from their partners, often more than is judged by outside observers.

Consequently, it is important to consider the interactive nature of dyadic interaction and whether responsive behaviors are mutual and reciprocal. The perception of responsiveness is a function of each partner's needs and motives, expectations of the other's responsiveness, and the nature of the existing relationship. People with insecure attachment may pick as a partner another insecure person who, during their ongoing interaction, may not only confirm the expectation of unresponsiveness, but make the unresponsive interaction a reality. In contrast, secure individuals tend to pick partners who are more likely to be responsive and, in addition, may be able to increase their partners' responsive behaviors through their own responsive behaviors. Even in child–parent relationships, children's temperament and responsiveness to parental behaviors may contribute to responsive or unresponsive parenting styles: Infants who maintain eye contact, smile often, and have calm temperaments may induce more responsive caregiving from parents than infants who fail to exhibit these behaviors. Furthermore, the situation must be taken into account. Levels of responsiveness expected from a specific person or role may influence the process; generally, people expect more responsive behaviors from close partners, but may perceive same behaviors by a colleague to be inappropriate. For example, partners who call several times a day during a sick day may be perceived as being responsive, whereas the same behavior by a colleague may be considered excessive or intrusive. Thus, research on responsiveness often takes into account the complexity of the interactive, dynamic nature of responsiveness, as well as the motives and behaviors of both interaction partners and situational circumstances.

Madoka Kumashiro

See also Attachment Theory; Caregiving Across the Life Span; Communication, Norms and Rules; Communication Processes, Verbal; Interpersonal Sensitivity; Intimacy; Parenting; Reassurance Seeking; Social Support, Nature of; Understanding

Further Readings

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.

Davis, D. (1982). Determinants of responsiveness in dyadic interaction. In W. I. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behaviors* (pp. 85–139). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (2nd ed., pp. 319–346). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Landry, S. H., Smith, K. E., & Swank, P. R. (2006). Responsive parenting: Establishing early foundations for social, communication, and independent problem-solving skills. *Developmental Psychology, 42,* 627–642.

Lemay, E. P., Jr., Clark, M. S., & Feeney, B. C. (2007). Projection of responsiveness to needs and construction of satisfying communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 834–853.

Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., & Holmes, J. G. (2004). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness. In D. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *The handbook of closeness and intimacy* (pp. 201–225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reis, H. T., & Patrick, B. C. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component processes. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 523–563). New York: Guilford Press.

RETIREMENT, EFFECTS ON RELATIONSHIPS

Retirement heralds a new stage in the life cycle. It marks the end of paid employment and the start of life as a senior citizen. Relationships with coworkers are important during a career, but how does retirement affect them? Relationships with coworkers are apt to change, and so are relationships at home, with the extended family and with nonkin. This entry discusses the extent to which personal relationships are affected by retirement.

Social relationships at the workplace enhance enjoyment, creativity, and career development and

are thus meaningful. They also contribute to one's sense of personal worth and importance. In addition, the support provided in these relationships may diminish the effects of work-related stress and often contributes to well-being. However, most relationships with coworkers are not preserved beyond the workplace and do not become personal relationships. Work relationships are more likely to become personal if people work in the vicinity of their home or when coworkers have common interests. If coworkers have shared activities beyond the working environment, the likelihood of coworker relationships continuing after retirement increases.

Three theoretical perspectives predict a retirement-related loss of personal relationships. Holding that old age is a stage of life with limited social expectations about the roles that older adults play, disengagement theory notes that older people tend to withdraw from society. Not only work-related but also other types of relationships deteriorate. For disengaged retirees, loss of the work role places constraints on them, and they are forced to withdraw from certain activities and relationships. In particular, people who have no control over when and how they stop working face greater disruptions in their relationships than people whose retirement occurs as anticipated.

Socioemotional Selectivity Theory predicts that older people disengage from relatively superficial relationships, such as with former coworkers, because they find their emotional engagement with network members such as close kin and close friends more effective for maintaining their social identity and sharing their joys and sorrows. Reengaged retirees also identify retirement with disengagement, but are selective and content with it. If the partner or other significant others in the personal network no longer have a job or never did, the new retiree may be absorbed into a post-retirement world. The retiree typically spends a great deal of time at home, focusing on kin relationships and leisure activities with significant others. It is unlikely that relationships with former coworkers would be continued in a situation of this kind.

According to Social Convoy Theory, networks consist of close relationships determined by attachments and peripheral relationships determined by role requirements. Role-guided relationships (e.g., with coworkers) can be important and affectionate, but are primarily linked to the role setting, which generally limits their duration and content. Realigned retirees may look forward to retirement to release them from the pressures of their work role. Retirement decreases the likelihood of coworker relationships continuing. These retirees see retirement as a time for extending their lives in different and more meaningful directions. The initial period after retirement is full of positive changes. Retirees may explore and enjoy new possibilities. Retirees may take new social roles, and people from other role settings such as volunteer work, leisure activities, or grandparenting might replace coworker relationships, although sometimes still some contact is maintained with former coworkers.

Few researchers have studied the retirement effect on relationships. A general finding is that the number of relationships does not decrease contrary to the disengagement perspective. Two studies particularly showed that an estimated average of half the personal relationships with coworkers end shortly after retirement. Network members with whom job-related relationships are continued are now tagged as *former coworkers* or *friends*. These continued relationships are not necessarily part of the persistent core of ties maintained across time and might be ended later. Intensive social interaction with the spouse, local kin, and other people in the neighborhood replaces ties with former coworkers. Retired people also may initiate or renew relationships linked to postretirement activities. Consistent with the social convoy perspective, retirees' total number of personal relationships thus equals the preretirement number, and retirement mainly affects the network composition.

Changes after retirement are not always positive. It is not easy for everyone to preserve a positive mood. After a number of years, the retiree's satisfaction and well-being can decrease, and relationships, in particular job-related ones, tend to deteriorate. Also marriage quality may be affected as older studies show. Marriage may improve because there is more time and energy to devote to the spouse. However, and more important, husbands spending more time at home or in the immediate vicinity can generate spousal tension because the home has traditionally been the wife's territory. As a result of increased female employment and

men's greater involvement in domestic tasks in contemporary Western society, the situation might be different for future cohorts.

No person's biography is one-dimensional, focused only on employment. Retirement may coincide with changes in other life domains. It can, for example, trigger changes in health, and poor health or being a caregiver for others may trigger early retirement. Retirement may be followed by a move to a more pleasant environment. This multi-dimensionality in personal biographies contributes to individual differences in relationship changes. For some people, retirement might be the start of a third stage of life with opportunities to develop and intensify relationships, whereas for others it leads to a constrained situation with limited chances to maintain existing relationships.

Theo van Tilburg

See also Change in Romantic Relationships Over Time; Contextual Influences on Relationships; Employment Effects on Relationships; Life-Span Development and Relationships; Workplace Relationships

Further Readings

James, J. B., & Wink, P. (Eds.). (2006). *The crown of life: Dynamics of the early post-retirement period.* New York: Springer.

Szinovacz, M., Ekerdt, D. J., & Vinick, B. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Families and retirement.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Thomése, G. C. F., van Tilburg, T. G., Broese van Groenou, M. I., & Knipscheer, C. P. M. (2005). Network dynamics in later life. In M. L. Johnson & V. L. Bengtson (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of age and ageing* (pp. 463–468). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

REVENGE

Definitions of *revenge* in the scholarly literature vary, but there is considerable agreement that the phenomenon these definitions are intended to describe is both ubiquitous and universal, appearing repeatedly and frequently throughout human history and across diverse cultures and relationship forms. Indeed, so common are acts of revenge in literature, historical records, and current events that some experts have concluded that the desire for vengeance ranks among the most powerful of human passions.

For purposes of this entry, *revenge* is defined generically as action that repays harm with harm. Consistent with this definition, Roy Baumeister has argued that, at its core, revenge entails a reversal of roles in which the original perpetrator becomes the victim. Revenge can thus be seen as a perversion of the maxim "do unto others as you would have them do unto you," in which an individual does unto others what has been done to him or her.

Revenge is often treated in the scholarly literature as if it is the polar opposite of forgiving. There may be reasons to question this viewpoint, however. For example, Everett Worthington has argued that there are a variety of ways to reduce the complexity of negative emotions (which he calls *unforgiveness*) that often arises when we experience offense or injury at the hands of another and that forgiving and taking revenge are just two of these. From this perspective, revenge and forgiving share a common identity as responses to interpersonal harm or strategies for reducing unforgiveness. In actuality, research suggests that desires for revenge and the inclination to forgive tend to be inversely related to each other, but that, in itself, does not imply that they need be antithetical to each other. Indeed, under certain circumstances—such as when forgiving is used to demonstrate one's moral superiority over an offender—forgiving may in fact serve vengeful purposes.

Empirical research on revenge is rather limited at this time despite that much has been written about the topic from philosophical and theoretical perspectives. In part, the lack of research in this area may stem from a tendency among scholars to focus their attention on acts of revenge that are extreme and violent. Not only are such extreme acts of revenge less amenable to systematic investigation, but existing research suggests that they may reflect just "the tip of the iceberg." In everyday life, milder, more mundane acts of revenge may be far more numerous and frequent than extreme acts of revenge.

Revenge in Organizational Settings

At present, the literature on revenge in organizations offers the richest descriptive base for understanding