybe in the past I've let it be the opposite way around... But not anymore. It's very empowering."

Cassius first hints at the role of perception with her comment on “perspective.” She alludes to personal boundaries with the phrase “it’s what you allow,” putting the responsibility for maintaining those boundaries solely on the shoulders of individual dancers. She then refers to the experiences of using and being used as personal decisions that she can’t make for someone else. Lastly, Cassius indicates that her personal journey has taken her from one side of the dichotomy to the other, describing her ultimate decision to use rather than be used as “empowering.”

Cassius’s comments on exploitation used words and phrases, “it’s what you allow,” “use or be used,” and “decision;” these all indicated what she viewed as the determinant in experiences of exploitation: choice. This is reminiscent of Lewis (302) who identified a form of power that is “tied to the degree of autonomy that workers have in the workplace.” Only here, Cassius described empowerment stemming from choice rather than autonomy, the decision to act rather than the freedom to act in self-government. The two are intricately linked, however, as one must choose in order to act autonomously, and only in the context of autonomy can one fully exercise choice. Unfortunately, this means the inverse is true: in the absence of autonomy, it is impossible to fully exercise choice; one must have the freedom to self-govern to choose to be empowered in the way Cassius indicated. For her statement to hold true, for empowerment in exotic dancing to be contingent on choice, it should be demonstrated that dancers possess sufficient autonomy to make choices.

Dancers’ ability to make choices at Pony can be seen in their decision not to wear face masks, even when this became mandated city-wide. When discussing the mask ordinance with an interviewee by the pseudonym Charm, she shed light on part of the negotiation process behind the club’s decision not to enforce the mandate:

“My point to [the owner] was: ‘how... are we supposed to make you money on your alcohol if we have to wear [masks] all night’ ... He said he’d leave it up to the girls’ discretion... you got so many girls that’s been there for so long and have made that club so much money. And when you got your main ones looking at him saying ‘this is fucked up. You need to do something about it...’”

She states that she made a case to the owner to stop enforcing the mask ordinance based on the potential reduced profits from alcohol sales. Charm explained that management initially tried enforcing the ordinance. According to her, it changed when she and some of the other more tenured and higher-earning dancers, the club’s “main ones,” bombarded the owner with questions, demands, and excuses for not wearing the masks until he conceded and gave them a choice.

Charm described the negotiation between dancers and the owner regarding wearing masks as a very direct process of dancers complaining and the owner conceding. She specifically mentions the involvement of the club’s “main ones,” the dancers who have “been there for so long and made that club so much money;” in doing so, she references two distinct, but not mutually exclusive categories of dancers: veteran dancers and high-earning dancers. The former category is a level of membership in the community representing a higher degree of expertise (Swales 473). The latter group, that of the dancers who are most profitable to the club, have a different type of privilege; they possess economic power (Lewis 301).

As Lewis (301) explained, “Gender and managerial power, however, are not the only forms of power relevant to the social organization of the strip club. Economic power also plays a role. It is determined by opportunities to earn money and, ultimately, by money earned.” My findings confirmed this. If gendered managerial power -- encompassing the capabilities granted to mostly male support staff-- were the only force operating, the dancers would’ve likely followed the rules set by management. Instead we saw that high earners were able to convince

the owner to leave following the mask ordinance up to “the girls’ discretion.” They were able to leverage their economic power with arguments about their ability to sell alcohol while wearing the masks.

Dancers’ success in making Pony a near-entirely mask-free zone depended partially on their perception that they possessed sufficient authority --in the form of their earning potential-- to make demands; this brings to mind Cassius’s claim about exploitation, “it’s your perspective.” Moreover, their success was ultimately determined by their decisions to challenge the mandate and the owner rather than obeying a rule that they found restricting. This illustrates the role of personal choice in dancers’ empowerment that Cassius described previously with her notable “use or be used” comments. It also shows that by leveraging their economic power at those who possess the most managerial power, dancers can gain more autonomy (Lewis 302). This is because the earnings of the club and its owner are contingent on dancers’ autonomy which, in this case, was their freedom to drink and socialize in order to sell drinks.

Dancers’ freedom is limited, however, by the goals of the discourse community. When discussing how she typically made her money, Cassius recounted an incident when she almost lost her job:

“I almost got fired for doing too many 3 [lap dances] for \$100... If I’m not pushing champagne rooms enough, I’m not ‘for the club.’ [The manager] said ‘I’m supposed to fire anyone who’s not for the club. I’m not for the club... I’m for Cassius. I’m for me... I had to pay them the difference.’”

She was scolded by management for selling too many individual lap dances at the rate of 3 for \$100 --where the club gets \$10-- when she could have alternatively sold a higher-priced champagne room--where the club gets 50%. While the club expected her to sell the higher priced room where she would make less money, she chose the option that made her the most money. In doing that, she had to face the consequences of paying management the percentage that they

would have made if she had sold the champagne room instead. The manager describes the reason for her nearly losing her job as her not being “for the club.” This is a poignant description of the exchanges that take place within the club.

Cassius’s account of a time she was nearly fired for not being “for the club” illustrated limits to the autonomy that dancers possess by virtue of and in promotion of their economic power. Lewis (302) explained that “The degree of autonomous power a worker has is inversely related to the degree of commitment they feel to their workplace.” Cassius demonstrated her autonomy by “not pushing champagne rooms” as the club preferred her to do; accordingly, she displays her lack of commitment with the comments “I’m not for the club... I’m for me.” When she admits that she had to pay the difference, we see the limits to both her self-governance and her earnings: if they are not serving the club, they will be taken away.

As Wardle (642) explained, “Authority is bestowed by institutions, can be just as easily withdrawn by those same institutions or its members, and must be maintained through appropriate expressions of authority.” Accordingly, dancers’ ability to earn money, their economic authority, is granted by virtue of their working at an adult entertainment establishment that profits from the autonomous female body. In addition to leveraging their economic power to gain more discretion in their actions, dancers also use the autonomy they’re afforded -- the freedom to disrobe, to drink, to ignore a city-wide mask mandate-- to increase their earnings, as Cassius did when she chose to sell 3 for \$100 dances that would afford her more profit than selling a champagne room.

Holding on to economic authority, however, requires enacting the appropriate expressions or conventional practices. In this case, the convention mandated selling a VIP room instead of individual dances, so that the club would profit equally as well as the dancer. As

Lewis (301) explains “Dancers' economic power in the strip clubs is tied to their direct or indirect involvement with the way the club and most of its workers earn money;” being “for the club” can be viewed as the conventional level of involvement. The club profits minimally from 3 for \$100 dances and maximally from VIP rooms, so it would stand to reason that dancers gain more authority when they sell VIP rooms than when selling individual dances. When a dancer’s earnings aren’t shared with the club or redistributed to other employees through tip out, she is not displaying “appropriate expressions of authority,” (Wardle 642). By not fully participating in the clubs’ conventions, dancers put themselves at risk of losing their job and thus all the authority associated with it.

According to these findings, the managerial authority to operate and regulate the strip club comes from larger forces outside of the club, and further research could investigate the impact of differential macro pressures on the development of managerial authority within strip clubs. Empowerment appears to be a complex interplay of perspective and choice within a club context that allows significant autonomy such as Pony; further research might explore the connection between instances of choice and levels of freedom possessed in the context of exotic dance clubs.

Dancers can leverage their earning potential in the form of economic power to gain more autonomy, but both economic power and autonomy have their limits in that they are only deemed legitimate when following the conventions of being “for the club.” I differentiate being “for the club” from Lewis’s (310) “informal economy of favors” --a system of reciprocal exchanges by self-interested employees-- because she states that the informal economy “operates outside of management control.” Further research is needed to determine whether or not being for the club, making sacrifices for job security, is entirely a separate concept from participating in the

reciprocal exchanges that constitute the informal economy of favors within the context of strip clubs.

Works Cited

- Barton, Bernadette. "Dancing on the Möbius Strip: Challenging the Sex Wars Paradigm." *Gender & Society*, vol. 16, no. 5, 2002, pp. 585–602., doi:10.1177/089124302236987.
- Bevan, Mark T. "A Method of Phenomenological Interviewing." *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2014, pp. 136–144.
- Boles, Jackie, and Albeno P. Garbin. "Strip Club and Stripper-Customer Patterns of Interaction ." *Sociology and Social Research*, vol. 58, no. 2, 1974, pp. 136–44.
- Deshotels, Tina, and Craig J. Forsyth. "Strategic Flirting and the Emotional Tab of Exotic Dancing." *Deviant Behavior*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp. 223–241., doi:10.1080/01639620500468600.
- Eriksson, Paivi, and Anne Kovalainen. "Ethnographic Research." *Qualitative Methods in Business Research*, by Päivi Eriksson and Anne Kovalainen, SAGE, 2008.
- Frank, Katherine. "Thinking Critically about Strip Club Research." *Sexualities*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2007, pp. 501–517.
- Lewis, Jacqueline. "'I'll Scratch Your Back If You'll Scratch Mine': The Role of Reciprocity, Power and Autonomy in the Strip Club." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne De Sociologie*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2006, pp. 297–311., doi:10.1111/j.1755-618x.2006.tb02226.x.
- Mirabelli, Tony. "The Language and Literacy of Food Service Workers." *What They Don't Learn in School*, edited by Jabari Mahiri, Peter Lang, 2004, pp. 143–62.
- "Power." Open Education Sociology Dictionary. Ed. Kenton Bell. 2013. Web. 27 Oct. 2020. <<https://sociologydictionary.org/power/>>.
- Swales, John. "The Concept of Discourse Community." *Genre Analysis: English in Academic*

and Research Settings. Boston: Cambridge UP, 1990.21-32.

Wahab, Stéphanie, et al. "Exotic Dance Research: A Review of the Literature from 1970 to 2008." *Sexuality & Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2010, pp. 56–79.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "Identity, Authority, and Learning to Write in New Workplaces." *Enculturation*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2004.

Wardle, Elizabeth, and Downs . *Writing about Writing*. Bedford Books St. Martin's, 2020.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Translated by Guenther Roth, University of California Press, 1922.