

Playing Hard-to-Get

Haley Hackendale

Communication 304, Interpersonal Communication

USC Annenberg School for Communication

Professor Michael Cody

April 6, 2008

Abstract

The following essay examines the courtship behavior of playing hard-to-get. Although the idea is not supported by the theory of reinforcement and liking, the paper goes on to note social scientific evidence for the strategy found in exchange theory, Darwin's sexual selection theory, the scarcity principle, social desirability theory, psychological reactance theory, Brehm's motivational model, frustration reduction theory, and cognitive dissonance theory. It then draws on anecdotes from researchers' interviews with a number of young men to come to the conclusion that playing selectively hard-to-get (not too hard-to-get) is a quite successful way to get attention, affection, and commitment from members of the opposite sex.

Playing Hard-to-Get

Introduction

“When I first started dating my now-boyfriend, he wasn't looking for anything serious, but I was. Knowing how he felt, I decided to play coy and be totally nonchalant about anything long-term. After about a month, he started giving me clues that he wanted to become a couple. Of course, I ignored all his hints, pretending that I didn't pick up on any of them. Eventually, he just came out and asked me to be his girlfriend. We've been dating for more than two years now, but I don't think we would have made it this far if I had tried to pressure him into being more serious than he was ready to be...or if I had let on how much I wanted him to commit to me. I guess playing hard to get really works!” –Allison, 20

Cosmopolitan reader Allison shared this strategy in an article in the most recent April 2008 issue titled “How I Got Him to Step Up His Game.” While some women might consider *Cosmopolitan* their tried-and-true go-to resource for advice on romance and relationships, others out there might be a bit skeptical. Do the tips and tricks in each issue actually work in real life, or is someone making all of this up? Playing hard-to-get worked for Allison, but does that mean it will work for everyone?

Playing hard-to-get is not a new phenomenon, regardless of how the editors at *Cosmopolitan* may reframe it from time to time. It has been around for a long while, explored by scholars in a number of disciplines: literature, economics, and, most importantly, social science, just to name a few. In the following pages, this paper will explore the concept of playing hard-to-get by bringing all of these approaches together. It will investigate why it works in some situations and not in others, bringing to light the most effective way to play hard-to-get.

Reinforcement and Liking

Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote, “All mankind love a lover.” Theorists from the reinforcement school of thought would agree. The idea behind reinforcement and liking is that liking is a reward. For others to reward us with their liking, they must truly like us or else they would not expend the energy to show their affinity and affection for us. Therefore, in return, we like those who like us because we appreciate them rewarding us with their liking; moreover, we reject those who dislike us because they are not rewarding us in any way (Walster, 1971). According to Kenny and Nasby (1980), there exists a “substantial body of evidence that purportedly supports the principle of reciprocal attraction consisting of experiments that demonstrate a causal sequence in which the belief or the perception of being liked by someone elicits liking for that person” (p. 249). One such experiment was conducted by Byrne et al (1968), in which researchers predicted an exact correlation between reinforcement and liking. Their hypothesis, that “attraction towards X is a positive linear function of the proportion of positive reinforcements received from X or expected from X,” was supported by the data (Walster, 1971, p. 87).

This evidence clearly contradicts the idea of playing hard-to-get. By playing hard-to-get, one refrains from showing too much liking or giving too much attention to another person, in hopes that the other will be motivated to work harder to win the affection of that person. The theory of reinforcement and liking, however, would dictate that since the person who is playing hard-to-get is not rewarding the other person with liking and affection, the other person will not like the person who is playing hard-to-get. As we well know, however, this strategy has to have worked for at least some people in the dating game, or else we would not continue to hear about it. Where does the reasoning behind reinforcement and liking go wrong?

Exchange Theory and Darwin's Sexual Selection

Kenny and Nasby (1980) argue that the principles behind exchange theory account for the discrepancy between the theoretical concepts of reinforcement and liking and the real-life success of playing hard-to-get. They explain that “according to exchange theory, individuals differ in their resources. Individuals with more resources should receive more liking than those with fewer resources” (p. 250). As we all know, in the real world everyone is not equal. People differ in terms of intelligence, personality, wealth, appearance, skills, and social networks, just to name a few areas. Exchange theory indicates that those individuals who have more positive assets to offer to a potential mate will be more well-liked in general, as more people probably wish to cultivate a relationship with them. Murstein (1971) confirms this, stating that “from the exchange point of view, popular individuals should be those who provide rewards for a great number of people” (p. 17). We encounter examples of this every day in real life, so we can see that exchange theory has some validity behind it.

Because of exchange theory, Kenny and Nasby (1980) claim that “the correlation between giving and receiving liking may well be negative. If Person A is liked by others, it is probable that he or she will not be a liker. Such a view is consistent with exchange theory, since if Person A is liked by others, A can afford to be choosy about whom A likes” (p. 251). The idea of having a choice falls in line with Darwin's theory of sexual selection, which suggests that “individuals compete with members of their own sex for reproductively relevant resources held by members of the opposite sex” (Buss, 1988, p. 616). According to Buss (1988), there are two key processes that comprise Darwin's sexual selection theory: intersexual selection and intrasexual selection. Intersexual selection is where the idea of being choosy comes into play.

This involves members of one sex wielding preferential choice for members of the opposite sex that possess certain qualities or specific magnitudes of those characteristics (Buss, 1988).

While Darwin mainly addressed the idea of “female choice,” Buss (1988) suggests that males will also be choosy, as they are searching for women with characteristics that imply a high reproductive value. Either way you look at it, it is apparent that someone who is well-liked and sought after by a number of people can afford to make a strategic decision in mate choice, and therefore will not necessarily like everyone who likes him or her to an equal extent. In other words, the idea of reciprocity and the theory of reinforcement and liking do not always hold true. Some people can in fact elicit liking from others without having to show liking and affection to those others in return.

Intrasexual selection, the other part of the equation, involves members of the same sex competing for the chance to mate with members of the opposite sex, a process in which characteristics such as perseverance, strength, or effective mating signals are selected for (Buss, 1988). It is in discussing intrasexual competition that Buss (1988) brings up playing hard-to-get:

Women more than men will show greater intrasexual competition for displaying cues that correlate with reproductive value or fertility... Playing hard-to-get is a hypothesized correlate of reproductive value. Actual difficulty of male access is correlated with female reproductive value. Women with greater reproductive value are more desirable and hence can be more choosy and discriminating. Therefore, women will use this cue to attempt to be highly desirable. Playing hard-to-get may also serve other functions, such as testing a man’s willingness and ability to invest resources or serving as a cue to the man of her fidelity. (p. 617)

Therefore, according to Darwin's theory, women compete with each other to appear to be the most hard-to-get, as making it hard for a male to gain the liking and affection of a woman is a sign that she is highly valuable. It is important to note at this point that playing hard-to-get may be a good strategy to boost a woman's perceived value, even if she does not have as much to offer as other women whom she is competing against.

The Scarcity Principle and Social Desirability

As we have just discussed, playing hard-to-get is a way to illustrate one's value and social desirability. The main concept behind this strategy is the scarcity principle. In his book, Cialdini (2001) explains the scarcity principle in laymen's terms: "Opportunities seem more valuable to us when they are less available" (p. 205). He then goes on to explain that scarcity can be used to influence and manipulate people because it taps into our weaknesses for shortcuts. More specifically, we feel enlightened when we recognize scarcity: "We know that the things that are difficult to get are typically better than those that are easy to get. As such, we can often use an item's availability to help us quickly and correctly decide on its quality" (Cialdini, 2001, p. 208). According to Walster, Walster, Piliavin, and Schmidt (1973), individuals have discovered through repeated experience that it is harder to get a date with someone who is socially desirable than it is to get a date with an undesirable partner, thereby linking elusiveness and value.

Interviews conducted by Walster et al (1973) most concisely illustrates the logic human beings use in assigning value to someone who is playing hard-to-get. College men who were questioned explained that a woman who is elusive and plays hard-to-get is usually always a valuable woman, as a woman must be popular if she is going to be choosy, and she must be popular for some reason (e.g. she is very attractive, she has a good personality, she is sexy, etc.) (Walster et al., 1973). This idea of elusiveness as a sign of social desirability is not just apparent

inside the realm of romance, however; it applies to the working world as well. In research done by Williams, Radefeld, Binning, and Sudak (1993), a job candidate who played hard-to-get by informing her interviewer that she had several other possible job opportunities made herself more appealing by indirectly providing the interviewer with social cues about her qualifications based on the other employers' evaluations. The process the interviewers used to determine that she was a valuable individual is called social comparison; when the candidate divulged that she had successfully interviewed with two other employers who were impressed by her qualifications, the interviewer compared the social cues he was receiving with the information he had on the candidate to determine that she would be worthy of hiring (Williams et al., 1993).

Returning to the idea of the scarcity principle, if someone is hard-to-get because that individual is perceived as valuable and desirable to others in society (as opposed to someone who may be hard-to-get because of a cold personality or rude manner), competition for that person will be extremely stiff. To illustrate this concept, we can extrapolate the results of a study noted in Cialdini (2001), in which participants were given a certain number of homemade cookies to begin with, and then some of the cookies were taken away, with different explanations given to different participants in the study as to why they suddenly had less cookies. Cialdini (2001) notes that "those [participants] whose cookies became scarce through the process of social demand liked the cookies significantly more than did those whose cookies became scarce by mistake. In fact, the cookies made less available through social demand were rated the most desirable of any in the study" (p. 223). This highlights just how important the role of competition is in the pursuit of someone that is elusive; we may want a person more when they playing hard-to-get, but we want them the most when there are others competing with us for that

person's attention (Cialdini, 2001). This proves that the individual in question really is valuable, and is not just feigning elusiveness to create the illusion of social desirability.

The Scarcity Principle and Psychological Reactance

When Cialdini (2001) describes how the scarcity principle can be used to influence and manipulate people, he notes a second source of power behind the idea of scarcity: "As opportunities become less available, we lose freedoms. And we *hate* to lose the freedoms we already have" (p. 208). This idea stems from the psychological reactance theory, that whenever we cannot exercise our freedom of choice, whenever it is threatened or limited, we are overcome by our need to maintain this freedom and we place significantly more value on this freedom of choice (and the goods and services, or, in this case, partners, associated with it) than we ever had before (Cialdini, 2001). Therefore, according to Cialdini (2001), "when increasing scarcity – or anything else – interferes with our prior access to some item, we will *react against* the interference by wanting and trying to possess the item more than we did before" (p. 209). This is yet another way to look at playing hard-to-get: when a potential mate starts acting elusive and unavailable and we had perceived that individual as available or attainable at an earlier point in time, we will work increasingly harder in an attempt to return to the state where we can again potentially acquire the attention and affection of that individual.

Another concept that Cialdini (2001) introduces that exemplifies psychological reactance is something called the "Romeo and Juliet effect." As Shakespeare's story goes, Romeo Montague and Juliet Capulet were two adolescents in love, doomed to be kept apart forever by the ongoing feud between their two families. Acting out against their parents' attempts to separate them, they both committed suicide so that they could be together forever in the next life. Analyzing the plot in terms of psychological reactance theory, Cialdini (2001) speculates:

The intensity of the couple's feelings and actions has always been a source of wonderment and puzzlement to observers of the play. How could such inordinate devotion develop so quickly in a pair so young? A romantic might suggest rare and perfect love. A social scientist, though, might point to the role of parental interference and the psychological reactance it can produce. Perhaps the passion of Romeo and Juliet was not initially so consuming that it transcended the extensive barriers erected by the families. Perhaps, instead, it was fueled to a white heat by the placement of those barriers. Could it be that had the youngsters been left to their own devices, their inflamed devotion would have amounted to no more than a flicker of puppy love? (p. 212)

As we can see, the two young lovers were so distraught by the idea that they would never be free to love one another that they reacted in a very extreme manner to regain that freedom. Although parental interference is not usually the driving force behind an individual playing hard-to-get, the idea that another person is denied the possibility to be with that individual (in most cases, of the individual's own accord) remains the same. Moreover, although a person would not normally commit suicide because he could not be with the person he desires, we can imagine that psychological reactance could drive a person to dramatic and valiant actions in attempt to secure the attention of the elusive individual.

Brehm's Motivational Model

When someone is unable to attain the attention and affection of an individual that is playing hard-to-get, what is it that keeps that person so determined to pursue the individual? Research by Wright, Toi, and Brehm (1984) concludes that Brehm's motivational model provides explains how people in pursuit are able to maintain their energy and determination:

According to this model, the magnitude of goal valence (the attractiveness or unattractiveness of a goal) varies as a direct function of the level of energy mobilized to attain or avoid that goal. It is proposed that one determinant of energy level is what an individual perceives can and must be done to achieve an outcome. Easily attained outcomes should produce little motivational arousal, while difficult to attain outcomes should produce relatively high levels of arousal. (p. 327-328)

In other words, if a person realizes that he must expend a greater amount of energy to attain a goal, the higher level of motivational arousal that accompanies this realization will cause him to become all the more focused on the goal in sight, thereby making it appear increasingly more attractive. When thought of in terms of an individual playing hard-to-get, the challenge posed by this individual to potential suitors drives up the level of motivational arousal in those suitors and causes them to think that the hard-to-get individual is so attractive that it is worth their efforts to try and attain the individual's attention and affection.

This is yet another explanation for why individuals who play hard-to-get are often perceived as more attractive than individuals who appear easy-to-get. The "goal," so to speak, that does not appear difficult to attain will subsequently appear much less attractive to a person than a goal that is difficult (but not impossible) to attain (Wright et al., 1984). Therefore, it would behoove a woman to err on the side of playing hard-to-get, because if she is perceived as "easy" then she will consequently also be perceived as relatively unattractive, when compared to others who are playing hard-to-get. There are two important things to note about this strategy, however. According to Wright et al (1984), the person in pursuit must believe or be able to be convinced that the individual playing hard-to-get is actually worth the trouble. If it is painstakingly apparent that the individual playing hard-to-get has some obvious and serious

flaws that make her unattractive without a doubt, little can be done to overcome this perception. So, in order to play hard-to-get, one must hide or at least successfully downplay any unattractive qualities that would interfere with the motivational arousal process. The second important thing to note, briefly mentioned before, is that a person must not play *too* hard-to-get, because “If individuals are impossible to “obtain,” or if the effort required to do so is believed to be more than the relationship would warrant, motivation and target attractiveness will be relatively low” (Wright et al., 1984, p. 328).

Balance Theory and Frustration Reduction

As mentioned in the previous section, when a person pursues someone who is playing hard-to-get, that person experiences motivational arousal. Where does motivational arousal stem from, though? It originates from the stress caused by the frustration that the person in pursuit experiences. According to Murstein (1971), social scientist Heider (1946, 1958) explains this process in terms of his balance theory. Balance theory revolves around the idea of person (P) and his attitudes and perceptions toward another person (O), and whether P and O’s attitudes and perceptions of one another are similar (i.e. both either think positively or negatively of one another), and therefore whether the relationship is balanced (Murstein, 1971). Imbalance, on the contrary, “occurs when relations of different signs occur. If P likes O (+) but he believes O dislikes him (-), disharmony ensues... and all cases of imbalance cause stress” (Murstein, 1971). In other words, if a person is pursuing someone that is playing hard-to-get, that individual’s playing hard-to-get will lead to the perception that she dislikes her pursuer, thereby instilling in him a sense of imbalance and consequently a feeling of stress.

Cialdini (2001) echoes these sentiments in his work on the scarcity principle, claiming that competition has quite a significant physical effect on a person: “When we watch something

we want becomes less available, a physical agitation sets in. Especially in those cases involving direct competition, the blood comes up, the focus narrows, and emotions rise. As this visceral current advances, the cognitive, rational side retreats” (p. 228). The adrenaline that surges through our body in the state of frustration we experience when we encounter someone playing hard-to-get puts us in such a state of drive that we throw logic out the window, pursuing someone even though in the back of our mind we know that that individual has not shown any liking toward us at all. We are motivated to act in ways we normally would not under rational conditions.

Because a person’s reactions to an elusive individual cause such instinctive, visceral reactions, playing hard-to-get is an advantageous strategy for those individuals hoping to win subconsciously a suitor’s affection and dedication. It may be hard for a person to realize what a strong effect an elusive individual has had on him until she already has him wrapped around her finger. Research by Walster et al (1973) suggests that this tactic is useful in manipulating others into appreciating every little bit of attention that is offered to them:

According to learning theory, an elusive person should have [a] distinct advantage: Frustration may increase drive – by waiting until the suitor has achieved a high sexual drive state, heightening his drive level by introducing momentary frustration, and then finally rewarding him, the hard to get woman can maximize the impact of the sexual reward she provides. (p. 114)

In this case, the elusive individual has to do relatively much less work in securing the adoration of her pursuer, compared to vice versa. By holding out on showing him any interest or emotion, she literally starves him for affection, causing him to relish the first bit of attention she shows to

him (however minor it may be). He is so physiologically aroused and driven by frustration that he eats up any sign of liking that she shows towards him.

On that note, the physical effects of both arousal and then drive reduction that a person undergoes can even lead him to develop feelings of passionate love toward the elusive individual. Walster et al (1973) explains that there are two circumstances necessary for a person to experience passionate love: He must become physiologically aroused and recognize this state, and the situation in which he is experiencing these effects must be conducive for him to conclude that his arousal is being caused by love. According to their research, “On both counts, the person who plays hard to get might be expected to generate unusual passion. Frustration should increase the suitor’s physiological arousal, and the association of “elusiveness” with “value” should increase the probability that the suitor will label his reaction to the other as “love”” (Walster et al., 1973, p. 114) As we can see, it is possible for an elusive individual to manipulate another into developing not just a small crush, but a case of full-blown passion without ever really having to interact with that other person. Playing hard-to-get is obviously a rather strategic, self-serving way to approach the dating game.

Cognitive Dissonance

One must wonder how exactly a person allows himself to become so manipulated by another individual. The person has to recognize that the individual whom he is pursuing is not reciprocating his signs of liking and affection, right? Why would someone allow himself to be thrown into a tizzy fit over someone whom he is not sure will *ever* love, let alone like, him in return? Festinger (1957) addressed the problem of inconsistencies between how a person acts and what that person believes and values in his theory of cognitive dissonance. He notes that “only rarely, if ever, are they accepted psychologically *as inconsistencies* by the person involved.

Usually more or less successful attempts are made to rationalize them” (Festinger, 1957, p. 2). Therefore, a person who desires to be liked by another individual and realizes that person is not showing any signs of liking in return, but who also continues to pursue that person and vie for her attention is experiencing inconsistency, or cognitive dissonance, which needs to be rationalized.

Walster et al (1973) explains the rationalization process in the case of a suitor pursuing someone who is playing hard-to-get. The suitor recognizes that he is expending much more energy in pursuing her than he would normally exert in a typical courtship. He feels uncomfortable with this change in his behavior and so needs a reason to justify it. According to Walster et al (1973) “one way for the suitor to justify such unusual effort is by aggrandizing her” (p. 114). By convincing himself of her increased status or value, he not only quashes his cognitive dissonance, but also subsequently increases his liking for her in the process. As we have discussed previously, this theory of cognitive dissonance does not apply solely to suitors engaged in courtship. Research by Williams et al (1993) on job candidates who play hard-to-get echoes these findings: “A hard-to-get [job] candidate may produce an increased state of arousal in the interviewer. Based on Festinger’s cognitive dissonance theory, an employer may have to expend more effort to obtain a hard-to-get than an easy-to-get candidate. The anticipated effort may be justified by enhancing the perceived desirability of the candidate” (p. 171). Obviously since this strategy stretches across a number of social situations, there is some validity behind it as partial reasoning for why those who play hard-to-get are just so irresistible.

Play Hard-to-Get...

We have explored many theories and empirical examples from social science that support the idea of playing hard-to-get, but we have not addressed many real-life situations to this point.

Several teams of researchers have conducted interviews with college-aged men and men involved in speed dating, inquiring about their personal opinions on the appeal of hard-to-get women versus easy-to-get women. The research suggests that people perceive others as likable if they show *platonic* liking for a large number of other people, but not if they noticeably show *romantic* liking for a large number of other people; if this is the case, it will be “anti-effective at inducing another person’s desire” (Eastwick, Finkel, Mochon, & Ariely, 2007, p. 317). Moreover, if a person exhibits romantic desire towards a larger number of individuals, he will not only be ineffective at inducing liking from any of them, but he may also generate negative reciprocated feelings and hurt his chances for chemistry in the future (Eastwick et al., 2007). From this, we can conclude that, in the eyes of men, easy-to-get equals unattractive.

What about easy-to-get women drives men away so quickly? In their interviews, Walster et al (1973) found that men had a number of reasons why to avoid easy women: “An easy to get woman spells trouble. She is probably desperate for a date. She is probably the kind of woman who will make too many demands on a person; she might want to get serious right away. Even worse, she might have a ‘disease’” (p. 113). Men that Walster et al (1973) interviewed conceded that pursuing an easy-to-get woman may initially seem like a good idea – any dates or sexual encounters would certainly be an ego boost and an enjoyable experience – but on the whole it is a bad idea:

Such a woman might be easy-to-get, but hard to get rid of. She might “get serious.” Perhaps she would be so oversexed or overaffectionate in public that she would embarrass you. Your buddies might snicker when they saw you together. After all, they would know perfectly well why you were dating *her*. (p. 116)

As this evidence has reiterated, playing easy-to-get is not a good strategy in the game of love. You are liable to get chewed up and spit out before you even know what is happening to you. Therefore, it is ideal to adopt the hard-to-get strategy instead.

... But Not Too Hard-to-Get

In advocating playing hard-to-get, a final disclaimer is necessary. Although it is highly recommended to play hard-to-get instead of playing easy-to-get, one must be careful not to play *too* hard-to-get. Research by Walster et al (1973) shows that, while people perceive a hard-to-get woman as “selective” and “popular,” there is also the possibility that they may develop negative perceptions about her, such as thoughts that she is “cold,” “unfriendly,” and “rigid” (p. 119). It is important not to appear too arrogant, nonchalant, or deeply committed to someone else, because “the uniformly hard-to-get woman seems to be liked slightly less than the easy-to-get or easy-to-control woman” (Williams et al., 1993; Walster et al., 1973, p. 119). While it is attractive for a woman to play hard-to-get, if her pursuer perceives that he will never in a million years have a chance with her and he becomes *too* frustrated, he may become despondent and discouraged and give up in the pursuit.

The idea, then, is to incorporate the positive characteristics of a hard-to-get woman – “selective” and “popular” – with the positive characteristics of an easy-to-get woman – “friendly,” “warm,” and “flexible”; a woman with all of these characteristics is what researchers refer to as a selective woman, or a selectively-hard-to-get woman (Walster et al., 1973, p. 119). Walster et al (1973) formulated this terminology through experiments testing significant determinants of how much a man likes a woman; they concluded that there are two important deciding factors that affect the liking: “how hard or easy she is for him to get, and how hard or easy she is for *other men* to get” (p. 116). When tested empirically, the selective woman was a

far more favorable choice than either the uniformly elusive woman or the uniformly easy woman (Walster et al., 1973); their interviews provided more insight into this revelation:

If a woman has a reputation for being hard to get, but for some reason she is easy for the subject to get, she should be maximally appealing. Dating such a woman should ensure one of great prestige; she is, after all, hard to get. Yet, since she is exceedingly available to the subject, the dating situation should be a relaxed, rewarding experience. Such a *selectively* hard-to-get woman possesses the assets of both the easy-to-get and the hard-to-get women, while avoiding all of their liabilities. (p. 116-117)

As is apparent, one must walk a fine line between easy and hard-to-get. In the previous pages, we have reviewed a number of academic works that support the idea of playing hard-to-get. We have examined empirical proof from scholars of the theories of exchange, sexual selection, scarcity, social desirability, psychological reactance, motivation, frustration reduction, and cognitive dissonance. This social scientific evidence was then complemented by real-life research conducted to find out exactly what men thought about women who play hard-to-get. As is apparent from this final section, research seems to give women the green light to be elusive and mysterious, but the anecdotal support modifies this idea slightly, confirming that women should play hard-to-get, but not *too* hard-to-get. *Cosmopolitan* should definitely embrace this new strategy and publish it in their next issue.

Works Cited

- Buss, D. M. (1988). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 616-628.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Driscoll, R., Davis, K. E., & Lipetz, M. E. (1972). Parental interference and romantic love: The Romeo and Juliet effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*, 1-10.
- Eastwick, P. W., Finkel, E. J., Mochon, D., & Ariely, D. (2007). Short report: Selective versus unselective romantic desire: Not all reciprocity is created equal. *Psychological Science, 18*, 317-319.
- Homans, G. C. (1971). Attraction and power. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.), *Theories of attraction and love* (pp. 46-58). New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- How I got him to step up his game. (2008, April). *Cosmopolitan, 244*(4) 166.
- Kenny, D. A., & Nasby, W. (1980). Splitting the reciprocity correlation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 249-256.
- Murstein, B. I. (1971). Critique of models of dyadic attraction. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.), *Theories of attraction and love* (pp. 1-30). New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Newcomb, T. M. (1971). Dyadic balance as a source of clues about interpersonal attraction. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.), *Theories of attraction and love* (pp. 31-45). New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Walster, E. (1971). Passionate love. In B. I. Murstein (Ed.), *Theories of attraction and love* (pp. 85-99). New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.

- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1971). The efficacy of playing hard-to-get. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 39(3), 73-77.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., Piliavin, J., & Schmidt, L. (1973). "Playing hard to get": Understanding an elusive phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26, 113-121.
- Williams, K. B., Radefeld, P. S., Binning, J. F., & Sudak, J. R. (1993). When candidates are "hard" versus "easy-to-get": Effects of candidate availability on employment decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 23, 169-198.
- Wright, R. A., Toi, M., & Brehm, J. W. (1984). Difficulty and interpersonal attraction. *Motivation and Emotion*, 8, 327-341.