ELSEVIER

The Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF)

David M. Buss [a,*], Todd K. Shackelford [b], William F. McKibbin [b]

[a] *Department of Psychology, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA*
[b] *Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, 2912 College Avenue, Davie, FL 33314, USA*

Abstract

People devote considerable effort to retaining their mates. Mate retention tactics range from vigilance to violence, and are linked to variables such as marital satisfaction and relationship aggression. The Mate Retention Inventory (MRI; 104 items comprising 19 tactics) has proven to be reliable and valid. Given the importance of assessing mate retention in various contexts, there is a need for a briefer version of the MRI. In Study 1 ($N = 1032$), we develop a short form of the MRI (the MRI-SF), which assesses performance of 19 mate retention tactics using two items per tactic. The tactic scales show internal consistency, high correlations with the MRI long-form tactic scales, and links with assessments of controlling behavior, relationship violence, and an assessment of injury. Study 2 ($N = 625$) replicates the MRI-SF reliability and high correlations with the MRI long-form tactic scales, and shows links to a sexual coercion measure. We conclude that the MRI-SF is sufficiently reliable and valid that it can be used in basic and applied research in place of the MRI long-form for most purposes.
© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Mate retention inventory; Intimate partner violence; Sexual coercion; Evolutionary psychology

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 512 475 8489 .
  E-mail address: dbuss@psy.utexas.edu (D.M. Buss).

1. Introduction

Evolutionary biologists apportion the effort an organism expends into somatic effort and reproductive effort, with the latter further divided between mating effort and parental effort (e.g., Low, 2000). Mating effort may be partitioned into at least two distinct domains—effort devoted to attracting a mate (Buss, 1988a; Buss & Schmitt, 1996) and effort devoted to retaining a mate (Buss, 1988b; Buss & Shackelford, 1997). For many species, long-term mate retention is not an adaptive problem, because mateships are brief. Mate guarding in these species is usually restricted to brief intervals (Thornhill & Alcock, 1983). Humans, however, represent an extreme end of the temporal continuum in the sense that they form mateships that can last years or decades. Because long-term mating is such a central strategy within the human menu of mating strategies, the adaptive problem of mate retention is especially pronounced. In evolutionary currencies, mates gained often must be retained to repay reproductively the effort allocated to mate selection and attraction.

The first instrument to assess human mate retention tactics (the Mate Retention Inventory, or MRI) appeared in 1988 (Buss, 1988a, 1988b). It assessed the performance of 19 tactics ranging from vigilance to violence, subsuming 104 specific behaviors. Empirical research using the MRI has yielded a number of important findings. Hypothesized sex differences in mate retention tactics, such as the greater use by men of resource provisioning and the greater use by women of appearance enhancement, have been documented among non-married couples (Buss, 1988a, 1988b) as well as newlywed couples (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Men more than women in both samples were more likely to use intrasexual threats and physical violence. Individuals who anticipated that they were likely to remain with their mate in the future, a key signal of commitment, devoted more effort to mate retention, especially the tactics of vigilance, monopolization of the mate's time, and public signals of commitment such as putting their arms around their mate when intrasexual competitors were around.

Mate retention intensity differs predictably based on sex-linked aspects of mate value. Specifically, men married to women who are young and physically attractive—key cues to fertility—devote more effort to mate retention than men married to women who are older and less attractive (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Women married to men with good jobs, higher incomes, and who devote more effort to getting ahead in the status hierarchy devote more effort to mate retention than women married to men lower on these qualities. Particular mate retention tactics, such as vigilance, monopolization of mate's time, emotional manipulation, and derogation of competitors have been shown to be correlated with partner-directed violence (Shackelford, Goetz, Buss, Euler, & Hoier, 2005), suggesting that displays of these tactics might be early harbingers of violence that could be used for practical intervention, therapeutic, or educational purposes. The MRI has also been used in studies of homosexual couples (VanderLaan & Vasey, in press) and Croatian couples (Kardum, Hudek-Knezevic, & Gracanin, 2007). In addition to these sources of evidence for the predictive validity of the MRI, the instrument shows reasonable internal consistency reliability as well as congruence between self-report and spouse-report (Shackelford, Goetz, & Buss, 2005).

For many research purposes completing the 104-item MRI is prohibitively time consuming. Thus, we sought to develop a reliable and valid short form, the MRI-SF. This article presents two empirical studies that were used to develop this instrument.

2. Study 1

2.1. Methods

2.1.1. Participants

Four hundred sixty-seven men and 565 women in a committed heterosexual relationship participated. Participants were drawn from universities and surrounding communities. The mean age of the men was 24.2 years ($SD = 7.9$), the mean age of their partners was 23.2 years ($SD = 7.3$) and their mean relationship length was 37.3 months ($SD = 59.8$). The mean age of the women was 21.5 years ($SD = 5.4$), the mean age of their partners was 23.7 years ($SD = 6.6$), and their mean relationship length was 28.8 months ($SD = 38.1$).

2.1.2. Materials

Participants completed demographic questions, the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI) and three indexes developed by Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, and Lewis (1995, 1996): the Controlling Behavior Index (CBI), the Violence Assessment Index (VAI), and the Injury Assessment Index (IAI). The CBI, VAI, and IAI measure the occurrence and consequences of violence and coercion in intimate relationships. The CBI, VAI, and IAI were designed to address shortcomings of other measures such as the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979). The CTS, for example, does not provide an explicit context for the violence. Without a context for the violence, men and women are portrayed as equally "violent," which may be true, but does not capture the psychological terrorism and severe physical and emotional costs that violent men inflict on their partners (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992). The CBI, VAI, and IAI, in contrast, use a "context-specific approach," and have been demonstrated by Dobash et al. (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) and by other researchers (e.g., Shackelford & Goetz, 2004; Shackelford et al., 2005) to provide valid and reliable assessments of intimate partner violence. This validation includes demonstrating the scales' convergent and discriminative validity by correlating scores on these scales with scores on other measures of intimate partner violence and with relationship satisfaction, documenting that men arrested for spousal battery score higher on these measures than do men not arrested for spousal battery, and replicating an interpretable pattern of relationships among the Dobash et al. measures and other forms of partner-directed violence across independent samples of college students and community members in several different countries.

2.1.3. Scale development and procedure

After obtaining men's and women's self-reports of mate retention using the 104-item Mate Retention Inventory (MRI; Buss, 1988a, 1988b; see also Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Shackelford et al., 2005), we calculated item-total correlations for each of the 19 tactics (see Table 1). We identified the two acts from each tactic with the highest item-total correlations. Using these 38 items, we constructed a new Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF; see Appendix). We constructed composite variables for each of the 19 MRI-SF tactics as well as the total 38-item MRI-SF. Table 1 presents alpha reliabilities for each of the tactic composites, which varied from $\alpha = 0.40$ to $\alpha = 0.87$. For the 38-item MRI-SF total score, $\alpha = 0.90$.

Table 1
Study 1: Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form item–total correlations and standardized alpha reliabilities using men's and women's self-reports of mate retention (long-form alpha reliabilities in parentheses)

Mate retention tactics and acts	Item–total correlation
Vigilance α = 0.63 (α = 0.81)	
Called to make sure my partner was where she said she would be	0.69
Snooped through my partner's personal belongings	0.68
Concealment of Mate α = 0.40 (α = 0.64)	
Did not take my partner to a party where other men would be present	0.72
Took my partner away from a gathering where other men were around	0.71
Monopolization of Time α = 0.53 (α = 0.70)	
Insisted that my partner spend all her free time with me	0.74
Spent all my free time with my partner so that she could not meet anyone else	0.50
Jealousy Induction α = 0.70 (α = 0.72)	
Talked to another woman at a party to make my partner jealous	0.78
Showed interest in another woman to make my partner angry	0.75
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat α = 0.57 (α = 0.79)	
Became angry when my partner flirted too much	0.75
Threatened to break up if my partner ever cheated on me	0.71
Emotional Manipulation α = 0.61 (α = 0.78)	
Pleaded that I could not live without my partner	0.69
Told my partner that I was dependent on my partner	0.68
Commitment Manipulation α = 0.42 (α = 0.41)	
Told my partner that we needed a total commitment to each other	0.84
Asked my partner to marry me	0.73
Derogation of Competitors α = 0.68 (α = 0.75)	
Pointed out to my partner the flaws of another man	0.75
Told my partner that another man was stupid	0.75
Resource Display α = 0.65 (α = 0.83)	
Bought my partner an expensive gift	0.81
Took my partner to a nice restaurant	0.75
Sexual Inducements α = 0.40 (α = 0.64)	
Performed sexual favors to keep my partner around	0.70
Had a physical relationship with my partner to deepen our bond	0.65
Appearance Enhancement α = 0.74 (α = 0.81)	
Made myself extra attractive for my partner	0.79
Made sure that I looked nice for my partner	0.78
Love and Care α = 0.55 (α = 0.65)	
Complimented my partner on her appearance	0.70
Displayed greater affection for my partner	0.69
Submission and Debasement α = 0.61 (α = 0.73)	
Gave in to my partner's every wish	0.73
Went along with everything my partner said	0.73

Table 1 (*continued*)

Mate retention tactics and acts	Item–total correlation
Verbal Possession Signals $\alpha = 0.66$ ($\alpha = 0.62$)	
Told my same-sex friends how much my partner and I were in love	0.74
Bragged about my partner to other men	0.72
Physical Possession Signals $\alpha = 0.65$ ($\alpha = 0.74$)	
Put my arm around my partner in front of others	0.64
Held my partner's hand when other men were around	0.62
Possessive Ornamentation $\alpha = 0.66$ ($\alpha = 0.58$)	
Asked my partner to wear my ring	0.70
Gave my partner jewelry to signify that she was taken	0.68
Derogation of Mate $\alpha = 0.49$ ($\alpha = 0.66$)	
Told other men my partner was a pain	0.73
Told other men that my partner was not a nice person	0.72
Intrasexual Threats $\alpha = 0.87$ ($\alpha = 0.82$)	
Stared coldly at a man who was looking at my partner	0.84
Gave a man a dirty look when he looked at my partner	0.83
Violence Against Rivals $\alpha = 0.67$ ($\alpha = 0.79$)	
Got my friends to beat up someone who was interested in my partner	0.77
Slapped a man who made a pass at my partner	0.74

Note. All ps < .001.

Table 2
Study 1: Correlations between long-form and short-form Mate Retention Inventory tactics and total score

Tactic	r
Vigilance	0.81
Concealment of Mate	0.90
Monopolization of Time	0.89
Jealousy Induction	0.86
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	0.89
Emotional Manipulation	0.83
Commitment Manipulation	0.99
Derogation of Competitors	0.87
Resource Display	0.91
Sexual Inducements	0.84
Appearance Enhancement	0.90
Love and Care	0.86
Submission and Debasement	0.87
Verbal Possession Signals	0.88
Physical Possession Signals	0.89
Possessive Ornamentation	0.85
Derogation of Mate	0.89
Intrasexual Threats	0.89
Violence against Rivals	0.85
Total	0.96

Note. All ps < .001.

2.2. Results and discussion

We correlated scores on each of the 19 MRI-SF tactics and total score with scores for the corresponding Mate Retention Inventory-Long Form (MRI-LF) tactics and total score (see Table 2). These correlations varied from $r = 0.81$ to $r = 0.99$, with MRI-SF and MRI-LF total scores correlated $r = 0.96$. These findings suggest that the short two-item scales represent well the longer versions of each of the 19 tactic scales.

We next correlated men's self-reported scores and women's partner-reported scores on the MRI-SF tactics and total with total scores on the CBI, VAI, and IAI (see Tables 3 and 4, respectively). In most cases, the MRI-SF scales correlated with the measures of controlling behavior, violence, and injury less well than the MRI long-form scales, but the differences were usually slight. The overall pattern suggests that the MRI-SF does a reasonably good job in predicting controlling and violent behavior toward romantic partners, and offers several significant predictors of assessments of injury.

Table 3

Study 1: Correlations between men's self-reports on Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form and scores on the Controlling Behavior Index (CBI), Violence Assessment Index (VAI), and Injury Assessment Index (IAI)

Tactic	CBI	VAI	IAI
Vigilance	.42[*] (.43[*])	.21[*] (.13)	.10 (.08)
Concealment of Mate	.25[*] (.28[*])	.02 (.06)	.09 (.11)
Monopolization of Time	.33[*] (.36[*])	.15[*] (.14[*])	.10 (.16[*])
Jealousy Induction	.26[*] (.31[*])	.06 (.11)	.16[*] (.15[*])
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	.45[*] (.49[*])	.20[*] (.19[*])	.11 (.13)
Emotional Manipulation	.25[*] (.42[*])	.16[*] (.23[*])	.17[*] (.17[*])
Commitment Manipulation	.20[*] (.20[*])	.09 (.08)	−.03 (−.03)
Derogation of Competitors	.32[*] (.35[*])	.11 (.13)	.16[*] (.15[*])
Resource Display	.09 (.09)	.07 (.06)	−.02 (−.03)
Sexual Inducements	.23[*] (.24[*])	.06 (.03)	.05 (.05)
Appearance Enhancement	.13[*] (.16[*])	.06 (.08)	.01 (.03)
Love and Care	.12 (.09)	.004 (.04)	−.04 (.02)
Submission and Debasement	.14[*] (.24[*])	.06 (.13[*])	.05 (.12)
Verbal Possession Signals	.12 (.17[*])	−.02 (.03)	.01 (−.04)
Physical Possession Signals	.09 (.13[*])	.02 (.02)	−.03 (−.01)
Possessive Ornamentation	.13[*] (.20[*])	.05 (.04)	−.07 (−.03)
Derogation of Mate	.40[*] (.35[*])	20[*] (.14[*])	.10 (.06)
Intrasexual Threats	.25[*] (.28[*])	.10 (.08)	.02 (.04)
Violence Against Rivals	.12 (.19[*])	.01 (.05)	.08 (.06)
Total	.39[*] (.39[*])	.14[*] (.14[*])	.06 (.09)

Note. Correlations with Mate Retention Inventory-Long Form in parentheses.

[*] $p < .01$.

Table 4
Study 1: Correlations between women's partner-reports on Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form and scores on the Controlling Behavior Index (CBI), Violence Assessment Index (VAI), and Injury Assessment Index (IAI)

Tactic	CBI	VAI	IAI
Vigilance	.50* (.59*)	.32* (.38*)	.20* (.28*)
Concealment of Mate	.45* (.56*)	.32* (.43*)	.22* (.32*)
Monopolization of Time	.56* (.62*)	.31* (.36*)	.19* (.22*)
Jealousy Induction	.38* (.36*)	.22* (.19*)	.09 (.12)
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	.45* (.59*)	.19* (.30*)	.10 (.23*)
Emotional Manipulation	.40* (.61*)	.24* (.40*)	.23* (.36*)
Commitment Manipulation	.30* (.30*)	.16* (.16*)	.07 (.06)
Derogation of Competitors	.37* (.49*)	.15* (.21*)	.08 (.13*)
Resource Display	.11 (.12*)	.03 (.06)	−.01 (.002)
Sexual Inducements	.34* (.36*)	.22* (.20*)	.16* (.10)
Appearance Enhancement	.17* (.20*)	.10 (.10)	.04 (.03)
Love and Care	.08 (.11)	.03 (.02)	.01 (.02)
Submission and Debasement	.28* (.42*)	.15* (.22*)	.11 (.16*)
Verbal Possession Signals	.12 (.20*)	.001 (.02)	.01 (.02)
Physical Possession Signals	.11 (.19*)	.04 (.07)	.01 (.07)
Possessive Ornamentation	.19* (.28*)	.13* (.14*)	.05 (.08)
Derogation of Mate	.34* (.36*)	.12* (.14*)	.08 (.09)
Intrasexual Threats	.40* (.47*)	.18* (.25*)	.17* (.23*)
Violence against Rivals	.09 (.19*)	.07 (.06)	−.02 (−.04)
Total	.48* (.53*)	.24* (.28*)	.14* (.20*)

Note. Correlations with Mate Retention Inventory-Long Form in parentheses.
   * $p < .01$.

3. Study 2

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants

Two hundred forty-seven men and 378 women in a committed heterosexual relationship participated in the study. Participants were drawn from universities and surrounding communities. The mean age of the men was 25.8 years ($SD = 10.0$), the mean age of their partners was 24.7 years ($SD = 8.9$) and their mean relationship length was 43.2 months ($SD = 63.6$). The mean age of the women was 25.5 years ($SD = 7.9$), the mean age of their partners was 28.4 years ($SD = 9.3$), and their mean relationship length was 51.4 months ($SD = 62.8$).

3.1.2. Materials

Participants completed a brief biographical section, the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI), and the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale (SCIRS; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004). The SCIRS secures information about how often the participant performed 34 sexually coercive acts. Items in the SCIRS vary in subtlety, ranging from subtle hints to outright physical force. Full scale scores were calculated by summing response values for each item in the entire scale. Previous

research has established the reliability, validity, and utility of the SCIRS as an assessment of sexual coercion in intimate relationships (Goetz & Shackelford, 2006; Shackelford & Goetz, 2004).

3.1.3. Procedure

We constructed composite variables for each of the 19 MRI-SF tactics, as well as the total MRI-SF score, using the 38 items identified in Study 1.

3.2. Results and discussion

We calculated alpha reliabilities for men's self-reports and women's partner-reports for each of the MRI-SF tactics and total score (see Table 5). As in Study 1, with a few exceptions, notably Commitment Manipulation, these tactic scales show acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability, especially given that only two items are used to represent each tactic.

We next correlated scores on MRI-SF tactics and total scores with MRI long-form tactics and total scores, using men's self-reports and women's partner-reports (see Table 6). Again the correlations between the short- and long-forms of the tactic scales were high, ranging from +.76 to +.99. The correlations for the total scores were +.95 and +.97 for men and women, respectively. In sum, the short forms of the tactic scales do an adequate job of representing the long forms.

Table 5
Study 2: Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form standardized alpha reliabilities using men's self-reports and women's partner-reports of mate retention

Tactic	Men	Women
Vigilance	0.56 (0.83)	0.63 (0.83)
Concealment of Mate	0.57 (0.77)	0.57 (0.70)
Monopolization of Time	0.63 (0.74)	0.60 (0.81)
Jealousy Induction	0.83 (0.73)	0.74 (0.79)
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	0.70 (0.78)	0.53 (0.75)
Emotional Manipulation	0.58 (0.81)	0.75 (0.83)
Commitment Manipulation	0.32 (0.24)	0.45 (0.39)
Derogation of Competitors	0.66 (0.78)	0.79 (0.80)
Resource Display	0.61 (0.82)	0.66 (0.84)
Sexual Inducements	0.48 (0.62)	0.47 (0.71)
Appearance Enhancement	0.74 (0.78)	0.77 (0.78)
Love and Care	0.47 (0.64)	0.59 (0.72)
Submission and Debasement	0.64 (0.70)	0.60 (0.67)
Verbal Possession Signals	0.61 (0.65)	0.62 (0.62)
Physical Possession Signals	0.69 (0.75)	0.74 (0.79)
Possessive Ornamentation	0.68 (0.59)	0.62 (0.53)
Derogation of Mate	0.63 (0.69)	0.33 (0.70)
Intrasexual Threats	0.88 (0.86)	0.85 (0.80)
Violence against Rivals	0.49 (0.78)	N/A
Total	0.89 (0.95)	0.89 (0.94)

Note. Long-form alpha reliabilities in parentheses; N/A = Not applicable; for "Violence Against Rivals," only two women reported usage of the acts in this tactic and, therefore, a composite reliability for this factor was not computed for women's partner-reports.

Table 6
Study 2: Correlations between long-form and short-form Mate Retention Inventory tactics and total score

Tactic	Men	Women
Vigilance	0.81	0.83
Concealment of Mate	0.93	0.92
Monopolization of Time	0.82	0.88
Jealousy Induction	0.89	0.90
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	0.91	0.88
Emotional Manipulation	0.76	0.85
Commitment Manipulation	0.99	0.99
Derogation of Competitors	0.86	0.93
Resource Display	0.89	0.91
Sexual Inducements	0.83	0.86
Appearance Enhancement	0.89	0.88
Love and Care	0.85	0.86
Submission and Debasement	0.86	0.85
Verbal Possession Signals	0.87	0.87
Physical Possession Signals	0.88	0.90
Possessive Ornamentation	0.79	0.83
Derogation of Mate	0.88	0.88
Intrasexual Threats	0.90	0.92
Violence against Rivals	0.79	N/A
Total	0.95	0.97

Notes. All $ps < .001$; N/A = Not applicable; for "Violence Against Rivals," only two women reported usage of the acts in this tactic and, therefore, a composite reliability for this factor was not computed for women's partner-reports.

Finally, we correlated MRI-SF tactics and total scores with total scores on the SCIRS, using men's self-reports and women's partner-reports. As seen in Table 7, a number of tactics correlated significantly with assessments of sexual coercion. In particular, Vigilance, Concealment of Mate, Monopolization of Mate's Time, Jealousy Induction, Punishment of Mate's Infidelity Threat, Emotional Manipulation, Commitment Manipulation, Derogation of Competitors, Derogation of Mate, and Intrasexual Threats, as well as the all-tactic total score, all significantly correlated with reports of sexual coercion.

4. General discussion

Our purpose was to develop a short version of the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI), given that the long version is prohibitively time consuming in many basic and applied research contexts. The MRI-SF is roughly a third the length of the MRI, containing 38 items, two for each of the 19 tactics.

In separate studies, the short versions of the MRI tactic scales showed internal consistency reliability as well as impressively high correlations with the longer versions of the tactics scales. Conventional wisdom regarding acceptable reliability is arbitrary, however, and encourages redundancy rather than validity. The items constituting the MRI-SF are behaviorally specific rather than synonymous trait-like items. This may serve to increase validity while paradoxically

Table 7
Study 2: Correlations between men's self-reports and women's partner-reports on Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form and scores on the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scales (SCIRS)

Tactic	Men	Women
Vigilance	.47[*] (.52[*])	.57[*] (.56[*])
Concealment of Mate	.41[*] (.45[*])	.43[*] (.39[*])
Monopolization of Time	.33[*] (.55[*])	.34[*] (.49[*])
Jealousy Induction	.39[*] (.39[*])	.32[*] (.26[*])
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	.38[*] (.45[*])	.46[*] (.50[*])
Emotional Manipulation	.36[*] (.52[*])	.43[*] (.48[*])
Commitment Manipulation	.29[*] (.31[*])	.23[*] (.22[*])
Derogation of Competitors	.21[*] (.26[*])	.37[*] (.43[*])
Resource Display	.09 (.13)	−.004 (.04)
Sexual Inducements	.13 (.20[*])	.25[*] (.31[*])
Appearance Enhancement	.21[*] (.24[*])	.09 (.09)
Love and Care	−.08 (−.01)	−.09 (−.16[*])
Submission and Debasement	.17[*] (.24[*])	.06 (.15[*])
Verbal Possession Signals	.14 (.20[*])	.10 (.18[*])
Physical Possession Signals	.03 (.12)	−.15[*] (−.07)
Possessive Ornamentation	.30[*] (.32[*])	−.28[*] (.17[*])
Derogation of Mate	.23[*] (.26[*])	.43[*] (.40[*])
Intrasexual Threats	.32[*] (.46[*])	.20[*] (.25[*])
Violence against Rivals	.31[*] (.41[*])	N/A
Total	.41[*] (.48[*])	.35[*] (.38[*])

Notes. Correlations with Mate Retention Inventory-Long Form in parentheses; N/A = Not applicable; for "Violence Against Rivals," only two women reported usage of the acts in this tactic and, therefore, a composite reliability for this factor was not computed for women's partner-reports.

[*] $p < .01$.

reducing reliability. The short tactic scales correlated nearly as highly as the long tactic scales with assessments of controlling behavior, violence, physical injury, and sexual coercion. These findings suggest that little or no validity is lost by using the more economic short form of the MRI.

We did not examine the reliability of the MRI-SF over time. Further research is needed to assess the reliability of this measure over time. We were unable to test for congruence between self-reports and partner-reports of mate retention behaviors (e.g. Shackelford et al., 2005). Future research should seek to assess whether the MRI-SF demonstrates similar cross-spouse congruence.

The current research nevertheless suggests that the MRI-SF is ready for use in basic and applied research contexts. Researchers have documented using the long-form of the MRI relationships between mate retention behaviors and relationship violence (Shackelford et al., 2005), sexual coercion (Starratt, Goetz, Shackelford, McKibbin, & Stewart-Williams, 2007), and partner-directed insults (McKibbin et al., 2007). Given the high correlations between the MRI long form and the MRI-SF, we expect that these relationships also will hold for the MRI-SF. The MRI-SF has much to offer to researchers. Also, given that mate retention behaviors are correlated with physical and psychological relationship violence, and sexual coercion, the MRI-SF may also be useful in practical contexts such as educational programs, marital counseling, and marital therapy.

Appendix. MRI-SF (Male, self-report version)

Instructions: On the following pages are listed a series of acts or behaviors. In this study, we are interested in the acts that people perform in the context of their relationship with their romantic partner. For each act, use the following scale to indicate how frequently *you* performed the act *within the past ONE year*:

0 = *Never* performed this act
1 = *Rarely* performed this act
2 = *Sometimes* performed this act
3 = *Often* performed this act

Please write in the blank to the left of each item the number that best represents how frequently you performed the act *within the past ONE year*. For example, if you *never* performed the act within the past one year, write a "0" in the blank to the left of the item.

___1.　Called to make sure my partner was where she said she would be.
___2.　Did not take my partner to a party where other men would be present.
___3.　Insisted that my partner spend all her free time with me.
___4.　Talked to another woman at a party to make my partner jealous.
___5.　Became angry when my partner flirted too much.
___6.　Pleaded that I could not live without my partner.
___7.　Told my partner that we needed a total commitment to each other.
___8.　Pointed out to my partner the flaws of another man.
___9.　Bought my partner an expensive gift.
___10.　Performed sexual favors to keep my partner around.
___11.　Made myself "extra attractive" for my partner.
___12.　Complimented my partner on her appearance.
___13.　Gave in to my partner's every wish.
___14.　Told my same-sex friends how much my partner and I were in love.
___15.　Put my arm around my partner in front of others.
___16.　Asked my partner to wear my ring.
___17.　Told other men that my partner was a pain.
___18.　Stared coldly at a man who was looking at my partner.
___19.　Got my friends to beat up someone who was interested in my partner.
___20.　Snooped through my partner's personal belongings.
___21.　Took my partner away from a gathering where other men were around.
___22.　Spent all my free time with my partner so that she could not meet anyone else.
___23.　Showed interest in another woman to make my partner angry.
___24.　Threatened to break-up if my partner ever cheated on me.
___25.　Told my partner that I was dependent on my partner.
___26.　Asked my partner to marry me.
___27.　Told my partner that another man was stupid.
___28.　Took my partner out to a nice restaurant.

___29. Had a physical relationship with my partner to deepen our bond.
___30. Made sure that I looked nice for my partner.
___31. Displayed greater affection for my partner.
___32. Went along with everything my partner said.
___33. Bragged about my partner to other men.
___34. Held my partner's hand while other men were around.
___35. Gave my partner jewelry to signify that she was taken.
___36. Told other men that my partner was not a nice person.
___37. Gave a man a dirty look when he looked at my partner.
___38. Slapped a man who made a pass at my partner.

References

Buss, D. M. (1988a). The evolution of human intrasexual competition: Tactics of mate attraction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 54*, 616–628.

Buss, D. M. (1988b). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 9*, 291–317.

Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 72*, 346–361.

Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1996). Strategic self-promotion and competition derogation: Sex and conflict effects on perceived effectiveness of mate attraction tactics. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 70*, 1185–1204.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (1995). Evaluating criminal justice programmes for violent men. In R. E. Dobash & L. Noaks (Eds.), *Gender and crime* (pp. 358–389). Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (1996). *Research evaluation of programmes for it violent men*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (1998). Separate and intersecting realities: A comparison of men's and women's accounts of violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 382–414.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Cavanagh, K., & Lewis, R. (2000). *Changing violent men*. Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage Publications.

Dobash, R. E., Dobash, R. P., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems, 39*, 401–421.

Goetz, A. T., & Shackelford, T. K. (2006). Sexual coercion and forced in-pair copulation as sperm competition tactics in humans. *Human Nature, 17*, 265–282.

Kardum, I., Hudek-Knezevic & Gracanin, A. (2007). Sociosexuality and mate retention in romantic couples. *Psychological Topics, 15*, 277–296.

Low, B. (2000). *Why sex matters*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

McKibbin, W. F., Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Schipper, L. D., Starratt, V. G., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2007). Why do men insult their intimate partners? *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 231–241.

Shackelford, T. K., & Goetz, A. T. (2004). Men's sexual coercion in intimate relationships: Development and initial validation of the Sexual Coercion in Intimate Relationships Scale. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 541–556.

Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Buss, D. M. (2005). Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 415–425.

Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2005). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from women's mate retention. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 447–463.

Starratt, V. G., Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., McKibbin, W. F., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2007). Men's partner-directed insults and sexual coercion in intimate relationships. Submitted for publication.

Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75–88.

Thornhill, R., & Alcock, J. (1983). *The evolution of insect mating systems*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

VanderLaan, D. P., & Vasey, P. L. (in press). Mate retention of men and women in heterosexual and homosexual relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.