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Rejection of men by women in singles bars was examined
using Erving Goffman’s concepts of performance and face to
help distinguish variables that influence a woman’s decision
to help a man save face. Each woman (N=20) was observed
rejecting a man, then was interviewed about the encounter
through a semi-structured interview. The subjects were
asked to rate the men’s personalities and physical
appearances and to describe the encounters with the men to
provide an understanding of the subjects’ impressions of the
men’s performances. Subjects’ rejections of the men were
categorized according to the degree to which the responses
offered the men opportunities to save face. An unexpectedly
high number of subjects offered rejections that helped the
men save face, even when the men were persistent or received
low performance ratings. Possible explanations for this
unexpectedly high number are suggested.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As individuals make their ways through public places each day, they sometimes encounter threats, both physical and social, to themselves (Goffman 1963, 1967, 1971; Lofland 1973; Snow, Robinson, and McCall 1991). Physical threats and devices available for dealing with them are rather easily identifiable. Well-lighted streets, crosswalks, and police officers help prevent muggings, accidents involving automobiles and pedestrians, and other physical threats. Hospitals, shelters, and counseling services help treat and repair the results of physical threats.

Social threats and devices for dealing with them, while perhaps not as easily identifiable as physical threats during a casual stroll along a street, exist just as well. Embarrassment is a common social threat that can occur during an encounter when an individual makes a claim about his or her character, but then something is said or something occurs to contradict that claim (Goffman 1967; Gross and Stone 1964).

Embarrassment exaggerates the core dimensions of social transactions, bringing them to the eye of the observer in an almost naked state. Embarrassment occurs
whenever some central assumption in a transaction has been unexpectedly and unqualifiedly discredited for at least one participant. The result is that he is incapacitated for continued role performance. (Gross and Stone 1964, p. 2)

This paper is focused on a specific cause of embarrassment—rejection. Goffman (1967) discusses the devices people use to deal with the social threat of types of embarrassment such as rejection. He says that each time a person enters into social interaction, he or she encounters the possibility of social threats because each person makes a claim, intentionally or not, about his or her evaluation of the situation. This evaluation includes claims, verbal or nonverbal, about oneself. The positive value a person claims for himself or herself is called one’s face (Goffman 1967, p. 5). If a person should say or do something to contradict one’s own, or another’s claim, then embarrassment may occur because someone is revealed not to be what he or she claims. The result is a loss of face.

Goffman (1967) notes that people involved in encounters will have a desire to help one another avoid a loss of face, or at least help save or restore face once it has been lost so that the order of the encounter or situation might be maintained. He discusses the devices used to save face by saying there are two processes that can be used when oneself or another has committed a face-threatening act. The first, the avoidance process, involves avoiding situations in which threats occur or, after a threat has occurred, pretending the action never occurred so it poses no threat to the
person who committed it. The second, the corrective process, involves bringing the action to the attention of the person who committed it but letting him or her correct it in some acceptable manner, thereby restoring order.

The focus of this paper is rejection. More specifically, it is focused on rejection in a singles bar. While social threats such as rejection exist in virtually every social setting, they may occur with greater frequency in some settings than in others. Goffman (1963) describes American bars and cocktail lounges as open places or places where two previously unacquainted people have the right to interact and become acquainted, or at least exchange greetings. This openness that exists in bars seems to mean there are a greater number of encounters between strangers in bars than in some other social settings. A greater number of encounters would mean an increased opportunity for social threats such as rejection.

Just as cross-sex interaction is more likely to occur in some public places than in others, this interaction may be more likely to occur in some types of bars than in others. Cavan (1966) differentiates among four bar types. She describes the home territory bar, the nightspot, the convenience bar and the marketplace bar. Home territory bars are places the regular patrons often refer to as second homes. Home territory bar patrons share a common social identity that helps define who is welcome in the bar and who is not.
Nightspots offer patrons some sort of scheduled entertainment. The entertainment—whether it be music, comedy, dance shows or some other type—serves as the focus of the bar. Few patrons attend the bar while the entertainment is not in progress. Convenience bars provide locations for people to buy and consume drinks when the situation and time allow. Typically, convenience bars are used while people wait: to be seated at restaurants, for the beginning of a play or movie, for the arrival of a cab, or for other similar events. Patrons often stay at the bar long enough to drink, then leave without dallying.

In marketplace bars patron attention is focused on the exchange of goods or services. There are two types of marketplace bars—those in which goods and services such as drugs or sex are exchanged for cash and those in which noncommercial exchange of sexual services take place. This researcher deals with the latter type. Singles bars are typically this noncommercial type of marketplace bar.

As described by Cavan (1966), the marketplace bar is the type in which there is likely to be the most encounters between men and women, thus the type in which there is the greatest opportunity to observe rejection and the devices used to deal with it. For these reasons a marketplace bar was chosen as the location for the observations and interviews conducted for this research.

Using Goffman’s (1959, 1967) concepts of performance, impression management, face, and face work as a theoretical
structures, this research represents an attempt to investigate the ways in which women reject men who approach them in singles bars. This research was done through observation of 20 encounters between men and women in one marketplace bar in a town of about 50,000 people in a Southern state bordering the North. The 20 women observed rejecting men were then interviewed. The 19 questions composing the body of the interview guide focused on the encounters, the men’s approaches, the women’s methods of rejecting the men, the women’s impressions of the men, background characteristics of the women and the women’s opinions concerning other women’s methods of rejection. Through qualitative analysis of the results of these observations and interviews this research is an attempt to add to the knowledge of rejection and face saving in marketplace bars and in public places in general.
The focus of this paper is social rejection occurring in a specific type of social encounter. The encounters that are of concern are those in which a man approaches a woman at a bar and attempts to get her to dance or talk with him or interact with him in some other way. The intent of the man is often to begin, and then prolong, a social encounter with a woman he finds attractive. This encounter, as Cavan (1966) defines it, would be a pickup if it also fits her other criterion. Cavan states that a "pickup always carries the implication that something more, something of a sexual nature, could, without surprise or indignation, come of it" (1966, p. 178). The woman either accepts or rejects the advance made by the man. It is the case of rejection that is of concern here. Of specific concern is the way that the woman rejects the man. She may offer a rejection with no attempt to help the man save face, or she may reject him while helping him save face. The differences in circumstances surrounding a straight-forward rejection and a face-saving rejection are the specific focus of this paper.

The literature on rejection in this type of social encounter is limited to studies of college mixers, singles
dances and singles bars. The predominant view is that attendance at such events or locations is for the purpose of having fun (Berk 1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976). Much of this fun comes in the form of social encounters between two heterosexuals of opposite sex. Some sociologists have recognized the potential for rejection in such social encounters. Waller (1937) recognized this potential in his study of the competitiveness of college dating: "This competitive dating process often inflicts traumas upon individuals who stand low in the scale of courtship desirability" (Waller 1937, p. 731). Schwartz and Lever (1976) recognized a similar potential for rejection and trauma at the college mixer, while Berk (1977) noted this potential at the singles dance. Allon and Fishel (1979), Cloyd (1976) and Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) noted this same potential at singles bars.

Much of the existing literature concerning rejection in such a social encounter does not deal with singles bars but instead deals with college mixers or singles dances. Thus, the reasons for including in this review these studies on college mixers and singles dances must first be established.

In Cavan's 1966 bar ethnography she defines the sexual marketplace as a place where people meet and make agreements concerning the exchange of sexual services. Cavan defines sexual services "in a very broad way to include everything from flirtatious sociability to sexual intercourse" (1966, p. 174). This marketplace sexual exchange occurs frequently
in some bars because they are defined as open places (Goffman 1963) where "men are free to engage women, even more so than in other public places" (Snow, Robinson, and McCall 1991, p. 428). Cavan supports this statement by saying that

"while almost any public place--beaches, parks, streets, movie houses, buses and trains--can be the setting for a pickup, the general expectations associated with public drinking places as well as many of their structural arrangements facilitate the establishment of such encounters." (1966, pp. 178-79)

Cavan (1966) differentiates among several bar types. One of those types is the marketplace bar in which sexual services are bartered and exchanged, as in a singles bar. Cloyd, in his 1976 study of marketplace bars, notes that the low light level in these bars, the loud music and flashing lights, and the openness and relaxation produced by the drinking of alcohol contribute to each individual’s ability to begin and conduct an encounter with another person. Schwartz and Lever (1976) make similar points in their observation that the beer table at a college mixer gives individuals something to do while not involved in a social encounter with a member of the opposite sex, and the effects of the alcohol in the beer serve to contribute to feelings of openness and relaxation. They also note that the loud music serves to keep conversations superficial, thus forcing people to evaluate others on the basis of physical appearance. Often college parties and singles dances are characterized by these same features: low light level (that
helps cover physical defects); loud music; and the consumption of alcohol and/or other drugs. Often there are also general expectations that pickups can be made at the parties.

Social encounters and pickups in sexual marketplaces are often not the result of pure coincidence but rather a result of some type of order. Cloyd (1976) acknowledges that many patrons of marketplace bars go to these bars looking for action. He defines action as

a concerted attempt by members to generate some form of social encounter, whether it is just to "meet some new people," to "score" (have a sexual encounter), or to meet a potential spouse. (p. 294)

Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) conducted observations and interviews in nine singles bars and nightclubs while studying the processes of cooling out and rejection that women use to parry advances made by men. They found a general perception among male patrons that women at the bars were there to take part in sexual service exchanges. One patron of these bars expressed to the researchers his opinion about the reason women were in the bars: "Why else would women be there if they didn’t want to be picked up?" (Snow, Robinson, and McCall 1991, p. 428).

Schwartz and Lever (1976) studied mixers at Yale University during its first year of coeducation. The sex ratio was still very uneven, with eight men to every one woman. For Yale men this made mixers with women from nearby all-female colleges an important means of meeting women, and
those at the mixers were there for the purpose of mixing with members of the opposite sex.

Patrons of sexual marketplaces are often actively seeking a social encounter or are perceived by the other patrons to be seeking a social encounter. Cloyd (1976) recognizes order to the process of the pickup, as well. In terms of picking up at a location that could be considered a sexual marketplace, Cloyd (1976) says that individuals who are more experienced at generating an appropriate "presentation of self" (Goffman 1959) are more successful. This success is measured by the degree to which the individual is able to attain his or her goals in the sexual exchange. For Goffman (1959) the manner in which a person presents his or her self is determined, at least partially, by past performances. By performing in a consistent manner a self develops a "line," or a pattern of behavior that the possessor of the line is expected to maintain. If a line is not maintained—something is said or done to discredit a person's line—loss of face occurs. Thus, to avoid loss of face a line must be maintained throughout a performance and from one performance to the next since a series of performances helps compose and determine one's entire presentation of self.

So, Cloyd (1976) considers the presentation of self to play a vital role in the marketplace bar. The individuals who know from experience how to present themselves well will be more successful at picking up other people, he says.
Also, the individual who knows how to interpret the performances of members of the opposite sex will also be more successful at attaining his or her goals. Traditionally, Cloyd says, the man assumes the aggressive role of predator and the woman assumes the passive role of attractor. While the men circulate through the bar or room deciding which women they find attractive, the women who wish to be picked up try to attract the men they find attractive. Allon and Fishel (1979) also noticed that gender roles in singles bars seemed to be traditional.

Singles bar patrons often upheld traditional sex role stereotypes, with men taking the initiative to start and continue acquaintanceships and relationships and women answering on the receiving end to these men. (Allon and Fishel 1979, p. 133)

In order to attract a man, a woman attempts to send messages to the right man with her choice of clothing, body language and eye contact (Cloyd 1976, p. 301).

The more provocative the clothing and body language, the more intense is the interaction during negotiations (of sexual exchange). Sometimes an experienced male studies a very sensually dressed female to determine whether he is "up to the interaction" or not. Often a strong come on is a sign of someone interested in a very intense negotiating period before any sexual exchange takes place. An experienced individual initiates an encounter with a partner whom he feels he "can handle" . . . .(Cloyd 1976, p. 301)

Men also assume the responsibility of watching women as they dance, often with other men, to determine which women are attractive. Eye contact is often made during this time. If prolonged eye contact is made, this can be a sign that the man should attempt to engage the woman in an encounter
(Cloyd 1976). This perusing of the women by the men is also done while the men sit at the bar and the women sit at tables. Allon and Fishel (1979) mention similar uses of manner of dress, body language and eye contact to signal that one person is interested in another.

For purposes of analysis, the pickup is broken down into three stages by Cloyd: the initiation; the negotiation; and the disclosure and settlement (1976, p. 301-11). During the initiation stage both the man and woman work within their respective roles (predator and attractor) to engage in an encounter with a desired partner. During the negotiation stage, both individuals involved in the encounter try to determine what the other desires from the encounter—an evening of fun, a sexual encounter, a future spouse, or some other goal. In the disclosure and settlement stage, the man and woman make known to one another what each desires from the encounter. It is at this third stage, Cloyd notes, that a man "will receive the fruit of his labor or will be shot down. Tempers often run high during this period and fights are most likely to break out" (1976, p. 309).

Schwartz and Lever (1976) note that, because of the environment of the college mixer (specifically the loud music that inhibits anything but superficial conversation), women rely on physical attractiveness as the major part of their presentation of self. Men, on the other hand, rely on what Schwartz and Lever refer to as "cool" (p. 419).

The men first ask pretty women or those with good
figures to dance; women usually prefer handsome men or men with some sort of "cool." Being "cool" is not necessarily based on looks for a man. It means that somebody "puts himself together" well, that he walks or talks with some authority, or that he looks "interesting" or at ease. (1976, p. 419)

Schwartz and Lever point out that, despite the fact that the men and women at these mixers thought that judging one another on appearance was "inadequate and demeaning" (1976, p. 419), they continued to do it. Schwartz and Lever recognized, though, that the process involved in meeting members of the opposite sex at these mixers may actually hinder the processes of dating, courting, or finding a potential spouse.

It must be remembered that the participants get assessed and rejected repeatedly in the course of a single evening. Rather than seeing the event as "pure fun," to the contrary, the participants feel the tension and anxiety associated with a situation where high personal stakes are involved. (Schwartz and Lever 1976, p. 428)

Despite the perceptions that sexual marketplaces are fun, individuals are in danger in these places because their desirability as partners is being evaluated by members of the opposite sex (Schwartz and Lever 1976). Allon and Fishel (1979) note that the potential of rejection can cause increased anxiety in bar patrons.

With known and unknown pasts, many [patrons] tried to be pseudo-secure in a singles bar. It was not easy to do, and while many might appear secure on the outside, they were quaking in their pants inside. Often we saw people taking a deep breath so as to relax themselves, relieve the tension a little.

The fear of being rejected or put down seemed to cause a lot of tension. No one wanted to be made to feel like a fool in public. So people tried to size others up beforehand to attempt to get an indication of
whether or not their overtures would be accepted. (Allon and Fishel 1979)

The high personal stakes mentioned by Schwartz and Lever often come in the form of a loss of face for the person who has been unsuccessful at picking up (Berk 1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976; Snow, Robinson, and McCall 1991).

Applying Goffman’s (1959) concepts of performance and presentation of self to the situation at the mixers, dances, and bars, it becomes apparent that for individuals encountering one another for the first time, a person’s presentation of self would be synonymous with his or her performance and line. Many patrons in sexual marketplaces may be encountering one another for the first time as Berk notes in his 1977 singles dance study. He says that regulars to the dances take care to avoid one another. So lines and performances become synonymous in sexual marketplaces because there has been no previous interaction between the person performing and the other patrons. The other patrons have no criteria on which to base a judgment concerning the performer’s maintenance of his or her line. In the case of the college mixer or singles bar, then, a woman’s presentation of self equals her performance, which is equivalent to her physical appearance. For a man the presentation of self and performance are equivalent to the degree of "cool" he possesses. Personality becomes of very little concern for those individuals who are unacquainted.

For Cloyd (1976) a man’s presentation of self and performance is equivalent to his ability to fulfill the
duties of the predator role. A woman's presentation of self and performance become equivalent to her ability to fulfill the duties of the attractor role. Again, personality becomes of little concern for individuals who have been previously unacquainted.

Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) attempt to outline different tactics women use to parry advances made by men. They report three broad categories of methods women use to reject men. The first of these tactics is designed to reject the men but help them save face. These tactics range from a pleasant "No, thank you," (p. 431), to excuses that give the man a socially acceptable reason for being turned down. Excuses of this nature include statements such as "No, I really can't. My date will be back in a minute," (p. 433) in response to a request to dance.

The rejection tactics in Snow, Robinson, and McCall's second broad category are used by women to reject men who persist after being initially rejected. The tactics in this second category are not designed to help the man save face. They are used to get rid of him. They include statements such as "I just told you, I'm not interested!" (p. 438). The third broad category is composed of avoidance tactics that help a woman avoid an unwanted encounter or escape from one in which she is engaged. It may be inferred from Snow, Robinson, and McCall that in addition to the level of past and perceived future involvement between a man and woman, the degree of persistence of a man after being initially
rejected also is a factor in the woman's use of face-saving or non face-saving rejection techniques.

Snow, Robinson, and McCall indicate that, as a first line of defense, women use face-saving tactics to reject men. If the man persists, saving his face is no longer a primary concern for the woman. This persistence, too, seems to be a factor in determining whether a woman is concerned with helping a man save face.

This information helps to bring into focus more clearly the thesis of this paper. Still of interest is empirical verification of the circumstances surrounding situations in which a woman would and would not choose to help a man save face. As for the actual rejection made by a woman directed at a man, Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) make an important distinction. Their distinction between polite refusals and defensive incivilities recognizes the ability of a woman to reject a man kindly or harshly. This distinction is the focal point of this research: What factors help determine whether a woman will help a man save face when rejecting him? This research differs from that conducted by Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) in that the influence of the men's performances is considered in this research.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The major principles of symbolic interactionism propose that individuals acknowledge objects and actions in their environment and assign meaning to, or interpret, each of them. Those objects and actions are then acted upon by an individual according to the meanings the individual has assigned to them. Herbert Blumer (1962) says that George Herbert Mead made the greatest contributions to this approach in that

Only G. H. Mead, in my judgment, has sought to think through what the act of interpretation implies for an understanding of the human being, human action, and human association. (pp. 180-81)

Central to the ideas of Mead (1934) is the concept of the self. Mead’s concept of the self is best understood with some basic comprehension of Charles Horton Cooley’s understanding of self. Cooley (1964) believes the self cannot exist without society nor can society exist without the self. "Self and other do not exist as mutually exclusive social facts..." (p. 126). In other words, Cooley suggests that the use of words such as "I," "my" and "mine" implies the existence of others. Thus, consciousness of one’s self demands consciousness of others.
According to Mead (1934) the self is the part of the individual that assigns meanings to objects and actions and then acts upon those meanings. Mead differentiates between the self and the physical organism. For Mead the organism consists of the body and its drives and instincts (reproductive instinct, parental instinct, gregarious instinct) that are social in nature (p. 139). The physical organism's instincts and drives imply the necessity of interaction with other individuals--human reproduction requires two individuals to act as mates, parenting requires at least one adult and one child, and gregariousness requires at least two individuals to live as neighbors. The fact that these drives are social in nature makes the self necessary or, more accurately, inevitable. As Mead says,

The self has a character which is different from that of the physiological organism proper. The self is something which has a development; it is not initially there, at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity. . . . (p. 135)

The self, Mead says, arises and develops in a person from the exposure to other individuals and the observation of the ways other individuals assign meanings to objects and actions. As the self develops it gradually learns to assign its own meanings to objects and actions and to react to those meanings. The self also learns to react to itself and its own actions. This reaction to itself, Mead says, involves being able to view oneself as another individual does. This process is not unlike Cooley's (1964) process of
development described in his discussion of the looking-glass self.

As we see our face, figure, and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it. (Cooley 1964, p. 184)

What Cooley suggests in this passage is that the self develops, arises, and learns about not only its surroundings from others but from itself as well. A self learns about itself and learns to react to itself by observing its own reflection in the behaviors and imagined perceptions of others. Being able to mentally put oneself in another's place is what Mead (1934) refers to as "taking the role of the other."

Taking the role of the other involves both seeing from another's point of view and understanding how the other is likely to react to one's own behavior. In a more advanced stage of the development of the self, Mead says, one is able to assume the roles of many other individuals at once. Mead uses the example of a baseball player involved in a game. "What he does is controlled by his being everyone else on that team, at least in so far as those attitudes affect his own particular response" (p. 154).

In other words, the first baseman will know he or she should not chase after a ball hit toward third base, but, rather, he or she will stand on first base and wait for the
ball to be thrown. The first baseman knows that this action is appropriate because he or she is able to assume the roles of the other players and understand that the third baseman or left fielder will get the ball and possibly throw it to first base. There is a further stage of development, however, in which the individual is able to assume the role of what Mead (1934) calls the generalized other.

The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self may be called "the generalized other." The attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community. (p. 154)

If the given human individual is to develop a self in the fullest sense, it is not sufficient for him merely to take the attitudes of other human individuals toward himself and toward one another within the human social process, and to bring that social process as a whole into his individual experience merely in these terms: he must also, in the same way that he takes the attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward one another, take their attitudes toward the various phases or aspects of the common social activity or set of social undertakings in which, as members of an organized society or social group, they are all engaged; and he must then, by generalizing these individual attitudes of that organized society or social group itself, as a whole, act toward different social projects which at any given time it is carrying out, or toward the various larger phases of the general social process which constitutes its life and of which these projects are specific manifestations. (p. 154-55)

Thus, an individual's surroundings help form the self, but the self also helps shape the surroundings. Mead differentiated between these two parts of the self, assigning the name "me" to the part of the self that is shaped by one's environment. The "I" is the part of the self that acts toward one's environment. As Mead says, "The attitudes of the others constitute the organized 'me,' and
then one reacts toward that as an 'I'" (p. 175). These concepts of the reaction of the me to the environment and the action of the I toward the environment can be found in the work of Erving Goffman. Goffman (1967) describes and clarifies his use of the term "self" in the following statement.

So far I have implicitly been using a double definition of self: the self as an image pieced together from the expressive implications of the full flow of events in an undertaking; and the self as a kind of player in a ritual game who copes honorably or dishonorably, diplomatically or undiplomatically, with the judgmental contingencies of the situation. (p. 31)

Here, Goffman is acknowledging the two parts of the self and analyzing how the I and the me play out their parts within the microcosm of a single social undertaking.

Before proceeding further into Goffman’s ideas concerning selves, action, and interaction, further discussion of some of Mead’s ideas may be useful. The type of communication carried on in the interaction Goffman discusses involves the exchange of what Mead (1934) calls "significant symbols." A gesture is made by an individual, and it represents an act, but a gesture is not always a significant symbol.

We see that an animal is angry and that he is going to attack. We know that that is in the action of the animal, and is revealed by the attitude of the animal. We cannot say the animal means it in the sense that he has a reflective determination to attack. (Mead 1934, p. 45)

A person, Mead goes on to explain, may shake a fist at another person. This gesture signifies a meaning behind the
gesture. If the gesture arouses the same idea in the individual it is directed toward, then the shaken fist becomes a significant symbol (p. 45). So, in order for a gesture to be significant it must not merely elicit a response from another individual, but it must also be made with a certain meaning behind it and the gesture must evoke that same meaning for the other individual involved. For Mead, this is real language.

Goffman (1959) discusses how individuals use what Mead would call gestures in social interaction in order to provide others with a certain image of oneself. According to Goffman, an individual "gives" and "gives off" signs to others. Both of these are means of expression of oneself that others will use to form impressions of the individual. Goffman describes giving and giving off as follows:

The expressiveness of the individual (and therefore his capacity to give impressions) appears to involve two radically different kinds of sign activity: the expression that he gives, and the expression that he gives off. The first involves verbal symbols or their substitutes which he uses admittedly and solely to convey the information that he and the others are known to attach to these symbols. This is communication in the traditional and narrow sense. The second involves a wide range of action that others can treat as symptomatic of the actor, the expectation being that the action was performed for reasons other than the information conveyed in this way. (1959, p. 2)

Here, Goffman is describing how an individual in a specific social undertaking intentionally gives and unintentionally gives off signs that leave others with a particular image about himself or herself. Goffman seems to be employing Mead’s concept of the gesture as part of the mechanism
through which one may express his or her image to others. The significant gesture, then, is part of the mechanism through which the others are able to form an impression of the individual.

Controlling others' impressions of oneself is desirable, Goffman (1959) says. By controlling the impressions others develop about oneself, one is also controlling the meanings the others assign to oneself and one's behaviors. Successfully controlling others' impressions of oneself can determine the ways in which others act toward oneself. A person may want to manage the impressions others have of him or her in order to "ensure sufficient harmony so that interaction can be sustained, or to defraud, get rid of, confuse, mislead, antagonize, or insult them" (Goffman 1959, p. 3). This attempt at managing or controlling the impressions of those around oneself is conducted through what Goffman calls a performance. In his own words, Goffman describes the performance as

all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers. (1959, p. 22)

In a given social undertaking or situation, according to Goffman (1959), individuals will seek information about one another in order to give form and shape to the situation and provide an understanding of the undertaking. Having information about a person allows the others to know what type of behaviors to expect and how to elicit specific
behaviors from him or her. This information makes easier each individual's task of managing the others' impressions of him or her. So, each person in a social situation is performing for the others. As Goffman (1967) says, each individual performs a "line":

that is, a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself. (p. 5)

While each person is interacting, performing, and acting out lines, she or he is also constantly taking the role of the other, as Mead would say. Supposing the social situation is a small group, as one speaks he or she considers the meaning of the symbols he or she is giving and giving off. The meanings, as they will be interpreted by the others, are considered by the speaker, and the symbols given and given off are adjusted so as to form the intended impression. The others in the group then assimilate into their current impression of the speaker the new symbols expressed by the speaker. From this new information each of the others forms a new, modified impression of the speaker; and each responds according to this new impression. Of course, each person in the group goes through the same process that the first speaker went through when taking a turn at expression, although different performers' turns may occur simultaneously. Each individual uses the other individuals (and the group as a whole) to evaluate his or
her performance and adjust it as necessary so as to keep with the line he or she has started.

So, Goffman has presented the motivation for trying to control others' impressions of oneself and the method to do it--the performance; Mead has provided real mechanisms that will be used to carry out the action--the self and the significant symbol.

It is worth mentioning at this point that there are similarities between Goffman's and Mead's understanding of the individual in a social situation. Goffman's speaker--who is acting, then looking at himself or herself through responses of others, then adjusting the actions, then checking again--illustrates the duality in the self that Mead pointed out when he differentiated between the I and the me. Mead's me is the part of the self that is shaped by the environment. The I is the part that then acts toward the environment. The me, then, is similar to the part of Goffman's speaker who is checking his or her actions with the group then reformulating his or her approach. The I is the part that completes the adjusted expression through action then hands the whole process back to the me so that the self can then readjust its actions to stay within the line that has been set forth.

We are continually following up our own address to other persons by an understanding of what we are saying, and using that understanding in the direction of our continued speech. We are finding out what we are going to say, what we are going to do, by saying and doing, and in the process we are continually controlling the process itself. In the conversation of
gestures what we say calls out a certain response in
another and that in turn changes our own action, so
that we shift from what we started to do because of the
reply the other makes. (Mead 1934, pp. 140-41)

The problem the self is now faced with, as it directs
and redirects its actions, is staying with the line that has
been initiated. The statement of this problem helps define
more clearly the direction of this paper. In relation to
lines Goffman (1967) also discusses the term "face."
Goffman defines "face" as "the positive social value a
person effectively claims for himself by the line others
assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 5).
The face, then, is a social creation. Within social
interactions an individual is usually trying to maintain
face. In other words the individual is trying to provide
support, through the performance (or lack of performance) of
certain actions, for the face he or she has assumed. The
problem the self confronts is staying within the line that
one has put forth for his or her self. As Goffman points
out, this problem becomes more complicated with the
assumption of a particular face because once a face is
assumed, the number of acceptable lines available to an
individual is greatly reduced. If one hopes to maintain
face, one must follow the lines that correspond to the
particular face assumed; but the face must also accurately
respond to one's previous behavior outside of the
immediate situation.

Thus while concern for face focuses the attention of
the person on the current activity, he [sic] must, to
maintain face in this activity, take into consideration
his place in the social world beyond it. A person who can maintain face in the current situation is someone who abstained from certain actions in the past that would have been difficult to face up to later. In addition, he fears loss of face now partly because the others may take this as a sign that consideration for his feelings need not be shown in the future. There is nevertheless a limitation to this interdependence between the current situation and the wider social world: an encounter with people whom he will not have dealings with again leaves him free to take a high line that the future will discredit, or free to suffer humiliations that would make future dealings with them an embarrassing thing to have to face. (Goffman 1967, pp. 7-8)

Maintaining face results in feelings of confidence and assurance, according to Goffman (1967), because others see one as just what one claims to be and because one has not upset the order of the social undertaking. But loss of face results in feelings of shame, inferiority, or embarrassment "because of what has happened to the activity on his account and because of what may happen to his reputation as a participant" (1967, p. 8) in social undertakings. Goffman suggests several reasons that people might engage in face maintenance or face saving, but he points out that studying face saving does not provide the researcher with the reasons a person desires to save face. The researcher is simply trying to understand the rules surrounding face work or those actions used to help maintain face. Individuals desire to maintain face—or save face if face is in danger of being lost—because they may like the image a particular face impresses upon others, Goffman suggests, or they may wish to retain pride and honor. An individual may also be
interested in maintaining a particular face because that face may provide a certain amount of power or prestige.

Finally, Goffman (1967) notes that one may be interested in maintaining or saving face for others because of his emotional attachment to an image of them, or because he feels that his coparticipants have a moral right to this protection, or because he wants to avoid the hostility that may be directed toward him if they lose their face. He may feel that an assumption has been made that he is the sort of person who shows compassion and sympathy toward others, so that to retain his own face, he may feel obliged to be considerate of the line taken by other participants. (p. 12)

People are expected to help one another save face if the situation should present itself, Goffman says, in order to preserve the continuation of the social relationship. To help one another maintain face "tacit cooperation will naturally arise so that the participants together can attain their shared but differently motivated objectives" (1967, p. 29). He does note, though, that in interactions with strangers one may feel more freedom to be humiliated (lose face) or assume a line that future interaction could discredit. This sense of freedom is the result of the expectation that there would be no further interaction with those people (1967, pp. 7-8).

The purpose of this paper is to apply Mead’s concepts of the self and significant symbols, and Goffman’s concept of face work, to a particular situation—that of the singles bar. The predominant view is that "social" activities such as dating and attending dances and parties are fun (Berk
1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976). Sometimes, however, dating and attending parties or bars can put an individual into a situation that can cause loss of face or can put one into an embarrassing situation (Berk 1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976; Snow, Robinson, and McCall 1991; Waller 1937). Of interest here is the situation in which a man at a singles bar attempts to "pick up" a woman. Picking up refers to the process of finding a suitable partner with whom one might seek thrills, often of a sexual nature, for a limited amount of time—sometimes for one night. Of specific interest here are the methods used by women to reject men who make unsolicited attempts to pick them up.

For the man, an attempt at picking up a woman at a bar involves risk. Well documented is the importance of the performance and maintenance of face for men and women in dating relationships and at dances (Berk 1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976; Waller 1937). Failure to put on a good performance or remain within one's line can decrease one's level of desirability as a dating partner (Berk 1977; Schwartz and Lever 1976). It follows, then, that this might also affect one's desirability as a partner, even if for one night. Failure to remain within one's line or failure to recognize gestures of disinterest from the woman can result in loss of face for the man. Berk (1977) emphasizes the intensity of emotion associated with rejection—in this case a rejection to a request for a dance at a singles dance—with his statement, "The most painful and threatening
encounters are those in which men ask women to dance and are refused" (p. 540). According to Goffman—as discussed above—both the man and the woman will have interests in helping the man save face in this situation. As he has noted, however, this desire to help one another maintain face may not be as strong between strangers as between those who are better acquainted.

Goffman (1967) has suggested two major types of face work: the avoidance process and the corrective process. Avoidance is used when one wishes to distance himself or herself from a face-threatening situation or when an individual or group wishes to avoid acknowledgment that a face-threatening incident has occurred. Avoiding acknowledgment involves overlooking a face-threatening behavior another individual has committed. Once the face-threatening incident has been acknowledged, Goffman says, the corrective process is employed. The corrective process helps restore order to the social situation that was thrown off balance by the act that destroyed face. Restoring order involves a four-step ritual. As Goffman says, "one's face, then, is a sacred thing, and the expressive order required to sustain it is therefore a ritual one" (1967, p. 19).

The first step in this process is the challenge. In this step the group members point out the action that caused loss of face. By doing so they are demanding that the action be corrected. The second step is the offering. In this step the individual who committed the act is given the
opportunity to compensate for the act. In the third step, acceptance, the people offended by the act accept the individual’s compensation. In the final step, thanks, the individual who committed the act thanks the others for allowing the forgiveness of the act. This ritual, Goffman says, helps restore the individual’s face and the order to the social situation.

Goffman’s two types of face work provide us with tools with which we can analyze the interaction involved in the pickup at the party. In the situations in which the woman does not wish to be picked up by the particular man who has approached her, she will need to reject him. According to Goffman both the man and the woman will be interested in helping the man save face. Unless the man employs avoidance tactics, the woman will have to act as what Goffman (1952) has termed a "cooler."

In Goffman’s study of the confidence, or con, game he describes the game itself as a way in which the operators of the game take money from the mark under false pretenses. The mark is the person whose money is taken. The play, or stages of operation of the game, has several phases. Goffman describes the play of a typical con game as follows:

The potential sucker is first spotted, and one member of the working team (called the outside man, steerer, or roper) arranges to make social contact with him. The confidence of the mark is won, and he is given an opportunity to invest his money in a gambling venture which he understands to have been fixed in his favor. The venture, of course, is fixed, but not in his favor. The mark is permitted to win some money and then persuaded to invest more. There is an "accident" or
"mistake," and the mark loses his total investment. The operators then depart in a ceremony that is called the blowoff or sting. They leave the mark but take his money. (1952, p. 451)

Not always, notes Goffman, is the mark willing to accept his loss calmly. Sometimes he or she may be inclined to report the operators to the police, or chase the operators. To avoid this the operators will sometimes add another phase to the play—cooling out the mark.

One of the operators will be designated as the cooler, or the person who stays with the mark to "keep the anger of the mark within manageable proportions," (Goffman 1952, p. 452).

In essence, then, the cooler has the job of handling persons who have been caught out on a limb—persons whose expectations and self-conceptions have been built up and then shattered. The mark is a person who has compromised himself, in his own eyes if not the eyes of others. (p. 452)

The mark must find a way to deal with these shattered self-conceptions. The cooler's role is to provide the mark with the way to deal with them—without chasing the operators or enlisting the police.

But Goffman acknowledges that the concept of cooling out a mark can be extended beyond the specific situation presented here—that of a con game. He acknowledges that many people, in many different situations, often need to be cooled out. "Cooling the mark out is one theme in a very basic social story," (1952, p. 453).

The woman in the pick-up scenario has, basically, two choices. She can give and give off expressions indicating
that she does or does not wish to be picked up by a particular man who is attempting to pick her up. The woman who does not wish to be picked up acts as a cooler if she must employ and carry out the corrective process as a method of face work. In relation to Goffman’s four steps in the corrective process she acts as a cooler by offering the man a way out of a situation in which he is confronting rejection. By using the corrective process she offers the man an escape route out of the situation, thus, an opportunity to save face.

Sometimes the man may need to be cooled out by the woman during an attempted pickup. During the attempt each individual gives and gives off expressions that the other forms into impressions and then reformulates his or her actions and expressions accordingly. If during this process of the pickup there is a loss of face for the man or if the man has not formed proper impressions about a woman who does not wish to be picked up and persists in the attempted pickup, then he may need to be cooled out. Of concern here is the man who must be cooled out because he refuses or fails to form the impression of the woman as one who does not wish to be picked up. The researcher’s use of "cooling out" is a derivative of Goffman’s original use of the term and essentially refers to defensive and protective practices on the part of the woman.

Here it becomes a matter of empirical verification as to whether Goffman’s assertion that all those involved in a
social undertaking—in this case the process of the attempted pickup—will be concerned with helping an individual save face, or if the desire to help another save face varies by situation. It may be that the impression the man creates for the woman influences her likelihood of helping him save face. There may also be other factors involved. Empirical verification would prove useful here in determining the circumstances surrounding situations in which the woman would and would not choose to help the man save face.
CHAPTER IV
METHODS

All social research can be reduced to attempts to answer one or more of three questions, says Lofland (1971). These questions are:

1. What are the characteristics of a social phenomenon, the forms it assumes, the variations it displays?
2. What are the causes of a social phenomenon, the forms it assumes, the variations it displays?
3. What are the consequences of a social phenomenon, the forms it assumes, the variations it displays? (p. 13)

Quantitative research is usually used to answer questions two and three. Qualitative research is usually conducted to answer the first question. "The qualitative analyst seeks to provide an explicit rendering of the structure, order, and patterns found among a set of participants" (Lofland 1971, p. 7).

A qualitative approach, involving observation and interviewing, is used in this study to provide a depth of understanding about a social situation that has had limited amounts of research devoted to it. The existing studies of rejection in singles bars, marketplace bars, and similar social situations are predominantly, if not entirely,

A qualitative approach was chosen for this study for two reasons. First, because of this lack of much existing material concerning how women and men deal with rejecting and rejection in bars, more description of the characteristics of this social phenomenon is needed. Before causes and consequences of social phenomena can be explained, the characteristics of the phenomena must be better known and understood. Second, the difficulty, expense, and length of time involved in finding a large enough sample to conduct quantitative research limited the choice. Put more simply, qualitative research is more appropriate and more convenient for this topic at this time.

The social phenomenon of interest in this study is the rejection of men by women in a marketplace bar setting. Of particular interest is the perspective of each woman involved in an encounter in which she rejects a man's invitation or invitations to dance, talk, drink, or interact in some other way. Interviewing the women was necessary to
determine their perspectives on the encounters and their reasons for rejecting the men. In order to determine which women should be interviewed and to try to obtain a more objective account of each encounter discussed by each woman, observation was also determined to be necessary.

The bar that served as the research site was in a town of about 50,000 people in a Southern state that borders the North. The pseudonym for the town is Springfield. The Looking Glass Lounge at the The Comeback Inn (also pseudonyms) in Springfield was chosen as the bar in which the observations and interviews were to be conducted.

Before the observation and interviewing process began, trips to various bars in Springfield determined this bar to best fit Cloyd's (1976) description of a marketplace bar—the light level is low, there are loud music and flashing lights, and there is alcohol available at the bar. The dance floor also seems to serve a key function as an ice-breaker for newly formed couples. The frequency with which men seemed to be attempting to pick up women seemed greater at this bar than at others that were attended. A greater frequency of pickup attempts would increase the opportunities for observing a rejection and, thus, increase the opportunities for obtaining an interview. The bar is open seven days a week, for it is the only business in Springfield that can legally sell alcohol on Sundays. Not only did this provide an extra day during the week for
observations and interviews, but Sundays, along with Fridays and Saturdays, seemed to be the busiest days of the week.

The author assumed the role of a bar patron in order to gain unquestioned access to the bar as an unknown observer. The author's identity as a researcher was kept secret until an interview was conducted to avoid influencing or altering the behavior of the people being observed, as has been the case when subjects know they are being observed (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939). While some people were recognized by the author to be regular patrons at the bar (at least once a week), there appeared to be many patrons who did not attend regularly so there was little danger of the author's identity being widely known among the patrons. On Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays attendance was usually large enough to facilitate the researcher blending in with the crowd. If the researcher attended the bar alone, an abundance of other apparently unaccompanied males provided anonymity. Position in the bar was then often taken between the bar and the dance floor where many other apparently unaccompanied males stood. This position provided a fairly clear view of the bar area, the tables, and the dance floor. If the researcher attended the bar with a friend, position was often taken on stools along a wall or at a table to the side of the dance floor. This position also provided a clear view of most of the establishment.

Upon entering the bar and choosing a location from which to observe, the first step for the researcher was to
visually locate women in the bar who appeared to be "uncoupled," or not with a male. Often uncoupled women were in groups at tables. They seemed more likely than women with men to be approached by uncoupled men. The researcher also attempted to visually locate uncoupled men who appeared to be approaching many women. After locating several women or groups of women who seemed likely to be approached by men, or perhaps locating one or more men who seemed likely to approach women, time was spent watching these people for an apparent rejection to occur.

As an apparent rejection occurred, the researcher watched the encounter, trying to make mental notes of the following: the location of the encounter within the bar; the manner of dress of the participants; a physical description of the participants; any indication of the apparent level of intoxication (if any) of the participants; the number of other people around (at the table or standing in the immediate group) at the time of the encounter; the gender of the other people around at the time of the encounter; the amount of eye contact between the participants; the amount of physical contact involved; other body language used; any words overheard; the approximate length of time elapsed during the encounter; and the behavior of the participants before (if possible) and after the encounter. Other details of encounters were also included in the observations when observed and remembered. The memory of the researcher was relied upon to some degree, for notes could not be
inconspicuously made in the bar. Since leaving the bar to make notes immediately after observing an encounter may have meant losing track of the subject (if she left the bar), notes were not made until immediately after the interview. Many encounters observed took place within 30 minutes of the closing of the bar. All but two took place within an hour of the closing of the bar. Since interviews took place immediately following the subject's departure from the bar (many of which were at closing time) and the interviews lasted from 15 to 30 minutes, notes were usually made within 45 minutes to an hour after the encounter.

A miniature tape recorder was used, with each interviewee's permission, to record each interview. None of the respondents refused to let the interview be taped. This tape recorder could be easily concealed in a pants pocket while in the bar, then taken out to record the interview. Each interview was then transcribed onto a word processor computer file for easy retrieval and printing. Notes on observations of each encounter were also made on the tape recorder following each interview. These notes were transcribed into the same file with the transcription of the interview to keep the two together.

The author's identity as a researcher was revealed to the potential interviewee when the request for an interview was made. Often this also involved revealing the identity to friends or acquaintances of the potential interviewee. It seemed as if many women were more receptive to being
interviewed after the bar had closed as opposed to while alcohol was still being served, music was still playing, and people were still interacting in the bar. Because of this perception on the part of the researcher most potential interviewees were approached as they left the bar, whether it was before or after the bar closed. The bar closed at 1:00 a.m. every day of the week except Saturday nights when it closed at midnight.

A potential interviewee would be approached by the researcher as she left the bar after she had been observed to have apparently rejected a man’s request to dance, sit and talk, or interact in some other way. Generally, the researcher would approach the woman with the following introduction:

Excuse me. My name is Rob McCracken, and I’m a graduate student at Western. I’m working on my master’s degree in sociology, and for my thesis I’m doing some research on barroom behavior. I was wondering if I could ask you a few questions. It should take only a few minutes.

This approach succeeded in securing an interview more often than not, but the success rate was 100 percent when a female friend accompanied the researcher. When a female friend did not accompany the researcher, four women (fewer than half those approached) did decline to be interviewed. Reasons given for declining to be interviewed included that friends were waiting for the woman and that the woman was not interested. There were some evenings when, perhaps due to low bar attendance or other reasons, no encounter resembling
the rejection of a man by a woman was observed. In these cases the researcher simply left and returned another night.

Because the bar was located just off the lobby of the hotel, the lobby itself provided a satisfactory place to conduct the interviews. Furniture in the lobby was arranged into two separate sitting areas. At bar closing time at least one of the areas was usually available. Most of the interviews took place in these areas. One took place in a doorway just outside the bar entrance, another interview with four women took place in front of the hotel while sitting on the curb, and another took place at a folding table set up temporarily in the lobby.

Because the main entrance and exit to the bar was through the hotel lobby, noise was a minor problem while conducting interviews. As patrons left the bar or as they loitered in the lobby after the closing of the bar, the noise would sometimes interrupt the interviews. Also related to the exiting of patrons through the lobby and past the interview site, there was a concern that the researcher's identity would be revealed to the patrons as they passed by while leaving the bar. It seemed as if few took notice of the interview being conducted, however. Again, there were a few minor exceptions to this. During five interviews on different nights individual men approached the interview area and inquired about the questions I was asking, tried to answer some of the questions, or approached the subject to request her address.
Four of these men appeared to be bar patrons, and three of these four appeared to be in different levels of inebriation. The other man was a security officer for the hotel. It may be that the interviews appeared to other patrons to be nothing more than individuals having a discussion.

The interviews consisted of 19 main questions although the subject was often asked to elaborate further on answers given. In addition to these 19 questions, four questions about health and AIDS issues were included for a possible later study. The interview guide appears in Appendix A. Health and AIDS questions were placed at the end of the guide because some interviewees were in a hurry to leave the bar and hotel or they were under pressure from friends to leave. In this event the health and AIDS questions could be dropped from the interview.

There were few problems relating to the nature of the questions and the interviewees' willingness or ability to answer. The main problem was the length of time required for the interviews. As mentioned, interviewees or their friends and acquaintances were often concerned about the length of time the interviews were taking (interview length ranged from 15 to 30 minutes), sometimes expressing a desire to leave. This time frame may have resulted in brief or incomplete answers. Interviewing the women as soon as possible after the apparent rejections occurred was necessary, though, so that their memories of the events and
feelings were still fresh, accurate, and complete. Because it seemed difficult to obtain interviews while the bar was still open, the next best option seemed to be obtaining interviews as the bar closed, thus inviting complaints about the length of the interviews.

Sometimes there were problems with securing an interview from a subject who had been observed to engage in an apparent rejection of a man. On several occasions—all when the researcher attended the bar by himself—the subject approached by the researcher declined to be interviewed. One night a female friend of the researcher’s accompanied him to the bar. When a subject was approached about being interviewed, the researcher’s friend provided assurance to the subject that the research was legitimate. The subject seemed reassured and agreed to the interview. Other female friends sometimes accompanied the researcher, and this arrangement seemed to facilitate the securing of interviews. The female subjects sometimes posed questions, such as "Is this for real?" to the female friends. When reassured by the researcher’s friends the subjects often seemed more at ease. The subject’s attitude also put the researcher more at ease, knowing the subject was reassured of the researcher’s identity and legitimacy.

The observations and interviews took place from March 26, 1993 to August 1, 1993. Over the course of that time the researcher attended the bar about three nights each week. Time spent in the bar by the researcher on any one
occasion varied from 45 minutes to three hours. On a typical night about one and a half hours were spent at the bar. This time includes the time spent interviewing the subject.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS

During the interviews each of the 20 women was asked to describe how she responded to the man who asked her to dance, talk, drink, or interact in some other way. Each woman was also asked to rate the personality of the same man on a scale from 1 to 10, with one being an extremely unattractive personality and 10 being an extremely attractive personality. Each was also asked to rate the same man’s physical attractiveness on a scale from 1 to 10.

At first glance common sense may seem to dictate that the more attractive a woman finds a man’s personality and physical appearance, the nicer she will be to him while rejecting him, or the easier she will make it for him to save face. The interviews with the women, however, do not suggest that this is necessarily true. A pattern that does stand out is that half of the women interviewed used some type of excuse, despite indicating that the men did not present themselves well. But before delving into a discussion of this pattern, a look at the people and the place involved may be helpful.
The Women

This section provides a description of the women as a group. For a more thorough description of each woman, see Appendix B in which physical description and background information is provided for each woman. They are listed alphabetically by their pseudonyms that were assigned by the author for purposes of anonymity.

Before this research was begun it was expected that the women in the bar would generally be in their twenties or thirties and single or divorced. These expectations proved to be accurate as a whole. The median age of the women was 25.5 years, with a range from 21 to 38. The mean age was 25.6 years. Fifteen of the women were in their twenties; the other five were in their thirties. In terms of marital status, nine of the women were single, seven divorced, two married, and one legally separated. There was one missing case. One of the single women, Heather, was to be married the next day. The separated woman said her divorce was to be final three days from the day of the interview.

The education levels of the women ranged from high school to some graduate work. Four women said they had no more than a high school education. Thirteen had completed some college or trade school. Five of them were still enrolled in college. Two of the women had completed college. One had completed some graduate work and was still enrolled.
Nineteen of the women said they were from Springfield or the surrounding area. The surrounding area, however, seemed to extend several counties. Six women were from surrounding counties. Nancy said she lived in a town between Springfield and a larger city. She lived about 50 miles north of Springfield. She said she usually attended The Looking Glass Lounge (author’s pseudonym) every Saturday. Many of the counties and towns surrounding Springfield have laws against the sale of alcohol. This may have been one reason that, as indicated by Nancy, a considerable number of subjects from other counties were willing to drive the distance to Springfield.

See, if I go to [a larger city], it’s probably farther. And I don’t know; it’s just, to me it’s handier to come down here. It’s closer. There’s not as many cops. You don’t have as many main roads to travel. (Nancy)

One woman, Kathy, said she was visiting town, but she indicated she lived near Springfield.

The Bar Setting

Before discussing the specific encounters between men and women, a general description of the bar and the general behavior of the people involved may be helpful. The bar, The Looking Glass Lounge at the The Comeback Inn in Springfield, is located off the main lobby of the hotel. Getting into the bar requires walking through the lobby. There was usually a security officer at the bar entrance
asking for identification of those who appeared to be younger than 21 years old.

The barroom was shaped like two rectangles placed together perpendicular to one another (see Figure 1). The stage for the live band and the dance floor were located in the larger of the two rectangular areas protruding from the long wall opposite the bar area. The bar area was located in the smaller of the two rectangular areas. The walls were mauve and were decorated with bands of mirrored glass. Padded, wooden stools were situated around the bar and against the wall in the stage area farthest from the main entrance. Padded, wooden chairs sat around square, laquered, wooden tables in the bar area on the side of the bar farthest from the stage and in the area all around the stage and dance floor forming a "U" around the stage and dance floor. The largest concentration of tables was in the stage area. There were more than 40 tables in the stage and dance floor section of the barroom and about 10 tables in the back area of the barroom behind the bar.

The atmosphere in the barroom was much as Cloyd (1976) describes a marketplace bar. The light level was low with the main sources of light being the dance floor lights, the muted light above the bar (so the bartenders could see to work), and four seashell-shaped lamps along the walls reflecting their dim light off the ceiling. Most of the other light came from the quick glows of cigarettes and cigarette lighters. The music played loudly and the red and
Figure 1. Floor Plan of The Looking Glass Lounge
yellow lights above the dance floor flashed wildly during fast songs. During slow songs couples held one another closely, and a large mirrored ball hanging from the ceiling spun, sending flashes of light around the room. A great deal of alcohol was consumed each night. Berk (1977, p. 533) notes that a low light-level allows individual defects to be hidden, helps create illusion, and helps set a romantic mood. Schwartz and Lever (1976) note that drinking alcohol, aside from giving each individual something to do while not engaged with a member of the opposite sex, helps "loosen inhibitions and numb sensitivities for the personal tests that are to come" (p. 418).

A live band played every night of the week. Monday through Saturday nights one band played its own versions of popular, danceable country and top-40 rock songs. On Sundays a different band played less danceable classic rock and alternative rock songs. This Sunday-night band seemed to bring in a crowd that appeared to be younger and contain more college students than the band that played the rest of the week. There appeared to be a certain crowd that regularly attended the bar on Sundays but never, or rarely, attended on other nights. Regulars from other nights of the week often attended on Sundays as well. When a live band was not playing, taped music played so the bar patrons could continue to dance.

Large groups of people would often push tables together, distorting the narrow aisles between tables. This
narrow spacing made navigating the spaces between chairs, tables, or people difficult for those trying to reach the dance floor. When a song would begin, there would often be a rush to the dance floor. When a song would end, the dance floor would begin to clear if another song did not start playing immediately. Between songs other noises that were usually occluded became audible: the clinking of glasses, the buzz of conversations, and yelps of laughter. While music was playing, people sitting around tables often leaned toward one another so they could hear conversations over the music. Couples at tables often also held hands or stroked one another’s arms or hair.

Marketplace Bar Gender Roles

As stated by Cloyd (1976), in his description of marketplace bars, the dance floor in The Looking Glass seemed to be the focal point of the bar. His description of the behavior of men and women in marketplace bars also accurately describes The Looking Glass in many ways.

Females usually come in groups of two or more and head straight for a table and sit down, most often without checking out or cruising the place very much. They usually stick pretty close to those they came with and only start to check out the guys after they have staked out some territory (table). Males, on the other hand, given their more predatory role, will usually manifest more cruising behavior by more blatantly checking out the situation. This is usually done by walking around the entire barroom area and noting the different females and the degree to which their presence is acknowledged by the females, determining the likelihood of a potential encounter. After the place has been checked out, they will usually stake out some territory, often at the bar or some area in which there
is a good visual access to those females who seem to be "available." (Cloyd 1976, pp. 297-98)

Cloyd notes that the bar provides an excellent lookout station because the bar stools are often about a foot higher than other chairs in the barroom. A crowded bar, he adds, may require some men to stake their territory standing near the dance floor or in a barroom corner. These locations chosen by the men allow them the best view of the women that are to be hustled (Cloyd 1976, p. 298). Similar behaviors and activities occurred in The Looking Glass. Every woman interviewed was at The Looking Glass with other people. Seven of the subjects, however, were with both men and women, and one subject (Carol) was with a man--her father. The other 12 subjects were at the bar with other women.

Allon and Fishel (1979) note that marketplace bars "appeared to be a definite subcultural reflection of traditional sex role stereotyping, with distinctive expectations for men and women's roles" (p. 177). Consistent with Allon and Fishel's statement and Cloyd's (1976) description, upon arriving at The Looking Glass the women would often head for a table while the men would often go to the bar to get a drink or check out the barroom. The gender role performances in The Looking Glass were strikingly similar to those described by Cloyd. The men assumed the predatory role while the women assumed the more passive attractor role. During the time the author spent observing in the barroom, never was a woman seen approaching a man asking him to dance or interact in some way. It
appeared that the men were always responsible for initiating encounters.

The role of the women should not be disregarded or thought to be totally passive. Many of the women wore clothing that appeared to help them fill the role of attractor. This type of clothing included, but was not limited to, tight dresses, blouses and dresses with low-cut necklines, and short skirts. This style of dress seemed to be more popular on weekends than during the week. Generally the men seemed more likely than the women to wear casual clothes such as jeans, T-shirts, baseball or cowboy hats, athletic shoes and other informal clothing. The men may have dressed in this more relaxed style because the men relied less on physical appearance as part of their performance and more on how they approached women, while women, in the attractor role, relied more on physical appearance to gain the attention of men.

As for the tendency of women to attend the bar in groups, Berk's 1977 study of the singles dance offers some explanation. Berk's study also helps explain the reasons some women offered for being at the bar. When attending a singles dance, Berk says, women often make an effort to have a friend or friends with them in order to help "establish a front of respectability that chaperons once did for participants who felt 'respectable' women do not come to dances alone" (p. 533). Berk also notes that there is a sort of strength in numbers for women at singles dances.
Being with other women can help provide "mutual protection from feared male exploitation" (p. 534).

Having a friend along at a singles dance can offer a dance-goer a way to explain attendance at a function that otherwise often carries with it a stigma.

Singles dances bear something of the stigma of "lonely hearts" clubs. Presence at the dance often implies failure in the usual forms of sociable interaction, and suggests that the individual is a "social reject," "misfit," or "loser." (Berk 1977, p. 530)

Berk indicates that patrons attend a singles dance in order to meet others, dance, and exchange phone numbers or arrange later meetings with others they find attractive. In this manner a singles dance is as much a sexual marketplace, as described by Cavan (1966), as a singles bar. Cavan says a sexual marketplace is a place where people can meet and agree about the exchange of sexual services. These services may be anything from talking and dancing to engaging in sex. Given the similarities in purpose of a marketplace bar and a singles dance, it may be that some bar patrons believe that attending a marketplace bar without another person carries as much stigma as attending a singles dance alone.

Awareness of this stigma could help explain why every woman interviewed was with at least one other person. Awareness of this stigma may also help explain the reasons some of the women offered for their attendance at the bar.
Women's Reasons for Attendance

Berk (1977) says that one strategy women employ to help save face at a singles dance is to give the impression that they are not there by choice.

One of the most common "lines" employed by female patrons was that they were "dragged to the dance by a friend" who usually just broke up with her boyfriend and needed to get out and meet others. The understanding is that they would never come to a place like this on their own under ordinary circumstances. (Berk 1977, p. 535)

Two women, Kathy and Tanya, indicated that they had been dragged along with friends who desired to attend this bar.

We were out with some friends who hadn't seen each other in a while and we were really just wanting to dance and stuff. I mean, it was not like a pickup place--obviously we're all couples. And, I didn't wanna come here. I was just with the group. (Kathy)

Well, I came because she wanted to go, basically. (Tanya)

I'm just basically the chaperon. (Tanya)

Both women mentioned they were already involved in relationships with men. Nancy was with her boyfriend at the bar. Tanya, who attended the bar with Susan, was married. Only two of the 20 women interviewed offered this type of explanation for their attendance at the bar. While this sample may not be enough to indicate that there is widespread understanding that marketplace bars have some stigma associated with them, it may be that some people attach this stigma to attendance there.

Many other women, while not necessarily saying they had been dragged to the bar, offered negative comments about the
bar and its patrons. Many of these comments concerned the type of men whom the women saw or met in the bar and indicated the women’s dislike of the bar:

There was old men, and—I hate to say it, but—they was all low-life. I mean redneckish. (Faye)

Creepy, little, old men. (Heather)

None of (the men) are marriage material. (Tanya)

This is the only bar I’ve been to so far, and it’s not a good place to try and find a decent man. (Lori)

The majority of ‘em are either high when they come in, or drunk. (Lori)

I think this is a redneck joint. (Anna)

I mean, I would never date somebody that I met here. (Gayle)

Others mentioned their general dislike for the bar or bars like it:

Guys totally disgust me in bars. (Kathy)

If I want to pick up somebody it wouldn’t be somebody in a bar. (Anna)

Oh, my God, I hate that place. Oh, I hate that place. (Pat)

And then we went out in the parking lot and I talked to these other four people that came up. They was from out of town. And they said, "Is there anywhere else in this town to go?" I said, "No, every place else is closed." I said, "But next time you come go to [another bar]." It’s a more warm place, you know. Instead of like a meat market like [The Looking Glass at The Comeback Inn]. I hate it. But anyway, I said to the people, "It’s more warm; it’s more fun. Everybody’s more open and everything." (Pat)

If so many women dislike the bar or the men in the bar and only two women indicated they were dragged to the bar, then why were the women attending the bar? Initial
Responses to this question were usually one of five types: the "I was dragged" response; the "to get out and have fun" response; the "other bars were dead" response; the special occasion response; and the "I always come here" response. With further probing (including questions 10 and 11) some women indicated whether they had come to dance, drink, or meet people. As stated above, two women—Kathy and Tanya—indicated that they had not chosen to attend the bar. They went because friends wanted to go.

Six of the women gave some sort of "to get out and have fun" response. This type of response usually indicated a general intention of having fun by getting physically and mentally away from work, home, or a specific person. Usually the fun to be had was mentioned only in vague terms.

Responses of this type include:

Just to get out. Get away from work for a while and get everything off my mind. Just get out and have a good time. (Evelyn)

Because I like to get out. I like to party. I hadn’t been out in a long time. (Susan)

Because I had nothing else to do and I work at a bar through the rest of the week. So it’s kinda nice to get out.... (Jackie)

Well, I have been so stressed out. I resigned from my job, I’m gonna have to... I’m gonna move, and I came out tonight to relieve some of the stress. (Anna)

To get away. To have a good time and get away. (Barbara)

One woman, Lori, offered a "to get out and have fun" explanation, but was more specific about the type of fun to
be had. When asked why she had come to the bar she said, "To meet people."

Two women offered "other bars were dead" responses. Both said they had been to other bars but came to The Looking Glass hoping it would be more fun.

Yeah, because the last one we went to was--there was nobody there. (Randi)

We went out to eat at [a steak house], and [The Looking Glass] was the closest convenient place. We went to [another bar], and it was bad. (Pat)

Six women said they were at the bar for some special occasion. Typically, this was a celebration of a special event, such as a friend’s birthday, although this specific reason was given as the reason for attendance in only one instance--Quinn’s. Quinn also noted that this was the first time she had ever been to a bar. Carol was also at the bar for her father’s birthday. He chose The Looking Glass as the place to celebrate, Carol said. The remaining four women attending the bar for some special occasion had all come to the bar together. Faye, Gayle, Heather, and Ida were at the bar to celebrate Heather’s wedding. Heather was to be married the next day. She added that their choice of bars was limited because her fiance and his friends were at another bar in town, and she and her friends were avoiding that bar. They had been to a few other places, but decided on The Looking Glass because it had more people, she said. The free admission was an additional reason to go there, she
said. Other bars assessed a cover charge. The Looking Glass did not.

The four remaining women offered the "I always come here" type of explanation for their attendance. Generally, this type of response indicates that this person visits the bar often. At first this explanation may seem to simply indicate that attendance at this bar has become habit or that this woman may feel some type of loyalty to this bar. The answers of all four of these women, though, indicate that, while their behavior may be perceived as habitual, habit was not the main reason for their attendance. Neither was loyalty to the bar as a business. Rather, the bar seems to serve as a meeting place for them and their friends. In other words, these women were some of the regulars.

...I always come. I just know a lot of people here, and I know the members of the band and things like that. I feel comfortable here, I guess. (Nancy)

Well, I've been coming here for years. 'Cause I know a lot of people. I have a lot of friends here. And, plus, I'm dating a guy in the band. (Olivia)

I know all the bartenders and a lot of the people in there, and it's not too far from my house. And all my friends come here. There's eight of us that come. (Meg)

Debbie, in addition to knowing many people at the bar, said she felt safe there. She cited both as reasons for her regular attendance at the bar. "...I know a lot of people..., and I feel safe here.... Like when I go out to the car in the parking lot I can always ask the manager and he always walks us out." It is interesting to note that,
while these four women may have made derogatory remarks or observations about the individual men who approached them, they were not among those interviewed who made derogatory comments about the bar or the patrons of the bar in general. Perhaps, being regulars, these women were less likely to identify the bar as a place for "losers" because that either labeled themselves as losers or demanded an explanation for their regular attendance at a bar for losers.

The variation of reasons given for attendance at the bar seems to indicate that there was some variation in definition of the type of bar this was. While some women tried to disassociate themselves with the bar and its patrons by indicating they had been dragged there, others freely admitted their regular attendance.

Women's Willingness to Interact

The five types of responses discussed above were the initial answers given when the women were asked to explain their reasons for coming to the bar. Two more interview questions were asked to determine each woman’s willingness to take part in the sexual service exchange. On the interview guide these two questions immediately follow the question concerning the woman’s reason for attending the bar. These questions are:

Is there any man in this bar tonight with whom you would have spent time talking if he had approached you? Why?

Is there any man in this bar tonight with whom you
would have spent time dancing if he had approached you? Why?

When these questions were added to the interview guide, it was anticipated that the answers given to question nine would be vague and that answers to these questions would help define more clearly why the women had come to the bar. In fact, these questions functioned much as expected in this regard. But one assumption made during the construction of these questions may have been inaccurate.

These questions were designed to help determine at what level a woman would be willing to interact with men in the bar. Dancing was assumed to be a more intimate type of interaction than talking, meaning it was assumed that dancing required greater personal investment than simply talking to someone. In other words, the researcher assumed that a woman might agree to talk with a man but not dance with him. But, if she danced with him, she would most assuredly spend time talking with him.

Olivia, who dates a member of one of the bands at The Looking Glass, made a comment that suggests this assumption is not necessarily correct. She indicated that there was no man in the bar with whom she would have spent time talking because she did not like strangers. She would have danced with some of the men, though, she said.

A dance is just a dance. You know, you can walk away from that. But if you get into, you know, a conversation with somebody you don’t know, I mean, you don’t know what they’re gonna.... (Olivia)
These questions proved to be useful, though, in that they helped specify the women’s reasons for attending the bar. They yielded one possible explanation for some of the rejection that was observed. Fifteen of the 20 women indicated that they would have danced with a man if they had been asked, or specifically mentioned that dancing was the reason they had come to the bar. Of the remaining five women, three danced with men they had not known before going to the bar, and the other two danced with men they knew. Dancing seemed to be the focal point not only of the physical layout of the bar but of the social layout of the bar as well. This sets the stage for the creation of tension between men and women in the bar.

Goffman (1963) and Cavan (1966) both observe that bars are defined as public settings in which men are free to approach women. Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) and Allon and Fishel (1979) go a step further by observing that not only do men feel freer to approach women in bars than in some other public places, but many men assume that a woman’s presence at a bar, specifically a singles bar or marketplace bar, indicates her desire to be approached. As one male bar patron asked Snow, Robinson, and McCall, "Why else would women be there if they didn’t want to be picked up?" (1991, p. 428).

Women interviewed in this research recognized the incongruity between some of the men’s reasons for being at the bar and their own reasons. When asked if she would have
spent time talking with a man if he had approached her,

Debbie responded:

It depends on how they act when they first meet you. If they act like they’re gonna treat you with respect, or they might be lookin' for... a one night stand. If they’re just out for sex you don’t. I’m just here to have fun and dance. (Debbie)

Anna’s female friend, Vickie, was slim and about average height. She appeared to be in her late thirties or early forties. During Anna’s interview, Vickie and Anna discussed the incongruity between the reasons men and women attend bars.

Anna: I know a lot of men think you’re lookin’ maybe for a pickup or.... But I come out to dance and have fun. I’m not really lookin’ for anything. Know what I’m saying?

Vickie: It is true there are a lot of guys.... I love dancing. [Anna] does too. And they think that because you come to a place like this that you are looking for someone.

Anna: Or just looking to get laid.

Vickie: That is not true. That is not true. It’s not. I mean, I’m like [Anna]. I love dancing. I love comin’ out, havin’ a good time but that’s as far as it goes. When I go home I want to go home by myself.

Vickie: They think that because you’re in here they think you’re thinkin’, "We’re a pickup."

Anna: If I want to pick up somebody it wouldn’t be somebody in a bar.

Other women made similar observations about why men came to the bar:

It’s about 12:30 so they’re lookin’ to see who they can take home. I think they’re just out for one thing... Girls are out there to dance--some girls are out there dancin’--but I think the other guys are out there trying to see who they can take home. (Faye)
Most men up here, they’re like, they want to dance with you then next thing you know they wanna take you home and take you to bed. (Evelyn)

Probably most of the people, most of the people out here are either college students or people who that haven’t made it through college, or men on business trips that are looking for a little fling. (Tanya)

The women indicated that, in general, they were at the bar to dance or, as sometimes they expressed rather vaguely, have a good time. Some women said they thought men went to the bar to pick up women, meaning these women thought the men were looking for sex. This perceived difference in motivations may have helped create some tension between men and women in the barroom. This tension would seem to be dysfunctional in a marketplace bar, where the main function is the exchange of sexual services.

Encounters and the Dance Floor

The dance floor was the major prop used in the encounters. All but one of the 20 encounters involved at least one request to dance. The man who approached Anna was the only one who did not request a dance. Cloyd (1976) and Allon and Fishel (1979) recognized that the dance floor could serve as a means of initiating an encounter in marketplace bars. Allon and Fishel observed people in bars that offered dancing and in bars that did not. Some people whom they interviewed said that the availability of dancing made it easier to meet people.

Some people thought that it was easier to meet someone if you could just go over and ask her/him to dance
rather than be forced to think of a clever introductory line. Some said that they just liked to dance, and they wanted to kill two birds with one stone—to be able to dance and also meet people. (Allon and Fishel 1979, p. 144)

Fifteen of the 20 encounters observed occurred at tables located between the bar and the dance floor. All but one of the encounters occurred in the stage/dance floor area of the barroom. This area seemed to be the center of the encounter activity, perhaps because of the physical layout of the barroom. As Cloyd described, the women usually headed for the tables upon arriving at The Looking Glass. The men, on the other hand, took their positions crowded around the bar, predominantly around the end of the bar nearest the dance floor and the open areas in the stage/dance floor section of the barroom nearest to the bar itself. Very few women stood in this area unless accompanied by a man. In general the men faced toward the dance floor. When not engaged in conversation the men watched the people dancing and those sitting at tables. In this way this barroom was much like the marketplace bar described by Cloyd. The dance floor served not only as a way to initiate an encounter, but also as a means for women to display themselves for men and a means for the men to determine which women they found attractive.

Types of Rejections

The women's negative responses to the men's requests to dance, talk, or interact in other ways are classified into
four categories: excuses, civilities, incivilities, and evasions. There is one missing response (Ida). One woman used a response classified as evasion. Two women used responses classified as incivilities. Seven women used responses classified as civilities, and 10 women used responses classified as excuses. There are 20 responses despite a missing case because one woman gave two different responses to the same man, and both responses were observed by the researcher.

An excuse would seem to allow the man the easiest path to saving face, in that it provides him with an acceptable reason for his failure to pick up a woman. In this sense the excuse will be defined as the nicest type of rejection the woman can give. Typical of an excuse is the response given by Pat, who rejected a request to dance by saying "I'm waitin' on a drink." When approaching a woman and asking her to dance a man has assumed a face and taken a line that requires his request to be accepted or he risks losing face. He has presented himself to the woman as a man who is desirable to dance with or to be seen dancing with. Should she reject his request, he risks losing face in that he is revealed to be undesirable to a woman he thought would find him desirable, at least desirable enough to dance with him. The excuse validates the man's desirability but still rejects his request to dance by offering him an acceptable reason why the woman cannot accept the dance. Pat said she did not want to dance with the man, indicating that she
sometimes gives men excuses because "I don't want to hurt their feelings. I mean, not that they're gonna be heart broken, but I don't want to hurt their ego like that."

At the opposite end of the continuum is the incivility. An incivility presents the man with the harshest answer and possibly the greatest threat to his face. Not only does it not aid him in saving face, but this response may actually be designed to discredit his face further. For this reason, this type of rejection will be defined as the meanest type of rejection. Typical of an incivility is the response given by Anna to a man who approached her and was talking to her. The man, who appeared to be somewhat drunk, said to her, "Boy, you sure do look good. I know you're a lot of woman. I'm sure. I know I couldn't handle you." Anna replied, "You're right. I don't want none, ain't had none, and don't you fuck with me." The man did not try to talk with her any longer. Anna, like Pat, did not wish to interact with the man who approached her, but unlike Pat she did not aid the man in saving his face. She not only offered him no reason for the rejection but rejected him in a manner that might have caused further damage to his face. Her purpose in choosing an incivility to reject the man seemed to be to get rid of the man as quickly as possible.

I didn't want him really messing with me, and I didn't like what he said to me. You know, I'm just sittin' there minding my own business. I'm not gonna let somebody say something like that to me. You know, I don't want anyone just comin' up trying to maybe pick me up. (Anna)
Between the excuse and the incivility is the civility. A civility neither berates the man nor provides him with a reason for the rejection. It merely provides him with the rejection, but in a relatively more pleasant way than the incivility. While there is no reason given to help the man deal with the rejection, the rejection also does not seem particularly threatening. Because of this the civility is defined as being a kinder response than the incivility but not quite as kind as the excuse. Typical of a civility is the response given by Olivia to a request to dance. She replied, "No, thank you." While this response does not seem to carry the extra face-saving potential an excuse does, the women using civilities generally seemed to believe that a "No, thank you," was sufficient to reject the man kindly. "I don’t want to be rude. I just didn’t want to dance." "Some women are rude, maybe. I mean, I don’t want to hurt anybody’s feelings," (Olivia).

A response of evasion is a more neutral type of response than the other three, in that direct confrontation is avoided by methods such as flight or non-observance. In this sense an evasive response (which characteristically would be no response at all to the man directly) is not along the continuum discussed but sits outside of it as a neutral response. Typical of this type of response is the response given by Kathy to a request to dance. The man told her he would be back in a few minutes to ask her to dance. She told the researcher she had been hoping the bar would
close before the man had a chance to ask her. A friend then spilled beer on her, and she spent the rest of the evening in the bathroom drying her clothes.

Men's Performances

Having described the types of responses used by the women the next step is to note the circumstances in which each type of response was used. To do so will involve discussing the performances conducted by the men and how those performances were perceived by each woman. Answers to two interview questions provide an indication of how the women perceived the presentations by the men. Preceding these two questions was one in which each woman was asked to rate her physical attractiveness on a 10-point scale in which 1 was the least attractive and 10 was the most attractive.

If you were to rate the man who just tried to pick you up on the same scale of physical attractiveness what value would you assign him?

If you were to rate the attractiveness of the man's personality on a 10-point scale with one being the least attractive personality and 10 being the most attractive, what number would you assign him?

Table 1 shows each woman's response to these questions. Most women were also asked to provide an explanation for their answers to this second question in order to determine what it was about his personality that warranted the assigned rating. Another variable to be used in examining
Table 1. Ratings of Self and Men on Physical Attractiveness and Men on Desirability of Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Own Physical Attractiveness</th>
<th>Physical Attractiveness</th>
<th>Desirability of Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each man's presentation will be the woman's account of what the man said to her and how persistent he was.

Goffman (1959) contends it is desirable to control the impressions others gather about oneself. To control others' impressions Goffman says individuals put on performances. A performance consists of all behaviors and actions that occur during a person's appearance before a particular group of individuals. The performance must also take place within a specific period of time and affect the others in some way.

In a marketplace bar one may want to control others' impressions of oneself in order to convince others that one is a desirable person with whom to spend time. This research is focused on situations in which a man approaches a woman in a marketplace bar and asks the woman to spend time dancing, talking, drinking, or interacting in other ways with him. In order to be successful the man must conduct a performance that makes himself appear desirable to the woman. When he performs successfully, he has assumed a line and been able to perform within the limits of the line assumed. This means, if the man assumes a line in which he presents himself as a desirable man, everything that occurs in his performance must support the conception that he is desirable, or he risks being embarrassed and losing face.

Understanding presentation of self, performances, and lines assumed by men and women in bars may help to explain the large number of civilities and excuses (instead of incivilities) used by women toward persistent men. Schwartz
and Lever (1976) discuss performances at college mixers in which music plays so loudly that conversations become difficult or impossible. In such situations, Schwartz and Lever contend, the main criterion for rating a person’s desirability is physical appearance. While men prefer women who are pretty or have good figures, Schwartz and Lever say women prefer men who are handsome or men who possess some kind of "cool" (p. 419).

Being "cool" is not necessarily based on looks for a man. It means that somebody "puts himself together" well, that he walks or talks with some authority, or that he looks "interesting" or at ease. (Schwartz and Lever 1976, p. 419)

The situation in The Looking Glass was similar to the situation described by Schwartz and Lever (1976). Loud music seemed to limit conversations. While Schwartz and Lever mention that the loud music makes physical appearance an important criterion, they also mention the importance of a man’s degree of cool. Saying that it’s not necessarily based on looks implies that at least one other factor plays a role in a man’s performance. This implication of another factor is the reason for the inclusion of the personality rating variable as an indicator of each woman’s perception of the performances of the men. Because, generally, the exchange between each man and woman was brief, these two indicators—physical attractiveness rating and personality rating—should be sufficient to determine the effectiveness of the men’s performances.
All but two of the women rated the men's physical appearances lower than their own. The scale was 1 to 10 with 1 being the least physically attractive and 10 being the most physically attractive. Jackie rated herself a five and the man who approached her a six. Olivia rated both herself and the man who approached her a seven. The mean rating the women gave themselves was 6.32. The mean rating they assigned the men was 2.92. Thirteen of the women rated the men in the low category (1-3). The other seven rated the men in the intermediate category (4-7). None gave the men a high rating (8-10). As occurred five times, when women replied with a rating such as "Well, I'd give him a seven or eight" (Kathy), the value between the two numbers was assigned. In the given example the man was assigned a personality rating of 7.5.

Some women gave the men the rating and made no further comment. Typical of the women who gave the men low scores were comments such as Faye's "He wasn't attractive," or Meg's "He was ugly." A few women cited different physical attributes or characteristics of the men that influenced their ratings. Meg said, with a laugh, she guessed the man who approached her didn't have the right hair color or the right teeth. She rated him a three physically. Tanya gave a one to the man who approached her. She said "He looked like an old geezer." Since the women were not asked to comment on specific physical characteristics of the men, however, these types of responses were limited.
Assuming excuses are the nicest types of rejections, incivilities the meanest, and civilities somewhere in between, there is no clear pattern that emerges when one compares the women’s ratings of the men’s physical appearances and the type of rejection used. The 10 women who used excuses rated the men a mean of 2.55, with a high of 6 from Jackie and a low of 1 from four women—Evelyn, Faye, Susan and Tanya. The seven women using civilities rated the men a mean of 4.14, with a high of 7 from Olivia and a low of 1 from two women—Lori and Nancy. The two women using incivilities rated the men a mean of 3.00, with Anna assigning a 1 and Debbie assigning a 5. Kathy, using evasion, rated the man who approached her a 3. Common sense would seem to dictate that the more physically attractive a woman finds a man, the kinder she would be when rejecting him; but, such a pattern failed to surface here.

Despite this lack of a pattern, physical appearances should not be wholly discounted in terms of their role in a man’s overall performance. Nancy rated the man who approached her a 1 but offered him a civility when rejecting him, saying "Thank you, but no thank you." She described the role of physical appearance as being the first impression a person makes on another. She acknowledged her use of physical appearance as a gauge for deciding whether or not she would be interested in a man.

He may have good qualities, I don’t know, but to me you have to have something physical there to be attracted to ’em before there could be anything else. But, you
don’t want to go out with a dog, because you’re not attracted to him. You have no reason to be, and you don’t actually know this person, exactly what kind of personality he has or anything like that. (Nancy)

So for Nancy, physical appearance seems to serve a screening function.

Other women indicated that physical appearance played some role in their perceptions of men. Barbara said that she might have danced with the man she had rejected if he had been physically more attractive. Barbara’s friend indicated that Barbara would have danced the slow dance with the man if he had been 6’5" and "built like a brick shit house." Barbara agreed. The man who approached her, however, was about average height and a little overweight. When he asked her to dance, she offered him an excuse, saying she didn’t like to dance slow dances. As she indicated during the interview, however, she may have danced with him had he looked different. So while there may be no pattern associated with the physical appearance rating the women assigned each man and the type of rejection offered the men, this does not mean physical appearance is not relevant. It may be that the physical appearance of the man plays a bigger role in a woman’s decision to accept a man’s offer or reject him than it does in determining how to reject him.

As stated, common sense may suggest that the more attractive a woman finds a man’s personality, the more likely she is to be nice to him. In fact, no such pattern was found. Grouping the responses by the four response
types discussed above and then averaging the numbers the women assigned to the attractiveness of the personalities of the men who approached them according to those four categories, the following results were obtained: the two women using incivilities rated the men an average of 1.00; the 10 women using excuses rated the men an average of 3.32; the seven women using civilities rated the men an average of 4.50; the one woman using evasion rated the man a 7.50.

If one were to assume that women are nicer when rejecting men whose personalities they find more attractive, then one would assume that women using excuses would rate the men the highest, women using civilities the next highest and those using incivilities the lowest. The means indicate, however, that there may be no such pattern. In other words, women are being kind to men they describe as not having particularly attractive personalities.

When Tanya’s friend (Susan) wanted to go to the bar, Tanya went with her. Both were approached by the same man. Tanya, rating the man’s personality a one (1) and at one point in the interview describing him as obnoxious, gave him an excuse when he asked her to dance. "I said, 'No. I’m married. Thank you, it’s very flattering.' So, I was very nice." Tanya is actually married, but she went the extra step to include that piece of information in her rejection, thereby giving the man an acceptable reason for his failure. When he asked her name, she gave him a false name, telling him her name was Maria. "I wouldn’t give any of these
people my real name. Please. They might try to find you or something," (Tanya).

Other women also commented on the undesirability of the personalities of the men who approached them, yet helped the men save face when rejecting them. Evelyn, rating the man's personality a one (1), said, "He was just like the type of person that just wanted to take you home and take you to bed." "He come on too strong," she had said earlier in the interview. In response to repeated requests to dance she repeated, "No," several times then said she didn't want to dance at the moment. Again, this gave the man an acceptable reason for the rejection, suggesting she might want to dance later.

This type of persistence was fairly common among the men who approached the women in this sample. The approaches used by the men as described by 11 of the women fit the definition of persistent approaches. A man is considered persistent if he is rejected by a woman in any way (civility, excuse, evasion or incivility) yet he does not discontinue his interaction with her, or he does discontinue interaction temporarily only to try to continue later. There are variations of persistence as well.

The time may vary between the man's first approach and rejection and his second approach to the woman. In Debbie's case a day elapsed between the man's first request to dance and his second.

Last night he'd asked me to dance when we first got
here, and I said, "No, not right now, maybe later." He danced with my friend, and he just kinda danced all over her and stuff like that. (Debbie)

The next night, the night of the interview, she rejected him again by saying "No, the answer's still the same as it was last night." More common, though, was the length of time elapsed between approaches as experienced by Evelyn. The man who approached her ignored her first rejection, an excuse, only to ask her to dance again within the same conversation seconds later.

In their study of women's barroom rejection techniques Snow, Robinson and McCall (1991) describe what amount to civilities, excuses, incivilities, and evasions. They indicate that they found abundant evidence of the use of all these tactics. They describe how incivilities are often used as a second line of defense against persistent men. While the majority of rejected men accepted the civility or excuse and moved on, some persisted and were dealt with by use of incivilities. Snow, Robinson, and McCall note that persistence on the part of a rejected man resulted in a woman showing "little of the earlier regard for salvaging the aggressor's initial presentation of self" (p. 436). Of the women who faced persistent men in this research, however, most continued to help the men salvage their presentations of self, presenting an inconsistency with Snow, Robinson and McCall's findings.

Only two women, Anna and Debbie, responded with incivilities. Debbie said she responded to the man as she
did because he had asked her to dance the night before and she had turned him down then, indicating the use of an incivility possibly due to persistence by the man. Anna, while using an incivility, did not exactly fit the pattern described by Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991). They point out that incivilities often occur when men do not accept the first rejection offered by an excuse or a civility. Anna’s first, and only, rejection of the man she turned down was an incivility. She did not attempt an excuse or civility on the man.

The encounter occurred in a corner of the stage and dance floor section of the barroom. Anna and two friends, a woman who appeared to be in her late thirties or early forties and a man who appeared to be about 10 years older, were sitting on stools seven to eight feet in front of the researcher. The man approaching Anna was about medium height, around average weight with long, dark hair, and a mustache. He wore jeans and a short T-shirt that would not tuck into his jeans, leaving his midriff exposed. He was holding a drink and appeared somewhat drunk.

The man approached Anna, stood about three feet from her and began dancing to the music, occasionally looking at Anna. She moved a little with the music but appeared disinterested in him. He then moved next to Anna’s female friend and talked with her for a few minutes. Then he backed up a few steps so he was next to Anna again, turned so he was half facing the dance floor and half facing Anna,
moved with the music for about half a minute, then moved closer to her and said something. He stepped back, moved with the music for a few seconds, leaned toward Anna and said something else. She responded and he left.

Anna’s account of the conversation goes as follows. The man said to her, "Boy, you sure do look good. I know you’re a lot of woman. I’m sure. I know I couldn’t handle you." Anna responded "You’re right. I don’t want none, ain’t had none and don’t you fuck with me." The man said he got her message and left. He laughed and smiled throughout the encounter. Anna, however, appeared expressionless, watched the dance floor instead of the man, and talked with her friends while he stood beside her moving with the music. Anna said women who act nice when rejecting men probably do so because they do not want to cause trouble.

Of the 20 women in the sample, 11 dealt with men who were persistent. This includes Ida, who describes her encounter with a man who was persistent, even though he was not the man observed by the researcher. Ida used civilities when dealing with this persistent man. These did not work, though. A friend (Heather) stepped in and confronted the man, using an incivility. The man who approached Ida was, perhaps, the most persistent of all the men. Ida was the only woman who mentioned considering the use of physical force to get away from the man.

There was a friend with the guy, the white shirted guy..., and he’d pester me and pester me. I kept saying "No, no, no," and he would not listen. And I
was this much [she holds two fingers closely together] to slapping him. I was so mad that, you know, but I was scared that he was gonna turn around and hit me back, actually. But he had upset me that much that he would not listen to me and leave me alone. (Ida)

I think it crossed my mind...to go get a security guard to ask this gentleman to get him away from me. I was coming that close, also. There was a lot of things that I had thought of that if he was not going to leave me alone I was going to do. (Ida)

Ida was at the bar with Faye, Gayle, and Heather. The man described by Ida was with another man who danced with Faye, Gayle, and Heather. While his friend was dancing with one of the women, the man described by Ida would sit in the seat made vacant by the dancing woman. He was finally dealt with by Heather who told him, "It'd be best if you just stay away for a while." So Ida, while claiming to be on the verge of slapping this man, did not use an incivility to end the encounter. Instead, her friend did. Eight women who were approached by persistent men not only did not use incivilities but even offered the men excuses.

Meg offered an excuse to a man who asked her to dance repeatedly within the course of an encounter that lasted 25-30 seconds. She was sitting at a table between the bar and the dance floor when the man, who had been standing at the opposite end of the table from where Meg was sitting, leaned across the table toward her. He appeared to be in his late thirties, and he was smoking and drinking alcohol. A slow song was playing at the time. The conversation, as reported by Meg, occurred as follows:

Man: Are you gonna just sit there?
Meg: Yes.

Man: You're not gonna dance?

Meg: No.

Man: You just, like, dance in your seat?

Meg: I don't feel like dancing.

Man: Why not?

Meg: Because my boyfriend's not here.

Man: Oh, is he working behind the bar?

Meg: No, he left to go to work an hour ago, and I don't want to dance.

She said the man then walked away. Meg rated his personality a one, noted during the interview that she thought he was ugly, he was drunk, "and he wasn't my type," yet she offered him an excuse when rejecting him even after he persisted.

Susan rated the man who approached her a one or two (1.5), and described him as pushy after he asked her to dance, was rejected, then came back. He appeared to be about 40. He was about 5'8", had a pot belly, was balding and wore his hair long, but combed it over his head. He wore a lightly striped, button-down, short-sleeved shirt, had a mustache, and smoked. Susan sat at a table between the bar and dance floor, but near the bar, with Tanya and a man she had met at the bar. He leaned over the table during the last song of the night talking to Susan for at least 20 seconds, asking her to dance. He then walked back to the bar where he looked around the room for about a minute. He approached her again and asked if she would like to go with
him when the bar closed. He also asked Tanya if she cared to leave the bar with him. Then, after the bar had closed, he approached Susan during the interview with the researcher and asked if she would tell him where she lived.

When discussing the man during the interview, Susan indicated her frustration with his persistence by saying "It's like, you know, what part of no don't you understand? That kind of thing." She offered the man an excuse when rejecting his request to dance, though. When he asked her to dance she responded, "No. Not right now." This is classified as an excuse because it suggests that there is some reason she won't dance with him now but she might at a later time. When asked if she would leave with him she responded, "No. I guess we're gonna go home." Tanya, who described the man as obnoxious, also gave the man an excuse, saying, "No. I'm married. Thank you, it's very flattering."

The man who approached Jackie asked her to dance and asked if he could buy her a drink. She turned him down both times but described him as kind. "He just complimented me on my looks, asked to buy me another drink. When I refused he was kind. Lots of men get defensive about that." The man asked if he could buy her a drink, and she responded by saying she could not because she was driving. Before this man approached her the second time she was approached by two other men. She appeared to reject both of them. Near closing time the man who had offered to buy her a drink sat
down beside her at her table along the edge of the dance floor. Two friends, a man and a woman, sat at the table with her already. The man who approached Jackie touched her on the shoulder as they spoke. He wore a white, short-sleeved shirt, had fairly short hair, and appeared to be about 30. They talked into one another’s ears, probably because the music was very loud. He talked with her for about 20 seconds, asking her to dance. She said no. He asked if he could visit her at work. She said no, because she doesn’t have time to socialize there but that he could come to the bar where she works a second job if he wished to see her. While she did not consider him pushy, his behavior does fit the definition of persistence.

Pat’s excuse, "I’m waitin’ on a drink," was given to a man who’s personality she rated a two (2). About 15 minutes before closing time a man who looked to be in his early forties, with a black cowboy hat, jeans, boots, and a mustache approached her by telling her he had a check for $20,000. She asked him, "What’d you do, hit the lottery?" He explained it was an insurance check from a car wreck. He asked her to dance while a slow song was playing. Although she did not want to dance, she stood up from her chair; but the song ended. She sat down and the man knelt beside her chair and they talked for one to two minutes. It looked as if he had his arm around the back of her chair. She said he asked about dancing to the next song, and she replied, "I’m waitin’ on a drink." He went back to the bar. Later, after
the bar had closed, Pat was in the lobby of the hotel when the man approached her again. She describes the encounter as follows:

He said, "Do you want to go home? Do you want to go somewhere else?" I said "No. I’m going home and go to bed." I said that I was out late last night and I needed some sleep. He said "I have a brand new bed. It cost so-and-so," an amount of money, you know. He kept braggin' on the money. (Pat)

Pat indicated that she did not like to hurt others' feelings but also indicated there may be another reason she tries not to be rude in bars and sometimes dances with men she does not like:

I think if you had a guy maybe go up there and she turns one or two down, she would not get any other dances. But if you dance with the ugliest guy in the whole place, you would get dances all night long. (Pat)

Explaining why she almost danced with the man in the cowboy hat she said:

I turned two down, and I didn’t get asked any other time the rest of the night. So I thought, "Better take the gamble." And if you do, and this is odd, but if you dance with one, you will get more dances the rest of the night. (Pat)

She believes that, because men don’t want to deal with rejection, they watch how women treat other men in the bar and then approach those women who seem nice or willing to dance.

This type of belief may help explain why nine of the women in the sample chose to use excuses on men whose personalities they rated no higher than five and why eight of the women used excuses on men who were persistent. Goffman (1967) notes that individuals in a social
undertaking will have interests in helping one another save face. He also notes, however, that this desire may not be as strong toward strangers. Despite the fact that only one woman offering an excuse had known the man previously, these 10 women still tried to help each man save face.

Pat’s explanation, that men in the bar watch the women and that the women do, or should, know this, seems to suggest that not only is each man taking a line, assuming a face and putting on a performance each time he enters the bar to take part in the sexual service exchange, but so is each woman. Taking this a step further, then, the women who express a desire to dance or interact with men in some other way and do not attract any men also risk losing face.

Cloyd (1976) noticed a very similar situation in his observations of the dance floor and its functions. "If the dance floor can function as a source of information for the male tactics, it seems to act also as an arena of display for females," (p. 299). He noted how women used the dance floor to display themselves to men crowded around the dance floor. The men would watch women dancing to determine how attached each one was to her dance partner and whether or not she was attractive. By looking for certain signals, through body language, eye contact, and other nonverbal behaviors, he could determine whether she might be interested in dancing with him.

Nancy said she believes that men watch women not only when they dance but when they drink, as well. She says if a
man watches how much a woman drinks throughout the evening, that can also help decrease his chances of being rejected.

There's a lot of guys that we call barflies, and they'll watch you all night to see how much you drink and things like that and think, "Well, she's drunk. I'll hit on her 'cause she'll go home with me." (Nancy)

By determining the woman's interest in him, and perhaps her level of drunkenness before approaching her, the man could reduce his chance of being rejected and losing face. This urge to help undesirable men save face as a means of facilitating future interaction with desirable men is a possible explanation for the large proportion of excuses found in this sample.

Carol mentioned that she would help a man save face, not necessarily because other men might then not be discouraged from asking her to dance but so that the man she was rejecting might ask her later. She said she sometimes rejects a man nicely if he asks to dance to a slow song. "I mean, I don't like being rude to anyone. But, I mean, like I said, I like to fast dance. And maybe they'll come ask me to fast dance later," (Carol). Carol was talking about a hypothetical encounter in which the man would be desirable but the situation would not. By helping him save face in the current situation she could help ensure later interaction with him in a desirable situation.
Explanations for Incivilities

The women were asked to explain not only why each of them responded as they did but also why they thought other women responded in different ways to men. The explanations given may provide some insight into the women's perceptions of why incivilities are sometimes used. The explanations fell into two main categories: differences in the women's personalities and differences in the men's approaches. Half of the subjects said the differences in the women's responses could be attributed to the differences in personalities of the women. There were two variations of this type of response. Only three women said the way men approached women was the reason for the difference in types of rejection. Several women suggested explanations that were not easily classified. The most common among these was that the level of drunkenness among women influenced their reactions. There were four missing responses.

Three women said that persistence by men caused women to become uncivil. These responses seemed to imply that in order to avoid incivilities, persistent men would have to change their approaches to women. Typical of this type of answer were the following:

Because sometimes (men) are really nice about it and they take "No," and they leave it alone. Sometimes they're obnoxious, and "No" just does not register. Right? But still, there's still some that will stand there and argue for five minutes, you know. "Dance with me, dance with me." (Jackie)

It's the way that they ask, usually. If they ask, and
you tell 'em no and they basically accept it and go on, then you can be nice to the next one. If he comes back (like with Ida) there, and refused to accept no,... plainly stating "No, no, no, forget it, no," push him away, "No." And like, for the eighth or ninth time, "No," and like, tried to ignore him, no, the guy would still not leave her alone. So, then, basically you kind of get a bad attitude, you know, like, you almost want to get up and walk away when they walk to you. (Heather)

These answers imply that men hold the key to reducing incivilities, thus reducing the number of rejected men who receive no help saving face. These women indicate that persistence by the men is at least one cause of the use of incivilities. If the men were less persistent, then they would receive fewer incivilities.

The idea that persistence by men leads to the use of incivilities by women seems in agreement with Snow, Robinson and McCall's (1991) analysis of women's rejection techniques. They describe a sequence used by women in which the civilities and excuses are used as initial techniques. When those fail and the man persists, Snow, Robinson and McCall say, women resort to incivilities. So, a man who is not persistent would accept a woman's initial rejection, thereby avoiding an incivility. But of the 20 encounters discussed in this research 11 involved men who were persistent. Of the 11 women who dealt with those persistent men only one woman used an incivility.

Eight women suggested that the use of incivilities when rejecting men in bars can be attributed to variations in women. Generally, these variations were described as
personality differences. Typical of this type of explanation were the following statements:

I guess I'd say it just depends on their personality. Some women are more bitchier than others. (Tanya)

I think personality is the thing. 'Cause I'm not a mean person. I'm a happy person most of the time. That girl that was sitting beside me, you know how she got. She's a very negative person. Very negative. She thinks her way of life is good and nobody else's. Everybody else is hopeless. It's her personality. I think when you're happy with yourself you don't want to hurt someone else. I don't know. I mean, like, I'm content with myself. I have very high self esteem...

(Pat)

Some women are rude, maybe. I mean, I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings. (Olivia)

...I don't like to be rude to anybody. I try to be nice about it. Some girls don't care. (Susan)

This type of explanation seems to imply that the responsibility for preservation of a man's face lies with the woman he approaches. It is suggested in this type of explanation that there is a certain type of woman that uses incivilities and a certain type that doesn't. According to this type of explanation, the "rude," "bitchier," or "negative" women, rather than the men, hold the key to reducing the number of incivilities used.

Two subjects, Nancy and Meg, and a female friend of Anna's expressed variations of this different-personality-types explanation. These three women said that other women simply do not know how to handle themselves when a man approaches them and they don't want to interact. They seemed to believe that directness, even incivilities, should be used in response to men. They indicated they were more
concerned with conveying a clear, direct message to the man than with helping him save face. Nancy, who used a civility when rejecting the non-persistent man who approached her, said that if a man were persistent with her she would reply,

"Get lost," you know, "I'm not interested." You know, I don't really be rude to somebody unless they get rude to me. Because I wouldn't want somebody to treat me that way. (Nancy)

When asked why some women might use made-up excuses she answered, "Because they don't know how to handle that. They don't know how to handle the situation."

Meg initially offered a civility when rejecting the man who approached her. He persisted and she offered him an excuse. When discussing the responses of other women, though, she described herself as direct. "I'm straightforward about everything because I've been hurt, because I've been hurt and I'm just not gonna..., I just don't wanna hear the bullshit." Apparently considering her response of an excuse to be straightforward, Meg explained why she thought some women used excuses. When asked to dance she responded, "I don't feel like dancing." The man persisted. She responded, "Because my boyfriend's not here." He persisted further. She added, "No, he left to go to work an hour ago, and I don't want to dance." Meg thought some women used excuses, though, "Because they don't know how to say no to anything. That or anything else. Their [phone] number or anything else." Despite what may be contradictions between her explanation and how she acted,
Meg’s emphasis on the need for directness from women was similar to Nancy’s.

Vickie, the woman who attended the bar with Anna, expressed a similar opinion during Anna’s interview. When Anna was asked why some women are less direct than she was when rejecting men, Vickie added her opinion.

I think because they didn’t have the nerve to really come up and say what [Anna] said. You know, if I’ve got something to say to somebody I’m gonna tell ‘em straight up. I’m not gonna go behind their back. A lot of people are not going to say that straight up. I say it the way it is. You know, "I do not want to dance with you. Understand?" A lot of people would try to kinda keep it calm and cool and friendly.

(Anna’s friend, Vickie)

No, I don’t care to tell someone what I think, straight up. If they can’t handle that that’s their problem, it’s not mine. (Anna’s friend, Vickie)

These women—Nancy, Meg and Vickie—would seem to be least concerned with helping a man save face when rejecting him. They, like eight other women, explain that differences in women account for the different methods of rejecting men. Unlike these eight other women, however, the explanations by Nancy, Meg and Vickie imply that the preferred way of dealing with men is directly, regardless of the damage to the men’s faces. They seemed to feel that the showing of regard for the men’s faces needed explaining more than did the use of incivilities.

Three women mentioned that the level of a woman’s drunkenness might influence how she rejects a man. Tanya noted that some women in bars are more, "Friendly. More outgoing. More drunk. I think it depends on how much
alcohol you have in you, too." Kathy answered, "Well, because I think it has a lot to do with what kind of buzz they have. In some place like this, I really do." Randi clarified the situation a little by indicating that she thought women became more rude to men as they got more drunk. "Some may be drunk or.... You know, the rude ones."

Additional Comments by the Women

The women were invited to add any comments about the research or anything related to it that may have been missed or passed over during the interview. Eight women did add comments although most were brief. The comments fell into two main categories: observations about bars and men in bars; and suggestions and observations concerning the research.

Five women talked about bars and the men in bars. The major theme seemed to be that a bar was not a good place to meet men. Faye, Gayle, Lori, and Anna all seemed to agree that a bar is not a place to meet a decent man. Pat commented on the man who approached her, saying she felt sorry for him.

Three women commented on the research. Two of the women made suggestions about improving the research. Barbara suggested that one must take part in the encounters to gain a better understanding. Tanya suggested that the men should be interviewed in order to determine how it feels to be rejected. Barbara did not offer a suggestion for
improvement, but made an observation about the research topic. "This is human nature. It's not, it's nothing about a bar, it's just human nature."
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

The data obtained from the observations and interviews conducted for this research suggest that there are numerous variables involved in determining how a woman will reject a man in a marketplace bar. Among the variables considered in this research are the approach used by the man, the woman’s impression of the man, the woman’s reason for attending the bar, the woman’s concern about others’ impressions of her, and the woman’s personality. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. There undoubtedly are many other variables affecting a woman’s decision to use an incivility, civility, excuse, or evasion when rejecting a man. But, the findings from this research should not be discounted.

The data gathered for this research reiterate several major themes reported by previous researchers who studied marketplace bars and similar phenomena. Perhaps the most basic of these themes is the bar’s status as a public open place where strangers may approach one another. Among other repeated themes is the importance of the dance floor as one of the main props used for unsingling in some marketplace bars. The traditional nature of gender roles in some marketplace bars is also reiterated. Men assume the
predator role, and women assume the attractor role. The types of rejections used by women toward men are also similar to those types described in other research. The categories of incivilities, civilities, excuses and evasions have corresponding or similar categories in the research of Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991).

The data gathered for this research also offered some themes that had not been previously reported in similar research. Some previous findings were contradicted by the data in this research. Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991) see a pattern to the way women rejected men in singles bars. They report that women use civilities and excuses as a first line of defense against men, then resort to incivilities if the men persist. The vast majority of women who dealt with persistent men in this research did not use incivilities in the pattern reported by Snow, Robinson, and McCall. When dealing with persistent men they continued to use civilities and excuses.

The women interviewed for this research offered three main explanations for the behavior of women when rejecting men. Two of the types of explanations offered by these women have received little or no attention in previous research on rejection in marketplace bars. The explanation that a woman's response depends upon the man's approach has been explored by Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991). They report that a persistent man seems to be at greater risk of facing an incivility than a man who is not persistent.
because women resort to incivilities after civilities and excuses fail. This explanation suggests that a woman’s response may be situational, meaning that a woman’s response may depend on her surroundings. The way a man acts toward her influences her reaction to him.

As another explanation some of the women suggested that women are as aware as men are of the necessity of impression management. Using an incivility to reject a man may scare away other men who are watching the encounter, so civilities and excuses are used to create favorable impressions for this larger audience. This explanation is also situational. If the woman wishes to create favorable impressions of herself for others around her, she will either accept the man’s offer or reject him with an excuse or civility. If she is unconcerned with the impressions she creates she may reject him with an incivility.

Many other women said that they thought the way a woman chooses to reject a man depends upon her personality. The traditional viewpoint held by sociologists and social psychologists is that personality is formed by cultural and social forces (Parsons 1964; Wallace 1970). These forces manifest themselves in the form of socialization. However, recent studies involving sets of twins suggest that both cultural and genetic forces help shape personality (Loehlin 1992). Both explanations acknowledge the importance of environmental factors, specifically interaction, in the formation of personality. Explaining a woman’s response by
stating that the woman’s personality affects her method of rejecting a man suggests that her reaction is less situational than would be the interpretation of the other two explanations. In other words, one woman would almost always respond with an incivility, while another woman might always respond with an excuse simply because their personalities differ. Their responses would vary little even if the situation varied.

Another unexpected pattern in the data was the large number of excuses and civilities used by women when dealing with persistent men. While some of the women’s explanations for their own and other women’s behavior could be used to account for this large number of excuses and civilities, these explanations do not account for the discrepancies between this research and that conducted by Snow, Robinson, and McCall (1991). They found that women used incivilities when men became persistent. The use of incivilities, even with persistent men, was very rare among the women interviewed at The Looking Glass. Snow, Robinson, and McCall did not mention a hesitancy to use incivilities.

While the explanations for this hesitancy could be numerous, a common characteristic of the women at the Looking Glass suggests one possible explanation. All of the women reported that they lived in or relatively near Springfield, a town in a Southern state. It may be that the women at the Looking Glass are different from the women interviewed and observed by Snow, Robinson, and McCall.
The women in their research were observed in urban bars, but the regional location is not mentioned. If the women in Snow, Robinson, and McCall's study were not Southerners, then regionality becomes a possible explanation for the hesitancy to use incivilities.

Since culture can vary by geographic region, then values, beliefs, norms, and other elements of culture can vary regionally. An individual growing up in one region can be socialized to hold different values and beliefs and to expect different behavior in certain situations than someone growing up in another region. Lynxwiler and Wilson recognized connections between regionality and social types in their 1987 study of New Southern Belles.

New Southern Belles, Lynxwiler and Wilson say, are one of many social types that make up all Southern women. Lynxwiler and Wilson outline the code that distinguishes the New Southern Belle (NSB) from other social types among Southern women. They also discuss similarities among different types of Southern women. Part of this New Southern Belle code states that "reliance on traditional sex roles by the NSB is one of the ways in which Southern women of most types differ from the women of other parts of the country" (Lynxwiler and Wilson 1987, p. 9). This discussion of the code continues:

There is a quid pro quo, not just in deference but in ego building and face saving for males. She takes an interest in sports, tells him how great he is, and intercedes or explains for him when he has committed a faux pas. Since she assumes that males operate on the
basis of their hormones, she dresses to please him and sharpens to a razor's edge her skills in coquetry. Sexuality based on traditional sex role distinctions is paramount to understanding the NSB. (Lynxwiler and Wilson 1987, p. 10)

This reliance upon traditional gender roles by Southern women may help explain this hesitancy to use incivilities with persistent men. To show disregard for his face would be disrespectful toward these gender roles and upset the order that exists between Southern men and women. If women in other regions are socialized differently, then there may be no reliance upon traditional gender roles among them--thus no hesitation when faced with a persistent man in a bar and no desire to help him save face.

Despite offering some new viewpoints on encounters between men and women in marketplace bars, this research is not without its limitations. The sample was small and was not picked at random. Twenty women were selected as subjects. A sample this small limits the generalizability of the findings, as does the lack of randomness.

Several factors may have affected the lack of randomness, thereby limiting the generalizability of the findings. Since the interviews and observations were conducted from late March to early August, the time of year the observations were conducted may have limited the randomness of the sample. The fact that only one bar in one Southern town was chosen as the research site may also have limited the randomness. The findings may have been different in a different region or in a more urban or rural
setting. The Looking Glass was not picked at random but was chosen for the very fact that many encounters occurred there. Because The Looking Glass drew a different type of crowd than some other bars in Springfield the sample was not representative of all bar patrons in the town. Although the researcher attended the bar at least once on every night of the week, interviews in the sample occurred on weekends proportionately more than other times during the week. The weekend crowd may have differed from the weekday crowd.

The researcher's behavior inside the bar may have biased the sample as well. He was usually seated in the barroom in a location that offered a view of most of the establishment. That position may have limited the chances of observing encounters that occurred in areas on the other side of the bar, in corners, in the back of the barroom, or in other locations that were not easily visible from the center of the barroom. The researcher usually attended the bar near closing time. Behavior of the patrons may have been different near closing time than earlier in the evening. Patrons may have been more drunk near closing, or certain types of patrons might leave earlier. These factors could affect answers to interview questions.

The process of locating a subject to be approached for an interview may also have been biased. Often the process for choosing was conducted on a first-observed, first-interviewed basis. The woman to be asked for an interview would be the first one to be observed rejecting a man on a
given night. Sometimes, though, the woman chosen would be the one last observed to reject a man before the bar closed because the encounter would then be fresh in her memory. The advantage to interviewing the first observed, however, was that she could then be observed for the time remaining before the interview, for most interviews were conducted when the bar had closed.

Other times, when several encounters were observed within a short time period and there was time for only one request for an interview, the woman who appeared most likely to agree to be interviewed was chosen. It is possible that the women perceived to be most likely to agree to be interviewed were also the women most likely to use excuses and civilities. A woman's apparent level of drunkenness, the number of people in her party, and general apparent attitude were all factors affecting this decision. Women who had been drinking but were not extremely drunk sometimes seemed likely to grant interviews.

Women leaving the bar alone or in small parties (fewer than four people) seemed less anxious to leave than those at the bar with larger groups. People in larger groups seemed more likely to urge the interviewee to speed up the interview or leave in the middle. Women who were judged by the researcher to be obnoxious, rude, or mean in the barroom were also judged to be less likely to agree to be interviewed than those women who did not appear to behave obnoxiously. Though this type of obnoxious behavior seemed
to be rare, when it did occur it seemed to be related to drunkenness. These factors affecting who would be chosen to be interviewed may have affected the sampling.

The variety of interview situations was not ideal. Variation occurred relative to location of interview, number of other people present, and number being interviewed at one time. However, available space and requests of the interviewee dictated the location for the interview. Asking to interview a woman alone may have led to more refusals to be interviewed. Interviewing more than one woman at one time occurred when the women chosen to be interviewed were leaving together.

While there may be factors limiting the generalizability of the findings in this research, these findings should be considered as avenues to be explored leading to future research concerning rejection and face work in marketplace bars. The discrepancy between Snow, Robinson, and McCall’s (1991) findings and the findings in this research concerning the use of incivilities is one of these avenues to be explored. One possible explanation—that of regionality—has been offered here. Confirmation or non-confirmation of this explanation awaits empirical verification.

The variables influencing a woman’s choice of rejection methods in a marketplace bar also need further exploration. The personalities of the women, the approaches used by the men, and the awareness of impression management on the part
of the women all need to be explored to determine to what degree and in what ways they affect a woman's choice of rejection technique. A better qualitative understanding could be combined with quantitative study of the occurrence and process of rejection to help determine the situations in which face-saving does and does not occur. A better understanding of the process of rejection through qualitative, and eventually quantitative, study could lead to a more fully-rounded picture of rejection and face work in public open places.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Did the man who just approached you at the table/dance floor/bar try to pick you up?

2. What did he say to you?

3. How did you respond to him? Why?

4. If you were to rate yourself on a 10-point scale of physical attractiveness, with one being extremely unattractive and 10 being extremely attractive, what number would you assign to yourself?

5. If you were to rate the man who just tried to pick you up on the same scale of physical attractiveness, what value would you assign to him?

6. If you were to rate the attractiveness of the man's personality on a 10-point scale, with one being the least attractive personality and 10 being the most attractive, what number would you assign him?

7. What type of job would you guess the man has? Why?

8. How much education do you think the man has? Why?

9. Why did you come to this bar tonight?

10. Is there any man in this bar tonight with whom you would have spent time talking if he had approached you? Why?

11. Is there any man in this bar tonight with whom you would have spent time dancing if he had approached you? Why?

12. What is your marital status: single, married, divorced, or separated?
13. What is your age?

14. What is the highest level of school you have completed?

15. What is your occupation?

16. When was the last time you were here? And the time before that?

17. Do you live around here, or are you just visiting town?

18. Why do you think some women use other methods of getting rid of men?

19. Is there anything I haven't asked about that you think is important?

Questions for an unrelated study on some health issues.

20. Do you smoke?

21. Do you drink alcohol?

22. Are you concerned with what ads on TV say about the risk of AIDS? Why or why not?

23. Do you think about what you might do if your doctor said you have AIDS?
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEWEES

The information contained in these descriptions has been obtained from the interviews with the women serving as subjects and from personal observation while in the barroom. The purpose of these descriptions is to provide a better perspective and context within which each interviewee’s statements and comments may be understood.

Anna

Anna, 38, had been divorced for 19 years. After finishing a year of nursing school in the nearby small town where she lives, she worked as a nurse until she resigned recently. She seemed to be rather outspoken.

Anna, whose blonde hair came to about her waist, was fairly attractive and had a slight tan. She was slim and about average height (around 5’6”). Her black skirt was slightly shorter than knee length; and she wore a black bikini top with a white jacket over it, leaving her midriff exposed.

Anna had two friends with her. One was a brunette woman who also was slim, about average height, and apparently in her late 30s. A balding man also was with
Anna and her friend. He appeared to be in his late 40s. Anna had been to The Looking Glass once in the past week. She said that before that it had been three months before she had been there.

Barbara

Thirty-year-old Barbara had been divorced and was working in retail. She had finished high school and picked up some computer skills at her job. She lived about 25 miles out of town.

Her blonde hair was very full and poufy. She wore slacks and a shirt that covered her completely; her style of dress was not suggestive. Her two friends with her, both women, were smoking and drinking. During the interview, one of them asked me, "Do you have a buzz, too?" They were dressed much like Barbara.

Barbara said she had been to The Looking Glass earlier in the week. The most recent time before that, she said, had been about three months earlier.

Carol

Carol was a single, 24-year-old college student and part-time sales clerk. She had finished one year of college, and she lived in town. She was slim and had blonde, curly hair that fell to about the middle of her shoulder blades.
Carol, who smoked, wore a silk, floral-print blouse with long sleeves, which was not low-cut or revealing. She also wore jeans and cowboy boots. She did not appear to be drunk. She went to the bar that night with her father so they could celebrate his birthday.

Carol had been at the bar a week before the interview. She said the time before that had been about two and a half months earlier.

Debbie

Debbie was 29 and single. She had completed two years of college but quit and was working as a secretary. She was dressed conservatively, but nicely. She wore a red blazer over a white shirt, and she sported a white hat with the brim turned up in front.

Debbie had been at the bar the night before and said the most recent time before that was about a month before. She said she smoked but did not drink. She seemed very outgoing and friendly.

Evelyn

Evelyn, 23, worked as a certified nursing assistant at a nursing home in Bowling Green. She was a high school graduate. She appeared to have been drinking, but she did not seem drunk.

Evelyn stood about average height and was fairly slim. She wore a tight black dress that came to a little above her
knee. The dress had a V-neck and short sleeves, and it showed her midriff.

Several other women were at the bar with Evelyn. Most of them appeared to be older than she by a few years, but probably no more than 10. Evelyn had been to The Looking Glass only one other time--two years before for her twenty-first birthday.

Faye

Faye was 22 and going to college full time. She had completed three years of college and also worked part time as a retail-clothing salesclerk. She was single.

Faye wore jeans or pants and a top with long sleeves. She, like the women she was with--Gayle, Heather and Ida--was not wearing revealing or clingy clothing.

Although she did not appear to be drunk, Faye said that she did drink. She did not smoke. She had not been to the bar for five months.

Gayle

Gayle, who was single and 21, had graduated with her bachelor's degree a week before the interview and was working as a waitress. She said she was "looking for a real job."

She was fairly short, with brown, wavy hair that came nearly to her shoulders. She wore pants and a short-sleeved shirt. Her clothes were neither revealing nor clingy.
Gayle was at the bar with Faye, Heather, and Ida. The last time she had been at the bar was four months before. She also attended the bar a month before that to celebrate Faye’s birthday.

Heather

Heather, 23, was single but was getting married the following day. Faye, Gayle and Ida were with Heather at the bar to celebrate her last night of being single. She had never been to The Looking Glass. Enrolled in graduate school, Heather was two classes away from finishing her master’s degree. She said, when she graduated, she would be a housewife.

Heather’s shoulder-length hair was straight and blonde. Her jean skirt came to just above her knees. She also wore a long sleeved, floral-print blouse. She stood 6’2” tall and appeared athletic and in very good physical condition. Heather said she did not smoke but did drink.

Ida

Ida was single, had completed three years of college, was still enrolled as a student, and worked as a waitress. She was 26 and said she would turn 27 in three weeks.

Like Faye, Gayle and Heather, with whom she was at the bar, Ida was not dressed in tight or revealing clothing. She wore shorts and a short sleeved shirt. She was slightly overweight.
Ida had not been to The Looking Glass in three months. The time before that had been another four months earlier. She did not smoke but did drink.

Jackie

Jackie, who was single, worked two jobs—one at a bar and another as a manager of a retail business. She had completed three years of college, two years of vocational/technical school, and a modeling course. Jackie reported her age as 26 but added that she would not turn 26 for another week.

Jackie was large chested and wore a low-cut, tight top. Her dirty-blonde hair was arranged big and poufy. She was about average height and weight. She smoked but said she did not drink often. She said she drank the equivalent of two or three drinks twice a month.

Jackie sat with a man and a woman at her table. She said she had not been to The Looking Glass in six months, adding, "It's really not my type of crowd." During the interview a very drunk man sat down beside her and complimented her on her physical appearance several times. She responded by laughing genuinely with him the first time but then focused her attention on the interview. After a few minutes he wandered away.
Kathy

Kathy was 25 and divorced. She had a bachelor’s degree and worked in the accounts payable department at a local plant of a large national corporation.

Kathy was slim and attractive and had wavy, long, brown hair. She wore a tight, black top that had a low, scoop neck and left her shoulders bare. A black belt was tied around her tight jeans.

Two men and one woman were at the bar with Kathy. The other male/female couple was a husband and wife. She said she hadn’t been to The Looking Glass in about six months, and the time before that had been six more months. She did not appear drunk.

Lori

Lori, 21, had taken two college classes after high school. She was divorced and about to start work as a waitress. She smoked and drank.

Lori stood between 5’ and 5’4”, was fairly thin, and had long, brown hair. She wore a short-sleeved, crew-neck sweater and jeans.

She was at the bar with a female friend. Lori had been at the bar the two nights preceding the interview.
Meg

Meg, 27, owned a styling salon. She had taken two semesters of college and had completed trade school in cosmotology. She was divorced.

Meg was about 5’5” and slightly overweight. Her hair was long, curly, and brown. She wore either dressy slacks or a skirt. Her blouse was neither tight nor low cut. She also had worn a blazer that she was not wearing during the encounter but had draped over her chair and put on when she stood to leave the bar.

Meg said she had had one drink the night of the interview. She said she drank occasionally. She did not smoke. She said she had been at the bar several times within the last week.

Nancy

Nancy was single and a factory worker. She had completed high school. She smoked and drank but did not appear drunk the night of the interview.

Nancy was tall and slim. She had long, brown, permed hair. She appeared younger than her age, 31, possibly because of her navy blue jumper dress with white polka dots. Under it she wore a plain white T-shirt. The dress came to about halfway between her knees and ankles.

Nancy seemed educated, outspoken, and unafraid to speak her mind. Her friend, a blonde woman who appeared to be
about 10 years older than Nancy, was drunk and also rather outspoken. Nancy said she came to The Looking Glass every Saturday.

Olivia

Olivia was 34 and divorced. She had completed high school and worked as a preschool teacher. She dated the bass player in the regular band at The Looking Glass and said that was one reason she went to that bar.

Olivia was a slim, attractive woman with long, blonde hair. She wore a white top that fell down around her shoulders leaving them bare. The shirt was frilly around the top and bottom. It was cut short and showed her midriff. She also wore hoop earrings and black slacks.

Sitting at Olivia’s table were three other women. One appeared to be about her age and was dressed as she was, and the other two appeared to be at least 10 years older. Olivia said she usually went to The Looking Glass every weekend.

Pat

Pat was 33 and divorced. She had completed trade school (barber school) and worked as a hairstylist. She emphasized that she called herself a hairstylist and not a beautician.

Pat was dressed conservatively in a blue, short-sleeved dress with white polka dots. Her blonde hair was slightly
longer than shoulder length and fairly curly. She was about average height and slightly overweight. She said she had not been to the bar in about a year, but at that time she attended it regularly.

Pat did not smoke, but she did drink. She seemed sober the night of the interview, though. Three or four women sat at Pat's table with her. One of them was very drunk and insisted to Pat that she not let me conduct the interview. Pat, who seemed very polite and congenial, took the author's phone number and called him 45 minutes later. The interview was conducted over the phone.

Quinn

Legally separated, Quinn was to finalize her divorce three days from the day of the interview. She had completed three years of college and was still enrolled. In addition to being a full-time student Quinn worked as a part-time data entry operator. She was 28.

Quinn had permed, blonde hair that was slightly longer than shoulder-length. She was stocky and had a large frame, with broad shoulders and a narrow waist relative to her shoulders. She wore a short-sleeved shirt that was black with a floral print. She also wore jeans.

Quinn did not smoke but did drink, although she said she had not had anything to drink the night of the interview. She sat with two women and one man. At one point while sitting at the table she put her elbows on her
knees and rested her chin in her hands, appearing very bored. She said this was her first visit to a bar.

Randi

Randi was married and worked as an administrative assistant at a finance company. She had completed two years of college. She was 25. Throughout the interview she gave short answers and seemed to be eager to leave the bar.

Randi was slim, tanned, average height and attractive. She had straight, brown hair that fell at least six inches below her shoulders. She wore a short, white dress that was somewhat tight but seemed very formal. Dressed as she was she would have fit in well at a dinner party as well as at the bar.

Two women were with Randi at the bar. She said she was the designated driver for the group. She had been to The Looking Glass the previous night but said the time before that had been about two years earlier. She was smoking a cigarette in the bar.

Susan

Susan, 25, was single and unemployed. She had completed technical school as a nursing technician. Tanya was at the bar with Susan.

Susan was fairly short but was about average weight for her height. She was tan and had brown hair that fell a little past her shoulders. Her clothing was somewhat
revealing. Her skirt was made of lacy, black material and she wore a low-cut top that showed cleavage. She wore a small jacket over her top.

The last time Susan had been to the Looking Glass was a few weeks before the interview. The time before that had been another week previous to that. A young man, who had not come with Susan, was with her during the interview and left the bar with her. He was lanky, had short hair and wore jeans and a striped, polo-style shirt.

Tanya

Tanya, 24, had completed some college and was still enrolled. She also worked as a nanny. She had gotten married within the last six months.

Tanya wore a white dress or skirt. She was about average height and weight. She had brownish hair. She had been to the bar about six months previous to that night and said the time before that had been about two years before. Susan was at the bar with Tanya. Tanya said she was serving as Susan's chaperon and joked that she had to approve of any men Susan met.
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