

Is it possible to scientifically test the efficacy of TRP? If so, how would you do it?

October 29, 2014 | 2 upvotes | by [TomHicks](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

analogbunny • 4 points • 29 October, 2014 09:04 PM

Basically, any "I went from zero to hero!" story ever written from an PUA, but with numbers. The backbone to social psychology is numbers and statistics, as well as thorough decomposition.

So take one aspect in specific - say, Myster's observation that you should never point your toes at your target - then simply go out and meet a lot of people, have some simple and solid goal in mind (like getting a solid number), and not only take a success/fail rate but also time how long it takes from open to close. If the toes-pointing thing is real and not just some placebo type of trick-of-the-mind, it'll show up in both higher success rates and faster closing times. Average over several PUAs over several nights over several sets, and you've got an answer.

The fact that different PUAs have different levels of skill, different levels (and types) of attractiveness, and different personalities will all come out in the wash if you do a within-subjects study with enough data to work on.

Same goes with every other pointer or skill; negging, kino escalation, locking on - all of that stuff that is claimed to be a "sure fire thing". Between PUAs, there's too much variation, but within any one of them, you can compare their length from open to close when they do and do not use the specific sub-technique in question - compare within themselves and across one another - and not only get a nice number showing whether or not there's a difference (beyond sample size errors and with a decent p-value, of course), but you could also maybe determine what the exact effect size is.

I'm sure that all of it does help to some degree, but to *what* degree? These things *are* measurable.

exit_sandman • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 10:09 PM

These things are measurable.

In theory at least.

analogbunny • 3 points • 29 October, 2014 10:15 PM

Everything is measurable, if you define your terms clearly enough.

If psychologists can put numbers on personality and awareness, I'm sure you could put numbers onto something as straightforward as "success rate".

exit_sandman • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 10:53 PM

No, it wasn't about them not being measurable, it was more about that experimental arrangement being very difficult to produce.

analogbunny • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 11:37 PM

Ah... well yes. Got ya. Agreed.

That said, this is where "experts" come in. There are so many possible confounds with human subjects that many things are just too coo-coo bananas to even look at. The effect you're seeing could just as likely be caused by some incidental other feature. That said, with experts, you can say with much more confidence that they've successfully isolated the behaviour and you truly are looking at with versus without the test behaviour.

Now you just need a valid working definition of "expert", a solid pass/fail rubric, and of course,

ethics approval. Alas....

SirNemesis • 5 points • 29 October, 2014 08:22 PM

Yes. Do a controlled test where you take a group of young volunteer males, randomly assign them to a red pill group and a blue pill control group (or any other control groups e.g. feminist, PUA, etc.), and then document the sexual success of the various males after giving them training/instruction in red pill and blue pill sexual strategy, respectively.

Those_Who_Remain • 10 points • 29 October, 2014 10:24 PM

randomly assign them to a red pill group and a blue pill control group

And what's 'Red Pill' and what's Blue Pill exactly? Even on this subreddit there's quite a diversity within both. How would you define them for research?

and then document the sexual success of the various males after giving them training/instruction in red pill and blue pill sexual strategy, respectively.

How do you determine sexual succes objectively?

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 October, 2014 12:18 AM

Red Pill strategy = be forward, cocky, cheeky and at the right times downright offensive.

Blue pill is more broad but basically it's talking to women like they're your friend. "How was your day? Do you like to read? I had a great trip up north recently, can I buy you a drink? Etc"

Anecdotaly the amount of sex im having in relationships went from onc a week to one to two times a day. My sex as a single men went from nothing to once or twice a month.

FollowThisAdvice • 3 points • 31 October, 2014 05:55 PM

Blue pill is more broad but basically it's talking to women like they're your friend. "How was your day? Do you like to read? I had a great trip up north recently, can I buy you a drink? Etc"

No it isnt. Blue pill is just NOT being a sexist "women are teenagers" arrogance=highest quality, disdainful dickhead.

Confidence, teasing and directness are absolutely things I, an avowed feminist BPer, would advocate in dating.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 November, 2014 02:30 AM

In a blue pill world;

Confidence = arrogance/male privelage.

Teasing = sexism.

Directness = rape.

If I took dating advice from twoxchromosomes I would never ever get laid.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 02:00 AM

One group gets laid a lot more than the other. It will be apparent.

Those_Who_Remain • 7 points • 30 October, 2014 08:39 AM

So amount of sexual partners is enough? I disagree. What if RP and BP look for different things and approach different women? That could be a confounding variable in this study.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 October, 2014 09:49 AM

[permanently deleted]

Those_Who_Remain • 2 points • 30 October, 2014 09:53 AM

I think a casual sex match would still be plenty interesting.

And I agree. It's just very hard to put it in research, since it is so hard to keep confounders out of the result.

[deleted] • 0 points • 30 October, 2014 11:07 AM

How about if all things were the same?

Those_Who_Remain • 3 points • 30 October, 2014 11:24 AM

Ideally, sure. But that's not very realistic.

[deleted] • 0 points • 30 October, 2014 11:36 AM

Identical twins? That could work. Isolate the factors to being just game.

Those_Who_Remain • 4 points • 30 October, 2014 11:42 AM

Except there aren't only personal factors at play here (and twins can be quite different as well in terms of personality, just not in genetics). The environment in general as well. There is a reason why most experiments are done in a controlled setting such as a laboratory.

You ideally want to isolate factors so that you can purely look at game, but realistically that is an almost impossible task.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 11:43 AM

Yes how about assuming it was possible. All things being equal?

Those_Who_Remain • 2 points • 30 October, 2014 11:46 AM

What is the point? Even then I'd say that sheer numbers aren't everything (Unless you define sexual success that way).

FollowThisAdvice • 1 point • 31 October, 2014 05:55 PM

I wouldn't touch 90% of the women most RPer's would sleep with.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 October, 2014 06:43 PM

Ok...

MakeTheSexyTalk • 1 point • 2 November, 2014 09:03 PM

Lol, that's about 90% of women on the planet.

FollowThisAdvice • 1 point • 3 November, 2014 10:16 AM

Well... yes

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 October, 2014 12:20 PM*

What is blue pill sexual strategy? I mean... I could easily gather at least 5 different opinions in one thread here... for example I think there is no such thing, just hang out with girls in your league and if mutual sympathy, ask out... while for example someone else would recommend Dr. Nerdlove (that site was actually recommended once on /r/tbp as a wholesomer alternative to RP)

Come to think of it... given that Dr. Nerdlove is fairly detailed and strategy-like, I would like to see that tested against, say, Heartiste.

To be fair, Dr. Nerdlove threw down the gauntlet quite straight:

<http://www.doctornerdlove.com/2014/09/the-red-pill/>

So, this could be fun to watch.

SirNemesis • 0 points • 30 October, 2014 02:55 PM

Dr. Nerdlove was actually one of the advice-givers that came to mind as a possible control. Another was Jezebel (<http://jezebel.com/5981581/how-to-talk-to-a-woman-without-being-a-creep>), although that might be low-hanging fruit.

We could also use the simple control of no dating advice (to measure how effective the average guy's societal advice/upbringing is).

cxj • 2 points • 30 October, 2014 02:01 AM

One major problem is that males selected at random might not be enthusiastic about self improvement, or willing to try redpill approaches since many feel they are ethically questionable. They might even get offended and quit the study. Also, it would take years to get an accurate result.

Dreamtrain • 1 point • 31 October, 2014 10:22 PM

All males should be just about attractive physically and within similar wage range and work type.

GuildedCasket • 1 point • 1 November, 2014 08:10 PM

It would be more sound to have males who are specifically trained in exactly what they'll say and how they'll say it in either category, and then randomly assign females to interact with one of the male options for some unrelated reason, and then measure rates of success when the males ask for their number at the end. You might actually be able to get IRB protocol for that, you can establish some kind of causality, and it is also far easier.

M_rafay • 2 points • 29 October, 2014 04:57 PM

http://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/2fy684/paper_on_pua/

CFRP submitted this paper investigating techniques given in two PUA books published in the mid 2010s("The Game" and "The Pickup Artist"). I thought the results in there were an interesting start in this direction, if a bit misleading.

aaron_the_just • 4 points • 29 October, 2014 07:00 PM

Yes.

I flip flipped between BP behaviour and RP behaviour when going on blind dates. After a few months of this, it was obvious most women (in a large US city, college educated, middle class, mid 20s, mixture of races) preferred RP behavioural patterns.

I also found it pretty soul destroying.

[deleted] • 6 points • 29 October, 2014 07:17 PM

If BP behavior is just being a "Nice Guy", of course women preferred the other type of behavior, because "Nice Guy" stuff is off-putting.

aaron_the_just • 4 points • 29 October, 2014 08:43 PM

Define "Nice Guy" stuff.

[deleted] • 8 points • 29 October, 2014 08:52 PM

What TRP describes their past selves to be, generally.

GuidedCasket • 2 points • 1 November, 2014 08:14 PM

Supplicating, excessively nice, overly protective, stuff like that. No one enjoys that, people like challenge, a bit of friction, some adventure. Which fits with RP, but is in no way the singular domain of RP.

aaron_the_just • 1 point • 1 January, 2015 01:05 AM

I defined BP behaviour as more of acting like a feminist man would be expected to act: not ordering for the woman in a restaurant; always picking up the bill; not pushing for physical contact too early.

GuidedCasket • 1 point • 1 January, 2015 01:12 AM

BP and Nice Guy behaviors are different.

exit_sandman • 2 points • 29 October, 2014 10:05 PM

Well, let's just say you don't refute RP dating advice when you go on a date with the idea of yourself as a bluepill (or rather: non-redpill), but project high value and more or less intentionally use PUA stuff.

If you say "I want to refute RP" then you'd have to

abstain from using stuff that RP says works

use stuff that RP says doesn't work

And all this by being average at best, because if you don't violate the first two rules (be attractive, don't be unattractive), you may actually be successful unless you behave like the biggest chump in existence (and with the right woman probably even then).

So yeah.

awesomesalsa • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 04:34 PM

you was dating too many old bitches, son

24 should be your absolute max and ideally you should aim for 20 or 21

aaron_the_just • 1 point • 1 January, 2015 01:07 AM

I happen to enjoy the company of women who are closer in age to myself. Age 22 - 23 seems to be ideal, but a woman in her late 30s is often a pleasure as well.

Nobody's talking about marrying them.

GuildedCasket • 1 point • 1 November, 2014 08:13 PM

That is not a scientific test.

soylentblueissmurfs • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 04:46 PM

It will be difficult to make a good experiment as it's hard to say if certain types of people are attracted/repulsed by Red Pill philosophy. I'd say take a bunch of random males and give them Red Pill coaching and see if they're satisfied with their relationships (and maybe the satisfaction of their partners) and compare their progress with random males that get other kinds of therapy and also males with no intervention.

Those_Who_Remain • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 06:02 PM*

I'd say take a bunch of random males and give them Red Pill coaching and see if they're satisfied with their relationships (and maybe the satisfaction of their partners) and compare their progress with random males that get other kinds of therapy and also males with no intervention.

That would be extremely hard though, due to the huge amount of covariables in such an 'experiment'.

soylentblueissmurfs • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 10:26 PM

Also expensive since you'd need a big sample population and a long followup time.

kitmomo • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 01:44 AM

I think it's possible. I'm not sure what ethics would let you get away with, but even with just self-report it could be viable.

I would be interested in measuring: * success in finding a partner (LTR and ONS) * the effects on life-satisfaction and relationship satisfaction for both sides of the diad * potential mediators and moderators (e.g., personality (using Big Five), dark triad, attachment styles, etc.) * short-term and long-term effects.

Below I've outlined roughly a few simple study designs that could potentially be implemented.

Studies:

Correlational Study. The simplest form would ask people to identify whether or not they read TRP, whether they try to implement RP tactics (with maybe a scale asking them to indicate which tactics they've employed and how often), how many partners they've had, their relationship satisfaction, their sexual satisfaction, and their life satisfaction. Participants who didn't indicate they read TRP would answer everything except the RP related questions. More complex forms of the Correlational Design could incorporate many different variables and use Regression or Structural Equation Modelling to identify mediation and moderation.

Quasi-Experimental Study. Randomly assigning men to be coached using RP or "standard" relationship coaching (for this to work, of course, we would need a standardized form to RP coaching) over (for example) two sessions, and then ask them to implement what they learned over the following week and document their activity in a diary format (detailing, for example, how many of the following they experienced: getting phone numbers, kissing, ONSs, dates, etc.).

Longitudinal Study. Track people who identify as RP and people who do not over a decade (ideally longer, but even a year could be interesting) and measure how many ONSs they had, how many relationships, whether they got married, whether they got divorced, what attachment style they have (does it change?), their life satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, sexual satisfaction, etc.

I'd say it's all doable. What's difficult is operationalising all the variables and what RP is, making everyone happy with the operationalisations, and, of course, getting ethics approval.

I would be most interested to see -- if RP is found to work -- *why* it works.

GuildedCasket • 1 point • 1 November, 2014 08:17 PM

All of these are subject to ridiculous amounts of confounds, we can establish a correlation but the correlation would be practically meaningless given how many other attributes RPer's have that could be responsible for any results found - negative or positive for the RPer's.

awesomesalsa • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 04:30 PM

No less possible than testing the efficacy of BP. "Just be yourself!"

GuildedCasket • 1 point • 1 November, 2014 08:07 PM*

Errrh... we can test correlation pretty easily with observational studies. Setting up an experimental study, however, would be much harder, and that's the only way to determine causality. Bah. Research design is a very dry topic.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 November, 2014 06:44 AM

it can be tested and it already has several times and the results are exactly what you'd expect them to be.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 November, 2014 08:41 PM

Give one group of people a blue capsule (a placebo) and tell them: *'There's a room full of women who you'll be talking to; they said they like caring, kind men, this pill is going to make you more like that.'*

Give another group of people a red capsule (placebo): *'The next room is filled with women who are very attractive, wear revealing clothing, this pill will make you less attracted to them.'*

exit_sandman • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 04:43 PM

Possible perhaps, but not for everything. How would you f.ex. test dread game? And apart from it being difficult to verify, testing as such wouldn't really be admissible because to my knowledge it's highly problematic from an ethical point of view to make psychological tests of that sort on living human beings these days (just think of Milgram and Zimbardo - these experiments wouldn't fly these days).

What you can do is to take (unbiased) studies about behavioralism, evolutionary psychology etc.pp. and see how they align with TRP ideas.

Those_Who_Remain • 5 points • 29 October, 2014 06:07 PM

What you can do is to take (unbiased) studies about behavioralism, evolutionary psychology etc.pp. and see how they align with TRP ideas.

The hard part is to make sure you also include research that does not align with TRP. Many people only seek sources that confirm their beliefs.

exit_sandman • -1 points • 29 October, 2014 09:43 PM

No, the hard part is actually finding research that is *reliably* unbiased (regardless of its findings), because that stuff is a hot iron.

[deleted] • 6 points • 29 October, 2014 05:46 PM

They actually played out the Milgram experiment on TV just a few years ago. It caused a lot of controversy but they still got away with it.

kitmomo • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 01:50 AM

Yes, they did in the 60s and 70s, but ethics changed as a result and you wouldn't be able to do those sorts of experiments today.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 01:57 AM

They also did it again in 2010, read the link.

kitmomo • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 02:21 AM

Interesting. I had a quick search and couldn't see it tied to any university. Apparently there were psychologists involved, however. It wouldn't surprise me that documentaries get away with more than researchers would.

24-7-69 • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 09:59 AM

My personal experience with women has been more than sufficient to convince me of the efficacy of TRP. I'm sure most men who have actually tried applying TRP will agree.

BellatorCordis • -1 points • 29 October, 2014 07:17 PM

You could do population level genetic tests to see if, over time, certain genes become more or less prevalent. You can then cross-reference those genes with their associated traits and see which are increasing or decreasing in frequency.

If TRP were true, I would expect to see a gradual increase in genes that promote height, testosterone, and other 'alpha' traits in men. In women I would expect to see genes that promote an hourglass figure, facial symmetry, and fertility to gradually increase.

OfSpock • 6 points • 29 October, 2014 08:59 PM

Who has been claiming that blue pill guys don't like women with hourglass figures?

BellatorCordis • -1 points • 29 October, 2014 09:03 PM

No one in this thread. TRP opponents will frequently deny that attraction to certain body types is heavily biologically influenced, though.

OfSpock • 6 points • 29 October, 2014 09:07 PM

But if both groups like the same body type, then increasing prevalence of it in the society proves nothing.

BellatorCordis • -1 points • 29 October, 2014 09:10 PM

If the frequency of genes that promote the aforementioned traits increase in the human population across cultures, it provides evidence that there is a biological basis for the preference of said traits.

If those traits that do become more prominent align with those predicted by TRP, it would be evidence in support of TRPs premises.

OfSpock • 4 points • 29 October, 2014 09:17 PM

But if blue pillers like women with hourglass figures, and I've never seen them say otherwise and they are better at picking up women than red pillers, that would skew the results.

BellatorCordis • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 02:29 AM

Let's take a step back and set some context.

The Red Pill is a philosophical movement. It asserts certain facts about reality. Specifically, it makes biological assertions about the nature of male and female humans. Taking 'the red pill' is an analogy of the Matrix. People who subscribe to the red pill philosophy assert that they are seeing the world and human nature as it really is.

The Blue Pill is really a movement that started as satire of The Red Pill. It quickly attracted people offended by the philosophical assertions of The Red Pill, and has turned into a movement that denies the assertions of The Red Pill philosophy. They also often provide an alternative hypothesis to explain human behaviors. Most commonly they argue that human sexual trends are mostly cultural.

If traits that Red Pill Philosophy claim are objectively attractive to human beings on a fundamental level *really are*, we would expect to see those traits selected for reproductively.

exit_sandman • 1 point • 29 October, 2014 10:12 PM

That's by far the worst approach unless you have several generations of time and can discount environmental factors (spoiler: you can't).

BellatorCordis • 1 point • 30 October, 2014 02:34 AM

You can tell that to population geneticists, who tack phenotypes across populations over several generations and do their best to control for environmental factors.