

# Development of Geocentric Spatial Language and Cognition

Egocentric spatial language uses coordinates in relation to our body to talk about small-scale space ("put the knife on the right of the plate and the fork on the left"), while geocentric spatial language uses geographic coordinates ("put the knife to the east, and the fork to the west"). How do children learn to use geocentric language? And why do geocentric spatial references sound strange in English when they are standard practice in other languages? This book studies child development in Bali, India, Nepal, and Switzerland and explores how children learn to use a geocentric frame both when speaking and performing non-verbal cognitive tasks (such as remembering locations and directions). The authors examine how these skills develop with age, look at the socio-cultural contexts in which the learning takes place, and explore the ecological, cultural, social, and linguistic conditions that favor the use of a geocentric frame of reference.

PIERRE R. DASEN is Professor Emeritus in the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. His field of expertise is cross-cultural developmental psychology, particularly culture and cognition and the interface between anthropology and psychology. Professor Dasen is the founder of the Association pour la Recherche Interculturelle (ARIC) and an honorary member of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP).

RAMESH C. MISHRA is Professor in the Department of Psychology at the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India. His principal interest is in cultural influences on human development, and he has contributed numerous articles to professional journals, both in India and abroad, in the fields of cognition, acculturation, schooling, and crosscultural studies.



### Cambridge Studies in Cognitive and Perceptual Development

Series Editors GIYOO HATANO<sup>†</sup> University of the Air, Chiba, Japan KURT W. FISCHER Harvard University, USA

Advisory Board
Gavin Bremner, Lancaster University, UK
Patricia M. Greenfield, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
Paul Harris, Harvard University, USA
Daniel Stern, University of Geneva, Switzerland
Esther Thelen, Indiana University, USA

The aim of this series is to provide a scholarly forum for current theoretical and empirical issues in cognitive and perceptual development. As the twenty-first century begins, the field is no longer dominated by monolithic theories. Contemporary explanations build on the combined influences of biological, cultural, contextual, and ecological factors in well-defined research domains. In the field of cognitive development, cultural and situational factors are widely recognized as influencing the emergence and forms of reasoning in children. In perceptual development, the field has moved beyond the opposition of "innate" and "acquired" to suggest a continuous role for perception in the acquisition of knowledge. These approaches and issues will all be reflected in the series, which will also address such important research themes as the indissociable link between perception and action in the developing motor system, the relationship between perceptual and cognitive development and modern ideas on the development of the brain, the significance of developmental processes themselves, dynamic systems theory, and contemporary work in the psychodynamic tradition, especially as it relates to the foundations of self-knowledge.

### Titles published in the series

- 1. Jacqueline Nadel and George Butterworth, Imitation in Infancy
- Margaret Harris and Giyoo Hatano, Learning to Read and Write: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective
- 3. Michael Siegal and Candida Peterson, Children's Understanding of Biology and Health
- 4. Paul Light and Karen Littleton, Social Processes in Children's Learning
- 5. Antonio M. Battro, Half a Brain is Enough: The Story of Nico
- 6. Andrew N. Meltzoff and Wolfgang Prinz, The Imitative Mind: Development, Evolution and Brain Bases
- 7. Nira Granott and Jim Parziale, Microdevelopment: Transition Processes in Development and Learning
- 8. Heidi Keller, Ype H. Poortinga, and Axel Schölmerich, Between Culture and Biology: Perspectives on Ontogenetic Development
- 9. Nobuo Masataka, The Onset of Language
- 10. Andreas Demetriou and Athanassios Raftopoulos, Cognitive Developmental Change: Theories, Models and Measurement
- 11. Kurt W. Fischer, Jane Holmes Bernstein, and Mary Helen Immordino-Yang, *Mind, Brain, and Education in Reading Disorders*



## Development of Geocentric Spatial Language and Cognition

An Eco-cultural Perspective

Pierre R. Dasen and Ramesh C. Mishra





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521191050

© Pierre R. Dasen and Ramesh C. Mishra 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data Dasen, P. R.

Development of geocentric spatial language and cognition : an eco-cultural perspective / Pierre R. Dasen, Ramesh C. Mishra. p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in cognitive and perceptual development ; 12) Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-0-521-19105-0

- 1. Child development–Cross-cultural studies. 2. Space and time in language.
- 3. Cognition. I. Mishra, Ramesh Chandra, 1952– II. Title. III. Series. HQ767.9.D38 2010 305.23109–dc22 2010023743

ISBN 978-0-521-19105-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



## Contents

List	t of figures	<i>page</i> vii
	t of tables	x xiv
	eface	
Ack	nowledgements	xviii
Par	t I Introduction and methods	
1	Theory and research questions	3
2	Methods	49
3	Settings	76
Par	t II Results	
4	Pilot study in Bali and first study (India and Nepal,	
	1999–2000)	109
5	Returning to Bali: main study 2002–2007	141
6	Varanasi	163
7	Kathmandu	184
8	Panditpur	213
9	Geneva	222
Par	t III Additional studies	
10	Spatial language addressed to children	233
11	Geocentric gestures before language?	242
12	Spatial organization schemes	248
13	Neurophysiological correlates of geocentric space	265
		**



vi	Contents	
14	Geocentric dead reckoning	281
Par	t IV Conclusions	
15	Discussion and conclusions	297
Арр	pendices	
1	Summary of instructions, questionnaires and coding schemes	323
2	Examples of language in each location	335
3	Extracts from school manuals	346
Bib	liography	355
Nar	Name index	
Sub	Subject index	



## Figures

1.1	An integrated theoretical framework for cross-cultural	
	human development	page 15
1.2	Three spatial frames of reference (FoR)	
	Reproduced with permission from Levinson (2003), p. 40	23
1.3	The basic design of the rotation paradigm. Reproduced	
	with permission from Levinson (2003), p. 132	27
2.1	Perspectives task	54
2.2	Different forms of the Perspectives task	55
2.3	Road task, in Bali	56
2.4	Animals in a row. Four animals and 180° rotation.	
	Adapted from Levinson (2003), Fig. 4.11, p. 156	60
2.5	Animals in a row. Items 6 and 7 with 90° rotation.	
	Adapted from Levinson (2003), Fig. 5.12, p. 204	61
2.6	Chips task	62
2.7a	Steve's Maze	63
2.7b	Steve's Maze scoring sheet	64
2.8	Testing the knowledge of the orientation system.	
	Example from Singaraja, Bali.	65
2.9	Rotation of Landscapes	67
	Simple and complex Route Memory task and b	69
	Block Designs Test (BDT)	70
	Three items of the SPEFT	71
	Balinese orientation system (KKKK)	77
3.2	Local adaptations of the Balinese orientation system	
	Source: Wassmann & Dasen, 1998	81
	Sanskrit orientation system	95
	Spontaneous language on Perspectives by age	144
5.2	Spontaneous language on Perspectives in three	
	language groups	145
	Spontaneous language on Road in three language groups	146
5.4	G language object score in three language groups	148

vii



viii	List of figures	
5.5	G language object score in rural and urban samples	148
5.6	Knowledge of Balinese orientation system (KKKK), inside,	
	in three language groups	149
5.7	Knowledge of Indonesian orientation system (NSEW),	
	inside, in three language groups	149
5.8	Knowledge of the two orientation systems (Balinese, KKKK	
	and Indonesian, NSEW) in the city and in the village	150
5.9	Development of knowledge of Balinese and Indonesian	
	egocentric terms (LRFB) in three language groups	151
5.10	R-A gradient on Animals, three assessment formats	
	(3 animals, 5 items; 4 animals, 5 items; 4 animals,	
	7 items including two at 90°)	154
5.11	R-A gradients on three encoding tasks: Animals	
	(4 animals), Chips and Steve's Maze, by location	155
5.12	Amos summary model for Bali	160
6.1	Knowledge of NSEW and LRFB by age and school type	167
	Graphic representation of Princals' derived two	
	dimensions of mobility	176
6.3	Amos summary model for Varanasi	182
7.1	Spontaneous language on Perspectives	187
7.2	Spontaneous language on Perspectives by age and	
	school type	188
7.3	Spontaneous language on Road by age and	
	school type	189
7.4	Mean use of English on Road, by age and school type	196
7.5	Princals analysis showing two dimensions of mobility	199
7.6	Amos summary model for Kathmandu	210
8.1	Spontaneous language on the Perspectives by age	215
8.2	Spontaneous language on the Road by age	215
8.3	R-A gradients on encoding tasks by age	216
8.4	R-A gradients on encoding tasks by grade	217
8.5	Princals component loadings of activities	218
9.1	Knowledge of LRFB and NSEW	224
9.2	Spontaneous language on Perspectives by age	225
9.3	Spontaneous language on Road by age	226
9.4	R-A gradients on three encoding tasks by age, and changes in	
	procedures	227
10.1	Frequencies of geocentric (NSEW) language addressed by	
	mothers in Roopchandpur to children from 1 to 11 years	237
10.2	Frequencies of correct geocentric (NSEW) language	
	addressed by mothers in Roopchandpur to children when	
	describing village sites	237



	List of figures	ix
11.1	Three types of gestures with deictic language, by age	246
12.1	Classification of schemes	256
12.2	Development of schemes with age in Kathmandu	261
12.3	Development of schemes with age in Geneva	263
15.1	Princals factorial space for non-verbal encoding tasks in	
	four locations	304
A3.1	Extract from grade 2 book, Nepali schools	
	Reproduced with permission from Awasti, M. & Bhandari, P.	
	(2006). Saral Nepali Srinkhala. Kathmandu: Ekta Books	
	(first edition 1990).	347
A3.2	Extract from grade 2 book, English schools	
	Reproduced with permission from Chandra, T. (2009).	
	Our social studies, book 2. Kathmandu: Ekta Books	
	(first edition 1986).	348
A3.3	Extract from grade 2 book, English schools	
	Reproduced with permission from Adon Rongong & Timothy	
	Chandra (2009). GK and IQ Test, book 2. Kathmandu:	
	Ekta Books (first edition 1989). p.12	350
A3.4	Extract from grade 1 book, Hindi schools	
	Source: Rai, S.N. (n.d.). Bhasha Manjari. Kolkata 7: Shail Publicat	ion.
	Class 1. Based on National Council for Educational Research and	
	Training (NCERT) pattern.	352
A3.5	Extract from grade 3 book, Urdu school	
	Source: Naasir (1989). Istalahat geographiya. Faizabad,	
	UP: Danish book dipo Tanda. Lesson "simt" (directions).	353



## **Tables**

1.1	Western vs. Asian thought according to Nisbett (2003)	page 5
1.2	Spatial frames of reference in developmental psychology	
	and in linguistics	19
1.3	Languages studied by Levinson et al. (2003, p.182)	24
1.4	Available FoR and preferred frames in the languages	
	of this study	25
2.1	Language coding scheme	57
3.1	Characteristics of English (private) and Nepali	
	(government) schools	101
4.1	Sample characteristics of study in Bali, 1994	111
4.2	R-A gradients on spatial encoding tasks in Bali by age group	111
4.3	Changes of answers between first and second session (N=27)	113
4.4	Design, and number of children in each sample in India and	
	Nepal, first study (1999–2000)	114
4.5	Percentage of modal language use on combined tasks, by age	
	group, in three locations	117
4.6	R-A gradients (and standard deviations) on spatial encoding	
	tasks by age group in three locations	120
4.7	Princals results on three encoding tasks	121
4.8	Categories of language used by schooled and unschooled	
	rural Nepalese children	122
4.9	Partial correlations between language and encoding	
	(R-A gradients), controlling for age and years of schooling	123
4.10	Language used on encoding tasks. Geocentric and Egocentric	
	encoding on items 4 and 5 of three tasks combined. Language	
	categories as defined in chapter 2.	124
4.11	Description on Perspectives task when moving around display	
	by predominant spatial language used (6 to 14 year old children	
	combined)	125
4.12	Partial correlations among the Piagetian tasks, controlling	
	for age and schooling	127
4.13	Princals analysis of Piagetian tasks	128

X



	List of tables	xi
4.14	Partial correlations, controlling for age and schooling, between the proportions of the different language categories and object scores on Piagetian cognitive tasks	128
4.15	Change in second administration of the Animals task,	120
1.13	with induction	130
4.16	Princals analysis of SES score	130
5.1	Sample characteristics of main study in Bali, 2002	142
5.2	Balinese and Indonesian used at home	142
5.3	Balinese and Indonesian used on tests	143
5.4	Cross-tabulation of language spoken in the home and preferred	
	on tests	143
5.5	Princals optimal scaling for 3 language tasks	147
5.6	Encoding on Animals task in 3 locations in Bali, 1994 and	
	2002 (in %)	152
5.7	Princals optimal scaling for non-verbal encoding tasks	156
5.8	Language and encoding on Nijmegen tasks (number of items and %)	157
5.9	Correlations between G language and G encoding and	
	social indicators	158
6.1	Sample characteristics, Varanasi main study	164
6.2	Spontaneous language use on Perspectives by school type	167
6.3	Spontaneous language use on Road by school type	168
6.4	Princals factor loadings for language elicitation tasks	169
6.5	Comparison of R-A gradients in 1st study and in main study	170
6.6	Princals component loadings for encoding tasks	170
6.7	Mean object scores on G language and G encoding by	
	school type	171
6.8	Pearson correlation coefficients between school type, gender,	
6.0	age, language, and encoding	171
6.9	Partial correlation coefficients between gender, age, language, and encoding, controlling for school type	172
6.10	Pearson correlation coefficients with BDT and SPEFT	174
6.11	Component loadings on Princals analyses of mobility measures	176
6.12	Princals component loadings for village contact	177
6.13	Princals analysis of SES status variables	177
6.14	Princals component loadings of media variables	178
6.15	Frequencies and percentages of children with village or city	
	background by school type	179
6.16	Princals component loadings for migration history	179
6.17	Pearson correlation coefficients between the various summary	
	scores for the background variables and school type	180



xii	List of tables	
6.18	Correlations between background variables and measures of	
	geocentric knowledge, language and encoding	182
7.1	Sample characteristics, Kathmandu	185
7.2	Knowledge of cardinal directions, indoors, by age group	
	and school type	186
7.3	Princals analysis of language elicitation tasks	190
7.4	R-A gradients on three spatial encoding tasks by age-group,	
	rural/urban	191
7.5	Mean R-A gradients by age group and task demands	192
7.6	Princals results on non-verbal encoding tasks	192
7.7	G and E language and encoding on items for three tasks	
	(frequencies)	194
7.8	Coherence between language and encoding (in percent)	194
7.9	Results of child questionnaire for mobility, by school	
	type (in percent)	198
7.10	Princals component loadings on contact with village	200
7.11	Princals component loadings of SES indicators	201
7.12	Princals component loadings of contact with media	201
7.13	Princals component loadings on migration history	202
7.14	Pearson correlation coefficients among background variables	204
7.15	Correlations between background variables, language and	205
0.1	cognition	205
8.1	Sample characteristics, Panditpur	214
8.2	Sample characteristics, age by grade	214
8.3	Component loadings of language tasks on Princals analysis	216
8.4	Component loadings of encoding tasks on Princals analysis	217
8.5 9.1	Princals component loadings for city contact Sample characteristics, Geneva	218 223
9.1	First languages spoken by children	223
9.2	Migration history	223
9.3	Correspondence between language and encoding on items 4 and	223
2.4	5 of encoding tasks	228
10.1	Mothers' language addressed to children in Roopchandpur	236
10.1	Mothers' language addressed to children in Poopenandput  Mothers' language addressed to children in Dolakha	238
11.1	Scoring of language and gestures	244
11.2	Consistent (in bold) and inconsistent items between language	2
11.2	and gestures	245
11.3	Deictic language and three types of gestures	246
12.1	Same or different description on Perspectives when moving	
	around display	250
12.2	Same or different descriptions according to G and E	0
	language FoR	251



	List of tables	xiii
12.3	Frequencies of children giving different or the same descriptions in positions 2 and 3 in various locations	252
12.4	Varanasi: t-tests between groups giving same or different descript on position 2	ion 253
12.5	Varanasi: t-tests between groups giving same or different description on position 3 (rotation of display)	253
12.6	Kathmandu: t-tests between groups giving same	233
12.0	or different description on positions 2 and 3	254
12.7	Percentage of spatial schemes used by Hindi- and Sanskrit-	237
12.7	school children at position 1, position 2 and after rotation of	
	the display	257
12.8	Correspondence of spatial schemes at position 2, and after	
	display rotation, relative to schemes at position 1 (in percent)	258
12.9	Same versus different schemes at position 2, and after	
	display rotation	259
12.10	Partial correlation (age controlled) of schemes with other	
	spatial cognitive variables	259
12.11	Bali: same versus different schemes at position 2, and after	
	display rotation (in percent)	261
12.12	Kathmandu: same versus different schemes at position 2, and	
	after display rotation (in percent)	262
12.13	Partial correlations between schemes and language in Geneva,	
	controlling for age	263
13.1	List of peripheral laterality tasks	269
13.2	Variables used for brain lateralization study	271
13.3	Partial correlations of hemispheric dominance variables with	
	G language and G encoding in Varanasi	272
13.4	Mean scores of brain-damaged (group 1) and normal (group 2)	
	subjects on various measures	277
13.5	Use of distractors (D) by brain-damaged and normal subjects on	
	encoding tasks and G- on Perspectives and Road tasks	278
14.1	Distribution of different levels of experts in Sanskrit and	
	Hindi schools	287
14.2	Interviews on processes in keeping track of directions in Sanskrit- and Hindi-school children with varying degrees of expertise:	-
	percentage of children giving various categories of answers	288
14.3	Language used on Route task by experts of different levels in	
	Sanskrit and Hindi schools	290
15.1	Pearson correlations (and partial correlations controlling for age)	
	between language and encoding and spatial ability measures	320



## **Preface**

This book reports a cross-cultural study of child development in Indonesia (Bali), India, Nepal, and Switzerland, particularly in the area of spatial language and cognition. It examines a particular skill that is unfamiliar in Western contexts, which consists of using large-scale ("geocentric") spatial directions such as north, south, east, and west (NSEW) when talking about the location of objects inside a room. Various ecological and socio-cultural conditions that favor the development of this skill are examined.

The geocentric spatial frame of reference (FoR) was first described and studied in anthropological linguistics by scholars at the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group (CARG) of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands. The findings are summarized in Levinson's (2003) book *Space in language and cognition*. This linguistic research, carried out through extensive field-work mainly with adults, examined over forty, mostly unwritten, languages spoken in small-scale, traditional societies, languages that favor a geocentric FoR. The argument is that when such a frame is used in language, it will also be used in non-linguistic cognition, such as memory and reasoning. Hence, Levinson (2003) and his group take a fairly strong "Whorfian" point of view of linguistic relativism.

One of us (P. Dasen) was made aware of this research in the early 1990s through Professor Jürg Wassmann, who had spent some time with Levinson's team, an anthropologist who was interested not only in cognitive anthropology (Wassmann, 1993a) but also in linking it to developmental psychology (Wassmann, 1988). Wassmann and Dasen (1994a/b) had carried out some research together in Papua New Guinea on number concepts and classification, and in 1994 the opportunity arose for a common study of the development of geocentric spatial language and cognition in Balinese children (Wassmann & Dasen, 1996, 1998, 2006). This study raised a number of interesting questions, which the authors of this book tried to tackle in a first study in India and Nepal in 1999–2000, and then again in what we call the main study, field-work for which was carried out from 2002 to 2007. Hence the research reported here has been a long-standing project, and we try to communicate to the reader some of the suspense we have experienced over these years somewhat like a detective

xiv



Preface xv

story. Every result leads to a next question, which is what keeps us going as researchers. But we now feel that we have a coherent body of information, and that it is time to share this in the form of a single volume.

The book is organized in four parts. In Part I, the theory and research questions are presented in chapter 1, which gives us the opportunity to review our understanding of the wider area of "culture and cognition" from a (cross-)cultural and developmental perspective. Throughout the various studies, some of the tasks remained the same to ensure comparability, while some tasks were modified along the way to take more recent developments into account, and still other tasks are specific to particular studies. The methods that are common to several studies are described in chapter 2. Similarly, chapter 3 provides a description of the various locations in different countries, including their relevant cultural and linguistic characteristics.

The second part of the book presents the main results, chapter 4 of the initial study in Bali and the subsequent first study in India and Nepal, and chapters 5 to 9 the results of the main study in different locations, i.e. Bali (Indonesia), Varanasi (India), Kathmandu (Nepal), Panditpur (India), and Geneva (Switzerland).

These chapters have much in common, since some of the research questions and the methods remained the same across locations, but each chapter also deals with a specific problem. Chapter 5 recounts a replication study in Bali, where we went to check on our initial results with much larger samples and more complete methods. The results point to the importance of traditional Balinese culture and language, which help to maintain the use of geocentric language and cognition, while the impact of acculturation through schooling, urban life, and in particular the use of Bahasa Indonesian as a language, contributes to the choice of a more egocentric FoR. In Varanasi (chapter 6), we examine in particular the importance of Hindu religious practices in fostering a geocentric FoR. The study is organized as a comparison of Sanskrit-school and Hindi-school pupils. In Kathmandu (chapter 7), we follow up on one of the findings from Bali, namely the impact of bilingualism with a language that usually favors an egocentric FoR, i.e. English. The comparison, in this case, is between English and Nepali school groups. Research in this location also includes full details of the relationships between using geocentric (G) language and G cognition (encoding) and various socio-cultural background variables. Chapter 8 reports a study in a rural location in India where it seemed that an egocentric FoR was predominant, which turned out not to be the case, and chapter 9 deals with Geneva as a sort of "control" group, i.e. a location in which the geocentric FoR is just simply never used.

The studies in Bali, Kathmandu, Panditpur, and Geneva provide developmental information on a large range of ages, namely 4 to 12 years, while in Varanasi we purposely studied an older group of children, 11 to 15 years. It is



#### xvi Preface

in this age group that individual differences in the choice between an egocentric and a geocentric spatial FoR seem to be most marked. This also provides us with an opportunity to study in more detail the relationships between using G language and G encoding and other aspects of psychological functioning, such as spatial ability and psychological differentiation.

In Part III, we report a series of additional studies, additional not because the questions they seek to answer are less important, but because these studies are specific to particular locations or samples. Chapter 10 recounts a study carried out in rural Nepal and rural India on mothers' spatial language addressed to children of various ages, from 12 months to 12 years. It is an attempt to describe the linguistic models children hear and learn to imitate. Chapter 11 deals with a study of spatial gestures, using these to guess which FoR young children in Kathmandu use when their language is ambiguous. In chapter 12, we carry out some micro-analyses on how children organize a spatial display depending on the FoR they use. For example, do they use the same description of a display from various positions when they move around it or when the display is rotated? Which schemes do they actually use to subdivide a display of three objects, and how do these change with age in the different groups we have studied?

Chapter 13 deals with neurophysiological correlates of using a geocentric FoR. It examines in particular the role of peripheral and central brain lateralization. It is commonly assumed that differences in neurophysiology cannot be cultural, i.e. these processes are either assumed to be universal, or differences are attributed to genetics. This is not necessarily so. While basic processes are no doubt universal, a diversity in brain functioning may develop through the exposure to particular experiences and practices (Fox, 2006). The question therefore arises whether using a geocentric FoR rests on, or produces, different neural pathways than using an egocentric frame. This is the part of our research, using a split-half visual field technique with children in Varanasi and Kathmandu, that comes closest to laboratory research. It is complemented by an exploratory study with twenty patients having undergone surgery for right-hemispheric brain damage.

In chapter 14, we report a study that seeks to test the limits of how people who use a geocentric FoR are able to carry spatial orientation with them. In this experiment, children in Varanasi were not only able to keep track of cardinal directions inside of a building, but some of them were able to do so even when blindfolded, turned around and led blindfolded to another room. Interviews with these "experts" tried to tease out how this process of dead reckoning functions and how it is acquired.

Part IV of the book is devoted to chapter 15, the general discussion of our results and conclusions. We link these back to an integrated theoretical framework for the cross-cultural study of human development that is presented in



Preface xvii

chapter 1. Our general conclusion is that the development of geocentric spatial language and cognition occurs in a complex eco-cultural system, which is adaptive and functional. The choice between an egocentric and a geocentric FoR is akin to a cognitive style. Consequently, on the basis of a review of the cross-cultural psychological literature and of the results presented in this volume, we argue that cultural differences occur not in the presence or absence of particular cognitive processes, but in the preference for particular cognitive styles.



## Acknowledgements

The research reported in this volume has been supported by the Swiss National Scientific Granting Commission (grants 11–54101.98 and 113–67178.01 to P. Dasen). The drafting of this volume was greatly facilitated by a Fellowship at the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS) attributed to R. C. Mishra.

Organization of programmatic research away from home requires help from colleagues and friends at various places. In our case it has been possible with the active participation and support of two good colleagues. Jürg Wassmann, Professor of anthropology at the University of Heidelberg, introduced P. Dasen to Bali in Indonesia, and we twice did field-work there. The main study in Bali was facilitated by Professor I. Gde Pitana, Udayane University, Denpasar, Bali, and Professor Wayan Nurkancana and Dr. I. Nyoman Adil, IKIP, Singaraja, Bali.

In Nepal our task was made easier by the active participation of Dr. Shanta Niraula, Professor at Tribhuvan University of Kathmandu, in organizing and supervising studies at the remote rural setting of Dolakha as well as in the city of Kathmandu. She shared the major responsibility of field-work in Nepal by arranging local research assistance and traveling to field sites for regular supervision of data collection, and providing us with regular feedback on the progress made on the work. In addition, she was a wonderful host during our visits to Nepal.

The success of any research depends on the sincerity and dedication of assistants and we feel quite privileged because we had highly motivated research assistants at all locations. We take this opportunity to thank them all and sincerely acknowledge their contributions. At Varanasi, Ms. Neha Acharya, Ms. Nishat Afroz, Ms. Vanadana Chaubey, Mr. Girish Chandra Chaubey, Ms. Shweta Kumary, and Dr. Surabhi Prakash rendered valuable help in data collection in different phases of the study. Dr. Akhilesh Chandra Chaubey and Dr. Aparna Vajpayee played a major role as research supervisors. Ms. Sunita Singh played multiple roles in the whole research program.

In Nepal, Ms. Laksmi Shrestha and Mr. Padma Ghimire collected data at Dolakha, and Ms. Rena Shrestha and Mr. Purushottam Tandon in the city of

xviii



#### Acknowledgements

xix

Kathmandu. In Bali, our initial study in 1994 was carried out with the help of Mr. Nengah Danta, and the second study with Mr. Made (Kadek) Aryawan Adijaya and Mr. I. Nyoman Pasek Hadisaputra. In Geneva, data were collected with the help of Ms. Marie Anne Broyon, Ms. Anahy Gajardo and Dr. Yvan Leanza (who is now Professor at the Laval University in Quebec City). Ms. Milena Abbiati and Dr. Nilima Changkakoti, also from the University of Geneva, helped with the coding of video data for the gesture study, together with Mr. Harold Foy, of the University of Quebec at Rimouski.

Several others have helped us in organizing field activities in or near Varanasi. We sincerely acknowledge the support of Akhilesh's family at Roopchandpur village for making a part of their house available for testing, arranging appointments with participants, and rendering great hospitality to the research team during the field-work in the village, and similarly Mr. G. C. Tripathi and his family in the city of Varanasi. Dr. Shabana Bano rendered her help whenever we called for it. For the second study in Varanasi we feel extremely grateful to Mr. Lalit Bahadur Singh, Manager, Malviya Shiksha Niketan, not only for making his own house available for research work, but also for his personal care. We also feel highly grateful to Ms. Prabha Singh, Principal, Malviya Shiksha Niketan, for welcoming us to work with children at her school. The work would have not been so smooth without their help and constant support.

Research work in Nepal would not have been possible without the all-round support of Mr. H. S. Niraula. He made us feel at home in Kathmandu by extending a very kind hospitality, and was functional in the field by arranging local contacts, research assistants and all the facilities for our stay and work in Dolakha. On several occasions he took the pain of traveling and staying with us. We sincerely thank him for his support. We also thank Professor Ayan Bahadur Shrestha, former Professor and head of the Psychology Department, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu. He was not only a great source of inspiration for the whole research team during the field-work, but also a great source of information about the life and culture of people in Nepal.

The late Professor Babban Misra of Gorakhpur University was instrumental in organizing research at Panditpur. He was a wonderful host and a good research supervisor. Ms. Jyotima Pandey, Ms. Ragini Rai and Ms. Shilpa Singh carried out all testing and interviews at Panditpur. Mr. Hari Madhav Pandey welcomed us in his village and introduced us to the village surroundings and the school teachers.

On several occasions during this project, we were able to discuss preliminary data and research issues with interested colleagues, in particular at workshops and conferences. We thank particularly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group (CARG) at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, the Netherlands; this group includes Steve Levinson, Melissa Bowerman, Gaby Cablitz, Daniel Haun, Olivier Le Guen, Asifa Majid, Bhuvana Narasimhan,



#### xx Acknowledgements

Günther Senft, Edith Sjoerdsma, and David Wilkins. We especially thank Penny Brown, who painstakingly read through our very rough drafts while she was herself on field-work in Papua New Guinea; any errors and misinterpretations are of course our responsibility and not hers. Colleagues from other locations who contributed ideas and discussions include Symen Browers, Pascale Cottereau-Reiss, Marie-Noëlle Chamoux, Fabienne Tanon, Bertrand Troadec, and Gisela Trommsdorff, as well as three anonymous reviewers.

We particularly thank Dr. Rudo Niemeijer for his expert help with statistical analyses, during many work meetings in Holland, Portugal and Switzerland, as well as at a distance.