Dear ESCP member,

with this newsletter we try to keep you informed about what is going on in the European Society for Cognitive Psychology. In the past year, there was no conference. Nevertheless, some members have been very active. There was a very successful summer school on psycholinguistics in Bressanone. Furthermore, the ESCP committee sponsored four workshops. You can read some witness reports about all these events in the present issue.

Needless to say we are all looking forward to the next major activity of the society, the Xth Conference in Jerusalem from September 13 through 17, 1998. According to the latest news, abstracts are coming in well, even though there were initially some problems with the distribution of the final calls for abstracts brochure. These booklets were mailed around February 10, and were received a few days later in some of the European countries. However, for some mysterious reason, in the majority of the European countries, these booklets arrived three weeks later, and in a minority of the countries (apparently, this was the case for Italy), the booklets did not arrive even after five weeks.

In the committee we have tried to cope with this unexpected situation by sending e-mail messages with a short indication of how and when abstracts should be submitted. This sounds like a simple action. In practice, we were faced with about 10–15% of the messages bouncing back because of errors in the e-mail addresses or because addresses have been changed since registration for membership. It follows, that our Membership Directory—by many members a valued instrument—contains a lot of errors. In order to update and correct our data-base, you find with this newsletter also an extract of your data-base entry. We would greatly appreciate that you would check carefully whether everything is correct, and to send us by e-mail or by snail mail the corrected data.
But let’s stay with the main business. The Jerusalem conference is the major upcoming event. For those of you who still did not receive a call for abstracts and registration, I include some of the most pertinent information in this newsletter.

Another important point for 1998 is that it is an election year. This issue also gives you the most important information concerning the organisation of the elections.

With this newsletter, we also want to prepare you for the upcoming business meeting. Those of you who have been a member for several years know that the society is a Dutch “Stichting” and that there were plans to shift to the status of a British “Charity”. This issue contains information concerning the decision the committee likes to propose. In addition, the committee also proposes a few minor changes, you could rightly say updates, to the constitution of the society.

In the committee we are also looking beyond 1998. As you probably know the next conferences are in 1999, 2001, etc. The venue for 1999 is Ghent (Belgium). More information about this event is also included in this issue.

André Vandierendonck
Secretary
1997: NO CONFERENCE, BUT ACTIVE

The Summer School

Ino Flores d’Arcais organised the 1997 summer school. He selected an attractive venue (Bressanone), a bunch of good teachers, and found a large group of young researchers who attended the summer school. Afterwards he asked a number of them to write a short impression about the school. You can find their testimony here.

A comment from The Netherlands

I have very fond memories of the ESCP Summerschool in Bressanone. Apart from being in a beautiful country for two weeks, meeting a whole bunch of colleague PhD students working in psycholinguistics was fun and also very stimulating. The same goes, without saying, for the numerous encounters with the teachers. But except for the fun part, it was also a very useful experience.

For one thing, the teachers presented an update of the various aspects of language psychology, providing us with the very latest developments in the different areas. Language comprehension, the topic of my own PhD project, was fortunately very well represented. Michael Tanenhaus, Chuck Clifton, Lyn Frazier and Gerry Altmann gave an excellent summary of the research to date. Moreover they presented their most recent findings and pointed to interesting venues for future research. It became clear that in sentence comprehension the two ‘camps’ still exist next to each other: the Clifton and Frazier group who posit that the grammatical analysis of an utterance is a modular process which precedes all other kinds of processing vs. Tanenhaus and co-workers who reject modular processing, with Gerry Altmann taking a somewhat in-between position. Nevertheless, there seemed to be some sort of rapprochement between the two extremes in the sense that modular camp now concedes that, in some very well circumscribed cases, there is no modular processing.

Also closely related to my own research were the lectures by Keith Rayner. He is a pioneer in the area of measuring eyemovements during reading and was one of the first scientists to use eyetracking as a way of investigating on-line language processing. The computermodel he implemented to predict eyemovements was very interesting. I think a number of findings in my own eyetracking work can be explained by mechanisms he laid out in his model.

Finally, I want to mention that I really enjoyed the one-to-one meetings with some of the teachers, and also the luncheon and dinner get-togethers, which were either scientifically (parsing and sentence comprehension) or geographically (‘the nordic experience’) motivated. There was one drawback, however, and that was the number of smokers present. This made it next to impossible for me not to cadge cigarettes (‘bietsen’ in Dutch) whereever I went. But, all in all, the Bressanone Summerschool was a unique experience and I enjoyed every drop of it. Many thanks to ESCP, and especially to Ino, for making it happen.

John Hoeks.
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
Nijmegen, The Netherlands
A comment from Finland

I was pleased to be able to attend the ESCP summer school on psycholinguistics last summer in Bressanone.

Three quarters of a year after the summer school I still appreciate the impact it let on me. During the sessions of the two weeks I learnt a lot of doing empirical science. Somehow the overwhelming amount of knowledge, information and descriptions of experiments made me see how hard work science is, but how fascinatingly it may proceed.

I valued the possibility to follow the discussions the professors from top of the field were having in front of us. It gave a human face to articles and books that I’ve encountered before.

The range of topics was good, not too broad, not too narrow. What I was missing was maybe more interactive or varied working methods. Now we had mainly listening lectures. I would have appreciated some simulations, group works or something that would have given us from time to time a bit more active role.

Veera Mustonen
University of Helsinki, Finland

A comment from Germany

Courses. I think that the course selection was excellent: in addition to providing an overview over the fields of language production, sentence comprehension, and (spoken as well as written) word recognition, specific problems were also discussed in detail. Therefore, the courses provided a good balance between more general questions and specific problems of the respective fields. This balance was very good in that a non-specialist in, e.g., production could learn much from the courses while the specialist was presented with current research in the field.

Teachers. I think the list of teachers speaks for itself. Additionally, the fact that the teachers came from various “schools” of psycholinguistics (e.g. in sentence processing from the UMass group and the Rochester group), made the discussions especially interesting and challenging. It was great that the teachers did not immediately leave after the courses so that we had the opportunity to ask them questions not addressed in the courses.

There were two sessions in which students could present their own work. This was a good opportunity to get some feedback by both teachers and fellow students.

Bressanone was a nice place to stay for the two weeks (although the town was a bit touristic, . . .). Thus, the summer school was not only hard (but very interesting) work but there was also some time to relax or hike in the mountains (on those days it did not rain).

All in all, I think that Ino did a wonderful job in organising the summer school, regarding both the selection of teachers and topics. To speak for myself, I have learned very much during the two weeks and I had interesting dicussions with some of the teachers about my own research.

Michael Walter
University of Freiburg, Germany
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A comment from France

As a first point, we have to say that we were very enthusiastic before, during and after the summer school. We did appreciate the wide variety of topics that were approached in the course, since it is not that frequent to focus on topics different from your own work during the preparation of a PhD. We also appreciated the very high quality of the teachers which allowed us to reach the core of actual debates in the field of psycholinguistics, especially in what comes to unsettled questions.

Getting to see the people we read about every day was part of the fun, and the possibility we had to discuss freely with them was a rich experience.

In addition to all these very positive points, we would like to highlight a few suggestions. Indeed, there were a lot of very interesting lectures, but could not some of them be replaced by some kind of open discussion? They would give us time to process the great amount of information delivered by the lectures and to put to a test our own opinions. We also regretted that, because of their tight schedules, most of the teachers could not spend the whole course with us: this might have facilitated interactions.

Going to Bressanone was a great experience: teachers, students and the general atmosphere were both serious and friendly. We learned a lot, in the most pleasant way, thanks to the very efficient and (again) friendly organization. As a matter of fact, we would like to seize the opportunity to submit by now our application to the next ESCP summer school!!

Elsa Spinelli and Xavier Alario
Université René Descartes and C.N.R.S.,
France

Another comment from the Netherlands

In the summer of 1997 I participated as a student in the ESCP Summer School on Psychology of Language. The school was held in Bressanone in Italy. As I am a great lover of Italian food I had some great expectations. However, it turned out that Bressanone is actually Brixen, and the first language is German. This had some unfortunate effect on the food, but otherwise the bilingual atmosphere of the village (beautifully situated in the Dolomites in Northern Italy) fitted that of the school very well. Of course everybody had to speak English as this was the official language of the classes, but among the participants several other languages in numerous different combinations were spoken. The two champions in this respect were Uli Frauenfelder who answered our questions fluently in at least five languages and Anne Cutler who has investigated even more languages, and could demonstrate all the effects that she had studied in person.

The different origins of the participants culminated in the discussion about the length of the lunch break which was too long according to some (probably from a cold country in the north) but too short according to others. This emotional state reached its peak when after a week of pouring rain the village was about to be flooded. Fortunately then the sun came out, and we could finally use those bathing suits that Ino Flores d’Arcais never forgot to mention in the correspondence that preceded the start of the school. The hotel that housed the classes and teachers also had a nice swimming pool. During the second week everybody agreed that
a lunch break could never be too long.

In other words, the Summer School was a great success. Ino brought together some of the best teachers in the field, and Edith Sjoersma made sure that the school was very well organized. Because of the good atmosphere there was a lot of interaction among the students. For people at the start of their career this has been a great experience. I think I speak for all when I thank Ino and Edith for organizing the school.

Diane Pecher
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Sponsored Workshops

**ESCP Workshop on Eye Guidance**

The origins of this workshop are in discussions held at a meeting of the European Society for Cognitive Psychology that was held in Würzburg in September 1996. Informally and formally a number of us with interests in eye movements were arguing about the landing position effect in reading—an effect that, if substantiated, would provide evidence of the use of parafoveal information in eye guidance. The argument was not resolved in Würzburg, and so we decided to continue talking about eye guidance at a meeting that was held in Chamonix in February 1997. A dozen of us joined the debate about how we know where to move our eyes next. Are our eyes under control of the visual information available in words and in scenes, or under the control of the meanings of those items, or is there little or no control at all?

ESCP not only provided a forum for our initial arguments in Würzburg, but also generously supported the workshop in Chamonix. We are very grateful to the Society for giving us the opportunity to sit around a table talking about eye movements to fellow enthusiasts. While the formal meetings were scheduled over three days, many of us stayed on in Chamonix to continue the argument informally, and to enjoy the mountains. Chamonix is a well-established ski resort, of course, and the final day of the visit saw an intrepid bunch of eye movement researchers facing the challenge of the Vallée Blanche, a 20 km ski run down a glacier—it turned out to be a piece of piste. Not all of the arguments in Chamonix centred upon questions of eye guidance of course, and academic rivalries saw expression in a number of competitions during our meetings. The most memorable must be the tall-story competition, which was won by an explanation of the events leading to one colleague arriving at the airport with minutes to spare before departure. This winning story involved a highly improbable overnight vigil and an illegal journey down a motorway. Chamonix also witnessed eye movement researchers engaged in a glove-throwing competition (the best throw won by several hundred metres) and a self-mutilation-while-snow-boarding competition (the winning entry involved a party of French schoolchildren, blood spilt on the snow and, appropriately enough, an accident researcher).

One of the visitors to the Workshop was a representative from Elsevier, who are publishing a volume based upon our discussions. Contributions from the Workshop participants have been supplemented by chapters from colleagues unable to attend the meeting, and we now look forward to a widening of the debate about how our eye move in characteristic ways.

Geoffrey Underwood
University of Nottingham, UK
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Audiovisual Speech: Computational and Cognitive Science Approaches

Obsessives, nerds and generally incomprehensible fanatics abound in many areas of science—even cognitive science. A particularly obsessive bunch are those with an interest in audiovisual speech. Any sensible person will be politely impressed by the McGurk illusion, but then get on with more important business like filling in lottery tickets or watching paint dry.

In 1995, in Bonas, France, just such a bunch of obsessives, including speech scientists, researchers in deafness, computational engineers and psychologists discovered their common compulsion to produce computer-generated speaking faces and to understand audiovisual speech perception and production computationally and psychologically. The occasion was a NATO ISI meeting organised by David Stork (Ricoh corporation). We were so enthralled by our work that we happily met up again in 1996 in Philadelphia, at a special symposium organised by Lynne Bernstein & Christian Benoit in the International Congress of Speech and Language Processing at Philadelphia, where we exchanged news on our progress (or sometimes lack of it) in researching such matters as—“how good can machines get at lipreading?”, “what exactly are good speechreaders doing when they recognise lipread words?”, “do Japanese speaker-viewers really not get McGurk effects?” and “can anyone make a speaking face that would pass a Turing test?”. This year, Christian and I teamed up to continue the party. The occasion was a two-day workshop satellite to the ESCA Eurospeech meeting—the location idyllic—Rhodes, Greece. And ESCP helped us to pay for the drinks!

The highlights? Christian finding that the poster boards would be taken down the morning of our meeting, and his audiovisual expulsive responses (he fixed it: Christian fixes most things). Chris Bregler’s “video-rewrite” was unveiled: this is a computational technique that uses a bunch of “hands-off” algorithms to learn what a face looks like when its saying a particular sound . . . and can then make Bill Clinton say “Maybe I had a relationship”—even when he never said it. We finally were able to figure out, thanks to Denis Burnham, why McGurk effects can sometimes be sensitive to the language of the viewer and the speaker. We learnt more from Eric Vatikiotis-Bateson and his colleagues on the successful implementation of a realistic audiovisual speaker, using relatively few physiological and biomechanical parameters. In fact, “work in progress” from about a dozen teams, worldwide, allowed us to gauge just how far we have come in the last three years in appreciating what a good model of audiovisual speech, whether implemented in a person or a machine, should look like. In this, the psychologists are really taking note of the computer scientists and what they are achieving in terms of both theoretical and practical (i.e., controlled stimulus) advances, while the computational folk seem to need the psychologists to generate behavioural data and ideas concerning production and perception of multimodal speech.

The meeting was highly successful on all fronts—pre-meeting registrations from the “hard-core” audiovisual folk numbered around 80, and at least as many people again were sufficiently intrigued to stay on after Eurospeech to see and hear what we had to say. Thanks in part to ESCP, the party will continue next year—the International Congress of Speech and Language Processing, in Sydney, Australia, will include an audiovisual speech workshop, organised by Denis Burnham, Erik Vatikiotis-Bateson and colleagues. All welcome!

Ruth Campbell
University College London, UK
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Resource Limitations of Human Information Processing

This international symposium on the resource limitations of human information processing was planned as an interdisciplinary workshop. It was held from the 9th to 11th of April 1997 at the University of Saarland, Saarbrücken, Germany, and was organised by Hubert Zimmer and Gilbert Mohr. About forty people participated, half of them were young researchers who had just started working in this field. In addition to the support from our Society, the workshop was sponsored by the German Research Foundation in the special research division “Resource adaptive cognitive processes” at the University of Saarland.

The aim of the symposium was to bring together researchers from varying disciplines who use “limited human resources” either as an explanatory construct or as something that has to be explained. To provide an impression of the topics, I mention some keywords from the titles: modelling time constraints, cognition and action, spatial encoding and mental effort, attention shifts, neglect, limitations of working memory, central executive deficits, processing resources and ageing, anytime algorithms in resource adaptive systems, etc. The participants of the workshop stemmed mainly from three research traditions: from cognitive psychology, from neuropsychology, and furthermore, from computer science. The latter group was of primary interest because we wanted to export psychological knowledge into cognitive science. Due to the fact that people from different disciplines and with divergent theoretical positions participated, a better opportunity was provided to obtain a good overview of discussed models. This was especially important for the young researchers who had the possibility to hear the most recent results from the represented research groups. Another significant aspect was that enough time was provided for “experts” to conduct open discussions. It was therefore possible to eliminate misunderstanding and to come closer to the “roots” of the models which very often remained unexplained in the publications. The friendly and open climate was something that all participants commended. I personally would like to see more of these small symposia. Their impact is probably higher than that of the larger conferences.

Dr. Hubert D. Zimmer
University of the Saarland, Germany

European Workshop on Imagery and Cognition

A European Workshop on Imagery and Cognition (EWIC), the sixth meeting in this series started up by Michel Denis in Paris 1986, was last year arranged in Oslo in August. This meeting received financial support from the European Society of Cognitive Psychology, and these means were used to reduce the expenses for participating doctoral students in the field.

Held in the traditional localities of the Norwegian Academy of Sciences, the atmosphere started out ceremonially. Good weather (northerly temperatures of 30 centigrades or more throughout a conference in August are not what we are accustomed to in Oslo), and good comradereship soon brought along the relaxed social relationship typical for this series of meetings. As also the quality of the presentations held a high standard, we all look eagerly forward to the next meeting which will be organised by John Richardson next year (1999).

On behalf of the organisers of the sixth EWIC

Tore Helstrup
University of Oslo, Norway
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**REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE**

The Treasurer’s Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balances at 1 January 1997</th>
<th>Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Float held by treasurer</td>
<td>Special assistance to secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Danske Bank</td>
<td>Travel by secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Balance</strong></td>
<td>Membership book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78,591</td>
<td>Postage, stationary, photocopying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receipts**

- Members’ subscriptions: 30,928
- EJCP royalties: 7,865
- Sale of address labels: 282
- Bank interest: 396
- Gain on exchanges: 26

**Total Receipts**: 39,497

**Balances at 31 December 1997**

| Float held by treasurer | 0 |
| Den Danske Bank         | 59,546 |
| **Total Balance 1997**  | 59,546 |
| **Total Payments**      | 58,542 |

Claus Bundesen  
Treasurer

**Comment.** The financial situation of the society is healthy and relatively stable. The balance decreased in the year 1997 by DEM 19,045, which is largely due to expenses for the summer school. The committee keeps its commitment vis-à-vis the organisation of summer schools as a very important but also very expensive type of activity. It is clear that a summer school can be organised at most every two years, and then preferentially in a year without a conference.
Report from the Journal Editor

For the period 8 September 1996 to 31 December 1997, the following statistics summarize the situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions of Manuscripts to the Journal and Subsequent Actions.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Revise/Resubmit</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The journal continues to publish many excellent papers, and I am particularly grateful to the referees, many of whom are members, for the thoroughness of their reviews.

The total number of submissions for 1997 dropped slightly, in comparison to previous years, and I hope members would consider EJCP more often as a potential outlet for their work. In recent months we have been able to speed up the reviewing process, to give a median lag of 3 months, and the delay between acceptance and publication is currently 9 months. Putting these two figures together means that a good paper could be published within 12 months of submission. We are currently considering a “fast-track” system for short (1-experiment) papers, with both accelerated reviewing and publication procedures: details to be announced shortly.

Members on e-mail will have noticed the call for papers for a Special Issue on Imagery, edited by Bob Logie and Tore Helstrup: details also appear in the March 1998 issue of the journal.

Some people I have talked to make the point that for those of you who do not write English fluently, submission to EJCP can be unattractive: if you have a very good paper you send it to a top American journal; if the paper is not quite so good, the effort of translating it into English seems too much, and you publish it in your native language journal. I sympathise with such an attitude, but I should point out that no paper is rejected by EJCP simply because its English is poor, and I am happy to work on final versions of papers to ensure that when they appear, their English is perfect.

Philip T. Smith  
Journal Editor
Xth CONFERENCE: JERUSALEM 1998

The Tenth conference of the European Society for Cognitive Psychology has its venue in Jerusalem. It starts on Sunday, 13 September 1998 at 18:00 with the Broadlent lecture by Anne Treisman followed by a cocktail party. It ends on Thursday, 17 September at 13:00.

I hope that all members have received the brochure by now. If not, you can obtain information from:

Dan Knassim Ltd.
Attention of Mrs. Elisheva Even-Chen
P.O.Box 1931, Ramat-Gan 52118, Israel
Phone: +972-3-6133340
Fax: +972-3-6133341
E-mail: congress@mail.inter.net.il
ELECTIONS COMING UP

As you all know, the committee consists of seven elected members and up to two co-opted members for special task assignments. Claus Bundesen (Copenhagen, Denmark) was a co-opted member with the special assignment of treasurer. He left the committee at the beginning of 1998. The committee and the membership is indebted to Claus for the very careful and dedicated way in which he ruled as a treasurer. Over all these years he has become a friend, and we will miss him.

Claus’s tasks are taken over by Joachim Hoffmann (Würzburg, Germany). Joachim stays on as an elected committee member for the next two-year term.

Every even-numbered year we elect a new president. This means that this year the term of Vicki Bruce (Stirling, UK) as our president comes to an end. According to the constitution, she automatically becomes the next vice-president. As a consequence, Ino Flores d’Arcais (Nijmegen, The Netherlands) leaves the committee.

In addition, also Johannes Engelkamp (Saarland, Germany) and André Vandierendonck (Gent, Belgium) end their four-year term and cannot be re-elected in the same function. Even though the secretary remains in the same hands (André is becoming a co-opted member from 1999 on), this means that two committee members have to be replaced.

We need candidates for three committee positions: one for president and two for regular committee members. The constitution stipulates (article 19):

(a) that the secretary issues a call for nominations;
(b) that each nomination must be made by a full member of the society and seconded by at least three other full members;
(c) that at least one of the secondees should be from a different country than the person making the nomination;
(d) that the candidate should give her or his written consent to being nominated;
(e) that the nominations should indicate whether the nomination is for President or for Committee member.

Nominations must reach the secretary’s office not later than May 15, 1998.

Please note that this is the only call for nominations, that we need nominations for President and nominations for two committee members. The deadline for nominations is May 15, 1998, at the address of the secretary.
THE STATUS AND CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIETY

When the society was founded, cognitive psychologists of the Netherlands played a prominent role. With the image of the Society for Attention and Performance in mind, a “Stichting” according to Dutch law, they convinced the so-called gang of five to use the formula of a Stichting also for ESCP.

After some years of existence, in the early nineties, some committee members were not longer satisfied with the formula of a Stichting, which they felt did not provide enough room for democracy. And they dreamed that the society should be a democratic society in which there was no room for gangs of any size, colour or inclination. They were right of course, and so Philip T. Smith was given the assignment (a) to rewrite the constitution so that democratic principles were given full support even within the context of a Stichting. (b) He was also asked to collect information about the relative advantages or disadvantages of a Stichting in comparison to other types of associations, such a charity under British law.

We are facing the end of the nineties now and still the society was not given the opportunity to choose. The committee has found out, however, that being a Stichting has a lot of advantages, as long as the income of the society does not grow too large. The big advantage now, is that we do not pay taxes, and that we pay an annual registration fee and a small amount each time there is a change in the committee. These fees are small.

According to the information we obtained, the advantages are of the same order as the ones that would hold if the society were registered as a charity under British law. However, the path to this alternative goal leads over a number of uncertainties. Taking into account also that our constitution guarantees us free elections every two years, the committee decided to propose to the membership to remain a Stichting under Dutch law.

This is a proposal that will be made for the membership to decide. However, such a decision should go hand in hand with a few small changes to the constitution. Presently, the constitution stipulates that there is an Advisory Board which consists of full members who are elected and represent the different countries, in such a way that every country that has members in the society is represented. After some debate, the committee has observed that the Advisory Board does no longer exist and has not been consulted since 1990. Because the board is not meant to be an organ that holds formal meetings, the committee proposes that the Advisory Board shall be a small unit consisting of minimally 6 and maximally 12 ex-officers of the society.

The consequence is that the committee proposes to change Article 17 of the constitution in the following way (changed text in bold face):

**Article 17.** The Advisory Board shall consist of **minimally six and maximally 12 members, who have been Committee members of the society.** The term of office for a member of the Advisory Board is four years, with eligibility for re-election. The Advisory Board shall not hold formal meetings, but the Committee shall seek the advice of its members where appropriate. A member cannot be a Committee member and a member of the Advisory Board at the same time.

Also Article 20 that defines the election procedure has to be revised:
Article 20. Every four years, or whenever the effective size of the Advisory Board drops below six members, the election procedure will be started by the secretary. Nominations shall be made as in Article 19 and voting shall take place in accordance with Articles 21 to 23, with the additional condition that only nominees that have been Committee members of the society before, are eligible.

The Committee also discussed the practice of membership acceptance. Thus far the constitution prescribes that new members must be proposed by two Full members of the society. In practice, this is very difficult for countries with a small membership. Therefore, the secretaries have always been lenient, and accepted proposals backed by only one full member. The committee proposes now to change Article 8 as follows:

Article 8. Proposals for membership should be made on forms obtainable from the Secretary and should be returned to the Secretary. A candidate for any type of membership should be proposed by one Full member of the Society. The Committee of the Society (or such Subcommittee as the Committee may determine) shall be responsible for processing applications.

According to the rules of the constitution all Full members of the society will be asked to vote on these changes, in due time.
XIth CONFERENCE: GHENT 1999

ESCP has a tradition of good conferences. The Committee is dedicated to continue this tradition and to guarantee high standards. This can only be achieved if planning start sufficiently early. That is why the Committee has already decided in 1996 that the XIth conference would take place in Ghent. Similarly, the venue of the XIIth conference in 2001 will be one of the university cities in Scotland (Edinburgh is a very likely candidate).

As far as the XIth Conference in Ghent is concerned, some information is already available:

Venue

“Het Pand” (= building, pledge), an old Benedictine monastery built in the 12th century, renovated during the sixties and seventies and given in pledge to the University of Ghent.

Format

Due to the Jewish holidays, the conference should take place early September 1999 (between 1 and 8 September). The conference will start on Wednesday 1 September shortly after noon, with the Broadbent lecture by Willem Levert (Nijmegen), followed by sessions and a cocktail party (the organisers are thinking of Belgian beers). The conference ends on Saturday evening (4 September), closing with the conference dinner. In between there will be three full days of conference activity with symposia, thematic sessions and poster sessions.

Symposia

Should be restricted to half-day symposia with 6 speakers per session (or 5 speakers and a discussion slot). Already planned are symposia on Bilingualism and on Time perception and time estimation.

Themes

All subjects in the domain of cognition are welcome. The organisers would like to stress the following themes (which will be apparent in the invited lectures and some of the symposia): language processing, (deductive) reasoning, executive processes and time estimation.

Meals

No lunches are provided. There are many occasions in the neighborhood, and for the more wealthy people, on week days, there is an excellent restaurant in the building.

Members who would like to convene a symposium within the confines of this conference are invited to contact one of the local organisers at the University of Ghent:

- André Vandierendonck
- Marc Brysbaert
Many messages that may concern members are sent on ESCP’s e-mail list. Members and associates are not automatically member of this list, which is open to everybody.

In order to become a registered member of the list, you can send an e-mail message to Majordomo@rug.ac.be with in the body of the message, the following text

subscribe escop-list [my e-mail address]  
end

The e-mail address is optional, but should be included if you would like to receive the messages on another e-mail address than the one from which you issue your subscription.

The majordomo program that controls the list, allows you to perform other operations as well, such as

• unsubscribe escop-list [e-mail address], which is useful when you do no longer want to receive the messages or when your e-mail address changes. In the latter case, you can unsubscribe the old e-mail address and subscribe to a new one in the same request.

• help. This request in the body of the mail, will cause Majordomo to send you a complete list of all possible commands or requests.

The e-mail address escop-list@rug.ac.be is associated to this list. This means that any message you send to this address is automatically forwarded to all addresses in the subscription list.
## EUROPEAN SOCIETY FOR COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
### MEMBERSHIP PROPOSAL FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>.................................................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME(s)</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF MEMBER:**
- [ ] Full member
- [ ] Associate member
- [ ] Affiliate member

**FULL CURRENT PROFESSIONAL ADDRESS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone:</th>
<th>.................................................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEGREES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Degree</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRENT RESEARCH INTERESTS:**

1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................
3. .................................................................
4. .................................................................
5. .................................................................
6. .................................................................

**RECENT PUBLICATIONS:**

| 1. ................................................................. |
| 2. ................................................................. |
| 3. ................................................................. |
| 4. ................................................................. |
| 5. ................................................................. |
| 6. ................................................................. |

**PROPOSED BY (Name):** .................................... (Signature)  ....................................

Date: .................................................................

Address: .................................................................

Please do not exceed the space indicated for each section. If necessary, list only selected publications indicating that the list is incomplete.