

The Editor's Desk

The papers in our third issue this year are an eclectic set, but a set with, I believe, potentially important implications. Wade-Benzoni's paper on intergenerational justice surely fits this description. As the author notes, "Some of the most important issues in business and society today involve a conflict of interest between present and future generations." Indeed they do. This paper also stimulated ideas for me not only as a scholar, but on a personal and visceral level. The issues are that important. I was intrigued by the application of psychological distance—in this paper, explored in terms of temporal, probabilistic, and social distance. Based on the studies reported in this paper, there is a (quite simple, in some ways) suggested prescription—the framing of decisions in intergenerational terms.

In the paper by Ferguson, Moye, and Friedman about the rather long-term effects of recruiting and negotiation practices—it seems that everything *does* count! The initial interactions during recruiting and negotiation have lasting effects, and whether or not recruits believe they have been treated respectfully and fairly (interactional justice) will have an impact on their intentions to stay at the organization. As noted by a reviewer, "The inclusion of a study...conducted at two points in time...is particularly commendable" and makes the results all the more compelling.

Taylor and Thomas' paper on linguistic style matching is a particularly good read. Strongly grounded in theory, it has useful implications for both theory and practice. In addition, these authors tackle the rather difficult interaction issues of a hostage negotiation. Counter to conventional wisdom that hostage negotiators should cede control to hostage takers, this paper cogently argues the need for the hostage negotiator to maintain rather than cede control.

The paper by Mohammed, Rizzuto, Hiller, Newman, and Chen emphasizes the importance of examining the interaction of individual differences with each other as well as with context factors. Research exploring individual differences in negotiations frequently has demonstrated only weak results, bringing into question the usefulness of these differences. Yet as these authors note, and their complex interactions reveal, it is important to understand the types of individual differences that matter and the contexts in which they come into play.

Once again, I want to thank all of our authors, reviewers, editors, and staff for their help in making our new venture a success with this, our third issue. Thank you all.



Judi McLean Parks
Editor