The Social Connection in Mental Representations of Space: Explicit and Implicit Evidence

Holly A. Taylor[1], Qi Wang[1], Stephanie A. Gagnon[1,2], Keith B. Maddox[1], and Tad T. Brunyé[1,2]

[1] Department of Psychology, Tufts University
490 Boston Ave., Medford, MA 02155 USA
[2] U.S. Army NSRDEC, Cognitive Science Team, RDNS-WS-S
15 Kansas St, Natick, MA 01760 USA
{holly.taylor,qi.wang,keith.maddox}@tufts.edu,
stephanie.a.gagnon@gmail.com, tadbrunye@hotmail.com
http://ase.tufts.edu/spacelab

Abstract. To understand memory of and reasoning about real-world environments, all aspects of the environment, both spatial and non-spatial need to be considered. Non-spatial information can be either integral to or associated with the spatial information. This paper reviews two lines of research conducted in our lab that explore interactions between spatial information and non-spatial information associated with it (namely social information). Based on results of numerous studies, we propose that full accounts of spatial cognition about real-world environments should consider non-spatial influences, noting that some phenomena, while seemingly spatial in nature, may have substantive non-spatial influences.

Keywords: spatial categorization, non-spatial categorization, implicit processing, social cognition.

1 Introduction

In the world around us, spatial and non-spatial information is inextricably linked. This point can be illustrated by imagining a tour of a university campus. On your tour, you may note an interesting campus building. In taking note of it, it becomes a landmark to you. What information do you process about this landmark? One aspect is its location, but this is surely not all you remember about it. Most of the features you remember, including its identity, are not inherently spatial. These non-spatial features vary in how "connected" they are to the landmark. Some are relatively fixed in relation to the building, such as its color (yellow), building material (brick), shape (L-shaped) and/or architectural style (Classical Revival). You may also note more fluid features of the building, such as its function (Philosophy Department) or decorations (neon pink flyers announcing an upcoming lecture). Finally, information situationally and transiently associated with the building, such as the race and/or gender of students seen walking out of the building, may capture your attention. Although we experience and remember both spatial and non-spatial information, little research has explicitly

M. Egenhofer et al. (Eds.): COSIT 2011, LNCS 6899, pp. 231–244, 2011.

examined their interaction in memory and problem solving. The present paper uses non-spatial information situationally and transiently associated with locations as a starting point in exploring this interaction.

In the present paper we build a case that understanding spatial cognition involves understanding spatial and non-spatial associations. We focus specifically on social information associated with locations. To meet this goal, we first outline cognitive parallels between processing spatial and social information. Next, we discuss methodological adaptations that cross between spatial and social cognition, potentially enhancing the toolbox of both sub-disciplines. With an understanding of the methodologies, we review a number of studies applying these methodologies to explore spatial and social information interactions. Finally, based on these studies' results, we argue that these associations may provide viable explanations for seemingly spatial phenomena. As such, a full account of spatial cognition must consider non-spatial associations.

2 Parallels in Cognitive Processing of Spatial and Social Information

The complexity and multi-faceted nature of spatial and social information make them cognitively interesting in their own right. People categorize both types of information in an attempt to make them cognitively manageable. Information categorization can also introduce costs; it can lead to biases and distortions in memory and the way the information is used.

Some of the complexity of spatial information comes from its hierarchical nature [1-3]. Spatial features, such as those found on your hypothetical campus tour, conform to geometric definitions of point, line, and plane. The campus itself is a plane, the roads and walking paths running through it are lines, and the buildings are points. The conceptualization of locations by their geometrical assignment helps define the environment's hierarchical nature. Spatial categorization takes advantage of this hierarchy. People use line-based features to sub-divide an overall space. Research has made apparent that people use line-based spatial features such as mountain ranges, roads [4], and artificial boundaries [5] and perhaps plane-based locations [6] to group and organize point-based locations [7, 8]. However, organizing spatial information is further complicated by its nested structure. The same information can be geometrically classified at different levels, depending on the specific scale, level of analysis, or zoom [9]. For example, the campus would be considered a point when thinking about the larger city in which it is located, but as a plane when trying to find a particular building on campus. Research suggests, however, that for a given scale and boundary availability, people structure their cognitive maps using these categorical grouping processes and they do so spontaneously [8].

The categorization process can lead to spatial distortions. In Stevens and Coupe's [6] now classic study, they illustrated how boundaries (e.g., state borders) promote categorical reasoning. Specifically, judgments about the relative location of two cities in different U.S. states relied on knowledge of those states' relative locations. More generally, people perceive locations sharing superordinate membership as more similar to one another and more distinct from locations not sharing this membership [5, 8, 10, 11]. Perceptions of within-category similarity induce spatial distortions in memory. Locations within a category are remembered as closer together than equally distant locations residing in different categories [e.g., 12, 13-15].

People similarly categorize social targets (people), as seen in the in-group bias [16, 17] and stereotyping [e.g., 18, 19, 20] literatures. The *in-group bias* suggests preferential treatment for individuals sharing some social identity [e.g., women, Asians; 16, 17]. People use different, relevant cues to categorize social information, including appearance (e.g. skin color) and/or behavior (e.g. aggression). As with spatial information, social categorization also leads to category-based errors. Such errors include failure to differentiate individuals within a social category, notably an out-group category [e.g., 18, 21], and differential similarity judgments within versus across social groups [e.g., 22, 23, 24]. People more often confuse individuals in the same racial category than they do individuals from different categories.

Social and spatial information are frequently linked in real-world experiences. It is not uncommon for individuals of different racial or ethnic groups to reside in the same neighborhood. Taking Boston, Massachusetts as an example, one expects to find a greater preponderance of Asian individuals in the China Town area, more Italian-Americans living in the North End, and more African-Americans in Dorchester. Indeed, neighborhood names frequently become associated with the dominant racial or ethnic group living there. If we organize our memory of the city using spatial categories and our memory of the people using social categories, how do these different category types interact?

Another cognitive connection between spatial and social information is evident in how physical space is harnessed to mentally represent abstract concepts. Two such connections can be seen in spatial representations of affective valence [25] and time [26]. Several studies have found similarities between thinking about space and thinking about time and in the language used within these two domains [27]. Like time, social information is generally abstract. Ties between social variables and physical space have cultural and ideological ties. Cultures around the world manipulate space at both smaller and larger scales, from house layouts to city planning, to convey social and ideological relationships [e.g., 28, 29-31]. For instance, residential patterns in ancient Mayan cities were arranged in relation to cardinal directions and topography, conveying a cultural map that represents social status. sElite and royal buildings were located northward—culturally associated with the sun's zenith and the celestial realm—and at higher elevations so as to be closer to their ancestors [28, 32]. This has carried over more subtlely in today's society with placement of politically important locations at higher elevations. For example, Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. is modeled after the most important Roman temple, dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus on Capitoline Hill, the highest hill in Rome [33].

Abstract indicators of social status (e.g., power, wealth, influence, intellect) have been related to physical space. We link the more intangible concepts with varying levels of height through metaphors. Take phrases such as "she was climbing the ladder of success" or "Alice was taught to dress *above* her station" [34] or "he thought unskilled labor *beneath* him" [35] as examples. Through these metaphors, social status becomes associated with vertical space. "Up," is used to represent the abstract concepts of power, wealth, and intellect, whereas "down" is comparatively inferior. The additional potential exists to transfer these spatial associations of social status to other social variables (e.g., race or gender), in line with culturally developed stereotypes [31, 36].

Whether the use of spatial information to represent abstract concepts is intentional or incidental is not known. They could be either or both. We do know that aspects of both spatial and social information appear to be, at least partially, processed implicitly. We explore further possible implicit associations between social and spatial information in studies described in this paper.

In sum, when considered both separately and in combination, spatial and social information engage similar cognitive processes. Both types of information, due to their complexity, are organized and used categorically. Further, because of its more concrete nature, people sometimes recruit the representational power of spatial information for understanding more abstract information, including social relations. For the most part, however, spatial and social information processing has been experimentally explored separately. The remainder of this paper describes the methodological, conceptual, and empirical progress our lab has made explicitly exploring the interaction of spatial and social information.

3 Cross-Application of Methodology

Methodology often develops within a discipline to address fundamental questions of interest. Increasingly, however, interdisciplinary approaches to research questions have shown success, in part, because they bring to bear different methodological approaches. The same can be applied to sub-disciplines of a field. As discussed above, similarities exist in how people process spatial and social information. To capitalize on these similarities and maximize our explorations of how spatial and social information might interact, we have adapted some paradigms more traditionally used in social psychological research in our studies of spatial phenomena. These include the "Who-Said-What" task (a Category Confusion task) and the Implicit Associations Task (IAT). These paradigms, however, can be seen more generally as assessing associations to categories. This broader definition makes them directly applicable to spatial information.

3.1 Category Confusion Tasks

The "Who-Said-What" task is a speaker-statement matching task developed by S. E. Taylor et al. [24]. Participants watch a simulated conversation between individuals representing different social categories (e.g., 3 Black and 3 White males). In other words, the conversation individuals differ on one social variable (e.g., race), but other social variables are held constant (e.g., gender). After watching the conversation, participants complete a surprise statement-matching task. In the task, they see a conversation statement and picture of one of the conversation participants and decide whether the pictured individual said the statement. Typical findings show that participants more likely wrongly attribute a statement to someone in the same racial category than to someone from different racial categories. This task can be generally conceived of as a category confusion paradigm and, consequently, is applicable to other domains, such as spatial information, where categorization appears to occur readily.

We call our adapted paradigm the “Who-Works-Where” task. Participants first learn a spatial environment and information associated with each location. To date, we have primarily used this task with learning via a map [15, 37] although future work will examine learning through virtual (VR) navigation. The associated information includes racial information about people associated with the locations. After learning, participants see a location name and a person name or picture and decide whether they associated the person and the location during learning. Because the task generally assesses category use, we adapted it to examine categorical social and spatial associations.

3.2 Implicit Association Task (IAT)

The IAT evaluates the relative effort required in making congruent versus incongruent associations by measuring speeded responses during a category discrimination task. Traditionally, this task has been used in experimental social and personality psychology to identify associations between, for example, gender target categories (male/female) and job-type attribute categories (engineer vs. teacher). If the target categories (male/female) are differentially associated with the attribute categories (engineer/teacher), participants will categorize examples from all four categories faster and more accurately when the associated target and attribute concepts are congruent (e.g., male/engineer) versus incongruent (e.g., female/engineer). Thus, the IAT is thought to measure automatic and implicitly activated subconscious judgments, while minimizing the use of explicit strategies [38, 39]. Like the category confusion tasks, the IAT can be modified to other categorizeable information types. Unlike the category confusion tasks, the IAT measures extant, rather than experimentally learned associations.

We adapted the IAT to measure the implicit association between either different aspects of spatial information (cardinal direction and topography) or between social (powerful/average individuals) and location-based information, such as topography (e.g., mountainous/level terrain) [40]. As with classic uses of the IAT, participants progress from a single to a multiple categorization task. They first see instances of one category (e.g., topography, represented by picture of mountains or flat plains) and button-press to indicate their categorization (mountainous or level). As the task progresses, the two categories of interest are intermixed in successive trials. Further, their associations to response buttons are either congruent with one another or incongruent. The implicit association is interpreted from the difference in response time and accuracy between congruent and incongruent category assignments.

3.3 Distance Estimation as a Similarity Assessment Task

The two tasks discussed thus far take traditional social cognition methods and apply them to a spatial context. A traditional spatial cognition task, distance estimation, can also be applied to explorations of spatial-social connections. Distance estimation tasks are methodologically simple. Participants simply estimate the distance between two locations. The task can specify a particular type of spatial distance, for example Euclidean (crow-fly) or route distance [41]. The task can be implemented by having participants give numeric responses on a particular scale (e.g., miles) or scaled responses based on a spatial reference (e.g., mark the distance on a line representing the farther distance between locations within an environment).

The application of distance estimation tasks to spatial-social connections comes from a more general interpretation of the task. Specifically, distance estimation can be viewed as a similarity assessment task [13]. Just as spatial relations are used metaphorically to represent abstract ideas, distance can be conceptualized in both concrete and abstract ways. The fact that people talk about “bridging the ideological gap” or “coming closer to agreement” when discussing ideas illustrates a metaphorical use of distance. “Closer”, in this sense, means more similar.

We have employed distance estimation in the more traditional spatial cognition approach, but include social variables in analyzing influences on these estimates. This approach has been effective in exploring the spatial-social information interaction.

4 Interaction of Spatial and Social Information

The import in understanding how spatial and social information interact lies in understanding spatial memory in the real world. Real-world environments generally include both spatial and social information. Walking around your own neighborhood you see the blue house on the corner and the Asian woman tending a garden in the yard or you see the old man sitting at the corner bus-stop. In our experiences, social and spatial information interact. This co-occurrence would suggest that they interact cognitively as well. However, these associations can also be quite transient. The Asian woman in the blue house may move out and an African-American man may move in. The old man presumably leaves the bus-stop when the bus arrives. In other words, these types of associations may be meaningful in the moment, but may not last.

Some earlier studies hint that social and spatial information can interact, but not until recently did researchers more systematically investigate this interaction. Earlier studies examined how one’s own racial membership and accompanying experiences influenced the cognitive map of his/her own neighborhood [42, 43]. On-going research in our lab is more systematically examining factors affecting spatial and social information interactions in memory [15, 37, 44]. Our approach is multi-pronged and employs traditional methodology from both spatial and social cognition. The application of the methodology, however, is not traditional and crosses between spatial and social cognition. Our overall approach can be said to combine explicit and implicit assessments. The more explicit approach involves participants learning a novel map that provides information about, but no direct experience with, unfamiliar individuals with different social characteristics. Memory and distance estimation tasks then assess effects of spatial and social information. The implicit approach involves the IAT. Results of multiple studies strongly suggest that even more transient social associations impact spatial cognition of real-world settings in ways important to understand.

4.1 Cross-Over Spatial and Social Influences

Think again about touring a college campus. You most likely noted the locations of some buildings. Further, if you encountered people on this tour, you automatically processed their social identities, such as race and gender [24, 45]. Did this information become cognitively integrated? We know that non-spatial characteristics of an environment are perceived and incorporated into one's cognitive map along with spatial features [46, 47]. When this information has categorical structure, people cluster locations based on their function [10, 48], their physical similarity [49] and the semantic category into which they fall [50]. But, as discussed previously, social information is usually more transiently associated with spatial information than is function or physical similarity. The people associated with a building change more frequently than does the building's function or appearance. In previous and on-going research, we have explored the extent to which social information associated with locations is cognitively integrated.

These investigations have used a common methodological approach. Participants study a map of small town business locations. The map is divided into neighborhoods (spatial categories). During study participants focus on one location at a time, learning its location and other associated information, including some type of social information about each business proprietor (e.g., race, political affiliation). After studying, participants complete distance estimation and category confusion (Who-Works-Where) tasks. Different instantiations of this methodology focused on making either the spatial or the social category more salient. We predicted that category salience, because it directs attention, would play a role in the interaction between spatial and social information [51].

We manipulated salience in a number of ways, including presentation order, presentation format, the nature of the category, and the correlation of the two categories. Presentation order either grouped locations by neighborhood (spatial category) or by social category. The spatial presentation order first went through all locations in a neighborhood before moving on to the next neighborhood. The social presentation order first presented all locations associated with one social category before going on to the next. Presentation format differences depended on the category. To make the neighborhoods more salient, one study labeled the neighborhoods. To highlight the social categories more, the associated information either used labels (less salient) or pictures (more salient, particularly for race). Another way of manipulating the social category involved instantiating different social categories. Most studies used the salient social category of race, but we also examined a less-salient category—political affiliation. The relationship between the categories could be highlighted through their correlation, functionally leading to either socially segregated or socially integrated neighborhoods. Segregated neighborhoods had the majority of locations (8 of 12) associated with one social category. Integrated neighborhoods had an equal number of associations to each social category.

This line of work has made clear the fact that spatial and social information interacts and that category salience changes this interaction. Maddox et al. [15] found consistent interactions between racial and spatial categories with distance estimates. Participants estimated locations from different neighborhoods that shared an association to the same race as closer together than those that had different race associations. For this spatial task, the interaction did not appear for locations within a neighborhood, suggesting a stronger role of spatial category on the more spatial task. Looking across multiple studies revealed the effects of category salience [52]. The correlation between categories highlighted their relationship. Participants showed a sensitivity to this correlation, as suggested by a more pronounced effect of social category on distance estimates with segregated neighborhoods [15]. Further, whether the presentation order focused on the spatial or the social category had an effect, for both the distance estimation and category confusion tasks. Both tasks showed interactions between spatial category, social category, and presentation order in the direction predicted by how presentation order directs attentional focus. Salience based on the category nature also had an effect; the less-salient category (political affiliation) did not interact with the spatial category, even though it has cultural associations to spatial areas (e.g., maps of red and blue states during U.S. presidential elections). Finally, we manipulated the salience of race by either relating racial information through labels (e.g., *African American, Asian*) or through pictures. Results showed that the interaction between social and spatial categories on distance estimates interacted with how the racial information was conveyed. Pictures appeared to strengthen the effect of the racial category compared to labels alone.

Taken together, the results of this line of work show strongly that people incorporate social information available in an environment into their spatial representation. Further, the more salient the social category is during learning the more it interacts. In these studies, unlike those discussed next, participants explicitly studied social along with spatial information. The next line of work we discuss examines implicit social-spatial associations that participants already have developed.

4.2 Implicit Spatial-Spatial Associations: An Interesting Phenomenon

Our recent investigations of implicit associations between social and spatial information came about in incremental and programmatic studies attempting to explain an interesting phenomenon, that of a southern bias in route selection [53]. The research progression is integral to our overall exploration of social and spatial information interactions and, therefore, is worthy of explanation. As an overview, the progression moved from identifying a particularly interesting spatial phenomenon to exploring spatial explanations for the phenomenon to exploring alternative and clearly related social and spatial interactions.

In the work that identified the southern bias, participants selected the “best” of two equidistant routes. The route choices either went generally eastward or westward, connecting landmarks that lay north-south of one another, or generally northward or southward, connecting landmarks east-west of one another. With east-west route dilemmas, route choice reflected the equidistant nature of the options with participants selecting the eastward route approximately half of the time. The north-south route dilemmas showed our interesting phenomenon. For these trials, route selection did not reflect the equivalent route distance. Instead, participants showed a consistent bias for south-going routes. This bias was evident in route selection within fictitious small towns and in estimates of travel times for routes traversing the U.S., thus showing generalization across scale. Current work in our lab is exploring whether this bias results from explicit strategy use or an implicit association.

People may show this southern bias in route selection because of an association between north and uphill. Some evidence of this association comes from a follow-up rating task with the same routes. Participants rated northern, compared to southern, routes as more scenic and requiring more calories to traverse, both qualities associated with higher elevation. East and west routes did not show differences in scenery or calorie ratings.

More direct evidence of an association between north and uphill comes from recent work using the modified IAT [44]. In this case, the IAT compared implicit associations between high and low elevation (mountainous versus level terrain) and cardinal directions (north and south). For the IAT, the congruent pairing had north and mountains sharing one response button and south and level sharing the other. The incongruent mapping required south and mountains to share one response button and north and level to share the other. Participants completed blocks of both mappings (congruent and incongruent) in counterbalanced order. Thus for these categories, response latencies for image categorizations should reflect the strength of implicit target (north/south) and attribute (mountains/level terrain) associations [38, 39]. We ran two experiments differing only in their representations of cardinal directions, either maps with stars to the north or south or compass roses showing “N” or “S” to designate direction. Results revealed faster categorization response latencies for congruent north/mountain pairings relative to incongruent south/mountain pairings ($p < .05$). Our findings provide direct evidence for an automatic association between north and higher elevations [54]. This association can then be implicated in spatial heuristics that bias spatial decision making performance.

The source of this association is unclear, however. Different possible sources make sense, including mapping conventions (e.g., north as up) and topography. We are currently examining effects of local topography in a cross-cultural and cross-topographical study. The participants in the original studies showing the south-route bias resided in the north-eastern U.S. where topography reinforces the idea that north is uphill. In this U.S. region, people travel north to hike or ski in the mountains. An international, collaborative follow-up, however, suggest that a topographical association is not contributing to the southern bias. Collaboration with other U.S. and European labs [55] suggest that local topography, e.g., mountains to the north, do not explain the phenomenon. Labs with mountains prominent in directions other than north (e.g., Sophia, Bulgaria) also find a southern route preference.

4.2 Implicit Social-Spatial Associations: Explaining the Interesting Phenomenon

Our success in using the IAT to explore associations between different aspects of spatial information suggested to us that the IAT could also be used to explore associations between spatial and social information, such as those seen in our map-learning studies [15, 37, 52]

To investigate social-spatial associations, we again employed the IAT [56]. Our adaptations were similar to those exploring the association between topography and cardinal directions. In this case, we examined associations between social variables (e.g., social power, gender) and topography (mountainous vs. level terrain).

As discussed earlier, social power has some association to higher elevations. While some cultures implement this association directly, such as in city layouts [28, 31], the obviousness of the association in Western cultures is lessened. To explore this association in U.S. participants, we selected powerful people from Time Magazine's list of powerful people, which includes international leaders and executives. Our participants most likely did not explicitly identify the powerful people, because they involved relatively unfamiliar individuals such as leaders of foreign nations or businesses [although, see 57]. Thus, from the participant's perspective, the operationalization of social power largely involved attire. The stimuli consisted of images of men and women, matched for age and ethnicity, dressed in either suits (powerful) or relatively casual clothing (average). We operationalized spatial topography using images of mountains (high elevation) and level plains (low elevation), matched for climate and amount of visible sky. Our findings provide evidence that participants implicitly associate powerful individuals and high elevation, and, as a corollary, average individuals and level elevation [31]. Data supporting this assertion involved faster response times for congruent (high/powerful, low/average) response mappings relative to incongruent (high/ average, low/powerful) response mappings. Further, the strength of this effect could be seen in the lack of either a main or interactive effect of block order (i.e., congruent versus incongruent first, p's $> .5$). These results support the notion that we ground abstract conceptions of social status in physical space and this association implicitly affects other judgments. Further, this suggests that our underlying social and ideological connotations regarding elevation might impact our perception of space in general, which carries important implications for predicting human behavior and theories of spatial and social cognition.

We also examined whether this association carries over to stereotype-based, more indirect relationships. In many western cultures, men are perceived as having higher social status than women. Evidence of this can be seen in higher compensation [58] and promotion [59] rates for men, holding qualification and performance measures constant. Another source of this association could be height; people may associate people's height with topographic elevation. Men, on average, are taller than women. Using an IAT that pitted categorization by gender against categorization by topography, results did not show a strong implicit association. Either the relationship between gender and topographic elevation does not exist or it may be too indirect to be captured by the IAT. If the association to gender is mediated through social status, it may not be evident with the IAT, although mediated semantic relationships do show implicit effects, in the form of priming [60]. Other cognitive processes engaged by the IAT, including executive functions [61], may make it insensitive to mediated associations.

To sum up, our recent studies show that the IAT can be used to explore implicit associations between spatial and social information, particularly those with a more direct connection. Important to the broader study of spatial memory and reasoning, the evidence of social-spatial associations strongly suggests they influence spatial cognition and should be considered when investigating real-world spatial behavior.

5 Conclusions: Why Spatial and Social Interactions Matter

Imagine you have just finished the college campus tour you began earlier in this paper. Perhaps on your tour, you passed the building housing the Asian Languages and Literatures Department. Further along the tour you noted the interesting Greek Revival architecture of the Asian Student Affinity House. Finally, as the tour neared its end, you saw a group of Asian students engaged in an animated conversation outside the Student Union. While there is nothing Asian integral to these particular locations, you have now made Asian associations to all of them. How do these associations come to bear when you later think about this campus, perhaps deciding whether you will attend this university or what the best route is to where you parked your car? Our work suggests that these associations spatial information retrieved from memory and decisions based on this information.

We have outlined two different lines of current research in our lab exploring how social associations to locations affect spatial cognition. The two lines originally had quite different goals. One line explicitly set out to examine the interaction of social and spatial category effects. The second came out of a programmatic approach to explain an interesting route-selection phenomenon. The two research lines approach the question of social-spatial information interaction using different methodologies and assumptions (e.g., intentional versus incidental learning). With these differences in mind, the strong evidence of social and spatial information interactions stands out to an even greater extent. People categorize both spatial and social information and when in the same overall context (e.g., learning a map) the two category types interact. They interact on tasks that focus specifically on spatial aspects of the map (distance estimation) and on associations about map locations. The interactions can be seen when information is intentionally studied. It is apparent in extant associations that are implicitly activated. The range of contexts in which they appear means far-reaching implications for spatial problem solving and decision making. These implications are further strengthened by the fact that the particular type of social and spatial associations we have examined are generally transient in nature and experience.

An important next step in this work is developing theoretical accounts for spatial and non-spatial information interactions. Given the nascency of research directly exploring such interactions, such a theoretical account at this time is not possible. The range of non-spatial associations is both vast and varied. At a basic level, landmarks have both an identity and a location. The identity is non-spatial. Working memory handles identity and location differently [62]. This basic spatial/non-spatial association is not completely understood. We know salience affects these associations, but have not completely outlined what impacts salience. Thus, this line of work, leading to theoretical accounts, is ripe for research and discussion.

The present paper also provides support for having methodology cross conceptual and disciplinary boundaries. We outline here the use of traditionally social cognition tasks that, in our research, revealed interesting spatial cognition findings. We also outline using traditionally spatial cognition tasks with which we have found interesting social-spatial information interactions. Crossing methodologies in this way and using multiple methodologies means variety in methodological assumptions and strength in convergent findings based on them. We strongly suggest that broadening our methodological toolboxes in this way should allow for new research insights.

Although it may sound trite, we cannot escape the fact that spatial behavior is complex. The body of research exploring spatial behavior supports this contention, as does our work, reviewed in this paper. While we would not claim to have brought parsimony to explanations of spatial cognition, our findings make clear that social and spatial information interact. This fact should be considered in broad accounts of spatial behavior.

Acknowledgments. We thank the following students for their data collection assistance: Matt DiGirolamo and Michael Fitzgerald. Funding by the NRSDEC U.S. Army Natick Soldier Research, Development, & Engineering Center, Cognitive Science division, is appreciated.

References

1. Bilge, A.R., Taylor, H.A.: Where is "here" in nested environments? Spatial updating from different sources. Spat. Cog. Comp. 10(2-3), 157–183 (2010)
2. Wang, R.F., Brockmole, J.R.: Human navigation in nested environments. J. Exp. Psychol. Learn 29, 398–404 (2003)
3. Wang, R.F., Brockmole, J.R.: Simultaneous spatial updating in nested environments. Psychon. B Rev. 10, 981–986 (2003)
4. McNamara, T.P., Ratcliff, R., McKoon, G.: The mental representation of knowledge acquired from maps. J. Exp. Psychol. Learn 10, 723–732 (1984)
5. McNamara, T.P.: Mental representation of spatial relations. Cog. Psychol. 18, 87–121 (1986)
6. Stevens, A., Coupe, P.: Distortions in judged spatial relations. Cog. Psychol. 10, 422–437 (1978)
7. Friedman, A., Montello, D.R.: Global-scale location and distance estimates: Common representations and strategies in absolute and relative judgments. J. Exp. Psychol. Learn 32(3), 333–346 (2006)
8. McNamara, T.P., Hardy, J.K., Hirtle, S.C.: Subjective hierarchies in spatial memory. J. Exp. Psychol. Learn. 15, 211–227 (1989)
9. Lloyd, R.: Spatial cognition: Geographic environments. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell (1997)
10. Hirtle, S.C., Jonides, J.: Evidence of hierarchies in cognitive maps. Mem. Cognition 13(3), 208–217 (1985)
11. Maki, R.H.: Why do categorization effects occur in comparative judgment tasks? Mem. Cognition 10(3), 252–264 (1982)
12. Huttenlocher, J., Hedges, L.V., Duncan, S.: Categories and particulars: Prototype effects in estimating spatial location. Psychol. Rev. 98(3), 352–376 (1991)
13. Montello, D.R., Fabrikant, S.I., Ruocco, M., Middleton, R.S.: Testing the first law of cognitive geography on point-display spatializations. In: Kuhn, W., Worboys, M.F., Timpf, S. (eds.) COSIT 2003. LNCS, vol. 2825, pp. 316–331. Springer, Heidelberg (2003)
14. Carbon, C., Leder, H.: The Wall inside the rain: Overestimation of distance crossing the former Iron Curtain. Psychon. B Rev. 12(4), 746–750 (2005)
15. Maddox, K.B., et al.: Social influences on spatial memory. Mem. Cognition 36(3), 479–494 (2008)
16. Brewer, M.B.: Ingroup bias in the minimal intergroup situations: A cognitive motivational analysis. Psychol. Bull. 86, 307–324 (1979)
17. Tajfel, H.: Experiments in intergroup discrimination. Sci. Am. 223, 96–102 (1970)

18. Hamilton, D.L.: Stereotyping and intergroup behavior: Some thoughts on the cognitive approach. In: Hamilton, D.L. (ed.) Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior, pp. 333–354. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale (1981)
19. Hamilton, D.L., Sherman, J.W.: Stereotypes. In: Wyer, R.S., Srull, T.K. (eds.) Handbook of social cognition, pp. 1–68. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Hillsdale (1994)
20. Sigall, H., Page, R.: Current stereotypes: A little fading, a little faking. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 18(2), 247–255 (1971)
21. Taylor, S.E.: A categorization approach to stereotyping. In: Hamilton, D.L. (ed.) Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior, pp. 83–114. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale (1981)
22. Klauer, K.C., Wegener, I.: Unraveling social categorization in the "Who said what?" paradigm. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 75(5), 1155–1178 (1998)
23. Maddox, K.B., Gray, S.A.: Cognitive representations of Black Americans: Reexploring the role of skin tone. Pers. Soc. Psychol. B 28(2), 250–259 (2002)
24. Taylor, S.E., et al.: Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotying. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 36(7), 778–793 (1978)
25. Brunyé, T.T., et al.: Bad news travels west: Handedness and map granularity influences on remembering locations of valenced events (2011) (submitted)
26. Boroditsky, L.: Metaphoric structuring: Understanding time through spatial metaphors. Cognition 75, 1–28 (2000)
27. Clark, H.H.: Space, time, semantics, and the child. In: Moore, T.E. (ed.) Cognitive development and the acquisition of language, pp. 28–64. Academic Press, New York (1973)
28. Ashmore, W.: Site-planning principles and concepts of directionality among the ancient Maya. Lat. Am. Antiq. 2(3), 199–226 (1991)
29. Bourdieu, P.: The Berber house, in Rules and meanings. In: Douglas, M. (ed.) Penguin, pp. 98–110. Harmondsworth, UK (1973)
30. Hodder, I.: The contextual analysis of symbolic meaning. In: Hodder, I. (ed.) The Archaelogy of Contextual Meanings, pp. 1–10. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987)
31. Keating, E.: Spatial conceptualization of social hierarchy in Pohnpei, Micronesia, in Spatial information theory: A theoretical basis for GIS. In: Kuhn, W., Frank, A.U. (eds.) COSIT 1995. LNCS, vol. 988, pp. 463–474. Springer, Heidelberg (1995)
32. Robin, C.: Peopling the past: New perspectives on the Ancient Maya. In: PNAS, vol. 98(1), pp. 18–21 (2001)
33. Weatherford, J.: Tribes on the hill: The U.S. Congress rituals and realities. Bergin & Garvey, Westport (1985)
34. Taft, J.: Mental hygiene problems of normal adolescence. Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. SS 98, 61–67 (1921)
35. Stevenson, R.A.: The union and Billy Bell. Scribner's 29, 401–409 (1901)
36. Xiao, D., Liu, Y.: Study of Cultural Impacts on Location Judgments in Eastern China. In: Winter, S., Duckham, M., Kulik, L., Kuipers, B., et al. (eds.) COSIT 2007. LNCS, vol. 4736, pp. 20–31. Springer, Heidelberg (2007)
37. Wang, Q., et al.: Seeing the forest or the trees: Categorical effects in map memory based on spatial focus (2011) (submit)
38. Greenwald, A.G., Farnham, S.D.: Using the implicit association test to measure self-esteem and self-concept. J. Per. Soc. Psychol. 79(6), 1022–1038 (2000)
39. Greenwald, A.G., et al.: Understanding and using the implicit association test: III. Meta-analyses of predictive validity. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 97, 17–41 (2009)
40. Brunyé, T.T., et al.: High and mighty: Implicit associations between physical space and social status. in prep. (2011)

41. Taylor, H.A., Naylor, S.J., Chechile, N.A.: Goal-specific influences on the representation of spatial perspective. Mem. Cognition 27(2), 309–319 (1999)
42. Ladd, F.C.: Black youths view their environment: Neighborhood maps. Environ. Behav. 2(1), 74–99 (1970)
43. Orleans, P.: Differential cognition of urban residents. In: Orleans, P. (ed.) Science, Engineering and the City, Publication 1498, National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC (1967)
44. Gagnon, S.A., Brunyé, T.T., Taylor, H.A.: To the north, Alice! Implicit associations between spatial topography and cardinal direction. In: 23rd Annual Convention of the Association for Psychological Science, Washington, DC (2011)
45. Ito, T.A., Urland, G.R.: Race and gender on the brain: Electrophysiological measures of attention to race and gender of multiply categorizable individuals. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 85, 616–626 (2003)
46. McNamara, T.P., Halpin, J.A., Hardy, J.K.: The representation and integration in memory of spatial and nonspatial information. Mem. Cognition 20, 519–532 (1992)
47. McNamara, T.P., LeSueur, L.L.: Mental representations of spatial and nonspatial relations. Q J. Exp. Psychol. 41A(2), 215–233 (1989)
48. Merrill, A.A., Baird, J.C.: Semantic and spatial factors in environmental memory. Mem. Cognition 15(2), 101–108 (1987)
49. Hirtle, S.C., Kallman, H.J.: Memory for the locations of pictures: Evidence for hierarchical clustering. Am. J. Psychol. 101(2), 159–170 (1988)
50. Hirtle, S.C., Mascolo, M.F.: Effect of semantic clustering on the memory of spatial locations. J. Exp. Psychol. Learn 12(2), 182–189 (1986)
51. Blanz, M.: Accessibility and fit as determinants of the salience of social categorizations. Eur. J. Soc. Psychol. 29(1), 43–74 (1999)
52. Wang, Q., et al.: Social categorizations of space: Explorations of category salience (2011) (in prep.)
53. Brunyé, T.T., et al.: North is up(hill): Route planning heuristics in real-world environments. Mem. Cognition 38(6), 700–712 (2010)
54. Gattis, M.: Spatial schemas and abstract thought, vol. 362. MIT Press, Cambridge (2003)
55. Brunyé, T.T., et al.: Spatial biases in topographically diverse environments: International replication of a southern route preference (2011) (in prep.)
56. Greenwald, A.G., Banaji, M.R.: Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. Psychol. Rev. 102(1), 4–27 (1995)
57. Rule, N.O., Ambady, N.: The face of success: Inferences from chief executive officers' appearnace predict company profits. Psychol. Sci. 19, 109–111 (2008)
58. DesRoches, C.M., et al.: Activities, productivity, and compensation of men and women in the life sciences. Acad. Med. 85(4), 631–639 (2010)
59. Blau, F.D., DeVaro, J.: New evidence on gender difference in promotion rates: An empirical analysis of a sample of new hires. National Bureau of Economic Research (2006)
60. McNamara, T.P.: Depth of spreading activation revisited: Semantic mediated priming occurs in lexical decisions. J. Mem. Lang. 27(5), 545–559 (1988)
61. Mierke, J., Klauer, K.C.: Implicit association measurements with the IAT: Evidence for effects of executive control processes. Exp. Psychol. 48(2), 107–122 (2001)
62. Thomas, A.K., Bonura, B.M., Taylor, H.A.: Age differences in remembering "what" and "where": A comparison of spatial working memory and metacognition in older and younger adults (2011) (in prep.)