In Da Club: An Econometric Analysis of Strip Club Patrons

Taggert J. Brooks[†]

Yo, a lot of y'all sitting with y'all girls
fronting like the Budweiser commercial
Talking about, "III, IIII, I don't be going to the strip joints
You're lying man! You'd be surprised who you see up in there man.
-Stripper's Anthem by Wyclef Jean

[†] Associate Professor Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse. 1725 State Street, 403 O Wimberly Hall La Crosse, WI 54601phone: (608) 785-5295. email: brooks.tagg@uwlax.edu

VERY ROUGH DRAFT: Do not cite or redistribute without permission from author.

In Da Club: An Econometric Analysis of Strip Club Patrons

Taggert J. Brooks
Associate Professor
Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin – La Crosse
403 O Wimberly Hall
La Crosse, WI
(608) 785-5295
brooks.tagg@uwlax.edu

ABSTRACT:

Recent experimental research finds men alter their rate of time preference and even their willingness to accept unfair offers in the ultimatum game, after viewing mere pictures of attractive or "sexy" women (Wilson and Daly, 2004; Van Den Bergh and Dewitte, 2006). In this paper I try to identify the demographic characteristics of individuals who expose themselves to similar treatments while engaged in economic interaction in the real-world. I do this by focusing on individuals who attend clubs that feature nude or semi-nude dancers.

Conservative estimates from the National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS) suggest 17 million Americans went to a club that featured nude or semi-nude dancers in 1991. In this paper I estimate a demographic logit model using the NHSLS which is the first and only national probability based sample which asks people if they have attended a strip club and the frequency of attendance. Using the model I also investigate a popular theory which explains the rapid increase in the number of clubs as a response to the AIDS/HIV crisis. I find those who reported changing their behavior in response to AIDS/HIV were much more likely to go to a strip club than those who did not report changing their behavior. The results are also consistent with the more likely thesis that patrons are high sensation seekers (Zuckerman, 1994).

JEL: (I19; J4; J10)

The full paper is available here: http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty/brooks/prof/research.htm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Thanks to Kristen Monaco, Sumit Agarwal, Kate Frank, Angelina Spencer, Scott Drewianka and seminar participants at Macalster, California State – Long Beach, and the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse. Any remaining errors are obviously mine alone.

I. Introduction

There is mounting experimental evidence which finds male decision making is altered after being exposed to attractive women (Wilson and Daly, 2004), or even pictures of sexy, scantily clad women (Van Den Bergh and Dewitte, 2006). Males also see an increase in their testosterone after conversations with women (Roney, Mahler, and Maestripieri, 2003), and testosterone has been implicated in changing responses in the ultimatum game and an individual's discounting parameter (Burnham 2007; Van Den Bergh and Dewitte 2006). Finally a recent article by Miller et. al. (2007) finds that female exotic dancers see an increase in their tips during the fertile phase of their ovulatory cycle. The authors argue this is an evolutionary response from males increasing their tips to appear to the dancers to be better potential mates.

That women have an effect on men is not earth shattering news, after all "sex sells". That even mere pictures of women can alter men's sense of fairness and rate of time preference in economic experiments is slightly less obvious and provides us an understanding of a possible mechanism through which "sex sells". However there are potential shortcomings with the experimental research. As Levitt and List (2007)[1] point out, the participants in lab experiments are often self-selected college students interested in pleasing the researchers, whereas market participants are self selected for the characteristics which benefit them in the marketplace.

This current work is meant only to begin the path towards identifying these effects in the real-world by identifying the demographic determinants of heterosexual males who intentionally expose themselves to environments which may severely alter

[1] See Wiederman (1999) for a description of the problems of volunteer bias in sex related research.

their decision making process. Specifically I will look at heterosexual males who have attended clubs that feature nude or semi-nude dancers (popularly know as strip clubs).

II. A Brief Introduction to Strip Clubs

According to a 1997 article in *U.S. News and World Report* by Eric Schlosser, "American's now spend more money at strip clubs than at Broadway, off-Broadway, regional, and nonprofit theaters; at the opera, the ballet and jazz and classical performances-combined." A more recent report by the Free Speech Coalition (2005), and recent testimony in front of the Ohio state legislature by an industry advocate, Angelina Spencer, put the total revenues earned by strip clubs at 15 billion dollars a year (Smyth, 2005; Thompson, et. al., 2003). Club revenues generally stem from admission fees, selling food and beverages, and stage fees collected from the dancers. Dancers in turn earn their wages through tips, often collected after dancing on stage or for performing lap or table dances.

Estimates from the National Health and Social Life Survey (1992) suggest 17 million Americans went to a club that featured nude or semi-nude dancers in 1991. Conservatively their attendance represents nearly 67 million visits, 10 million more than the attendance at major league baseball games that year[2]. Beginning in 1987 the rate of new clubs increased dramatically with the number of strip clubs doubling by 1992 (Schlosser 1997, Hanna, 2005). Much of this growth occurred through the process of "upscaling" as the newly opened clubs tended to be of much higher quality than existing clubs (Frank, 2002, p.50). Hanna (2005) puts the current total number of clubs in the US

[2] Author's calculations from the NHSLS (1992). This estimate is conservative owing to the difficulty of identifying the frequency of attendance for some patron. See appendix C for the discussion of the construction of the redcnt1 variable. The point estimate is 67,118,632 and the 95% confidence interval is +/- 28,718,592 Attendance at major league baseball games in 1991 was approximately 57 million.

near 3,000, though there is no official source for a complete listing of all clubs currently operating[3]. There are magazine directories and web sites which list clubs, but they are likely to substantially underestimate the actual number[4]. Spencer (2005) cites the Association of Club Executives, a trade organization which claims there are 3,829 clubs in operation nationwide.

An example of the costly financial mistakes that can occur in these settings can be found in the *New York Times*:

> This time it's an executive from Missouri named Robert McCormick, who, treating himself and friends, ran up a $241,000 bill at Scores on his corporate American Express card two years ago. American Express is now suing him for refusing to pay up. Several other unhappy customers have also sued Scores over large bills. (Eaves, 2005)[5]

Scores has generally won these battles as they often require finger prints from their big spending customers as additional proof of the often impulsive purchases.

The use of strip clubs as venues to entertain business clients has even been the focus of a recent fictional Harvard Business Review case study (Mobley and Humphreys, 2006). Several Wall Street firms have lost sexual discrimination suits for the pervasive practice of entertaining clients at strip clubs and The New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) and the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD) have both taken steps to

[3] "According to Rob Abner, a former analyst at E.F.Hutton who now publishes Stripper magazine, a trade journal, the number of major strip clubs in the United States doubled between 1987 and 1992. Today [1997] there are about 2,500 of these clubs nationwide, with revenues ranging from $500,000 to more than $5 million at well-run 'gentlemen's club.'" (Schlosser 1997)

[4] Exotic Dancer's Adult Nightclub Guide (2005) lists 1,912 female strip clubs and stripperweb.com currently lists 2,647 clubs.

[5] Another example includes "…the case against Craig Everett and 18-year-old buddy Malik Wakji - who combined piled up a mind-boggling bill of $2,460 in lap dances at the Fantasy World nightclub in one very long evening and then couldn't pay - has been dismissed by Albuquerque prosecutors." (Tosches 2005)

eliminate the practice through a series of proposed rule changes (O'Donnell, 2006)[6]. Despite the rapid increase in the number of establishments, the purported large size of the industry, and the increased regulatory interest in the business I am not aware of any academic research by economists on the topic of strip clubs (see Hanna, 2005; Thompson, et. al., 2003; Price 2000). At best there are fleeting tangential references, such as those found in Richard Posner's 1992 book, *Sex and Reason*.

Previous research, entirely outside of the economics discipline focuses almost exclusively on the dancers, be it their motives, their career pathway, how they mitigate the stigma of a deviant occupation or their methods for interacting with customers. Relatively few studies have tried to identify the characteristics of strip club patrons (notable exceptions are Frank, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005; Erickson & Tewksbury, 2000; Brewster, 2003). Of the few studies which have focused on patrons, all are plagued by small convenience samples with an inherent inability to draw distinctions between patrons and non-patrons. In this paper I identify the (relatively few) unique demographic characteristics of a typical strip club customer. I also present preliminary evidence on a popular explanation for the rapid increase in the number of strip clubs.

The theory I explore suggests that the rise in strip clubs was caused in part by the AIDS/HIV crisis (Frank, 2002; Hanna, 2005) as it was concurrent with the rapid increase in the number of AIDS/HIV cases (see table 1 in appendix B). Therefore the rise in the number of clubs was the supply response to a change in male behavior as more men, fearing the risk of sexual activities, substituted the safer - "near sex" - intimacy offered in

[6] "The NASD and the New York Stock Exchange both recently proposed rules that would force firms to adopt business entertainment policies that cap amounts and specify appropriate venues. The move is expected to rule out company-paid or work-related strip club jaunts at the more than 5,000 brokerage firms in the USA." (O'Donnell, 2006)

a strip club. I find that those who reported changing their behavior in response to AIDS/HIV were much more likely to go to a strip club than those who did not report changing their behavior. However, I am not able to sufficiently address the obvious endogeniety problem that may exist. It is likely that people who go to strip clubs were simply more likely to report changing their sexual behavior in response to AIDS. It appears those that go to strip clubs simply exhibit many of the classic characteristics of high sensation seekers which include being riskier, more impulsive, engaging in a greater variety of sexual behaviors, and they have been found to have higher levels of testosterone (Zuckerman, 1994)[7]. Further suggesting the lack of causality I use other measures of AIDS/HIV awareness which Francis (2006) found to alter sexual behavior on the heterosexual/homosexual margin, but they fail to explain attendance at a club.

III. Strip Club Literature Review

The history of exotic dancing, alternatively known as stripping, striptease, erotic dancing, lap dancing, table dancing, or even burlesque is one with a wide variation in the degrees of art, entertainment and nudity. Burlesque is usually the term reserved for the practice of entertaining while scantily clad, but often not exposing oneself, or if so only for a brief moment. In fact there is currently a revival of the burlesque show, with shows opening in Las Vegas and New York (Shteir, 2004; Hanna, 2005). There has also been more popular interest in the art of stripping. There are now "work out" video tapes that teach the dance techniques that are often used by exotic dancers. For an excellent history of striptease as an art form see Shteir (2004). For the purposes of the current work, I am

[7] The current preferred test for sensation seeking is a 40 question forced choice test developed by Zuckerman (1994, p.389) and title the Sensation Seeking Scale form V. It includes choices such as – I dislike "swingers" or I enjoy the company of real "swingers". I would like to learn to fly I plan or I would not like to learn to fly a plane, etc.

more immediately interested in the visual consumption of the nude or semi-nude form, than the artistic manner in which they get there, which is of less interest for no other reason then the limitations of the data.

There has been a fair amount of research on exotic dancers and strip clubs produced in the other social sciences, mostly in sociology, anthropology or cultural studies. Previous work falls into two basic categories. Most of the research either focuses on the dancer and their pathway to stripping or the effects of operating in a deviant occupation. Much less common are studies which concern the patrons, their characteristics, motivations or their tipping style. The research often involves some ethnography through participant-observation which is sometimes covert and sometimes not. At other times data is gathered through small convenience samples of interviews with dancers or customers.

Some of the first detailed studies of the industry focused on how the dancers came to the occupation, often citing the importance of economic need, early physical maturity, and opportunity (see Skipper and McCaghy, 1970; Boles and Garbin, 1974a). However, the industry has changed substantially over the intervening three decades (Frank, 1998; Shteir, 2004). More recent examples of research on the pathways into the occupation of stripping can be found in Forsyth and Deshotels (1998), Sweet and Tewksbury (2000a, 2000b), and Mestemacher and Roberti (2004). Although financial gain is still cited by dancers as the main reason for entering stripping, Sweet and Tewksbury (2000a) argued contrary to Forsyth and Deshotels (1998) that it was no longer out of a crisis of need as it had often been in the past.

Turning to how the dancers manage the stigma of a deviant occupation we have notable works such as Thompson and Harred (1992), Thompson et. al. (2003), and Bernard, et. al. (2003). Still others look at the dancer's methods of interaction with the customers (Boles and Garbin, 1974b; Enck and Preston, 1988; Ronai and Ellis, 1989). A few researchers focus on the creation of fantasy and issues of power and control in the clubs (Frank, 1998; Egan, 2003; Price, 2000; Forsyth and Deshotels, 1997; Wood, 2000). Finally there is a study which looks at the habits of drug use among lap dancers (Frenken and Sifaneck, 1998). What the research lacks in quantitative rigor it makes up for in qualitative breadth covering all areas of the dancer's work and life including the adaptation of the dancer's sexual preferences in response to dancing (McCaghy and Skipper, 1974).

Turning to the research which focuses more specifically on the customers and their motivations we have Frank (1998, 2002, 2003, 2005), Erickson and Tewksbury (2000) and Brewster (2003), all of which focus on male customers of female strip clubs[8]. Frank (2002) highlights the motivations of "regulars" at upscale gentlemen's clubs in the South Eastern United States. She emphasizes their lack of desire to pursue sexual release but instead notes their desire to "just relax". Erickson and Tewksbury (2000) identify six different types of customers from the Lonely, Socially Impotent, Bold Lookers, to the Detached Lookers, the Players and the Sugar Daddies. Brewster (2003) identifies the tipping behavior of the different customer types detailed by Erickson and Tewksbury (2000).

[8] For a look at the female patrons of male strip clubs see Montemurro, et al (2003).

The literature displays a constant tension between those that view the pursuit of sex as the main motivation for customers and those that view the main motivation as the pursuit of intimacy[9]. Although early work on striping suggested prostitution was part of the job (Boles and Garbin, 1974a), more recent work suggests it is not (Frank, 2002). There is scant empirical evidence to suggest that sexual intercourse is happening with regularity at modern clubs. A fact Chris Rock so eloquently put in his 1999 song titled "*No Sex*".[10] One needs to be cautious in over generalizing, or even drawing evidence from song lyrics, because most of the previous research was conducted on a very heterogeneous set of clubs. Some occurred at "lower class" clubs (see Forsyth and Deshotels, 1997) or what are often called "dives" (Hanna, 2005), while others occurred in more "upscale" gentlemen's clubs (Frank 2002).

There are the occasional references to sexual acts being performed in the clubs, such as in Thompson et. al. (2003) where they say: "In contrast to a decade ago, three of these clubs featured private rooms for 'VIP' customers where we were told that masturbation, oral sex, and sexual intercourse took place." This is unlikely to occur in large numbers as is noted in other research since the owners have a large incentive to prevent their establishments from being closed. They often use surveillance techniques to regulate the dancers activities(Egan, 2004). The clubs also employee bouncers whose main function is to monitor compliance with the club rules, which often include "no contact" (DeMichele and Tewksbury, 2004). Many of the researchers who suggest that

[9] Here I use the term intimacy, not as a euphemism for sex, but rather to note everything else about a sexual relationship, except sexual intercourse or sexual release. This can include physical contact of a sexual natural, such as heavy petting but is not intended to provide the customer sexual release.

[10] "No matter what a stripper tells you, there's no sex in the champagne room. None. Oh there's champagne in the champagne room, but you don't want champagne, you want sex, and there's no sex in the champagne room."

sexual release is happening are also quick to note that the dancer is involved in a constant negotiation of boundaries and they are very adept at managing the interaction with the customer to maintain the illusion of the possibility of sexual release (Ronai and Ellis 1989; Wood, 2000; Price, 2000; Frank, 1998; Egan, 2003). I think it is safe to say the primary experience being consumed in the clubs is not sexual release, but rather sexual intimacy.

The difficulty is drawing inferences about the larger population from the often small, non-probability based, samples collected by participant-observers. The researchers find their participation takes the form of either being a dancer, as was the case for one of the authors in Frank (1998, 2002) Egan (2003), and Ronai and Ellis (1998) or the author was a customer sometimes even a female customer as was the case in Mestemacher and Roberti (2004). While all of these works are clear to point out the potential shortcomings with their work few of them have good measures of the customer's motivations. And of course most of the participant observers would be unable to differentiate the characteristics of club patrons from the non-patron public since they would not have a representative sample of the latter. In this paper I overcome the problems of previous research with a nationally representative sample from which I can make empirical comparisons between patrons and non-patrons.

IV. Empirical Analysis

1. Data and Descriptive Statistics

The data come from the first national probability based survey of people's health and sex life. The National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS) combined surveys and self administered questionnaires which covered the universe of the non-

institutionalized United States population aged 18-59 able to complete an interview in English. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) developed a multistage area probability sample designed to give each household an equal probability of inclusion. The samples were comprised of a cross-sectional sample (3,159 cases), and an oversample (273 cases) intended to increase the number of Blacks and Hispanics in the study. The overall response rate was 78.6 percent of the 4,369 eligible respondents (Laumann et. al. 1994)[11].

The primary variable of interest comes from the section of the questionnaire reproduced in appendix A. The variable, REDDUM1, takes the value one if the respondent has been to a club that featured nude or semi-nude dancers in the past 12 months and zero otherwise. The questionnaire also captures the frequency of attendance. Unfortunately the frequency question can be ambiguous since it could be referring to the other activities they are questioned about in this section. For the current paper I focus merely on the decision to attend[12].

The descriptive statistics can be found in tables 2-9 contained in appendix B. Not surprisingly table 1 demonstrates there are significant differences between the genders in their attendance at strip clubs with 20.68% of males and 4.22% of females reporting that they have been to a club in the last 12 months. And while the popular image may be of old married men attending the strip clubs, the data show a significantly younger average age for patrons and a much smaller percentage of them are married or are cohabitating.

[11] All analysis in this paper used the probability weights developed unless otherwise noted. The weights allow one to combine the cross section observations along with the over sampled observations, while also adjusting for household size and non-response. This weight is scaled to sum to the total combined sample size of 3,432. Use of the survey weights is extremely important. Since the survey was a household survey, failure to utilize the survey weights will over represent responses from single person households and they are highly correlated with some of the variables under consideration.

[12] See Appendix C for a discussion of the frequency variable REDCNT1.

In order to get a sense of the popularity of going to a strip club and the gender differences in such activities Table 2 compares attendance at a strip club to other leisure activities from the General Social Survey (GSS). The GSS is also conducted by NORC and has a similar target population. The difficulty we face when comparing leisure activities from the GSS stems from the fact that the GSS questions often contain multiple activities. For example the variable AUTORACE captures the response to the question "in the last 12 months have you gone to an auto, stock car, or motorcycle race?" From table 3 we can see that 22.87% of men report going to such a race, while just over 10% of women have gone. While the gender differences are an order of magnitude less than for strip club attendance, they are still significant. More importantly the percent of men who have attended such events appears very close to the percentage who has attended a strip club.

Table 3 presents data from the 1997 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA), which includes a more narrowly defined set of leisure activities. From the table we can see the gender difference is largest for attending a strip club compared to the other activities in the SPPA. Male attendance at strip clubs is similar to seeing a live musical (22.25%). It is worthwhile to point out that male attendance at a strip club certainly exceeds activities such as the percentage who see a live play or live drama, yet it falls well below attendance at a sporting event. It is hard to validate Shlosser's (1997) from these facts, though it could be that men who do go to strip clubs, go more often and spend more money then men who go to sports events.

The NHSLS dataset was not originally designed to answer specific questions about strip club patrons so I inevitably need to make some choices with the data. The

first choice I make is to concentrate on the male patrons who self identified as heterosexual or straight/normal, and exhibit a preference for women. I do this for practical reasons as well as methodological. With the data I can not tell if the female patrons (or homosexual males) went to a club which featured male or female dancers. Previous work (such as Egan and Frank, 2005) showed female patrons are still an anomaly in female strip clubs. Likewise the motivation for attendance at male strip clubs is entirely different than the motivation for attendance at a female strip club (Montemurro, Bloom and Madell, 2003; Bernard et. al., 2003). I therefore eliminate all women and any men who self identify as homosexual, bisexual, or who had sexual relations with a man in the previous 12 months. I use a dummy variable, named HETMAN, which takes the value of one for heterosexual males and zero otherwise. I am therefore assuming that the remaining heterosexual men who reported having gone to a strip club, have gone to a strip club that featured female dancers. This leaves us with a sample size of 1,433 men of which 315 went to a club in the last 12 months. From here forward all statistics and regressions are run on the subpopulation of heterosexual males (HETMAN equals one), unless otherwise noted.

Tables 5 through 9 in appendix B provide several cross tabulations between those who went to a club and those that did not for several variables of interest. Some generalizations can be drawn from the initial summary statistics. Strip club patrons appear to be less likely to be married, more educated, more likely to have had a sexually transmitted disease, and more likely to have changed their sexual behavior due to AIDS. They also find a greater variety of sexual fantasies appealing, and they report usually masturbating for reasons often not identified by those who didn't go to a club. Of course

some of these may be simple correlations driven by another variable. In the next section we build a multivariate probability model of strip club attendance.

2. The Empirical Models

2.1. Demographic Models

Estimating the demand for attendance, or participation in any activity should include some measures of the price of participation. As Borgonovi (2004) notes in her study of the demand for the performing arts found in the SPPA, the price of participation should include admission fees, transportation costs, and other measures of opportunity cost. Unfortunately good information on these variables is not available for the present study, but it is likely that several included variables will be correlated with some of these variables. For example, transportation costs may be reflected in the regional dummy variables if there is sufficient regional heterogeneity in the density of strip clubs relative to the patrons. Therefore caution should be used when interpreting the marginal effects of any of the included variables which may be correlated with omitted variables related to the price of participation.

Table 10 contains the results from the purely demographic specification of a logit model to predict strip club attendance. I find there are relatively few variables that help predict attendance with some notable exceptions. Noticeably absent are the variables for race, regional location, income, occupation, religious identification and the lower frequencies of church attendance. Age, marital status, and attending church once or more per week all negatively affect the likelihood of having been to a strip club in the last 12 months while education has a positive effect.

Interestingly strip club patrons tend to be more educated than one would first think. In fact education plays the largest role, with a college degree and an advanced degree increasing the predicted probability of attendance over the reference group by 0.174 and 0.229 respectively. This is consistent with previous research on other forms of participation in the arts, such as art museum attendance, classical music performances, operas, and live dramas (see Gray, 1998; Borgonovi, 2004; and Lewis and Seaman 2004)[13]. In work on the other forms of arts participation the authors argue the effect of education occurs through increased "consumptions skills" which leads to an appreciation of the more complex arts (Gray 1998). I doubt many would attribute the same reason to the patrons of strip clubs, but possibly education is capturing a lower susceptibility to social stigmatization from strip club attendance, or education is an indicator of higher sensation seeking in the patrons (Zuckerman 1994, p.115).

Marital status negatively affects the probability of having gone to a strip club. While that is not to say married men do not go to strip clubs since they still comprise nearly 39% of the heterosexual male patrons, but the probability of them going is 0.078 less than never married, divorced, or widowed individuals holding other included variables constant. Whether men are going to a strip club in pursuit of a sexual experience (Ronai & Ellis, 1989; Forsyth & Deshotels, 1997; Brewster, 2003; Erickson & Tewksbury, 2000), or to consume a purely intimate experience without sexual release (Frank, 1998, 2002, 2003; Enck & Preston, 1988) what is likely is that they are pursuing some form of relationship they do not have access to. Clearly married men are more likely then unmarried men to be able to consume intimacy, companionship and sexual

[13] This is also consistent with Fisher (1999). In a report prepared for a legal case involving the Florida strip club, Mons Venus, he found from surveys of patrons that they had significantly higher educational attainment than residents of the county within which Mons Venus was located.

release at home with their spouse, so they are less likely to go to a club. This argument is clearly incomplete since currently unmarried cohabiting men are not also less likely to go to a strip club. It may suggest the matching that occurs for married people on the relationship domain is not yet complete for cohabitating individuals.

Finally, one of the more striking results is that religion plays little role. Both the religious affiliation and most of the frequency of religious attendance variables are indistinguishable from zero, except for those who report going to church at least once a week, or more. Going to church that often reduces the probability of having attended a strip club by 0.13. Of course part of the cause may simply be the reduced leisure time available for other activities, including attending a strip club. Meanwhile the religious affiliation does not seem to play a role. Even those who identify with the more conservative Protestant religions (such as Protestant type II, see Laumann et. al.(1994) for a more complete description) appear no less likely to have attended a club than those who do not have a religious affiliation (the excluded dummy)[14].

2.2. The Impact of AIDS/HIV

The AIDS/HIV epidemic entered the American consciousness in the late 1980s which precipitated a dramatic change in the sexual landscape in the United States. By this time most other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) were no longer life threatening with the appropriate treatment, yet AIDS was a death sentence. Table 2 presents the annual number of new AIDS/HIV infections reported by the Centers for Disease Control. It is easy to see the explosion in the number of cases, increasing from 19,064 in 1986 to 78,705 by 1992. The timing of the explosion in the number of new AIDS cases is

[14] Protestant type II includes people identifying with denominations that are more likely to be politically conservative, more likely to be fundamentalists, or evangelicals. Examples include Baptists, Pentecostals, Church of Christ, and Assembly of God.

certainly concurrent with the rise in the number of strip clubs, so it is a plausible explanation from that standpoint (Hanna, 2005).

Economic theory suggests that the increased prevalence of a non-curable disease should raise the cost of sex in general, particularly risky sex, which should result in people having less sex or substituting less risky sexual behaviors (Posner, 1992; Francis, 2006). For example one would expect there to be an increase in masturbation, or an increase in less risky sex, possibly by wearing a condom when they may not have reviously. Also men could have been substituting the "near sex" experiences such as they might get from going to a strip club. Recall that much of the literature on the motivation of strip club patrons suggests that they were consuming a commodified version of intimacy (Bole & Garbin, 1974b; Enck & Preston, 1988; Frank, 1998). Even the previous research which suggests that the main motivation of the strip club patron was the pursuit of sex, identify that it was often forestalled by the dancers. Customers remained interested as long as the fantasy of sexual relations was maintained.

Even though the probability of heterosexual men contracting AIDS through vaginal insertive sex is low (see Francis 2006), it is common for people to overestimate or rather over react to the consequences of small probability events (Tversky and Kahneman, 1979). So it is plausible that men changed their behavior in response to AIDS. In fact table 6 reports 30.18% of all heterosexual males claim to have changed their sexual behavior in response to AIDS, while over 50% of heterosexual male strip club patrons claimed to have changed their behavior. However, most previous literature finds that heterosexuals did not alter their behavior in response to the increased risk of AIDS (see Francis, 2006 for a complete review). Many of the studies suffer from poor

methodology, poor data, or both. More recent work by Francis (2006) finds that on the margin people did respond with homosexual men substituting heterosexual sex and heterosexual women substituting with homosexual sex.

The question is whether this trend truly drove behavior in other areas besides the heterosexual/homosexual dimension. Was the consumption of intimacy in a strip club truly serving as a replacement for partnered sex, a much safer replacement, or was it serving as a complement to masturbation at some later point? If so the club would again serve to facilitate another form of safe sex. Frank (2002) points out:

> Significantly not one man I interviewed said he went to the clubs for specifically sexual release, even in the form of masturbation at a later time. This may be because the Laurelton sex industry is quite large and varied, and men who wanted sexual contact or release had many other venues to choose from in the area…Most men I spoke with however also realized that sexual activity was available in other venues of the industry and were explicit about their knowledge of this fact.

If the men were not going to the club to facilitate sexual release at that moment or even later outside the club, then what could their motives be? Given the increased costs of sex, men might have been looking to consume a safe experience, something very "near sex", such as the intimacy a strip club provides (Hanna, 2005).

There is some suggestion that men were using strip clubs as a commitment mechanism. It simultaneously kept them out of the paid sex markets and even kept them from the unpaid sex markets of singles bars. Frank (2002, p107) notes, most of her regulars acknowledged they knew where sex could be purchased, but they preferred strip

clubs as a mechanism to prevent them from cheating on a spouse or as a venue sexualized but safe from physical contact and the risk of AIDS (Frank, 2002, p.108). This is not inconsistent with the classical behavior of high sensations seekers, but suggests that they are cognizant of their own behaviors.

2.2.1 AIDS Knowledge, Awareness and Strip Club Attendance Models

Tables 11 through 16 include results of the logistic regressions after augmenting them with several measures of AIDS awareness, knowledge, sexual behaviors and attitudes, along with variables which capture past social deviance. First I add measures of a respondent's knowledge of AIDS. AIDSKNOW captures the number of people the respondent knows with the AIDS virus. Theoretically the more people an individual knows with AIDS the more likely they are to be aware of the problem and change their behavior, yet in this case it does not appear to be correlated with strip club attendance. Another measure, AIDSREL, comes from Francis (2006) which captures if the respondent has a relative with AIDS. This too appears not to influence the probability of going to a strip club. However, these are only proxies for the awareness of AIDS, and likely to be incomplete measures. There are many other avenues through which individuals may have become aware of the virus, and therefore changed their behavior. What is clear is that the number of people you know with the disease and their relationship to you does not appear to affect the probability of attending a strip club.

A measure of AIDS knowledge is constructed from a set of 6 questions in which the respondent is asked how effective certain measures are at preventing the transmission of AIDS. The measure includes questions on condom use, diaphragm use, or monogamy among others. The questions were given one point for a correct answer and zero

otherwise yielding a maximum possible score of 6. It appears improving your score on the quiz by one question has a small, positive statistically significant effect on strip club attendance.

2.2.2 Sexual Behavior, STDs and Strip Club Attendance Models

The variables related to sexual behavior and STDs that appear to positively affect the probability of going to a strip club are whether the respondent ever had an STD, thought they had an STD, or if they responded that they have changed their sexual behavior as a result of AIDS. Clearly having had an STD previously makes the risks more tangible for the respondent. Yet it does not appear as though reporting that you have masturbated in order to avoid AIDS is significantly correlated with having gone to a strip club.

The biggest factor in this section is having changed your behavior because of AIDS raises the probability of having gone to a strip club by 0.127. Sometimes you desire sex, sometimes intimacy and sometimes both. If men are going to strip clubs as a means of separating sex from intimacy, so that they may consume the latter without the inherent risks of the former, than public policy which bans these clubs may lead them to more risky outlets. This in turn may lead to an increase in the prevalence of AIDS. Though I should again caution that identifying causality is not feasible, so it is possible people who go to strip clubs are more likely to report having changed there behavior because of AIDS. It could be the high sensation seekers which go to strip clubs realize they are at risk and report changing their behavior, whether they have changed it or not.

2.2.3 Sexual Behavior and Strip Club Attendance Models

In order to further investigate this point I run the model including other measures of past sexual behavior, leading one to conclude strip club attendance is more likely associated with past behaviors, than recent changes in behavior. Having had sex with someone other than your spouse while married, having ever paid someone for sex, or having sex 4+ times per week are all positively correlated with having gone to a strip club. Again, the effects are relatively large and consistent with the notion that strip club patrons are high sensation seekers (Seto et al., 1995; Zuckerman, 1994).

Another measure of past sexual behavior is the age of first vaginal intercourse. Here, an additional year of waiting before you had intercourse for the first time results in a small but statistically significant decrease in the probability of having gone to a strip club in the last 12 months. Again, this is also consistent with the finding in Seto et. al (1995) where age of first intercourse was negatively associated with higher sensation seeking scores.

2.2.4 Social Deviance and Strip Club Attendance Models (Table 1

The evidence on social deviance and strip club attendance is mixed. Though Zuckerman (1994, p.245) finds that high sensation seekers are more like to be heavy drinkers and at least recreational drug users, in table 14 I find having more drinks during a typical outing increases the probability of having gone to a club, yet having injected drugs does not. Similarly having spent any amount of time in jail, prison or juvenile detention does not seem to positively predict having been a patron, but the number of days spent in jail, prison or detention, does seem to increase the chance of having gone to a strip club. This effect does not withstand a robustness check as there is one respondent who reports having been in jail for 10,975 days, and he has been to a strip club in the past

year. Dropping this observation changes the marginal effect to .0000509 with a p-value of 0.11

2.2.5 Sexual Attitudes and Strip Club Attendance Models

Zuckerman (1994, p187) finds that high sensation seekers have more permissive sexual attitudes. Whether it is a means of reducing cognitive dissonance with their own sexual behavior, or their attitudes facilitate their sexual behavior is not know. Again, I confirm the similarity between high sensation seekers and strip club patrons. Respondent's views on the legality of pornography, views on the appropriateness of premarital sex, and views on having sex with someone whom you are not in love with are all negatively related to strip club attendance. The more permissive the respondent's attitudes the more likely they are to attend a strip club. The largest factor was the respondent's views on pornography. Believing pornography should be illegal reduces the probability of having been to a strip club by 0.115, some of which appears to come at the reduction of the estimated marginal effects for frequency of church attendance and the education dummies.

V. Conclusions

After working with the data one gets the sense that the sexual scripts of individuals are very different, and attending a strip club is just another way it is apparent. There are people whose sexual scripts are – not to put to pejorative a term on it – rather mundane. And these mundane men tend not to patronize strip clubs. On the other hand those who attend strip clubs tend to eschew normal cultural taboos in search of higher sensations consistent with Zuckerman (1994). The empirical difficulty is trying to

identify this cause separately from the effects AIDS had on strip club attendance. As other research has found, it is very difficult to identify an instrument for these issues (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004). While I don't believe people changed their sexual behavior by going to strip clubs I do believe for those people who are sensation seekers and more likely to engage in risky sexual behavior, strip clubs are an entertainment outlet. In so much as it reduces their exposure to risky sex the strip club serves an important public health function. However, in the end, I can only say that people who have reported changing their behavior in response to AIDS are more likely to have gone to a strip clubs.

The findings consistent with club patrons being high sensation seekers also suggest the patrons may be altering their market behavior (by altering their rate of discount and their notions of fairness) in response to the economic exchanges occurring in the club. Wiederman found participants in sex research are generally higher in sensation seeking attributes, while the sex related research of Wilson and Daly (2004) found men are more likely to discount the future after exposure to pictures of attractive females. And Van Den Bergh and Dewitte (2006), found men were more willing to accept the less fair split in the ultimatum game after similar exposure.

References

Barnes v. Glen Theater, Inc., 501 560 (U.S. Supreme Court 1991).

Bernard, C., DeGabrielle, C., Cartier, L., Monk-Turner, E., Phill, C., Sherwood, J., et al. (2003). Exotic Dancers: Gender Differences in Societal Reaction, Subcultural Ties, and Conventional Support. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture,, 10*(1), 1-11.

Blanchflower, D. G., & Oswald, A. J. (2004). Money, Sex and Happiness: An Empirical Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 106*(3), 393-415.

Blau, F. D., Simpson, P., & Anderson, D. (1998). Continuing Progress? Trends in Occupational Segregation in the United States over the 1970s and 1980s. *Feminist Economics, 4*(3), 29-71.

Boles, J., & Garbin, A. P. (1974a). Stripping for a Living: An Occupational Study of the Night Club Stripper. In C. D. Bryant (Ed.), *Deviant Behavior: Occupational and Organizational Bases* (pp. 312-335). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Boles, J., & Garbin, A. P. (1974b). The Strip Club and the Stripper-Customer Patterns of Interaction. *Sociology and Social-Research, 58,* 136-144.

Borgonovi, F. (2004). Performing Arts Attendance: An Economic Approach. *Applied Economics, 36*(17), 1871 - 1885.

Brewster, Z. W. (2003). Behavioral and Interactional Patterns of Strip Club Patrons: Tipping Techniques and Club Attendance. *Deviant Behavior, 24*(3), 221-243.

Cameron, A. C., & Trivedi, P. K. (2001). Essentials of Count Data Regression. In B. H. Baltagi (Ed.), *A Companion to Theoretical Econometrics* (pp. 331-348). Oxford: Blackwell.

Diamond. (2004). *A Stripper's Tail: Confessions of a Las Vegas Stripper*. New York: iUniverse, Inc.

Doan v. Salem Inn, Inc., 422 922 (U.S. Supreme Court 1975).

Eaves, E. (2005, October 25th). The Lap of Luxury. *The New York Times*.

Egan, R. D. (2003). I'll be Your Fantasy Girl, If You'll be My Money Man: Mapping Desire, Fantasy and Power in Two Exotic Dance Clubs. *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society, 8*(1), 109-120.

Enck, G. E., & Preston, J. D. (1988). Counterfeit Intimacy: A Dramaturgical Analysis of an Erotic Performance. *Deviant Behavior, 9,* 369-381.

Erickson, D. J., & Tewksbury, R. (2000). The Gentlemen in the Club: A Typology of Strip Club Patrons. *Deviant Behavior, 21*(3), 271-293.

Fisher, R. (1999?). *Consumers of Erotic Entertainment: A Survey of the Patrons of the Mons Venus*.

Forsyth, C. J., & Deshotels, T. H. (1997). The Occupational Milieu of the Nude Dancer. *Deviant Behavior, 18*, 125-142.

Francis, A. (2006). The Economics of Sexuality: The Effect of HIV/AIDS on Sexual Behavior, Desire, and Identity in the United States.

Frank, K. (1998). The Production of Identity and the Negotiation of Intimacy in a Gentleman's Club. *Sexualities, 1*(2), 175-201.

Frank, K. (2002). *G-Strings and Sympathy*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Frank, K. (2003). "Just Trying to Relax": Masculinity, Masculinizing Practices, and Strip Club Regulars. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*(1), 61-75.

Frank, K. (2005). Exploring the Motivations and Fantasies of Strip Club Customers in Relation to Legal Regulations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 34*(5), 487-504.

Frenken, G. M. N., & Sifaneck, S. J. (1998). Sexworkers and Dope: An Ethnography of Heroin using Lap Dancers in New York City. *Addiction Research, 6*(4), 341-370.

Hanna, J. L. (2005). Exotic Dance Adult Entertainment: A Guide for Planners and Policy Makers. *Journal of Planning Literature, 20*(2), 116-134.

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A Survey Method for Characterizing Daily Life Experience: The Day Reconstruction Method. *Science, 306*(5702), 1776-1780.

Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The Social Organization of Sexuality : Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levitt, S., & List, J. (2007). What Do Laboratory Experiments Tell Us About the Real World? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, forthcoming*.

Lewis, G. B., & Seaman, B. A. (2004). Sexual Orientation and Demand for the Arts. *Social Science Quarterly, 85*(3), 523-538.

Linz, D., Blumenthal, E., Donnerstein, E., Kunkel, D., Shafer, B. J., & Lichtenstein, A. (2000). Testing Legal Assumptions Regarding the Effects of Dancer Nudity and Proximity to Patron on Erotic Expression. *Human Behavior, 24*, 507-533.

Mano, K. (1993). A Club of One's Own. *Playboy, 40,* 121-130.

McCaghy, C. H., & Skipper, J. K., Jr. (1974). Lesbian Behavior as an Adaptation to the Occupation of Stripping. In C. D. Bryant (Ed.), *Deviant Behavior: Occupational and Organizational Bases* (pp. 154-166). Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

McDowell, A. (2003). From the Help Desk: Hurdle Models. *The Stata Journal, 3*(2), 178-184.

Mestemacher, R., & Roberti, J. (2004). Qualitative Analysis of Vocational Choice: A Collective Case Study of Strippers. *Deviant Behavior, 25*(1), 43-65.

Miller, G., Tybur, J. M., & Jordan, B. D. (2007). Ovulatory Cycle Effects on Tip Earnings by Lap Dancers: Economic Evidence for Human Estrus? *Evolution and Human Beahvior*.

Mobley, M. E., & Humphreys, J. (2006 April). How Low Will You Go? *Harvard Business Review*.

Montemurro, B., Bloom, C., & Madell, K. (2003). Ladies Night Out: A Typology of Women Patrons of a Male Strip Club. *Deviant Behavior, 24*(4), 333-352.

O'Donnell, J. (2006, March 22, 2006). Should Business Execs Meet at Strip Clubs? *USA Today*.

Posner, R. A. (1992). *Sex and Reason*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Price, K. (2000). Stripping Women: Workers' Control in Strip Clubs. *Current Research on Occupations and Professions, 11*, 3-33.

Ronai, C. R., & Ellis, C. (1989). Turn-ons for Money - Intereactional Strategies of the Table Dancer. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 18*(3), 271-298.

Roney, J. R., Mahler, S. V., & Maestripieri, D. (2003). Behavioral and hormonal responses of men to brief interactions with women. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*(6), 365-375.

Schlosser, E. (1997, February 10). The Business of Pornography: Most of the Outsized Profits Being Generated Today Are Being Earned by Business Not Traditionally Associated with the Sex Industry. *U.S. News & World Report, 122*, 42.

Seto, M. C., Lalumière, M. L., & Quinsey, V. L. (1995). Sensation Seeking and Males' Sexual Strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*(5), 669-675.

Shteir, R. (2004). *Striptease: The Untold History of the Girlie Show*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skipper, J. K., Jr., & McCaghy, C. H. (1970). Stripteasers: The Anatomy and Career Contingencies in a Deviant Occupation. *Social Problems, 17*(3), 391-404.

Smyth, J. C. (2005). *Panel Gets Bare Facts on Adult Industry*. Retrieved October 7, 2005, from http://www.cleveland.com/printer/printer.ssf?/base/news/1128596205247890.xml&coll=2

Spencer, A. (2005). *The Erotic Economy*. Retrieved 10/5/2005, 2005, from http://www.ricks.com/eroticeconomy.html

Sweet, N., & Tewksbury, R. (2000a). Entry, Maintenance and Departure from a Career in the Sex Industry: Strippers' Experiences of Occupational Costs and Rewards. *Humanity and Society*, *24*(2), 136-161.

Sweet, N., & Tewksbury, R. (2000b). What's a Nice Girl Like You Doing in a Place Like This?: Pathways to a Career in Stripping.''. *Sociological Spectrum, 20*, 325-343.

Thompson, W. E., & Harred, J. L. (1992). Topless Dancers - Managing Stigma in a Deviant Occupation. *Deviant Behavior, 13*(3), 291-311.

Thompson, W. E., Harred, J. L., & Burks, B. E. (2003). Managing the Stigma of Topless Dancing: A Decade Later. *Deviant Behavior*, *24*(6), 551-570.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263-292.

U.S. Club Listings. (2005). *Exotic Dancer's Adult Nightclubs Guide*, 39-223.

Van Den Bergh, B., & Dewitte, S. (2006). Digit Ratio (2D: 4D) Moderates the Impact of Sexual Cues on Men's Decisions in Ultimatum Games. *Proceedings- Royal Society of London. Biological sciences, 273*(1597), 2091-2095.

White Paper 2005: A Report on the Adult Entertainment Industry. (2005). Retrieved October 1, 2005, from http://www.freespeechcoalition.com/whitepaper05.htm

Wiederman, M. W. (1999). Volunteer Bias in Sexuality Research Using College Student Participants. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*(1), 59-60.

Wood, E. A. (2000). Working in the fantasy factory: The attention hypothesis and the enacting of masculine power in strip clubs. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 29*(1), 5-31.

Zelizer, V. A. R. (2005). *The Purchase of Intimacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendix A: NHSLS 1992 Survey Questions

There are many activities that people participate in to enhance their sexual experiences or to give an outlet to their sexual feelings. I am going to ask you about your participation in some of these activities.

8. In the last 12 months did you...

	Yes	No
a. go to night clubs with nude or semi-nude dancers?	1	2
b. get a professional massage?	1	2
c. hire a prostitute or pay anyone to have sex with you?	1	2
d. attend a public gathering in which you were nude?	1	2
e. have your picture taken in the nude?	1	2

9. (IF YES TO ANY of Q.8:) About how many times in the last 12 months did you do (this/these)?

!___!___!___!

20. Have you made any kind of changes in your sexual behavior because of AIDS?

YES.....1
NO.....2

Appendix B: Summary Tables

Table 1: Trend in cases of AIDS/HIV

Year	AIDS/HIV Cases diagnosed	AIDS/HIV Deaths occurring
1981	323	122
1982	1,170	453
1983	3,076	1,481
1984	6,247	3,474
1985	11,794	6,877
1986	19,064	12,016
1987	28,599	16,194
1988	35,508	20,922
1989	42,768	27,680
1990	48,732	31,436
1991	59,760	36,708
1992	78,705	41,424
1993	78,954	45,187
1994	72,266	50,071
1995	69,307	50,876
1996	60,613	37,646
1997	49,062	21,630
1998	41,605	18,028
1999	38,640	16,648
2000	35,986	14,433

Source: AIDS related data are from the Centers for Disease Control.

Table 2: Some Descriptive Statistics of Entire Sample

Characteristic	Percentage (sample size)	Gone to a night club with nude or semi-nude dancers in last 12 months?	Pearson Chi-squared test
Full Sample		12.42%	
Female	50.21% (3415)	4.22%	0.00***
Male	49.79% (3415)	20.68%	0.00***
Married	58.57% (3415)	8.11%	0.00***
Cohabiting	65.39% (3386)	9.09%	0.00***

Notes: Percentages in the first column are for the row characteristic as a percentage of the total number of individuals with the column characteristic, **adjusted** for survey design. The second column is the percentage of people that went to a club that featured nude dancers in the last 12 months conditional on membership in the row. Sample sizes are the actual number of observations, unadjusted for survey design.

Table 3: Leisure Activities from the General Social Survey 1993

Leisure activities in past twelve months From GSS	Males	Females	Chi-squared test
Go out to see a movie in a theater. SEEMOVIE	68.81%	73.91%	0.03**
Attend an amateur or professional sports event. ATTSPRTS	62.16%	51.76%	0.00***
Go camping, hiking, or canoeing. CAMPING	50.63%	38.39%	0.00***
Go hunting or fishing. HUNTFISH	49.37%	26.48%	0.00***
Go to a live performance of popular music like rock, country, or rap, not including school performances. POPMUSIC (1998)	40.40%	37.99%	0.39
Visit an art museum or gallery. VISITART	38.66%	42.50%	0.15
Go to an auto, stock car, or motorcycle race. AUTORACE	22.87%	10.33%	0.00***
Go to a live performance of a non-musical stage play, not including school performances. DRAMA	21.26%	25.96%	0.05*
Went to club with nude dancers REDDUM1*	**20.68%**	**4.22%**	**0.00*** **
Go to a classical music or opera performance, not including school performances. GOMUSIC	13.16%	17.56%	0.03**
Go to a live ballet or dance performance, not including school performances. DANCE	12.85%	24.54%	0.00***

Notes: Percentages are adjusted for survey design. The data (except in **BOLD**) come from the General Social Survey (GSS) 1993 unless otherwise noted. The last column presents the p-value for a chi-squared test.

Table 4: Leisure Activities from the SPPA 1997

Leisure time activities in past twelve months From SPPA 1997	Males	Females	Pearson Chi-squared test
Went out to movies last 12 mo	66.07%	65.00%	0.53
Went to sports event last 12 mo	49.24%	33.78%	0.00***
Went to historic park last 12 mo	48.16%	45.8%	0.05**
Went to art fair last 12 mo	41.61%	53.03	0.00***
Went to art museum last 12 mo	34.27%	35.47%	0.27
Went to live musical last 12 mo	22.25%	26.69%	0.00***
Went to club with nude dancers *	**20.68%**	**4.22%**	**0.00*** **
Went to live play last 12 mo	14.62%	16.84%	0.01%
Went to live classical last 12 mo	14.24%	16.84%	0.00***
Went to live jazz last 12 mo	13.22%	10.64%	0.00***
Went to live dance last 12 mo	11.71%	12.95%	0.00***
Went to live ballet last 12 mo	4.12%	7.46%	0.00***
Went to live opera last 12 mo	4.02%	5.22%	0.01***

Notes: Percentages are adjusted for survey designs. The data (except in **BOLD**) come from the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) 1997. The last column presents the p-value for a chi-squared test.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Crosstabulations of Education HETMAN==1

Characteristic	Percentage answering yes	Gone to a night club with nude or semi-nude dancers in last 12 months?	Pearson Chi-squared test **P Value**
Hetman==1		20.28%	
Relationship Status			
Married	58.46% (1425)	13.58%	0.00***
Cohabitating	65.02% (1421)	14.81%	0.00***
Education			
Less than High School	14.27% (1425)	11.95%	0.00***
High School	28.97% (1425)	16.94%	0.07*
Some College	32.75% (1425)	22.28%	0.25
College	16.13% (1425)	28.56%	0.00***
Post graduate work	7.89% (1425)	22.67%	0.51
Religious Affiliation			
None	12.92% (1429)	27.33%	0.02**
Protestant Type I	22.01% (1429)	20.63%	0.89
Protestant Type II	29.00% (1429)	14.08%	0.00***
Catholic	29.00% (1429)	23.11%	0.14
Jewish/Other	7.07% (1429)	20.53%	0.96
Religious Attendance			
Never	15.76% (1429)	18.79%	0.59
Less than once to several times year	43.88% (1429)	26.98%	0.00***
Once a month to nearly every week	19.71% (1429)	20.29%	1.0
At least every week	20.65% (1429)	7.20%	0.00***
Reborn	33.76% (1084)	12.72%	0.00***

Notes: Percentages in the first column are for the row characteristic as a percentage of the total number of individuals with the column characteristic, **adjusted** for survey design. The second column is the percentage of people that went to a club that featured nude dancers in the last 12 months conditional on membership in the row. Sample sizes are the actual number of observations, unadjusted for survey design. Subpop HETMAN==1

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics and Crosstabulations of Education HETMAN==1

Characteristic	Percentage answering yes	Gone to a night club with nude or semi-nude dancers in last 12 months?	Pearson Chi-squared test **P Value**
Hetman==1		20.28%	
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	76.97% (1431)	20.79%	0.42
Black, non-Hispanic	10.40% (1431)	16.75%	0.28
Hispanic	8.56% (1431)	20.39%	0.98
Other (Asian, NAM,PCIS,AL)	4.07% (1431)	19.31%	0.87
Income			
$0	8.67% (1300)	16.43%	0.34
$1-$5,000	11.08% (1300)	29.41%	0.02**
$5,001-$10,000	8.72% (1300)	25.97%	0.20
$10,001-$15,000	9.50% (1300)	14.36%	0.10*
$15,001-$20,000	9.73% (1300)	20.36%	0.96
$20,001-$30,000	19.06% (1300)	22.61%	0.40
$30,001-$50,000	23.81% (1300)	18.73%	0.41
$50,001-$75,000	6.04% (1300)	15.29%	0.25
$75,001 +	3.39% (1300)	16.11%	0.45
Region			
New England	5.05% (1433)	19.08%	0.81
Middle Atlantic	14.44% (1433)	19.84%	0.88
East north cent.	15.67% (1433)	21.41%	0.69
West north cent.	8.55% (1433)	20.65%	0.92
South Atlantic	20.43% (1433)	22.14%	0.43
East south cent	6.02% (1433)	9.99%	0.01***
West south cent	8.55% (1433)	17.5%	0.41
Mountain	6.47% (1433)	21.17%	0.86
Pacific	14.81% (1433)	22.55%	0.42

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics and Crosstabs of the Appeal of Different Activities

How would you rate each of these:	R found it to be at least somewhat	Gone to a night club with nude or semi-nude dancers in last 12 months?		Pearson Chi-squared test
Variable	appealing.	**Yes**	**No**	**P Value**
Apdum01 sex w >1 person	40.98% (1431)	62.57%	35.48%	0.00***
Apdum02 same sex	1.75% (1432)	1.89%	1.71%	0.85
Apdum03 forcing sex	2.16% (1432)	2.88%	1.98%	0.43
Apdum04 being forced	2.38% (1430)	3.97%	1.98%	0.08*
Apdum05 watching others	35.77% (1432)	50.38%	32.05%	0.00***
Apdum06 sex w stranger	30.17% (1431)	49.79%	25.21%	0.00***
Apdum07 watch P undress	91.91% (1427)	95.66%	90.95%	0.01**
Apdum08 vaginal sex	96.91% (1426)	99.15%	96.34%	0.01**
Apdum09 using dildo	21.54% (1417)	30.76%	19.16%	0.00***
Apdum10 receiving oral	76.66% (1421)	92.98%	72.46%	0.00***
Apdum11 performing oral	70.13% (1421)	85.88%	66.08%	0.00***
Apdum12 P stim anus	19.58% (1423)	21.24%	19.15%	0.49
Apdum13 stim P anus	22.89% (1421)	26.76%	21.90%	0.12
Apdum14 passive anal	8.31% (1399)	9.28%	8.07%	0.56
Apdum15 active anal	11.30% (1380)	16.70%	9.93%	0.01**

Notes: Percentages are adjusted for survey design, sample sizes are actual number of observations, unadjusted for survey design. Subpopulation Hetman==1

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics and Crosstabs of the Reasons for Masturbation

Reasons R usually masturbated.	Percentage answering yes	Gone to a night club with nude or semi-nude dancers in last 12 months?		Pearson Chi-squared test
Variable		**Yes**	**No**	**P Value**
(Mast12c) in order to relax	15.19% (1433)	20.24%	13.90%	0.01**
(Mast12d) to relieve tension	40.49% (1433)	55.54%	36.66%	0.00***
(Mast12e) unavailability of a partner	17.18% (1433)	30.37%	13.83%	0.00***
(Mast12f) for pleasure	21.84% (1433)	35.05%	18.48%	0.00***
(Mast12g) out of boredom	5.07% (1433)	9.53%	3.94%	0.00***
(Mast12h) because partner refused sex	9.66% (1433)	11.31%	9.24%	0.32
(Mast12i) in order to sleep	9.14% (1433)	15.58%	7.50%	0.00***
(Mast12j) afraid of STDs	4.00% (1433)	7.35%	3.15%	0.00***

Notes: Percentages are adjusted for survey design, sample sizes are actual number of observations, unadjusted for survey design. Subpopulation Hetman==1

Table 10: Full Demographic Specification of Strip Club Attendance (Dependent Variable REDDUM1)

Variables with labels below					
region2	0.00662	occup6	-0.0246	currel3	-0.0232
region==middle atlantic	[0.91]	occup== 6.0000	[0.54]	currelig==prot type ii	[0.56]
region3	0.0438	lywage3	0.0315	currel4	0.00671
region==east north cent.	[0.50]	inccat1a==$ 5001-10k	[0.55]	currelig==catholic	[0.87]
region4	0.0894	lywage4	-0.0686**	currel5	-0.0318
region==west north cent.	[0.28]	inccat1a==$10001-15k	[0.040]	curelig==jew/other prot/other	[0.46]
region5	0.0482	lywage5	0.0319	church2	0.0416
region==south altantic	[0.46]	inccat1a==$15001-20k	[0.55]	church== 2.0000	[0.27]
region6	-0.00592	lywage6	0.0659	church3	-0.00612
region==east south cent.	[0.93]	inccat1a==$20001-30k	[0.14]	church== 3.0000	[0.89]
region7	0.0367	lywage7	0.0524	church4	-0.130***
region==west south cent	[0.61]	inccat1a==$30001-50k	[0.25]	church== 4.0000	[0.000021]
region8	0.0837	lywage8	0.00468	educ3	0.0500*
region==mountain	[0.36]	inccat1a==$50001-75k	[0.94]	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	[0.098]
region9	0.0736	lywage9	0.0326	educ4	0.174***
region==pacific	[0.32]	inccat1a==$75001+	[0.67]	edlevel1==college graduate	[0.0017]
occup2	0.000232	ethnic2	-0.0110	educ5	0.229***
occup== 2.0000	[0.99]	ethnic==black, non-hisp	[0.77]	edlevel1==> coll grad	[0.0047]
occup3	-0.0210	ethnic3	-0.0317	age	-0.00797***
occup== 3.0000	[0.63]	ethnic==hispanic	[0.40]	age of r	[6.30e-10]
occup4	-0.0165	ethnic4	0.00485	married	-0.0782***
occup== 4.0000	[0.81]	ethnic==as/pcis/nam/al	[0.94]	r is married	[0.0052]
occup5	0.0397	currel2	-0.0189	cohabnm	-0.0291
occup== 5.0000	[0.32]	currelig==prot type i	[0.61]	r cohabitating but not married	[0.43]
Observations	1228	Predicted	.15189288		

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1.

Table 11: AIDS Knowledge, Awareness and Strip Club Attendance

VARIABLE	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.129***	-0.130***	-0.128***
		[0.000027]	[0.000019]	[0.000041]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	0.0495	0.0503*	0.0508*
		[0.10]	[0.096]	[0.097]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.171***	0.175***	0.171***
		[0.0018]	[0.0016]	[0.0020]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.225***	0.228***	0.219***
		[0.0051]	[0.0051]	[0.0067]
age	age of r	-0.00799***	-0.00802***	-0.00775***
		[6.28e-10]	[5.15e-10]	[1.57e-09]
married	r is married	-0.0776***	-0.0778***	-0.0849***
		[0.0058]	[0.0052]	[0.0025]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0305	-0.0289	-0.0345
		[0.40]	[0.43]	[0.33]
aidsrel	r knows a relative with aids with aids	-0.0450		
		[0.38]		
aidsknow	number of persons r has known w aids		0.00309	
			[0.51]	
aidsqz	score on aids knowledge quiz			0.0183**
				[0.044]
Predicted		.15178451	.15165154	.15196988
Observations		1228	1228	1222

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls, see table XX for list.

Table 12: Sexual Behavior, STDS, and Strip Club Attendance

VARIABLE	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1	(4) reddum1
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.118***	-0.131***	-0.0782**	-0.123***
		[0.000100]	[0.000015]	[0.028]	[0.000049]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	0.0511*	0.0526*	0.0485	0.0494
		[0.088]	[0.085]	[0.14]	[0.10]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.178***	0.179***	0.162***	0.178***
		[0.0010]	[0.0013]	[0.0066]	[0.0018]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.218***	0.233***	0.154	0.199**
		[0.0071]	[0.0045]	[0.10]	[0.012]
age	age of r	-0.00784***	-0.00814***	-0.00658***	-0.00809***
		[1.23e-09]	[2.80e-10]	[0.0000027]	[4.26e-10]
married	r is married	-0.0304	-0.0682**	-0.0968***	-0.0705**
		[0.27]	[0.015]	[0.0022]	[0.011]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0112	-0.0217	-0.0636**	-0.0330
		[0.78]	[0.57]	[0.031]	[0.35]
sxchang1	r has changed behavior because of AIDS	0.127***			
		[0.000047]			
mast12j	r masturbated to avoid stds		0.0988		
			[0.20]		
stddoubt	r has ever thought he or she had an std			0.0791***	
				[0.0039]	
stdever	r has ever had an std				0.0840**
					[0.047]
Predicted		.14606919	.15111842	.13024616	.14894341
Observations		1226	1228	955	1217

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls see table XX for list.

Table 13: Sexual Behavior and Strip Club Attendance

VARIABLE	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1	(4) reddum1
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.117***	-0.121***	-0.131***	-0.113***
		[0.00013]	[0.00012]	[0.000022]	[0.00015]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	0.0351	0.0494	0.0456	0.0552*
		[0.22]	[0.10]	[0.13]	[0.059]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.161***	0.178***	0.184***	0.197***
		[0.0030]	[0.0019]	[0.0012]	[0.00052]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.203***	0.242***	0.230***	0.253***
		[0.0093]	[0.0047]	[0.0048]	[0.0029]
age	age of r	-0.00866***	-0.00937***	-0.00769***	-0.00725***
		[0]	[0]	[3.03e-09]	[7.66e-09]
married	r is married	-0.0669**	-0.0694**	-0.0845***	-0.0695***
		[0.013]	[0.014]	[0.0031]	[0.0096]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0440	-0.0120	-0.0383	-0.0355
		[0.20]	[0.75]	[0.28]	[0.27]
evstray1	r has had sex w s.o. else while married	0.142***			
		[0.00051]			
rpaidw1	r has ever paid a woman for sex		0.149***		
			[0.00047]		
sexfreq7	sexfreq==4+ times a week			0.114**	
				[0.030]	
firstvi	age r 1st had vaginal intercourse				-0.0181***
					[0.000021]
Predicted		.140917	.14709641	.15318062	.13818308
Observations		1170	1195	1213	1179

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls see table XX for list.

Table 14: Social Deviance and Strip Club Attendance

COEFFICIENT	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1	(4) reddum1
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.122***	-0.135***	-0.128***	-0.128***
		[0.0061]	[0.000011]	[0.000030]	[0.000036]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	0.0342	0.0520*	0.0506*	0.0517*
		[0.38]	[0.091]	[0.095]	[0.090]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.239***	0.172***	0.175***	0.178***
		[0.00058]	[0.0023]	[0.0017]	[0.0015]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.286***	0.244***	0.232***	0.236***
		[0.0025]	[0.0038]	[0.0043]	[0.0039]
age	age of r	-0.00902***	-0.00801***	-0.00818***	-0.00802***
		[0.00000051]	[1.84e-09]	[8.57e-11]	[4.65e-10]
married	r is married	-0.0604*	-0.0733***	-0.0744***	-0.0758***
		[0.086]	[0.0092]	[0.0074]	[0.0067]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0564	-0.0202	-0.0445	-0.0329
		[0.25]	[0.61]	[0.18]	[0.35]
drunk	number of drinks r consumes on a typical outing	0.00740*			
		[0.068]			
injct1	r has ever injected drugs with a needle		0.0893		
			[0.20]		
daysnjail	number of days r has spent in jail or other			0.0000634***	
				[0.00055]	
jail1	r has been in jail, prison, juvenile detention				0.0337
					[0.25]
Predicted		.19707849	.15256366	.14965309	.15125514
Observations		938	1182	1228	1228

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls, see table XX for list.

Table 15: Sexual Attitudes and Strip Club Attendance

COEFFICIENT	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1
church2	< once/year to several times a year	0.0415	0.0459	0.0338
		[0.26]	[0.22]	[0.36]
church3	about once a month to nearly every week	0.00658	0.00730	-0.000619
		[0.88]	[0.87]	[0.99]
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.0954***	-0.112***	-0.109***
		[0.0038]	[0.00053]	[0.00041]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. school	0.0443	0.0437	0.0514*
		[0.13]	[0.14]	[0.089]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.162***	0.167***	0.178***
		[0.0027]	[0.0024]	[0.0016]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.207**	0.237***	0.253***
		[0.010]	[0.0033]	[0.0019]
age	age of r	-0.00746***	-0.00785***	-0.00788***
		[4.91e-09]	[1.40e-09]	[4.17e-10]
married	r is married	-0.0702**	-0.0759***	-0.0520*
		[0.011]	[0.0063]	[0.056]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0303	-0.0351	-0.0171
		[0.39]	[0.31]	[0.66]
porn1	r believes pornography should be illegal	-0.115***		
		[0.00000058]		
premarsx1	r believes premarital sex is wrong at least sometimes		-0.0544**	
			[0.026]	
sexlove1	r would not have sex unless in love			-0.123***
				[0.0000012]
Predicted		.14368311	.14977174	.14589907
Observations		1222	1224	1221

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls, see table XX for list.

Table 16: Sexual Interest and Strip Club Attendance

COEFFICIENT	LABELS	(1) reddum1	(2) reddum1	(3) reddum1
church2	< once/year to several times a year	0.0417	0.0365	0.0430
		[0.29]	[0.33]	[0.24]
church3	about once a month to nearly every week	-0.00541	-0.00682	-0.00329
		[0.90]	[0.87]	[0.94]
church4	every week to several times a week	-0.133***	-0.132***	-0.115***
		[0.000025]	[0.000010]	[0.00011]
educ3	edlevel1==some /vocat. sch	0.0484	0.0470	0.0438
		[0.12]	[0.12]	[0.13]
educ4	edlevel1==college graduate	0.171***	0.170***	0.147***
		[0.0022]	[0.0022]	[0.0048]
educ5	edlevel1==> coll grad	0.213***	0.226***	0.210***
		[0.0088]	[0.0050]	[0.0079]
age	age of r	-0.00812***	-0.00813***	-0.00723***
		[1.36e-09]	[3.96e-10]	[3.75e-09]
married	r is married	-0.0820***	-0.0712**	-0.0801***
		[0.0047]	[0.010]	[0.0037]
cohabnm	r cohabitating but not married	-0.0324	-0.0291	-0.0416
		[0.39]	[0.42]	[0.20]
thnkpic2	r thinks in pictures	0.0427*		
		[0.064]		
sxgrat1	r has lacked interest in sex for some period in last 12 months		0.0602	
			[0.11]	
thinksx4	r thinks about sex every day			0.139***
				[0.0000031]
thinksx5	r thinks about sex several times day			0.180***
				[0.00016]
Predicted		.15770432	.15115465	.1424699
Observations		1189	1219	1226

Notes: Author's calculations from NHSLS using survey weights. Estimates are marginal effects evaluated at the mean, except for dummy variables which are the marginal effects for a discrete change from 0 to 1. p values in brackets *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.* Subpopulation Hetman==1 Included in the regression but omitted from the table were a complement of demographic controls, see table XX for list.