

Public perceptions of “negging”: lowering women’s self-esteem to increase the male’s attractiveness and achieve sexual conquest

Kathleen Green, Zoe Kukan and Ruth J. Tully

Abstract

Purpose – “Negging” can be described as the purposeful lowering of a woman’s self-esteem to increase perceived attractiveness of the man in order to achieve sexual conquest. Negging has evolved over time. Whilst “original” negging was intended to be a harmless tool for attracting women, more recently dating companies have been teaching men “evolved” negging in a potentially damaging way, which could escalate into an abusive intimate relationship. The paper aims to discuss these issues.

Design/methodology/approach – An online survey involving vignettes depicting negging between strangers with three conditions: “original”, “evolved”, and “control” was completed by 308 participants. Participants were asked how harmful, acceptable, and how likely to escalate each scenario was. A fourth vignette described “evolved” negging between partners.

Findings – Mixed methods analysis of variance indicated that participants perceived all negging as being significantly more harmful than control “pick-up” lines. “Evolved” negging was considered to be more likely to escalate in seriousness than “original” negging.

Research limitations/implications – Despite the public viewing negging as harmful and with the potential to escalate in seriousness, women are still being targeted in this manner and the industry “teaching” negging is growing despite controversy. This study aims to increase general awareness of negging in order to minimise harm caused to women who are “picked-up” through this technique. To this end, directions for future research are highlighted.

Originality/value – This paper is one of the first empirical studies in the area of negging. The perceived, and potential, harm caused can be studied in light of these novel findings with the aim of protecting women from harm.

Keywords Self-esteem, Dating, Emotional abuse, Intimate relationships, Negging, Partner violence

Paper type Research paper

Kathleen Green is a Forensic Psychologist and Zoe Kukan is a Forensic Psychologist Trainee, both at the Centre for Forensic and Family Psychology, The University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. Ruth J. Tully is a Consultant Forensic Psychologist at Tully Forensic Psychology Ltd, Nottingham, UK and Assistant Professor at the Centre for Forensic and Family Psychology, The University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

In 2014, the UK Home Office banned Julien Blanc, a controversial American “pick-up artist” (PUA), from entering the UK, following a petition signed by 158,000 UK residents. A similar outcry occurred in February 2015, where PUA Daryush Valizadeh, nicknamed “Roosh V.”, published an article advocating that raping women should be legal “when done off public grounds” (Valizadeh, 2015). Whilst there is currently no formal definition of a PUA, informal definitions exist, such as:

A pick up artist is a man (or less commonly, a woman; FPUA) who is dedicated to improving his skills with the opposite sex through the methods found in the pickup community – a community of guys who study how to seduce and sleep with women.

Pick-up artistry is not a new notion; books on pick-up techniques date back to 1970, for example, *How to Pick Up Girls* (Weber, 1970). The concept of what is referred to as “negging” developed more recently following the publication of books such as *The Venusian Arts Handbook* (Mystery Method Corporation, 2005), *The Game – Penetrating the Secret Society of Pickup Artists* (Strauss, 2005) and *Revelation* (Odom, 2008).

Received 26 June 2016
Revised 20 September 2016
25 September 2016
Accepted 25 September 2016

Negging combines the delivery of compliments alongside subtle insults to undermine the self-esteem of a woman. Negging is designed to make women more vulnerable to complying with sexual advances, by lowering self-esteem to increase how attractive the PUA seems. Negging can occur between individuals of any sex, this study focusses on its use by men on women as taught by “date-coaching companies”.

Increasing parallels are emerging between pick-up techniques and models of domestic abuse. The Duluth Power and Control Wheel (DPCW; Pence and Paymar, 1993) suggests that emotional abuse, through name-calling, belittlement, and humiliation, allows an abusive partner to gain power and control (Woman’s Aid Federation of England, 2014). The elements above are essentially negging which, combined with additional factors in the model, may prevent victims from escaping abusive relationships. In 2014, Blanc was heavily criticised by the public for posting the DPCW on social media with the caption “How to make her stay” (Pleasance and Evans, 2014).

Negging: an original conceptualisation

Negging, as used by Blanc, was originally introduced by Erik Von Markovik, a Canadian PUA claiming to turn socially inexperienced men into master seducers of women. In *Revelation* (Odom, 2008), Von Markovik described negging as harmless, engaging, and fun. He proposed that negging should not be insulting, but imply romantic disinterest in order to initiate the woman’s attraction. As beautiful women are regularly pursued by men, they may pre-emptively dismiss male attention. Therefore, men who appear disinterested may gain the romantic attention of the woman. These “original Negs” aimed to playfully identify flaws in women, to both challenge a woman’s perceived ability to attract any male and heighten the perceived attractiveness of the male. For example, “You’re weird [...] fun!” (Odom, 2008, p. 109).

In *Revelation* (Odom, 2008, p. 257), a complex model of courtship is proposed (Table I).

Von Markovik recommends that negging should only occur during the second part of the “attraction” phase; yet the complexity of the model risks misuse of negging after phase 3. Evidence suggests that the intention of negging has evolved, with articles advocating its use in long-term relationships (Zimmerman, 2010). Rather than ceasing, negging could increase in frequency and severity to sustain attraction, consistently lowering a woman’s self-esteem as a consequence. Aguilar and Nightingale (1994) explored self-esteem in 48 domestic abuse survivors, finding only emotional/controlling abuse to be significantly correlated with low self-esteem. Low self-esteem may be an effect of domestic abuse, or linked to the maintenance of abusive relationships. Manipulating and perpetuating low self-esteem in a partner is emotionally abusive; this may be the same with negging. Depending on how negging is taught, for instance as a “harmless” one-off activity to initiate a woman’s interest, or as a form of abuse, it feasibly has the potential to escalate into more serious harm.

Emotional abuse

Emotional and psychological abuses are now formally recognised as domestic abuse (Home Office, 2013). Siltala (2014) investigated the impact of emotional, sexual, and physical abuse in 1,952 people, finding that victims of emotional abuse scored lower on all measures of well-being than victims of sexual or physical abuse. Williams *et al.* (2012) found that victims of domestic abuse viewed emotional abuse as more harmful with longer-lasting effects, however observers

Table I Von Markovik’s M3 model of courtship: the M3 model

<i>Phase 1: attraction</i>	<i>Phase 2: comfort</i>	<i>Phase 3: seduction</i>
A1: the approach	C1: building rapport	S1: foreplay
A2: female-male interest	C2: building emotional and physical connection	S2: last-minute resistance
A3: male-female interest	C3: intimacy	S3: sex

viewed physical abuse as more harmful and deserving of punishment. This suggests that members of the public may not recognise the impact of emotional abuse, highlighting the importance of understanding the public perception of behaviours such as negging.

Negging: an elucidation

Although negging may be harmful, there is some evidence supporting its efficacy. Walster (1965) gave personality tests to female students, allocating a male research assistant to give feedback. Half were given positive feedback to temporarily elevate their self-esteem and half negative feedback. When asked to rate how attractive they found the research assistant, those who received negative feedback rated him as significantly more attractive than those who received positive feedback. Walster hypothesised that those viewing themselves as flawed may have lower standards in a potential partner and that lower self-esteem may increase desire for affection and acceptance, increasing the need for a potential partner. Similarly, Dittes (1959) explored self-esteem and attraction towards groups, finding that subjects with low self-esteem prefer an accepting group compared to those with high self-esteem.

There is little further research investigating self-esteem and attraction; however there is evidence supporting the link between self-esteem and compliance. Gudjonsson and Sigurdsson (2003) asked participants to complete measures of self-esteem, compliance, and coping, finding those with low self-esteem were more likely to be compliant and agreeable to others' requests. In this way, lowering a woman's self-esteem may help to gain their compliance for sex. Despite limited empirical evidence it is clear that PUAs teaching techniques to other men is lucrative, although some consider it dishonest (Almog and Kaplan, 2015).

One of the world's largest dating companies hosts approximately 1,000 live teaching programmes annually, across 70 countries and 270 cities, for over 40,000 clients (Real Social Dynamics Inc., 2002-2015). Amongst other pick-up techniques, these companies teach and demonstrate negging. Despite negging being originally conceptualised as harmless, Plier (2014) suggested that such companies teach pick-up techniques in a way that promotes sexual violence and hatred towards women. Plier's concerns were reinforced by news coverage suggesting that staff of such companies engage in sexually violent behaviour (Tillet, 2014). Following Blanc having his visa denied from the UK, anti-violence campaigners have also protested that these techniques are potentially harmful to women (Travis, 2014).

Raising concerns about the potential dangers of PUA teachings is the case of 22-year-old Elliot Rodger, who killed six individuals and injured 13 others before committing suicide in 2014. Before his killing spree, Rodger recorded a video explaining that he wanted to punish all women and sexually active men, as he had never been intimate with a woman. Rodger had been actively participating in forum discussions about pick-up artistry and subscribed to a YouTube channel for a dating company teaching negging techniques. Individuals with poor social skills and low self-esteem may access and model their behaviour on the techniques that these companies teach (Almog and Kaplan, 2015). Plausibly such people may fail to recognise signs of a woman's attraction and therefore realise that negging should cease, according to the original concept. Research suggests that when faced with potential threats to a relationship, individuals with lower self-esteem feel insecure of their partner's acceptance of them, and cope by devaluing their relationship and their partner (Murray *et al.*, 2003). This coping mechanism could be supported by negging, suggesting that the behaviour may be maintained or escalated due to insecurity in a partner's acceptance or low self-esteem.

Given the current prevalence and popularity of negging, combined with the potential impact on women and the associations with emotional abuse, the current study aims to more fully understand public perceptions of this phenomenon.

Overview of the current study

While originally intended to be harmless, negging has arguably been taught by modern date-coaching companies in an emotionally abusive and potentially harmful manner.

Empirical research into the public perception of the evolution of negging is lacking. The current study aims to explore perceptions of negging delivered by a man to a women in both stranger and partner conditions, and at different “levels” of negging development.

Method

Design

A repeated measures design was used to establish whether the source and context of negs affected how participants perceived them. The four levels of the independent variable were “stranger control”, “stranger original negs”, “stranger evolved negs”, and “partner evolved negs”. Three dependent variables were ratings of harmfulness, acceptability, and likelihood of escalation to abusive behaviour.

Participants

A power calculation indicated that, assuming a medium effect size for a 2x3 repeated measures design, a sample of 158 participants would be appropriate. The retrieved sample exceeded this target, with 308 UK-based participants. Inclusion criteria were adults (aged more than 18) with previous experience of being in a bar or club. Participation was sought via opportunistic social media recruitment and snowballing.

Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 71 years with a mean age of 30. The majority were British, 18-30 year olds ($n = 211$, 69 per cent), but 30-45 year olds also took part ($n = 51$, 16 per cent), as well as those aged 45+ ($n = 46$, 15 per cent). In total, 82 per cent were employed ($n = 254$), 15 per cent were students ($n = 49$), and 3 per cent were unemployed ($n = 5$). The majority were women ($n = 199$, 65 per cent women, $n = 109$, 35 per cent men).

Materials

Participants were presented with an online survey beginning with an information sheet, consent form and demographic questions. Participants were then presented with four vignettes, each depicting a scenario in which a man approached a woman:

- Vignette 1 – stranger-control condition. A stranger approaches a woman in a bar and uses a pick-up line without a negging element (examples drawn from a pick-up line website (Pick-up lines galore, n.d.)).
- Vignette 2 – stranger-original neg condition. A stranger approaches a woman in a bar and uses a neg as originally conceptualised (taken from *Revelation*, Odom, 2008).
- Vignette 3 – stranger – evolved neg condition. A stranger approaches a woman in a bar and uses a neg as demonstrated by employees of a modern dating company (taken from in-field footage, available online at Blanc (2002-2014) and YouTube (2016)).
- Vignette 4 – partner evolved condition. During an interaction between a heterosexual couple, the man uses a neg as demonstrated by employees of a modern dating company (taken from in-field footage, available online at Blanc (2002-2014) and YouTube (2016)).

Specific negs for each condition are detailed in the list as follows.

Negs used in each condition:

1. Stranger evolved negs (sources below)
 - Get down on your knees, call me master, and beg me to kiss you (P.I.M.P website – www.pimpingmygame.com/).
 - You are just a dead beat white trash whore, www.youtube.com/watch?v=YU2uVkwvkzA3MINS35
 - I’m intrigued by you, you look so cute and classy but then you look a mess at the same time, www.youtube.com/watch?v=CEuKxDquy7E1MIN08SECS

2. Partner evolved negs (sources below)
 - Okay my attraction for you has just died, www.youtube.com/watch?v=YU2uVkwkzA3MINS30SECS
 - “Eurgh the gum, you’re disgusting I’m done”, www.youtube.com/watch?v=YU2uVkwkzA0MINS50SECS
 - Seriously in a flash you’ll be almost 80, an old dog about to die, www.youtube.com/watch?v=NggqmAw6Qqg0MINS29SECS
3. Original negs (source: Odom (2008). *Revelation*. Venusian Arts LLC)
 - I can already tell we are not going to get along. We are too similar. You wouldn’t take my shit and I wouldn’t take your shit.
 - I don’t know why this happens, but every time I look at you, I see you without your makeup. I can’t explain it.
 - You’re very little.
4. Control (no neg. Source: www.pickuplinesgalore.com/cheesy.html)
 - I’m sorry, I don’t think we’ve met. I wouldn’t forget a pretty face like that.
 - My buddies bet me that I wouldn’t be able to start a conversation with the most beautiful girl in the bar. Wanna buy some drinks with their money?
 - I seem to have lost my phone number. Can I have yours?

After each vignette, participants were asked to answer three questions on a five-point Likert scale:

1. Harmful can be defined as “The extent to which the dialogue could hurt the target’s feelings”. Please select how harmful you perceive the dialogue in Scenario X to be.
2. Acceptable can be defined as “To what extent do you agree with the dialogue that has been used”. Please rate how acceptable you perceive the dialogue in Scenario X to be.
3. If the two individuals in Scenario X were to start dating each other and this dialogue continued, please rate the likelihood that it may lead to emotional abuse (not asked after vignette 4, partner evolved condition, as this scenario involved individuals already dating).

All conditions involving interactions between strangers (vignettes 1-3) began with the following passage:

Emily, a woman in her 20’s has been sat in a local bar for 20 minutes waiting for her friend to arrive. When she sits down, she notices a male stranger across the bar that appears to take an interest in her. The stranger tries to catch her eye a few times and later points in her direction before standing up, leaving his group of friends and starting to approach her with a smile on his face. The stranger pulls up a chair next to Emily and says *NEG*.

The partner condition (vignette 4) began with the following passage:

Emily and Tom first started dating when they met in a bar 18 months ago. They soon became partners and moved in together last month. The couple are sat at home relaxing in the living room together. During the course of their conversation Tom says things to Emily such as *NEG*.

In order to ensure that the negs used for each condition were representative of the source material, three negs were selected from each source per condition. Which particular neg was presented was determined by participants clicking on a pattern of their choosing (+++, 000, XXX) at the start of the survey.

Ethical considerations

This research was approved by the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences’ ethics committee at The University of Nottingham.

Procedure

Participants were invited to complete an online survey which included debriefing and informed consent. Data were collected between 21 March 2015 and 3 April 2015.

Results

Approximately one-third of participants took each route of the survey (33 per cent ($n = 103$), 34 per cent ($n = 105$) and 33 per cent ($n = 100$), respectively). Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 22. Cronbach's α reliability analysis was performed to assess whether dependent variables of acceptability and harmfulness were related to a common theme and could be combined. Data did not reach the threshold of 0.70 ($\alpha = 0.68$), so dependent variables were analysed separately.

The Shapiro-Wilk test was carried out to determine the normality of data distribution for dependent variables. The Shapiro-Wilk statistic was significant in all cases ($p < 0.001$), meaning data were not normally distributed. Given that there is substantial evidence that analysis of variance (ANOVA) models are robust to violations of normality when other assumptions are met (Schmider *et al.*, 2010), ANOVA was used where the assumption of homoscedasticity was not violated (assessed via Levene's statistic). In mixed methods comparisons, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied where Mauchley's test of sphericity was significant. *Post hoc* comparisons employed a bonferroni correction to account for multiple comparisons (Table II).

Harmfulness

A mixed methods ANOVA identified ratings of harmfulness differed significantly between "stranger original negs", "stranger control", "stranger evolved negs", and "partner evolved negs" ($F(2.743, 839.333) = 321.780, p < 0.0001$). *Post hoc* comparisons identified that there were no significant differences in harmfulness between the "stranger evolved negs" and "partner evolved negs" conditions. However, both "stranger evolved negs" and "partner evolved negs" were rated as significantly more harmful than "stranger original negs" (for each $p < 0.0001$); "stranger original negs" were rated as significantly more harmful than "stranger control negs" ($p < 0.0001$).

There was also a significant interaction between sex and neg condition ($F(2.743, 839.333) = 3.136, p = 0.029$). *Post hoc* comparisons identified that women rated "partner evolved negs" as significantly more harmful than men ($p = 0.008$). There were no other significant differences between sexes in ratings of harmfulness for neg conditions.

Table II Summary of results

Neg condition	Gender (mean (95% confidence interval))	
	Male	Female
<i>Harmful (range = 1-5)</i>		
Partner evolved	3.211 (3.010-3.412)	3.553 (3.404-3702)
Stranger evolved	3.358 (3.162-3.554)	3.503 (3.57-3.48)
Stranger original	2.468 (2.301-2.67)	2.382 (2.245-2.510)
Stranger control	1.404 (1.272-1.535)	1.452 (1.355-1.550)
<i>Acceptable (range = 1-5)</i>		
Partner evolved	3.275 (3.075-3.475)	3.508 (3.359-3.656)
Stranger evolved	3.817 (3.639-3.994)	4.342 (4.210-4.473)
Stranger original	2.963 (2.790-3.137)	2.995 (2.867-3.123)
Stranger control	2.028 (1.858-2.197)	1.995 (1.869-2.121)
<i>Likely to escalate (range = 1-5)</i>		
Stranger evolved	3.284 (3.085-3.484)	3.573 (3.425-3.721)
Stranger original	2.569 (2.387-2.750)	2.714 (2.579-2.848)
Stranger control	1.862 (1.729-1.996)	1.945 (1.846-2.043)

Acceptability

A mixed methods ANOVA identified ratings of acceptability differed significantly between “stranger original negs”, “stranger control negs”, “stranger evolved negs”, and “partner evolved negs” ($F(2.854, 873.186) = 278.128, p < 0.0001$). *Post hoc* comparisons suggested that “stranger evolved negs” were rated as significantly less acceptable than any other condition ($p < 0.0001$ in all cases); “partner evolved negs” were considered less acceptable than either “stranger original negs” ($p < 0.0001$) or “stranger control negs” ($p < 0.0001$). “Stranger original negs” were rated as significantly less acceptable than “stranger control negs” ($p < 0.0001$).

There was a significant interaction between sex and neg condition ($F(2.854, 873.186) = 4.658, p = 0.001$). *Post hoc* comparisons identified that women rated “stranger evolved negs” as significantly less acceptable than men ($p < 0.0001$). There were no other significant differences between sexes in ratings of harmfulness.

Likelihood of escalation

A mixed methods ANOVA identified ratings of likelihood to escalate to emotional abuse differed significantly between “stranger original negs”, “stranger control negs”, “stranger evolved negs”, and “partner evolved negs” ($F(1.795, 549.417) = 225.303, p < 0.0001$). *Post hoc* comparisons suggested that “stranger evolved negs” were rated as significantly more likely to escalate than any other condition ($p < 0.0001$ in all cases); “stranger original negs” were also rated as significantly more likely to escalate than “stranger control negs” ($p < 0.0001$).

There was no significant interaction between sex and neg condition ($F(1.795, 519.417) = 1.082, p = 0.334$).

Discussion

In considering an interaction between strangers, participants rated “evolved negs” as significantly less acceptable, more harmful, and more likely to escalate to abuse than “original negs”. Both negging conditions were considered less acceptable, more harmful, and more likely to escalate to abuse than control conditions. In considering communication between partners, participants similarly considered “evolved negs” as more harmful and less acceptable than “original negs” or control conditions. There was some evidence of sex differences, with women rating “evolved negs” between partners as significantly more harmful, and “evolved negs” between strangers as less acceptable.

Overall, negging was considered by the UK public to be harmful to women. This finding is consistent with popular media opinions, which deem modern negging as unacceptable and harmful (Cowburn, 2016). Despite these views, the industry of teaching negging is growing. It may be that these types of businesses are expanding because negging is relatively new and its true harm has not been widely recognised. Negs are apparently successful in catalysing the pick-up process resulting in women capitulating to men’s advances, possibly due to the self-esteem effects reported by Walster (1965). It is important to consider that this study found that the public (including men and women) perceived negging as harmful, yet those engaging in negging workshops and applying the techniques clearly consider this behaviour acceptable. Thus, perceptions of negging second hand, as in this vignette study, may differ in some way to experiencing negging first hand as the victim or perpetrator.

A possible explanation is that participants were more aware of the impact that each neg may have on the target’s self-esteem than they would be in real life, and therefore were more conscious of the potential harm. In this research, participants were presented with a neg in a written form, excluding non-verbal cues such as tone of voice, facial expression, and body language. Non-verbal cues convey interpersonal attitude such as dominance or insult (Hall, 2007). In reality, non-verbal cues may aid the subtle delivery of negs, the lack of non-verbal cues in the current study may have made participants more aware of the process of negging than they may have been had they seen this process in reality. Targets may not be aware of negging as a concept, or due to its initial subtlety they may not be conscious that they are being targeted in this way.

Feasibly, bystanders of negging behaviour may also be oblivious to the process. This may make negging appear more socially acceptable and less harmful than it is, perpetuating the popularity of it being taught as an industry. Negging is not a widely known phenomenon despite being taught internationally, and little is known of its prevalence or public awareness. Organisations such as governments and charities highlighting the potential harm of negging may raise public awareness; it is clear from the public outcry against Blanc and Roosh V. that when people are aware of harm to women they take action.

Participants rated “evolved negs” as more harmful and less acceptable than “original negs” from Von Markovik. This tentatively suggests that “non-harmful” negging as it was originally described has evolved, and that the public recognise this evolution as harmful. Current findings echo those of previous authors (Plier, 2014; Travis, 2014), suggesting that these taught techniques may promote violence and derogatory views towards women and are potentially harmful to PUA targets.

If negging persists in a longer term relationship, the harmful nature of “evolved negs” and the belief that women should be manipulated into meeting men’s needs could result in an emotionally abusive cycle of power and control (Pence and Paymar, 1993). In the current research participants rated “evolved negs” as more likely to escalate into emotional abuse if the couple became partners than “original negs”, regardless of participant gender. This supports the hypothesis that the original intention of negging has dangerously evolved, both in its nature and the context in which it is used (Zimmerman, 2010).

The current study found some sex differences; females viewed “evolved negs” between strangers as less acceptable and “evolved negs” between partners as more harmful than men did. It is possible that women empathised more with the (female) target, while men related more to the (male) PUA. However, there is some evidence that women do generally view abusive behaviour as less acceptable than men, in particular psychological abuse (Capezza and Arriaga, 2008). Both sexes acknowledged that negging was harmful (despite it not being labelled as negging), suggesting that the public identified the behaviour as emotional abusive.

There were no differences in ratings of harmfulness between partner and stranger conditions for “evolved negs”, in contrast to previous findings suggesting that negging may be viewed as more harmful between partners (Williams *et al.*, 2012). Although the public identified that all “evolved negs” were harmful, women in emotionally abusive relationships may be more likely to tolerate these behaviours and remain in contact with the male, particularly if they co-occur with other controlling acts designed to maintain the relationship (Pence and Paymar, 1993). Women who experience negs from a stranger may feel more able to terminate contact, as they have no investment in the relationship. This finding suggests that further exploration of public awareness of emotional abuse within relationships is required.

Participants rated “evolved negs” between strangers as significantly less acceptable than “evolved negs” between partners, suggesting a higher level of tolerance to partner negging despite equal ratings of harmfulness. This suggests a public lack of awareness of the significance of emotionally harmful acts in intimate relationships, potentially extending to victims and their families. This implies that those in emotionally abusive relationships may be more likely to tolerate abuse, or find a lack of understanding from those they choose to confide in even if they do see psychological abuse as more damaging than violence. This could potentially undermine safeguarding interventions, leaving victims at an increased risk of remaining in an abusive relationship even if they do view psychological abuse as more damaging than physical abuse (Capezza and Arriaga, 2008). Victim blaming is an established phenomenon in violence against women and fear of victim blaming has been found to influence disclosure of domestic abuse (Lila *et al.*, 2013). It is plausible that this also applies to negging.

Recommendations for further research

Although the “original” and “evolved” conditions were both entitled “negging”, it is possible that they involve different psychological processes. Further research into factors influencing the identification of negging, and the effect on a target’s self-esteem, would inform this area.

Future replications could usefully employ video clips to include non-verbal communication in scenarios. In addition, scenarios including PUAs who are women and targets who are men would increase the generalisability of findings and establish more complex sex differences, given that man-woman aggression is generally considered more harmful than woman-man aggression (Basow *et al.*, 2007). Given societal changes in dating behaviour, research incorporating an online dating condition would be informative.

Research establishing the prevalence of negging, and the incidence of emotional abuse in relationships initiated by negging, could help to inform preventative strategies and awareness campaigns.

Limitations

Negs in this research were selected from the writings of Von Markovik and from the teachings of a high profile dating agency, and it is acknowledged that selection bias may limit generalisability. Future replications could address this limitation via random selection of a range of negs from various sources.

Three negs were selected per condition to increase the robustness of the findings, however the data were not normally distributed. Although this is common in forensic research (Rosenfeld and Penrod, 2011), this may be associated with the five-point Likert scale employed. This scale could be piloted in future replications; with an additional response to test whether a forced choice affects data distribution.

The current research was conducted in the UK, and nationality and cultural data were not collected. Negs were selected from Canadian and American sources, so cultural differences may have impacted on participants' responses, as could any prior knowledge of negging, which was not measured.

Conclusion

In the current research, the public identified negging as both unacceptable and harmful, however PUAs argue the technique is successful and it is taught internationally. Research into negging is in its infancy; this study aims to promote awareness of negging as well as present initial findings regarding public perceptions. Further research is necessary to help researchers, professionals, and the public understand the relationship between this behaviour and emotional abuse, and the potential impact on targets.

References

- Aguilar, R. and Nightingale, N. (1994), "The impact of specific battering experiences on the self-esteem of abused women", *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 35-45, doi: 10.1007/BF01531967.
- Almog, R. and Kaplan, D. (2015), "The nerd and his discontent: the seduction community and the logic of the game as a geeky solution to the challenges of young masculinity", *Men and Masculinities*, (ahead of print), doi: 10.1177/1097184X15613831.
- Basow, S.A., Cahill, K.F., Phelan, J.E., Longshore, K. and McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. (2007), "Perceptions of relational and physical aggression among college students: effects of gender of perpetrator, target, and perceiver", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 85-95, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00333.x.
- Blanc, J. (2002-2014), "PIMP", RSD Julien, available at: www.pimpingmygame.com/
- Capezza, N.M. and Arriaga, X.B. (2008), "Factors associated with acceptance of psychological aggression against women", *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 612-33, doi: 10.1177/1077801208319004.
- Cowburn, A. (2016), "Roosh V: militant pro-rape 'pick-up artist' has organised events in eight UK cities", *The Independent*, 1 February, available at: www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/militant-pro-rape-pick-up-artist-has-organised-events-in-eight-uk-cities-a6846716.html
- Dittes, J.E. (1959), "Attractiveness of group as function of self-esteem and acceptance by group", *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 77-82, doi: 10.1037/h0041812.
- Gudjonsson, G. and Sigurdsson, J. (2003), "The relationship of compliance with coping strategies and self-esteem", *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 117-23, doi: 10.1027//1015-5759.19.2.117.

- Hall, J.A. (2007), "Nonverbal cues and communication", *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 626-8.
- Home Office (2013), "Domestic violence and abuse", available at: www.gov.uk/guidance/domestic-violence-and-abuse
- Lila, M., Gracia, E. and Murgui, S. (2013), "Psychological adjustment and victim blaming among intimate partner violence offenders: the role of social support and stressful life events", *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, Vol. 2 No. 5, pp. 147-53, doi: 10.5093.ejpalc2013a4.
- Murray, S.L., Bellavia, G.M., Rose, P. and Griffin, D.W. (2003), "Once hurt, twice hurtful: how perceived regard regulates daily marital interactions", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 84 No. 1, pp. 126-47, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.126.
- Mystery Method Corporation (2005), "*The Venusian Arts Handbook*": *The Mystery Method*, The Mystery Method Corporation LLC, available at: www.pdfarchive.info/pdf/T/Th/The_Mystery_Method_The_Venusian_Arts_Handbook.pdf
- Odom, C. (2008), *Revelation*, Venusian Arts LLC.
- Pence, E. and Paymar, M. (1993), *Education Groups for Men Who Batter: The Duluth Model*, Springer Publishing Company.
- Pick-up lines galore (n.d.), available at: www.pickuplinesgalore.com/cheesy.html
- Pleasance, C. and Evans, S.J. (2014), "'Use intimidation, coercion and threats': the shocking 'checklist' for picking up women posted online by California 'dating guru' Julien Blanc", Associated Newspapers Ltd, 15 November, available at: www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2835834/The-shocking-checklist-picking-women-posted-online-California-dating-guru-Julien-Blanc.html
- Plier, A. (2014), "Investigate the company real social dynamics (RSD) and deport it's non-US citizen staff members", available at: www.change.org/p/the-government-of-the-united-states-of-america-investigate-the-company-real-social-dynamics-rsd-and-deport-it-s-non-us-citizen-staff-members
- Rosenfeld, B. and Penrod, S.D. (2011), *Research Methods in Forensic Psychology*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, NJ.
- Schmider, E., Ziegler, M., Danay, E., Beyer, L. and Bühner, M. (2010), "Is it really robust?", *Methodology*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 147-51, doi: 10.1027/1614-2241/a000016.
- Siltala, H. (2014), "The adverse effects of domestic violence on psychosocial well-being", available at: <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/44477/URN%3ANBN%3Afi%3Aju-201410233083.pdf?sequence=1>
- Strauss, N. (2005), *The Game: Penetrating the Secret Society of Pickup Artists*, ReganBooks.
- Tillet, A. (2014), "Revealed: boss of vile American 'Pick Up Artist' Julien Blanc facing UK ban bragged about 'raping' stripper who was 'totally not in the mood'", *Mail Online*, 18 November, available at: www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2839028/Boss-vile-American-Pick-Artist-Julien-Blanc-facing-UK-ban-bragged-raping-stripper-totally-not-mood.html
- Travis, A. (2014), "Julien Blanc barred from entering UK", *The Guardian*, 19 November, available at: www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2014/nov/19/julien-blanc-barred-entering-uk-pick-up-artist
- Valizadeh, R. (2015), "How to stop rape", 16 February, available at: www.rooshv.com/how-to-stop-rape
- Walster, E. (1965), "The effect of self-esteem on romantic liking", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 184-97, doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(65)90045-4.
- Weber, E. (1970), *How to Pick Up Girls*, Symphony Press.
- Williams, C., Richardson, D.S., Hammock, G.S. and Janit, A.S. (2012), "Perceptions of physical and psychological aggression in close relationships: a review", *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 489-94, doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.005.
- Women's Aid Federation of England (2014), "Emotional abuse", available at: www.womensaid.org.uk/domestic_violence_topic.asp?section=0001000100220042=Emotional+abuse
- YouTube (2016), available at: www.youtube.com/?gl=GB&hl=en-GB
- Zimmerman, N. (2010), "Negging 101: how it works and why it fails", 7 November, available at: www.examiner.com/article/negging-101-how-it-works-and-why-it-fails

Further reading

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G. and Buchner, A. (2007), "G*power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences", *Behavior Research Methods*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 175-91, doi: 10.3758/BF03193146.

Likert, R. (1932), "A technique for the measurement of attitudes", *Archives of Psychology*, Vol. 140, pp. 1-55.

Lin, V. (2008), "Pick-up artist (PUA)", 27 December, available at: www.pualingo.com/pick-up-artist-pua/

New York Daily News (2014), "'Elliot Rodger's Retribution': Santa Barbara killer in his own sick words before shooting", *New York Daily News*, 25 May, available at: www.nydailynews.com/news/national/elliott-rodger-retribution-santa-barbara-shooter-sick-words-article-1.1804761

Oppenheim, M. (2016), "Roosh V: controversial 'pick-up artist' declares himself 'the most hated man in the world' in secret press conference", *The Independent*, 8 February, available at: www.independent.co.uk/news/people/roosh-v-has-declared-himself-the-most-hated-man-in-the-world-a6860461.html

Sorenson, S.B. and Taylor, C.A. (2005), "Female aggression toward male intimate partners: an examination of social norms in a community-based sample", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 78-96, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00170.x.

Starratt, V.G., Goetz, A.T., Shackelford, T.K., McKibbin, W.F. and Stewart-Williams, S. (2008), "Men's partner-directed insults and sexual coercion in intimate relationships", *Journal of Family Violence*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 315-23, doi: 10.1007/s10896-008-9153-z.

Corresponding author

Ruth J. Tully can be contacted at: ruth.tully@nottingham.ac.uk

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com