

Letters to the Editors

Dear Monica and Christian:

This is in reference to the p.7 accounting of *PSPB* and *PSPR* editors in the Spring *Dialogue*.

You might at some point wish to mention for historical accuracy that although the *Personality and Social Psychology Review* was indeed started in 1997, it was a direct outgrowth of the annual *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, published 1980-1995. The Editors were:

Ladd Wheeler, 1980-83
Phil Shaver, 1983-86
Clyde Hendrick, 1986-90.
Margaret Clark, 1990-95

It was the custom for the previous Editor to overlap one year with the subsequent Editor.

By 1995, Sage Publications was demanding control of the content, wanting each volume to be thematic and to appeal to audiences in addition to social and personality psychologists. Peggy Clark suggested that we publish it as a journal (rather than annual volume) for personality and social psychologists.

And so the *Personality and Social Psychology Review* rose out of the ashes of the *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Best regards, and thanks for the terrific

job you are doing with *Dialogue*!

—Ladd Wheeler and Peggy Clark
June 22, 2004

Chris, Monica,

I really enjoyed the contributions to the Undervalued Classics column in the latest *SPSP Dialogue*. The following two papers are not exactly undervalued classics, because I don't think that many social psychologists ever knew about them in the first place. But people *should* have known, and if they didn't know part of the fault is mine, so please let me take your series on Undervalued Classics as the opportunity to correct an error of omission.

In our papers encouraging personality and social psychologists to take an interest in neuropsychological evidence (SESP 1993, *JEP:General* 1996, and *PSPR* 1998), Stan Klein and I unaccountably neglected to cite two articles by Ray Jackendoff that influenced our thinking (I heard Ray give a colloquium based on the 1992 paper at Arizona sometime before I left in 1994). Neither paper made it into the *Foundations in Social Neuroscience* volume recently edited by John Cacioppo et al. (MIT Press, 2001), either, so I don't feel so bad, but they are so interesting that they ought to be more widely read.
Jackendoff, R. (1992). Is there a faculty

of social cognition? In R. Jackendoff, *Languages of the Mind: Essays on Mental Representation* (pp. 69-81). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Jackendoff is a linguist and cognitive scientist at Brandeis University, very much influenced by the arguments of Chomsky and Fodor that the mind can be construed as a collection of "mental modules" each responsible for performing some cognitive task (broadly construed). While most cognitive scientists have focused on "input-output" modules associated with language and perception, Jackendoff lays out the arguments that one or mental modules are specifically devoted to social cognition. As with other modularity arguments, the implication is that each of these mental modules is associated with a specific brain module or system—hence the connection to social neuropsychology (we preferred "neuropsychology" to neuroscience" on the ground that psychology is primarily concerned with mind and behavior, while neuroscience is concerned with—well, neurons): Jackendoff, R. (1994). Social organization. In R. Jackendoff, *Patterns in the Mind: Language and Human Nature* (pp. 204-222). New York: Basic Books.

In this paper, Jackendoff extends the analysis to consider precisely what aspects of social cognition might be so universal as to be plausibly modularized. Based in part on the work of Alan Fiske, he argues that there are specialized modules for face and voice perception, and for processing information about kinship, group membership, and dominance. The proposal for a face module anticipates the current controversy over the nature of the "fusiform face area", and there is a discussion about the "theory of mind" in humans and nonhuman animals that foreshadows more recent interest in mindreading in children (and chimpanzees) and mindblindness in people with autism.

Thanks for listening.

—John Kihlstrom
June 25, 2004 ■

Dialogue's First Limerick

"The More We Read It, the More We Like It,"
Say Editors.

By William Ickes and Gordon Bear

"Repeated exposure," said Zajonc,
"Makes liking increase," in defajonc
of maxims that said
contempt comes instead.
Thus witness the triumph of scajonc.