



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Personality and Individual Differences 39 (2005) 415–425

PERSONALITY AND
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

www.elsevier.com/locate/paid

Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory

Todd K. Shackelford ^{a,*}, Aaron T. Goetz ^a, David M. Buss ^b

^a *Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, 2912 College Avenue, Davie, FL 33314, USA*

^b *Department of Psychology, The University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA*

Received 4 October 2004; received in revised form 10 January 2005; accepted 31 January 2005

Available online 17 March 2005

Abstract

The Mate Retention Inventory (MRI) assesses the performance of behaviors that function to maintain and retain a romantic partner's exclusive involvement with the individual. We first review existing evidence for the psychometric utility of the MRI. We then examine in the current study agreement between self-reports and partner-reports of mate retention behaviors using data from married couples. Both members of 107 couples completed the MRI for their own and their spouse's use of mate retention behaviors. Men's and women's self-reports of their mate retention behaviors are substantially congruent with their spouse's reports of their mate retention behaviors, indicating that men and women can provide reliable accounts of spousal mate retention using the MRI.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Mate retention; Marriage; Evolutionary psychology

1. Introduction

Maintaining a romantic relationship can be difficult work fraught with conflicts and challenges. Inadequate finances, meddling in-laws, and personality clashes, for example, can be sources of

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 954 236 1179; fax: +1 954 236 1099.
E-mail address: tshackel@fau.edu (T.K. Shackelford).

conflict in a romantic relationship. Perhaps the most important threat to a romantic relationship is infidelity (see Buss, 2000). Indicators of the likelihood of infidelity are key criteria that men and women use to select a long-term partner (Buss, 1989), and infidelity is a frequently cited cause of relationship dissolution and divorce across cultures (Betzig, 1989). An important part of maintaining a relationship, therefore, is fending off intrasexual competition and preventing a partner's infidelity. Previous research indicates that jealousy, in particular, generates behaviors that serve "mate retention" functions—they are designed to fend off rivals and to prevent a partner's infidelity or departure from the mateship (Buss, 1988, 2000; Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982).

Using an act nomination procedure (Buss & Craik, 1983), Buss (1988) identified and categorized the behavioral output of jealousy into 19 mate retention tactics (subsuming 104 diverse acts), the performance of which could be assessed by the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI). Mate retention behaviors are hypothesized to function to maintain a romantic partner's exclusive involvement with the individual. Example mate retention acts (and corresponding tactics) include, "Introduced my partner as my spouse or romantic partner" (Verbal Possession Signals), "Dressed nicely to maintain my partner's interest" (Appearance Enhancement), and "Monopolized my partner's time at a social gathering" (Monopolization of Time). Buss (1988) and Buss and Shackelford (1997) provide additional information about the development of the MRI.

1.1. Validity of the Mate Retention Inventory

Several studies have generated evidence of the validity of the MRI. Buss (1988) assessed the reported performance frequencies of the 19 tactics, and found that men and women differ in the frequency with which they perform these behaviors. Buss documented several hypothesized sex differences, in accordance with evolutionary psychological theory. Men are more likely than women, for example, to use the tactics of Resource Display and Concealment of Mate to retain a mate. Women are more likely than men, for example, to use the tactics of Appearance Enhancement and Jealousy Induction to retain a mate.

Buss and Shackelford (1997) used the MRI to test additional hypotheses derived from evolutionary psychological theory. Buss and Shackelford found that men's mate retention is more frequent and more intense with partners of greater reproductive value, as indexed by their partner's youth and physical attractiveness. Women's mate retention, in contrast, was affected by the current resource holdings and the resource holding potential of their partners. Women partnered to men with higher incomes and greater "status striving" engaged in more intense mate retention than women partnered to men with lower incomes and less ambition. Buss and Shackelford also found that men's mate retention increased when the perceived probability of a partner's infidelity increased. Goetz et al. (2005) also used the MRI, and found that men mated to women who are more physically attractive and have personality characteristics that attract rival men reported using mate retention tactics more frequently than men not mated to such women.

The MRI also has been used in studies of marital satisfaction. Shackelford and Buss (2000), for example, found that more frequent use of several mate retention tactics negatively correlates with spousal marital satisfaction. People whose partners monopolize their time and manipulate them emotionally, for example, are less satisfied with their marriage than are people whose spouses do not perform such behaviors. These results indicate that mate retention behaviors sometimes

include the infliction of costs on the targets of these retention efforts, perhaps with the goal of making it more difficult for the partner to defect from the relationship temporarily or permanently (Shackelford & Buss, 2000).

Using the MRI, Shackelford, Goetz, Buss, Euler, and Hoier (in press) investigated the relationship between men's mate retention tactics and violence directed toward their partners. Shackelford et al. hypothesized that because male sexual jealousy has been linked to female-directed violence in relationships (e.g., Daly & Wilson, 1988; Daly et al., 1982), men's mate retention efforts also will be linked with violence directed toward their partners. As hypothesized, men's use of particular mate retention tactics was associated with their use of female-directed violence in the relationship. Men's use of the tactic Emotional Manipulation, for example, was a reliable predictor of violence against their partners, according to men's self-reports of their own behaviors and to women's reports of their partner's behaviors.

1.2. Reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory

The studies reviewed above also provide evidence of the reliability of the MRI. The participants assessed by Goetz et al. (2005) included university and community samples of 305 men (mean age 25.8 years), and alpha reliabilities for the mate retention tactics were generally acceptable, with a mean $\alpha = 0.73$. Using a different sample of young adults (mean age 22.9 years), Shackelford et al. (in press) documented acceptable alpha reliabilities for the tactics, with a mean $\alpha = 0.71$.

The current study provides additional evidence of the reliability of the MRI. We collected self-reports and partner-reports of mate retention using the MRI from both members of 107 married couples, as part of a larger project designed to investigate conflict among newlyweds (see Buss, 1991). Men's and women's self-reports of their mate retention behaviors are congruent with their spouse's reports of their mate retention behaviors, indicating that men and women can provide reliable accounts of spousal mate retention using the MRI.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Participants were 214 individuals, 107 men and 107 women, who had been married less than one year. The mean age of husbands was 25.5 years, ranging 17–41 years ($SD = 6.6$). The mean age of wives was 24.8 years, ranging 18–36 years ($SD = 6.2$). Additional information about the participants can be found in Buss (1991).

2.2. Materials

Each member of each couple completed two versions of the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI; Buss, 1988). The MRI assesses the performance over the past year of 104 acts nominated by independent samples of participants as functioning to maintain a romantic partner's exclusive involvement with the participant. Participants indicate how frequently they or their spouse performed the act within the past, ranging from 0 (*Never*) to 3 (*Often*). Buss (1988) grouped the acts into 19

tactics of mate retention, ranging from vigilance about a partner's whereabouts to violence against real or perceived rivals. Buss further organized these 19 tactics into five categories and two domains of mate retention (see Table 1). Most previous work, however, has addressed mate retention at the tactic level.

Table 1
Reliabilities for self-reported and spouse-reported mate retention

Mate retention tactics, categories, domains	Husband's mate retention		Wife's mate retention	
	Self-report	Spouse-report	Self-report	Spouse-report
<i>Mate retention tactics (acts)^a</i>				
1. Vigilance (1, 20, 39, 53, 59, 64, 70, 76, 89)	0.74	0.74	0.63	0.72
2. Concealment of Mate (2, 21, 43, 96)	0.67	0.66	0.73	0.87
3. Monopolization of Time (4, 22, 47, 77, 102)	0.78	0.81	0.73	0.74
4. Jealousy Induction (3, 40, 90, 104)	0.68	0.81	0.74	0.79
5. Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat (5, 38, 48, 65, 71, 82, 99)	0.82	0.84	0.79	0.71
6. Emotional Manipulation (6, 24, 66, 69, 75, 78, 85, 101)	0.75	0.82	0.77	0.81
7. Commitment Manipulation (7, 26, 60)	0.46	0.36	0.14	0.43
8. Derogation of Competitors (8, 27, 42, 54, 63, 79, 95)	0.62	0.86	0.64	0.84
9. Resource Display (9, 28, 41, 61, 74, 91)	0.67	0.73	0.64	0.74
10. Sexual Inducements (10, 29, 55, 83, 97)	0.66	0.68	0.67	0.69
11. Appearance Enhancement (11, 25, 30, 67, 94)	0.66	0.76	0.76	0.80
12. Love and Care (12, 31, 58, 80, 86)	0.66	0.65	0.54	0.74
13. Submission and Debasement (13, 37, 50, 72, 103)	0.61	0.70	0.58	0.54
14. Verbal Possession Signals (14, 32, 49, 62, 88)	0.49	0.63	0.43	0.60
15. Physical Possession Signals (15, 33, 52, 84, 93)	0.71	0.79	0.71	0.74
16. Possessive Ornamentation (16, 34, 45, 56, 98)	0.67	0.44	0.51	0.49
17. Derogation of Mate (17, 35, 46, 57, 92)	0.49	0.16	0.66	0.74
18. Intrasexual Threats (18, 36, 44, 68, 73, 87)	0.83	0.82	0.57	0.82
19. Violence Against Rivals (19, 23, 51, 81, 100)	0.80	0.60	N/A	N/A
<i>Mate retention categories (tactics)^b</i>				
1. Direct Guarding (1, 2, 3)	0.76	0.81	0.81	0.83
2. Intersexual Negative Inducements (4, 5, 6, 7, 8)	0.75	0.74	0.68	0.78
3. Positive Inducements (9, 10, 11, 12, 13)	0.71	0.75	0.66	0.67
4. Public Signals of Possession (14, 15, 16)	0.78	0.68	0.74	0.73
5. Intrasexual Negative Inducements (17, 18, 19)	0.60	0.64	0.62	0.58
<i>Mate retention domains (categories)^c</i>				
Intersexual Manipulations (1, 2, 3)	0.83	0.76	0.81	0.68
Intrasexual Manipulations (4, 5)	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.47

Note: $N_s = 107$ men, 107 women, comprising 107 married couples. Reliabilities are standardized alpha coefficients. N/A = Not applicable; for "Violence Against Rivals," wives reported that they had never used three of the five acts (acts 23, 81, and 100) and, therefore, a composite reliability for this factor was not computed for wife's self-reports. In addition, husbands reported that their wives had never used four of the five acts (acts 19, 51, 81, and 100) and, therefore, a composite reliability for this factor was not computed for husband's reports of wife's mate retention.

^a Acts refer to act numbers from the Mate Retention Inventory, as provided in the Appendix.

^b Tactics refer to tactic that is preceded by number shown in this table.

^c Categories refer to category that is preceded by number shown in this table.

Participants completed a self-report version of the MRI, on which they reported their own performance of 104 mate retention acts. The Appendix presents the male version of the self-report MRI. Women completed an identical instrument, with the substitution of gender-relevant terms. Participants also completed a spouse-report version of the MRI, on which they reported their spouse's performance of the 104 mate retention acts.

2.3. Procedure

Participants engaged in two separate episodes of assessment. First, they received through the mail several instruments to be completed at home, including a self-report version of the MRI. Second, participants came to a laboratory session one week after receiving the first set of instruments. During this session, spouses were separated to preserve independence and to prevent contamination due to discussion. During this session, participants completed the spouse-report version of the MRI.

3. Results

We summed ratings for the constituent acts to produce scores for the 19 tactics of mate retention according to the taxonomy developed by Buss (1988, see Table 1). We standardized scores on each of the 19 tactics and then averaged these scores to create the five categories and two domains of mate retention defined by Buss (1988, see Table 1). We present and discuss the results according to the three levels of analysis afforded by scores on the MRI: tactics (combinations of acts), categories (combinations of tactics), and domains (combinations of categories).

3.1. Mate retention tactics

As displayed in Table 1, alpha reliabilities for the tactics were mostly acceptable, with mean $\alpha = 0.67$. Table 2 presents cross-spouse correlations of husband's and wife's mate retention. The first column shows correlations between husband's self-reported mate retention and wife's reports of her husband's mate retention. The second column shows correlations between wife's self-reported mate retention and husband's reports of his wife's mate retention. Cross-spouse correlations for husband's mate retention behaviors were significantly positive for 18 of the 19 tactics, and cross-spouse correlations for wife's mate retention behaviors were significantly positive for 16 of the 19 tactics. None of the cross-spouse correlations for the tactic Violence Against Rivals was significant, and this may be attributable to the low base-rate performance of the constituent acts (see note to Table 1).

We performed Fisher's r -to- z transformations to identify differences between correlations in the first column of Table 2 (correlations of husband's self-reported mate retention and wife's reports of husband's mate retention) and the second column of Table 2 (correlations of wife's self-reported mate retention and husband's reports of wife's mate retention). We identified differences in cross-spouse correlations for three tactics: Monopolization of Time, Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat, and Emotional Manipulation. For each of these tactics, correlations of husband's self-reported mate retention and wife's reports of husband's mate retention were significantly greater

Table 2
Cross-spouse correlations for the reported performance of mate retention behaviors

Mate retention tactics, categories, domains	Cross-spouse correlation		
	Husband's Mate retention	Wife's Mate retention	Difference between correlations (z)
<i>Mate retention tactics</i>			
Vigilance	0.58 ^{***}	0.52 ^{***}	0.62
Concealment of Mate	0.36 ^{***}	0.17	1.48
Monopolization of Time	0.58 ^{***}	0.20 [*]	3.32 ^{***}
Jealousy Induction	0.44 ^{***}	0.51 ^{***}	−0.65
Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat	0.66 ^{***}	0.44 ^{***}	2.31 [*]
Emotional Manipulation	0.58 ^{***}	0.21 [*]	3.24 ^{***}
Commitment Manipulation	0.46 ^{***}	0.30 ^{**}	1.35
Derogation of Competitors	0.48 ^{***}	0.32 ^{***}	1.38
Resource Display	0.35 ^{***}	0.29 ^{**}	0.48
Sexual Inducements	0.58 ^{***}	0.64 ^{***}	−0.69
Appearance Enhancement	0.56 ^{***}	0.65 ^{***}	−1.03
Love and Care	0.38 ^{***}	0.44 ^{***}	−0.52
Submission and Debasement	0.39 ^{***}	0.35 ^{***}	0.33
Verbal Possession Signals	0.61 ^{***}	0.52 ^{***}	0.96
Physical Possession Signals	0.70 ^{***}	0.69 ^{***}	0.14
Possessive Ornamentation	0.52 ^{***}	0.49 ^{***}	0.29
Derogation of Mate	0.28 ^{**}	0.18	0.76
Intrasexual Threats	0.39 ^{**}	0.40 ^{***}	−0.09
Violence Against Rivals	0.14	−0.03	1.23
<i>Mate retention categories</i>			
Direct Guarding	0.65 ^{***}	0.41 ^{***}	2.45 ^{**}
Intersexual Negative Inducements	0.69 ^{***}	0.44 ^{***}	2.71 ^{**}
Positive Inducements	0.31 ^{**}	0.36 ^{***}	−0.41
Public Signals of Possession	0.51 ^{***}	0.47 ^{***}	0.38
Intrasexual Negative Inducements	0.35 ^{***}	0.10	1.91
<i>Mate retention domains</i>			
Intersexual Manipulations	0.49 ^{***}	0.47 ^{***}	0.19
Intrasexual Manipulations	0.49 ^{***}	0.49 ^{***}	0.00
<i>Mate retention, all acts</i>			
	0.48 ^{***}	0.43 ^{***}	0.46

Note: $N = 107$ married couples. Cross-spouse correlations for husband's mate retention generated by correlations between husband's reports of his mate retention with wife's reports of her husband's mate retention. Cross-spouse correlations for wife's mate retention generated by correlations between wife's reports of her mate retention with husband's reports of his wife's mate retention. Difference between correlations assessed via Fisher's r -to- z transformation procedure.

* $p \leq 0.05$.

** $p \leq 0.01$.

*** $p \leq 0.001$ (all ps two-tailed).

than the correlations of wife's self-reported mate retention and husband's reports of wife's mate retention.

3.2. *Mate retention categories*

Alpha reliabilities for the five mate retention categories were acceptable, with mean $\alpha = 0.72$. All cross-spouse correlations were significant except for the Intrasexual Negative Inducements category of wife's mate retention. The low correlations between wife's self-reported use of Intrasexual Negative Inducements and husband's reports of his wife's use of Intrasexual Negative Inducements might be attributable to the inclusion in this category of the tactic Violence Against Rivals, which in turn included several acts that received very low endorsement by men and women with reference to women's use of these acts (see note to Table 1).

We used Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformations to identify differences between cross-spouse correlations at the category level. We identified such differences for two categories: Direct Guarding and Intersexual Negative Inducements. For these two categories, correlations of husband's self-reported mate retention and wife's reports of husband's mate retention were significantly greater than the correlations of wife's self-reported mate retention and husband's reports of their wife's mate retention.

3.3. *Mate retention domains*

Alpha reliabilities for the two mate retention domains were mostly acceptable, with mean $\alpha = 0.64$. Cross-spouse correlations were significant for both of the domains, and there were no differences between cross-spouse correlations at the domain level.

4. Discussion

The results of the current study provide further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI). Cross-spouse correlations indicate that men and women can provide reliable accounts of their partner's mate retention behaviors using the MRI. The results also indicate that the tactics, categories, and domains of mate retention assessed by the MRI have sufficiently high reliability to warrant the continued use of the MRI and, moreover, that the 104 acts comprising this inventory can be organized into meaningful groups which are theoretically and empirically associated with retaining a mate.

The numerically largest cross-spouse correlation occurs for husband's use of Physical Possession Signals. This may be attributable to the fact that physical possession signals are observable, conspicuous behaviors often performed by husbands in the presence of their wife. A similar explanation may account for the many other large cross-spouse correlations between self-reports and spouse-reports of both men's and women's mate retention behaviors. A few tactic-level cross-spouse correlations are small and statistically not different from zero. Women's reports of their own use of the tactic Derogation of Mate, for example, do not correlate with men's reports of their wife's use of this tactic. This lack of agreement may be attributable to the fact that men are not likely to be present when their wives derogate them to others. A similar explanation may help to account for the few other cross-spouse correlations that do not differ from zero.

It should be noted that, conceptually, one does not expect perfect correspondence between self-reports of mate retention acts and reports by their spouses of those acts. A person may perform an act of mate retention of which the spouse is unaware (e.g., snooping through a partner's mail). Furthermore, there may be some acts of mate retention observed by the partner of which the individual performing them might be unaware (e.g., indirectly making a partner feel guilty about talking with another person).

The results of the current study indicate that there are three mate retention tactics for which the cross-spouse correlations are sex-differentiated: Monopolization of Time, Punish Mate's Infidelity Threat, and Emotional Manipulation. For example, spouses are in greater agreement about the frequency with which husbands use Emotional Manipulation than about the frequency with which wives use Emotional Manipulation. At the category level, there are two mate retention categories for which the cross-spouse correlations are sex-differentiated. Spouses are in greater agreement about the frequency with which husbands use Direct Guarding and Intersexual Negative Inducements than about the frequency with which wives use the mate retention behaviors included in these categories. Future research is needed to investigate the source of these sex-differentiated cross-spouse correlations.

Of course, the MRI has limitations that characterize most measures of past behaviors. Memory for mate retention behaviors performed by oneself or by one's partner is subject to decay and to bias. Future work could investigate explicitly the extent to which such bias and decay might be problematic for assessments of mate retention. The MRI is the only inventory of which we are aware that is specifically designed to assess the performance of a wide range of behaviors intended to maintain a romantic partner's exclusive involvement with his or her regular mate. It is a self-administered survey that can be adapted for use in an interview, and the standardized instructions make self-administration uncomplicated. The researcher can alter the target assessment period (e.g., past year, past month) to assess the occurrence of mate retention behaviors during specified time periods. Previous research has generated substantial evidence of the psychometric utility of the MRI, including its reliability and validity. The current study provides further evidence of the reliability of the MRI: There is substantial agreement between self-reports and spouse-reports of the frequency with which both men and women perform the tactics, categories, and domains of mate retention assessed by the MRI.

Appendix A. Mate Retention Inventory (male version, self-report)

MRI-MSR

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 at unexpected times to see who my partner was with.
- ___2. Did not take my partner to a party where other men would be present.
- ___3. Flirted with someone in front of my partner.
- ___4. Spent all my free time with my partner so that she could not meet anyone else.
- ___5. Became angry when my partner flirted too much.
- ___6. Cried when my partner said she might go out with someone else.
- ___7. Asked my partner to marry me.
- ___8. Cut down the appearance of other men.
- ___9. Spent a lot of money on my partner.
- ___10. Gave in to my partner’s sexual requests.
- ___11. Dressed nicely to maintain my partner’s interest.
- ___12. Told my partner “I love you.”
- ___13. Told my partner that I would change in order to please her.
- ___14. Introduced my partner as my spouse or romantic partner.
- ___15. Held my partner’s hand when other men were around.
- ___16. Asked my partner to wear my jacket.
- ___17. Told other men terrible things about my partner so that they wouldn’t like her.
- ___18. Yelled at a man who looked at my partner.
- ___19. Hit a man who made a pass at my partner.
- ___20. Called to make sure my partner was where she said she would be.
- ___21. Refused to introduce my partner to my same-sex friends.
- ___22. Insisted that my partner stay at home rather than going out.
- ___23. Picked a fight with a man who was interested in my partner.
- ___24. Made my partner feel guilty about talking to another man.
- ___25. Made up my face to look nice.
- ___26. Got my partner pregnant so she would stay with me.
- ___27. Started a bad rumor about another man.
- ___28. Bought my partner an expensive gift.
- ___29. Acted sexy to take my partner’s mind off other men.
- ___30. Wore the latest fashion to enhance my appearance.
- ___31. Went out of my way to be kind, nice, and caring.
- ___32. Told my same-sex friends how much my partner and I were in love.
- ___33. Kissed my partner when other men were around.
- ___34. Asked my partner to wear my ring.
- ___35. Told other men that my partner was not a nice person.
- ___36. Stared coldly at a man who was looking at my partner.
- ___37. Became a “slave” to my partner.
- ___38. Ignored my partner when she started flirting with others.
- ___39. Had my friends check up on my partner.
- ___40. Went out with another woman to make my partner jealous.

- ___ 41. Bought my partner a bouquet of flowers.
- ___ 42. Cut down the strength of another man.
- ___ 43. Took my partner away from a gathering where other men were around.
- ___ 44. Threatened to hit a man who was making moves on my partner.
- ___ 45. Gave my partner jewelry to signify that she was taken.
- ___ 46. Told other men that my partner was stupid.
- ___ 47. Monopolized my partner's time at a social gathering.
- ___ 48. Threatened to break-up if my partner ever cheated on me.
- ___ 49. Bragged about my partner to other men.
- ___ 50. Gave in to my partner's every wish.
- ___ 51. Got my friends to beat up someone who was interested in my partner.
- ___ 52. Held my partner closer when another man walked into the room.
- ___ 53. Snooped through my partner's personal belongings.
- ___ 54. Pointed out to my partner the flaws of another man.
- ___ 55. Performed sexual favors to keep my partner around.
- ___ 56. Wore my partner's clothes in front of others.
- ___ 57. Told other men that my partner might have a sexually transmitted disease.
- ___ 58. Complimented my partner on her appearance.
- ___ 59. Questioned my partner about what she did when we were apart.
- ___ 60. Told my partner that we needed a total commitment to each other.
- ___ 61. Took my partner out to a nice restaurant.
- ___ 62. Mentioned to other men that my partner was taken.
- ___ 63. Told my partner that the other person she is interested in has slept with nearly everyone.
- ___ 64. Dropped by unexpectedly to see what my partner was doing.
- ___ 65. Yelled at my partner after she showed interest in another man.
- ___ 66. Told my partner that I was dependent on my partner.
- ___ 67. Made sure that I looked nice for my partner.
- ___ 68. Gave a man a dirty look when he looked at my partner.
- ___ 69. Pretended to be mad so that my partner would feel guilty.
- ___ 70. At a party, did not let my partner out of my sight.
- ___ 71. Hit my partner when I caught her flirting with someone else.
- ___ 72. Went along with everything my partner said.
- ___ 73. Told other men to stay away from my partner.
- ___ 74. Bought my partner some jewelry (for example, ring, necklace).
- ___ 75. Told my partner I would "die" if she ever left me.
- ___ 76. Read my partner's personal mail.
- ___ 77. Insisted that my partner spend all her free time with me.
- ___ 78. Cried in order to keep my partner with me.
- ___ 79. Told my partner that another man was stupid.
- ___ 80. Was helpful when my partner really needed it.
- ___ 81. Vandalized the property of a man who made a pass at my partner.
- ___ 82. Said that I would never talk to my partner again if I saw her with someone else.
- ___ 83. Had a physical relationship with my partner to deepen our bond.
- ___ 84. Put my arm around my partner in front of others.

- ___ 85. Threatened to harm myself if my partner ever left me.
- ___ 86. Displayed greater affection for my partner.
- ___ 87. Confronted someone who had made a pass at my partner.
- ___ 88. Told others the intimate things we had done together.
- ___ 89. Stayed close to my partner while we were at a party.
- ___ 90. Talked to another woman at a party to make my partner jealous.
- ___ 91. Bought my partner a small gift.
- ___ 92. Told others my partner was a pain.
- ___ 93. Sat next to my partner when others were around.
- ___ 94. Made myself “extra attractive” for my partner.
- ___ 95. Told my partner that another man was out to use her.
- ___ 96. Did not let my partner talk to other men.
- ___ 97. Gave in to sexual pressure to keep my partner.
- ___ 98. Hung up a picture of my partner so others would know she was taken.
- ___ 99. Became jealous when my partner went out without me.
- ___ 100. Slapped a man who made a pass at my partner.
- ___ 101. Pleaded that I could not live without my partner.
- ___ 102. Would not let my partner go out without me.
- ___ 103. Acted against my will to let my partner have her way.
- ___ 104. Showed interest in another woman to make my partner angry.

References

- Betzig, L. (1989). Causes of conjugal dissolution: A cross-cultural study. *Current Anthropology*, *30*, 654–676.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *9*, 291–317.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1–49.
- Buss, D. M. (1991). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality*, *59*, 663–688.
- Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion*. New York: The Free Press.
- Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review*, *90*, 105–126.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology and psychology. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 251–255.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 346–361.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *3*, 11–27.
- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Weekes-Shackelford, V. A., Euler, H. A., Hoier, S., & Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Mate retention, semen displacement, and human sperm competition: A preliminary investigation of tactics to prevent and correct female infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 749–763.
- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Marital satisfaction and spousal cost-infliction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 917–928.
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (in press). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from men’s mate retention tactics. *Personal Relationships*.