

THE PROXEMICS LEXICON: A FIRST APPROXIMATION

T. Matthew Ciolek*

ABSTRACT: A lexicon of terms used in research and theory of human spatial and territorial behavior is presented. The need for greater consistency and refinement in the terminology of these fields, in light of growing research attention, is discussed.

During the last 25 years there has been a vigorous growth of studies concerned with man-environment Relations. Several hundreds of investigations have been carried out within the framework of human ethology, social and environmental psychology, sociology of face-to-face interactions, and human geography as well as urban planning and environmental design research traditions. The diversity of approaches and perspectives has two important implications. First, it generates the strength and vitality of both *theory* and *methodology* of the man-environment Studies. This strength and vitality is the outcome of cross-fertilization of ideas and techniques. Second, the plurality of approaches carries with it a serious confusion and the lack of consistency at the level of concepts and *terminology*. Due to the proliferation of terms and notions

*The bulk of the work on this document has been initiated and carried out at the Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford University, while the author was on a Nuffield Foundation Traveling Fellowship, 1978-1979.

During that time, Roger Lamb and Peter Collett of Oxford University kindly provided their comments and suggestions on the manuscript. The remainder of the work was carried out in 1982 while I was a visiting professor in the congenial environment of the Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska.

My main indebtedness, however, is to my wife, Irena Goltz, without whose direct and indirect support and encouragement neither this nor other work would ever be originated, carried out, or completed. It is to her, therefore, that I direct my words of thanks and gratitude for the assistance in the work on this project.

Reprint requests may be addressed to Dr. Ciolek at 4 Boucaut Place, Curtin, Canberra, A.C.T. 2605, Australia.

pertaining to the human spatial and territorial behavior, architectural, and social psychology, human geography, hodology, and topophilia as well as micro-ecology of social encounters, even a simple comparison of terms, not to mention a comparison of the data becomes increasingly difficult and frustrating. Yet it is obvious that in order for a research discipline to earn the title of a science, it is necessary that its adherents come to some agreement about the terms which they are to employ.

It is the intention of this document to introduce some order and consistency in the terminology of studies in human spatial and territorial behavior. To this end it lists some 140 terms which have been found useful in descriptions and accounts of the ways people relate spatially themselves to themselves and to their immediate physical surroundings. The main part of the Lexicon is an attempt to form an internally coherent language of description of people's spatial and postural relationships they enter in face-to-face social encounters. It is in this part that concepts such as angle, spacing, formation, o-space, configuration, domain, and jurisdiction are used. In addition to these core concepts, there is also an additional, supplementary list of terms which although they find some currency in the field of man-environment Studies (e.g., terms such as E.T. Hall's notion of *intimate distance*, Speigel and Machotka's notion of *limbic space* and I. Altman's notion of *primary territory*), are not easy to integrate into a systematic and coherent lexicon of proxemic terminology. Certainly neither of the two sets of terms, which are presented here in a joint alphabetically arranged list, is complete or fully satisfactory. Both are in dire need of revision, augmentation, expansion, and refinement. However, an attempt at a generally satisfying and useful solution has to be made somewhere for the first time. It is hoped, therefore, that by publishing this first approximation of the Lexicon of Proxemics, a critique of the listed definitions will be provoked and that the suggestions for revision and improvement of this glossary of terms will be submitted. It is hoped that in this way the preparation of a more satisfactory and more useful tool for description and analysis of the human spatial behavior can be developed.

A-Space Region of space which remains outside normal unaided sensory processing by a given *participation unit* (Ciolek 1978b). See also *b-* and *c-space*.

Activity Sphere of action — individual or social. In outdoor pedestrian settings it may be useful to distinguish such activities as: (a) waiting and watching; (b) gathering information (e.g., reading a

newspaper, studying a noticeboard, looking at shop windows); (c) manipulation (self-; other- and object-oriented); (d) conversation (talking, greeting and parting, asking the way etc.); (e) "other" activities — which, in Ciolek (1977) included drinking, eating, taking notes or taking photographs. Obviously for other settings and other populations this list of activities may be extensively modified.

Address The orientation of *body regions* relative to some point of reference. May be the same or different for any set of body regions.

Angle A characteristic of the spatial relationship between two individuals. It refers to the estimated or measured number of degrees between their *frontal body planes* (measures being taken at the pelvis or, alternatively, shoulder level). It has been found useful to distinguish the five basic estimated angles (Ciolek 1978a).

0 = body planes parallel or nearly parallel (e.g., H or N arrangements)

45 = body planes at sharp angle to each other (e.g., V arrangement)

90 = body planes are perpendicular to each other (e.g., L or T arrangements)

135 = body planes are forming an obtuse (open) angle (e.g. C arrangement)

180 = body planes merge with one another (e.g. I arrangement).

Approach Locomotory movement of people aimed at a rapid decrease in the *separation distance* between two or more individuals (e.g., during the earliest stages of a greeting sequence) and, as such, distinct from movements which only incidentally lead to such a decrease in the distance.

Arrangement The way a pair of individuals in a gathering or in a cluster are spatially related to each other. Arrangements are created by various combinations of *spacing*, *angle*, and *orientation* of each of the individuals as well as by their *vertical* and *lateral displacements*. Most typically, however, this term refers to people placed on the same level (that is with 0 *vertical displacement*). Various attempts at taxonomies of arrangements, often confused with *angles*, were suggested by earlier scholars. The most widely known attempts are those of Sommer (1959) and Hall (1963). A comprehensive taxonomy of arrangements has recently been developed in Ciolek (1978a).

Array Sequence of repeated *arrangements*. Arrays are the building blocks of *formations*. For example, a sequence of H zero ar-

rangements repeated two or three times creates a linear queue. A sequence of I arrangements may lead to the creation of a horizontal queue.

Assembly A number of people who came to a given *setting* in order to participate in a patterned fashion in a (usually) public event.

Axial space In Spiegel and Machotka's (1974) terminology space stretching from the boundary of *proximal space* to the limit of the area controlled by the extended arms and legs.

b-space Region of space which is accessible to sensory processing by people in a given participation unit but the one which lies outside space conceived as "*present space*" or "*here space*" (Ciolek 1978b). Events taking place in b-space by definition are seen or can be seen (or otherwise perceived) but are of little or no relevance to the organization of the behavior of people in face-to-face interaction. See also *a-space* and *c-space*.

Behavioral setting A behavioral setting (Barker & Wright, 1955) is a stable combination of behavior and physical environment which possess the following properties: (a) a recurrent behavior pattern; (b) a particular physical *environment*; and (c) a specific time-period; with (d) strong congruence between (a) and (b).

Body buffer zone Region of space surrounding an individual which is left free during the period of the person's transactions with this physical *environment* (Horowitz et al. 1964).

Body Plane—see Frontal and Median Body Plane.

Body regions Scheflen and Ashcraft (1976) write about four body regions which can be deployed simultaneously in various combinations of *addresses* (orientations). These are: (a) head; (b) torso; (c) pelvis; (d) legs and feet. It seems that one could extend this list by adding (e) gaze (i.e., direction towards which the narrow 1 degree cone of detailed vision is directed); (f) left and (g) right hand.

Boundary Transition line between a claimed or otherwise distinguished or discerned space and the "rest of the environment." Usually any physical feature of the *environment* which is sufficiently different from other features and is used as an indicator of where such a transition line is located.

Buffer space Area which functionally separates and, at the same time, links and facilitates smooth transition between *private* and *public space* (Sommer, 1969).

Buffer zone Region or belt of space which is left around *participation units* (stationary or mobile) and which is larger than the

extent of space which would be left unoccupied by other people on purely random basis. In its second meaning it may denote also a region of space which is left free and which surrounds a *cluster* of people in an *unfocused interaction*.

c-space Region of space which is enveloping a *participation unit* and which is being perceived by its members as relevant and important to the interaction or *activity* engaged in by such a unit. An equivalent of *present space*, it has no fixed area or shape (though it tends to be roughly circular) and is context- and user-specific. Part of it is usually carved out as a unit's *domain* (Ciolek, 1978b).

Centrifugal space Space in which interactions and individual *activities* tend to be located away from the space's geographic center and to be placed close to its boundaries, edges and entrances (e.g., a forest clearing). See also *centripetal*, *sociofugal*, and *sociopetal space*.

Centripetal space Space in which interactions and *activities* tend to be located in the center or middle of the area and away from its boundaries and edges (e.g. a beach). See also *centrifugal*, *sociofugal*, and *sociopetal spaces*.

Channel Following Schefflen and Ashcraft (1976) the space between the bodies of two or more people who are facing one another, who are positioned at some distance from each other and who are engaged in an overt exchanged or transaction.

Cluster Term for a spatial aggregation of a number of people both individuals and in multipersonal *participation units* who do not enter into *focused interaction* among themselves, but position themselves in an orderly fashion in relation to each other and constitute a single well delineated *assembly*. For example: a horizontal or bulk queue, or a *platoon* of mobile pedestrians. A spatial aggregation of people in focused interaction is called a *gathering*.

Coenetics Study of behavioral organization and management of face-to-face interactions. At present the three following branches of coenetics can be distinguished: (a) *Kinesics*; (b) linguistics (including paralinguistics) and (c) *proxemics*.

The term "coenetics (pronounced "se-NETT-ix") was introduced by Wescot (1966). It is derived from the Greek work "koinos" which may be glossed in English as "common" or "joint" and thus is highly suitable to denote the study of communication or of all that people (and animals) do jointly or interactively.

Coenesis Behavioral process through which occasions of interaction, both *focused* and *unfocused*, become *patterned and organized*.

Compensation Compensatory movement of one or more person aimed at reestablishing the form of spatial relationship which existed between them before some change in it or disturbance to it occurred. See also *equilibrium*.

Configuration Unit of spatial organization of people which is higher than a *formation*. For example, an *F-formation* together with its *regional associates* forms an F-configuration. Configurations, together with solitary individuals, constitute basic building blocks of *constellations*.

Constellation Way all individuals and *gatherings* and *clusters* within a *setting* are spatially organized in relation to each other and in relation to their physical *context*. Cocktail parties obviously have different constellations of people than do restaurants, churches, and railway stations.

Context Any set of factors human and physical in relation to which behavior or interaction studied at a given level can be seen to be meaningfully and non-randomly related. At a very gross level of patterns of spacing of people in an outdoor pedestrian *setting*, the four following factors could be distinguished: (a) people present in the setting; (b) animals (dogs, sparrows, horses, elephants — according to the geography and culture of a given setting); (c) physical features and artifacts: barriers, entrances, edges, demarkation lines, free standing objects, seats; and finally, (d) microclimatic factors such as rain, dust, smoke, sunshine. In the case of animate features of the setting in which a given set of people operates the notion of context refers both to agents (e.g., people) and their behaviors (e.g., laughter) which cause the others to maintain or modify the mode or content of their behavior. It may be convenient to set the upper spatial limit of an outdoor, unstructured context at the distance of 100 yards (Ciolek, 1980) in any direction from a *participation unit*.

Co-presence Ecological/social/cultural/psychological/cognitive state of being mutually and potentially available for an engagement in a *focused interaction*.

Core area Those areas with the *home range* which are most commonly inhabited, which are known best and which are used on a daily basis (Rapoport, 1977).

Crowd Large and usually densely packed number of people stationary or mobile in a given *setting*.

Crowding Experience of crowding involves the perception of inadequate control over the *environment* both human and physical and evokes the desire to augment physical or psychological space as a means of gaining control over the environment and avoiding actual or anticipated interference with one's activity line (Stokols, 1972).

Defensible space In Newman's (1972) elaboration of Jacob's (1961) discussion of factors contributing to the people's safety and security in contemporary cities it is a semi-private and semi-public space so designed (small scale, well delineated, with reduced flow of strangers as contrasted with residents, suggestive of territorial *jurisdiction* on the part of a clearly defined set of residents, under the residents' continuous surveillance) that it results in the two complementary processes: (a) the resident's proprietary attitude toward this space is encouraged and supported; (b) outsiders (i.e. nonresidents) entering and using this space feel conspicuous and under surveillance. It has been postulated that in such spaces the amount of delinquent, criminal, or deviant behavior tends to be dramatically reduced if not entirely eliminated.

Density Notion of physical density involves two separate components: (a) number of persons per given unit of space; and (b) amount of space per person. For instance, the density in two different settings might have been 30 square feet per person, but in one case there were 100 people in a theater's foyer and in the other three or four persons in a small waiting room (Stokols, 1972).

Dispersion Spacing or spatial distribution of people (or animals) in space. See *spacing*.

Distal space In Spiegel and Machotka's (1974) terminology—space from the limit of area controlled by extended arms and legs up to the outer limits of scanning available to the unaided ears and eyes. Comparable, roughly speaking, with the combined areas of *b-* and *c-* spaces.

District In Lynch's (1960) study of imageability of cities, districts are "the medium-to-large sections of the city, conceived as having two-dimensional extent, which the observer mentally enters 'inside of' and which are recognizable as having some common, identifying character." See also *path*, *edge*, *node*, and *landmark*.

Domain A subjective *territory*, a multiperson *personal space*. There are two main forms of domains: self- and other- allocated. These two different ways of looking at a unit's interaction space

may be called: territorial claim and territorial allowance respectively. The basic feature of both is that they should, by definition and users' consensus, stay free of other stationary people. Their extent and shape tends to be correlated with the characteristics of the users but is basically context specific. In terms of the size it seems to be equal, roughly speaking, to the overall combined area of *o*-, *p*-, and *r*-spaces.

Dynamic space The notion of dynamic or informal space (Hall, 1964) refers to the *spacing* and *orientation* of individuals which undergoes frequent, gradual, informal, spontaneous transformations during given encounter. It is usually space characteristics of which are not predetermined by the presence of *fixed* or *semifixed* features of the *environment*.

E-formations *Formations* in which people are organized in such a way that they occupy one or more *sectors* of space so that they may have good instrumental/visual/acoustic access to the remaining sectors. Soldiers in a firing squad, or a line of spectators or an assembly of people in a 19th century theater are a good example.

Edge In Lynch's (1960) study of imageability of cities edges refer to the linear elements not used or not considered as *paths* by observers (a motorist, a pedestrian). Such edges may be barriers, more or less penetrable, which close one region off another, or they may be seams or lines along which two regions are related and joined together. See also *districts*, *nodes*, and *landmarks*.

Environment Following McBride and Clancy's (1976) terminology — all of the components of the *surroundings* which are in any way attended to, and thus incorporated, in the individual's internal maps of the world, against which all sensory input is checked.

Equilibrium The "intimacy equilibrium" model of face-to-face interaction (Argyle & Dean, 1965) known also as the 'immediacy' model (Patterson, 1973) assumes that the interacting parties always strive at maintaining a certain overall "balance" in the way they deploy their behaviors (use distance, *orientation*, *address*, eye contact, etc.) in relation to each other's presence and *activity*. Thus, any change in the use of behavior type X is usually compensated by appropriate changes in the use of behavior type Y and vice versa.

F-formation These are sometimes know as Face or Facing formations. In line with Kendon's (1976, 1977; Ciolek & Kendon, 1980) terminology a spatial *formation* in which people have established and maintain the *o-space* to which everybody in the *gathering* has a direct, easy and equal access. Typically it means that in an F-formation people arrange themselves in a form of a circle, ellipse, or a

horseshoe so that they can have easy and preferential access to one another and at the same time exclude the outside world with their backs.

Field of co-presence An entire spatial extent which is directly or indirectly (e.g., use of shadows, reflections, echoes, vibrations accessible to unaided human sensory processing and which offers an adequately strong and rich sensory input. For all practical purposes in an unstructured, open space, during the daytime the radius of such a field seldom exceeds the limit of 100 yards (Ciolek, 1980). This limit is related to the ability of our sight to recognize the personal identity of another human being. The field of copresence is made of five zones corresponding to the five basic manners in Man's transactions with his *environment*. These are: use of sight; sight + hearing; sight + hearing + olfaction; sight + hearing + olfaction + touch mediated by the use of tools: finally all the previous modes of perception + direct (unmediated) touch. It appears that for reasons at present unknown the radius of each of the listed zones is only one third of the previous, larger zone (Ciolek, 1980). It should be noted that boundaries between zones which can be distinguished for theoretical purposes do not seem to exist clearly in everyday situations. Further, it should be noted that the distinguished zones of *copresence* should not be confused with degrees of copresence by which we would rather mean the subjective rating (scaling) of the degree to which a given person is present (assessment of the interaction potential).

Fixed space The notion of fixed space (Hall, 1964) refers to the size and shape of space determined by presence and placement of walls, partitions, screens, fences, hedges, and other permanent barriers to human movement and senses. This space, unlike the *dynamic* and *semifixed* ones, tends to remain unchanged irrespectively of a phase of a given encounter and irrespectively of the encounter's nature. If any changes occur they tend to be sporadic and related to a change in the user's lifestyle or a general change in the functional definition of a given *environment*.

Focused interaction Occasions on which people openly cooperate in one another's presence to sustain some joint form of *activity* (Goffman, 1963). Such occasions are exemplified by duels, conversations, interviews, musical performances, loading a cart, open-heart operations, and dancing.

Formation The way a *gathering* or a *cluster* of people is spatially in relation to itself.

Free bonding site According to Deutsch (1978)—an edge of the *o-space* which is usually approached by new members of a *F-formation*.

Frontal body plane An imaginary plane bisecting the human body into two halves: frontal and dorsal. Roughly speaking the plane which is parallel to the pelvis and shoulder blades. See also *Median Body Plane*.

Gathering Term referring to an assembly of people engaged in *focused interaction*. A conversational group in a seminar room, a group of card players, a mother and a child in arms constitute examples of various gatherings.

Gathering's orientation The way people in a *gathering* position the entire spatial unit in relation to some external point of reference. For instance, an L-shaped *F-formation* may orient its opening as in Deutsch's (1978) "free-bonding site," towards or away from a nearby shop window.

Group Term which when loosely used refers to a multiperson *participation unit*. More strictly, it refers to the way people organize themselves and function in terms of their social relationships and therefore should not be used in the context of people's behavioral and communicational relationships.

H-formations *Formations* of people, often formed by two opposing E-formations facing and joining together, in which the central space of a *gathering* or of a *cluster* is occupied by a person or object who (or which) is the focus of people's attention and a rationale for their assembling.

Home A structure or area in which a long-term emotional investment has been made by an individual or small *group* (Porteous, 1977).

Home range The usual limit of regular movements and activities which can be defined as a set of *settings* for individual's behavior and the *paths* linking them (Rapoport, 1977).

Informal space—see *Dynamic Space*.

Interaction distance This term has two meanings: (a) the distance which is typical of a given type of interpersonal transaction (e.g., conversation distance, farewell distance); (b) the distance observed at any stage of an interpersonal transaction, both *focused* and *unfocused*, which extends between two individuals.

Interaction mode Sommer (1965) suggested a distinction between people in the state of "Coaction" and of "Interaction" that is between people in *unfocused* and *focused interactions*. In his

studies of the use of space in public buildings he suggested a useful distinction between those persons in the interacting mode of copresence who were either (a) competing or (b) engaged in casual conversation or (c) cooperating in accomplishing some joint technical task.

Internal space In Speigel and Machotka's (1974) terminology—the space between the inner core of the body and the skin.

Interpersonal distance Shortest possible distance in hodological space between the body surfaces or other specified points on the bodies of two individuals.

Interpersonal space Extent of space between bodies of a given set of people. Often it is deliberately created and maintained as in the case of *o-space*.

Intimate distance In Hall's (1964) taxonomy of spatial zones of copresence a belt of space stretching from 0–18 inches from a given person. Within this zone the presence of the other person is unmistakable and at times may be overwhelmingly due to the greatly increased *sensory involvement*. There are two phases of this zone: the close zone 0–6 inches and the far zone 6–18 inches. See also *personal, social, and public distance*.

Jurisdiction Term introduced by Roos (1968) to denote the extent of space or *territory* which is “owned” or otherwise controlled for a limited time only and by some agreed (overt or tacit) rules.

Kinesics Study of interactional properties of the human body *movement and posture*. See Birdwhistell (1970).

Landmark In Lynch's (1960) study of imageability of cities landmarks are one of the several points of reference (the other being *paths, edges, districts, and nodes*). Unlike the other points of reference landmarks are not entered, they are external to the observer. They are “usually a rather simply defined physical object: building, sign, store, or mountain.”

Lateral displacement Degree to which two individuals are removed from the spatial position in which their *body planes* are parallel to each other and their body contours fully overlap. The phenomenon of lateral displacement can be seen in the difference between a *vis-a-vis arrangement* (H type) and the diagonal (N type) one.

Limbic space In Spiegel and Machotka's (1974) terminology it is the space placed outside the range of unaided human senses. An equivalent of *a-space*.

Location An exact spot where a *participation unit* is at the moment of our observation. This spot is usually defined as the spatial center of a *gathering* or as the spot between the feet of an individual in question. Less precisely: the area enclosed by an individual's *personal space* or by the *gathering's domain*.

M-formations When a multiperson *participation unit* navigates through the space it often adopts one of the *formations* which enable it to combine freedom of individual movement and direction with participants' relative interpersonal proximity; easy mutual verbal and eye contact as well as the unit's ability to maintain its spatial integrity in the presence of outsiders, passersby, and various physical obstacles. The M-formations are exemplified by "lines" of people walking abreast; "diamonds" in which four individuals form a square or rhomboid and move as a whole along the extension of the formation's diagonal; "wings" in which two or three people walk side-by-side with the fourth or fifth person walking at the line's end one step forward or one step behind the line; "steps" when people walk in a form of mobile chain of N-zero *arrangements*; "crescents" in which people establish a semicircle and move along the imaginary axis bisecting it; finally one may mention here an "Indian file" that is a formation in which people are organized in an *array* of H-zero arrangements and which moves forward as a unit.

Macrospace According to Porteous (1977) the macrospace refers to a cluster of regularly visited and used private areas in public settings, the maximum range of the persons or primary group's wanderings. See also *microspace* and *mesospace*.

Marker Any feature of the physical *environment* which is used by people for the purpose of distinguishing the space or object which is under their permanent or temporary control or for the purpose of defining their interactional status with respect to another person present in the *setting*. Goffman (1971) suggests the existence of four types of markers: "central" and "boundary" ones defining the focal point and the outer limit of the claimed territory (domain) respectively, "ear markers" tagged to the territory (domain) respectively, "ear markers" tagged to the territorial claim and defining the fact of ownership by a particular person and, finally, "relationship markers" indicating the nature and strength of interactional relationship between two or more people.

Median body plane An imaginary plane bisecting the human body into two halves: left and right. Roughly speaking it is the

plane which links the tip of the nose, crown of the head and all the vertebrae of a given person. See all *frontal body plane*.

Mesospace According to Porteous (1977) the mesospace refers to areas larger than encompassed by the *microspace*. Mesospace is usually semipermanent, used by an individual or *group* yet always on a private basis and is actively defended by it's occupants. It may refer to a space occupied by a small primary group (nest, house, yard) or a space occupied by a collective (neighborhood). In either case the mesospace operates at the home base for a given set of users. See also *macrospace*.

Microspace According to Porteous (1977) the minimum space necessary for the organism to exist free of psychological or physical pain. It corresponds to the area claimed by a body of an individual or bodies of a small group of people interacting with one another. The microspace can often extend beyond the immediate body zone, such as in the case of a person occupying an office or a park bench. It is movable space and always occupied. See also *mesospace* and *macrospace*.

Movement This term has a number of usages and it may refer to: (1) locomotory behavior of people: (a) moving towards or away from the person or *gathering* in question, (b) moving within the *gathering* or *cluster*, and (c) moving at some distance away from the reference person or cluster but in some systematic relationship to it; (2) nonlocomotory "drifting" or "oscillating" or *compensation* within the limits of a given *location*; and (3) kinesic behavior of a given set of people.

Neighborhood A home base at the collective level. At its simplest, one's neighborhood is the geographic space in which one feels at home. This space generally contains the individual's core home base, the house, though this element may be lacking (Porteous, 1977).

Node Place where two or more pedestrian *traffic lines* merge or intersect. Nodes typically occur at street corners and entrances to buildings. At these places the probability of finding stationary people tends to be heightened. Also, in Lynch's (1960) study of imageability of cities nodes are points, "the strategic spots in a city into which an observer can enter, and which are the intensive foci to and from which he is travelling." The concept of node is necessarily related to that of a *path*, since nodes occur on the intersection or in the converging point of two or more paths. See also *edge*, *district*, and *landmark*.

o-space Joint interaction *territory* of a *participation unit* comprising two or more participants (Kendon, 1976; Scheflen & Ashcraft, 1976). It is the space to which everybody, by definition, has direct, easy and equal access. It is created from a number of *transactional segments* which have been brought to an overlap and carefully maintained in such an overlap for the purpose of creating an arena for the overt *activity line* of the people assembled.

Orientation Spatial relation of the person's *frontal body plane* to some locus of reference such as a point of the compass, an object or another person. When face, legs and feet or eyes are oriented toward such a reference point the term *address* is usually used. Orientation of the trunk (pelvis + torso) may be measured in terms of the number of degrees between the full (head-on) address and the observed one, or in terms of the fivefold scale (Ciolek, 1977) which distinguishes between people standing (sitting): (a) frontally; (b) obliquely frontally; (c) sidewise; (d) obliquely away; and (e) fully away from a given point of reference.

Orientation hold In Scheflen and Ashcraft's (1976) terminology the action of orienting and holding the *orientation* (address) of the body or of a bodily part until a certain action is completed. An orientational hold may be shared by a number of people.

Orientalional segment In Scheflen and Ashcraft's (1976) terminology the *sector* of space commanded by the orientation of the torso of an individual. It seems to denote a spatial field somewhat larger than the individual's *transactional segment*.

p-space According to Kendon (1976, 1977; and Scheflen & Ashcraft 1976) it is the belt of space enveloping the *o-space*. In this space bodies of the participants as well as some of their belongings (*possessional territories*) are placed. This space is used not only as a kind of "parking space" but also as the interaction status *marker*, since only those who are truly participating in a given *activity line* can occupy p-space. The privilege of using this area puts on people a number of obligations such as the heightened attentiveness to the events unfolding in the *o-space*, prompt bodily movements calculated to aid the continuous maintenance of the overlap of people's *transactional segments* and, finally, attentiveness to the formation's surroundings so that the interaction may be protected from unwanted outside interference. Within the p-space some minor behaviors and activities, either entirely private or occult (Goffman, 1963) or the ones defined as the "off-the-record" transactions usually take place.

Parallel postures In Scheflen and Ashcraft (1976) terminology the parallel or congruent *postures* denote a relation among the postures or stances of several people in which all are holding their bodies and extremities in the same way.

Pass Spatial-postural manouever through which approaching pedestrians avoid colliding with each other. When a pass is executed while facing another person it is an open pass and when it is performed with one's back to the person it is a closed pass (Collett & Marsh, 1974).

Participation unit People "navigate streets and shops and attend social occasions . . . either in a 'single' or in 'with.' These are interactional units, not social-structural ones. They pertain entirely to the management of *co-presense* . . . A single is a party of one, a person who has come alone, a person by 'himself,' even though there may be other individuals near him. A with is a party of more than one whose members are perceived as to be 'together'" (Goffman, 1971: 40–41).

Path Paths are customary, occasional or potential movement channels (roads, streets, railroads, walkways) through an *environment*. They are used by people for their transit from one *setting* to another. People in course of their movement along a path are likely (Lynch, 1960) to observe their environment and cognitively structure it in terms of both paths and such elements as *edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks*.

Personal field In McBride's (1971) terminology the personal field or social force field refers to the area stretching directly in front of an individual (usually of an animal) and the other which is avoided or otherwise respected by other individuals present in the vicinity. An equivalent of the transactional segment.

Personal distance In Hall's (1964) taxonomy of spatial zones of copresence — a belt of space stretching from 1.5 to 4 feet from a given person. Within this zone the presence of the other person is very clear and strong and for that reason it is within this special range that the majority of intensive and delicate interpersonal transactions occurs. There are two phases of this zone: the close phase (1.5 to 2.5 feet) and the far phase (2.5 to 4 feet). See also *intimate, social, and public distance*.

Personal space A concept which was introduced 20 years ago by Sommer (1959) and became a starting point of the intensive and systematic research into human spatial behavior. It refers to a solitary person's spatial *domain* and is usually defined as a bubble of

space, variously shaped (typically circular, elliptical or hourglass shaped), which surrounds an individual while he is in *unfocused interaction* with others. Such a spatial preserve cannot be, by definition, entered by others without causing the invaded or violated person to withdraw, flee, get overaroused or otherwise negatively respond. The people in *focused encounters* do not seem to have a personal space in the strict sense of this term, since they surrender some of the individual claims they make so that a series of jointly used and managed spaces and *zones* can be established among them. Similarly, people who are alone, that is not in the presence of others, also cannot be thought to make *territorial claims* in the form of personal space bubbles simply because the entire space surrounding them is exclusively at their disposal. However, in the case of both people alone and those who are engaged in focused interaction it is necessary to point out the existence of some form of *use-space* or *body buffer zone* which is kept between themselves and the surrounding people and objects. An extensive number of studies and experiments accumulated over the past few years indicates (Evans & Howard 1973; Hayduk, 1978) that the size and shape of the personal space as well as the kind of reactions an invasion is likely to bring about is correlated with individual, interpersonal, and situational factors.

Place Place refers to the unit of the physical *environment* which has a common functional, social, or psychological definition among people who use it. Physical environment can be envisaged as a sequence of adjoining places interspersed with undefined and therefore neutral spaces.

Platoon Mobile *cluster* of people. Platoons are made of *participation units* which are in *unfocused interaction* between each other. They form, typically, at pedestrian-crossings through gradual accretion of pedestrians who join the stationary cluster and then cross the street and walk along the pavement together with it for some time.

Possessional territories In Goffman's (1971) taxonomy of *territories* of the self it is any set of objects that can be identified with an individual and arrayed around his body whatever it is. It seems to be useful to extend this concept to the jointly used possessions of a *gathering* (e.g., blankets, radios, and towels of people who go to the beach together).

Postural position Postural relationship of two or more individuals in a *gathering*. Positions differ from one activity to another

and are *situation-specific*. Handbooks such as the *Kama Sutra* discern and list tens and hundreds of positions which are known to be used by people in sexual intercourse. There is not, so far, a study which would list types of postural positions typical of people engaged in other forms of social interaction.

Posture Gross stable pattern of the body which can be sustained for some length of time. Hewes (1955) studied the geographical and cultural distribution of certain postural habits. Hall (1974) suggests that ordinary face-to-face situations are characterized by the use of five basic postures: standing, leaning, sitting, squatting, and prone. This list may be usefully extended by adding another posture: reclining which is an intermediate form between sitting and being prone. The analysis of people's postural behavior should include a study of (a) spatial relationships between the trunk and the walking surface or other space-establishing elements, and (b) between the trunk and its extremities.

Present space In Sandstrom's (1974) terminology a "quantity of space-volume which has satisfactory qualities of security . . . space which can be comprehended as a meaningful unit of experience." It may be assumed to be comparable with the notion of *c-space*.

Primary territory In Altman's (1975) taxonomy of spaces the primary territories are owned exclusively by individuals or *groups*, are relatively permanent, and are central to the people's everyday lives. They include homes, rooms, and other *private spaces* which are "off limits" to other people. See also *secondary* and *public* territories.

Privacy State or situation in which participants are in the control of the flow of information and/or people from Here to There and from There to Here. See also Altman (1975).

Private space Space which in order to enter a person must be of a certain personal or "caste" identity, a certain appearance or of a certain *group* membership or must otherwise hold a right of free entrance, passage, and exit. Approved users of such a space have a relative freedom of behavior and a sense of intimacy and control over the private space area. See also *public space*.

Proxemics Study of the ways people use space in the course of face-to-face interactions. In its original meaning: "the study of how man unconsciously structures microspace—the distance between men in the conduct of daily transactions, the organization of space in his houses and buildings, and ultimately the layout of his towns" (Hall, 1963). According to the most recent approach of Hall (1974) the term "proxemics" denotes the study of cultural patterning of

sensory involvement of people engaged in social, usually dyadic, encounters.

Proximal space In Spiegel and Machotka's (1974) terminology it is a space between the body surface and its coverings. It may be assumed to correspond roughly to the notion of *sheath*.

Public distance In Hall's (1964) taxonomy of spatial zones of co-presence—a belt of space around a person stretching from 12 feet to the upper limit of the unaided senses. Within this zone the other person's presence is not well-defined and it can be either acknowledged or "ignored." In this zone if a *focused* transaction takes place it tends to be either brief or highly formalized or both. The close public distance stretches from 12–25 feet from a person, the far distance starts around 25 feet and stretches until it strikes a barrier or the person cannot be perceived any longer with any accuracy. See also *intimate*, *personal*, and *social distance*.

Public space Space which can be entered practically by anybody and at anytime. A public space offers freedom of access though not necessarily freedom of action appearance. See also *private space*.

Public territory In Altman's (1975) taxonomy of spaces the public territories constitute those places and those spaces which can be only temporarily occupied by people and over which individuals and groups cannot claim long-term *jurisdiction*. An example of public territory is a street, a park, or a public transportation system. It embraces all spaces which are not occupied by *primary* or *secondary* territories.

Q-formations *Formations* in which individuals are assembled in a certain order so that they can obtain access (on one person at a time basis) to a given, usually limited, resource. Basically speaking, there are three types of queues: linear, horizontal, and bulk ones.

r-space Belt of space enveloping *o*- and *p*-spaces. It is an area which surrounds a stationary *participation unit* and the one which falls under such a unit's *jurisdiction* or control. People joining or leaving a given unit mark their arrival as well as their departure by engaging in special behaviors displayed in a special order in special portions of r-space.

Region In Goffman's (1959) terminology a portion of the total *environment* available to the naked senses which is delineated by the presence of barriers impenetrable to senses. There are two kinds of regions, namely: the focal region which is the stage of a given activity, and the outside region which is, by definition, the area where the center of the interaction is clearly NOT located. Within a focal

region it is useful to distinguish between the front and back regions or the areas in which, respectively, the official and unofficial, formal and "off the record," main and subsidiary lines of social interaction are located.

Regional associate In Kendon's (1976, 1977) and Scheflen and Ashcraft's (1976) terminology an individual who forms a *participation unit* together with people arranged in a *F-formation* but who have not established an access to the formation's *o-space*. The regional associates stay, by definition, in the *r-space* though, sometimes, they may occupy the *p-space*.

Seating arrangement There are two possible meanings of this term. Firstly it may refer to the *set-up* or the way seats, chairs, tables, pews and/or other furniture are organized spatially within a given *setting* (cf. Goodman, 1975). Thus, one can talk about seats arranged in rows-and-files, horseshoes, and semicircles. In its second and more correct meaning, this term refers to the mutual spatial relationship obtaining between a pair of individuals seated at a rectangular or circular table (Sommer, 1959; 1965). For instance, people seated at small rectangular tables in a public library could be seen to use the following kinds of seating arrangements: corner, across, side, and distant ones.

Secondary territory In Altman's (1975) taxonomy of spaces the secondary territories are less central, less pervasive, and not so exclusive as the *primary* ones. However, they are not fully accessible to anybody as the regular users establish some control (jurisdiction) to and use of spaces such as private clubs, gang turfs, and neighborhood bars. See also *public territories*.

Sector If the space around a *participation unit* is divided into a series of triangular segments with their apexes merging in the center of a person's body, or in the middle of the space encompassed by the *formation*, the space can be said to be divided into sectors. It may be useful to segment space in the three following fashions: (a) into the front, two side and one back sector, each subtending a 90 degree cone of space: (b) into six sectors each subtending 60 degrees, or (c) into 12 sectors (each of 30 degree).

Semi-fixed space In Hall's (1964) terminology it is a type of spacing and orientation between individuals which is established and influenced by placement of tables, desks, chairs, armchairs, sofas, benches, railings, edges of rugs, and doorsteps. These usually moveable features of the *environment* tend to remain unmoved and unrearranged in the course of a given encounter although they can and frequently are changed in a variety of ways prior to and on

the completion of a given social encounter. See also *dynamic* and *fixed space*.

Sensory involvement Degree to which people in a given setting allow themselves to be flooded with the sensory information generated by the other people. On the whole, the fewer barriers and obstacles between the people, the closer they are to each other, the more fully they face each other, the more direct (or more frequent, or more prolonged) their eye contact and the more enclosed (defined) the given setting is — the more deeply or intensively or involvement they tend to be engaged with one another. When the sensory involvement is voluntary it may often lead to the sense of heightened immediacy or intimacy (Argyle & Dean 1965). If such an involvement is not voluntary it may give rise to the sense of an overload or the sense of *crowding*. The experience of involvement as such is emotionally, cognitively, and physiologically arousing.

Separation distance Shortest possible distance (in Euclidean space) between the most proximate body surfaces of two individuals in question. Sometimes some specified points on their bodies (toes, noses, head centers, elbows, chests, and pelvises) or, alternatively, on the furniture used by them (chairs' backs, centers of the seats, front edges of the seats, and spokes between the front legs of the chairs) may be used in measuring the separation distance. See also *interpersonal distance*.

Setting Any portion of the physical *environment* which is accessible to unaided human senses and to ordinary physical *movement*. The areas which are accessible to only one of these two ways of exploring the environment can be regarded as the background, latent space, the macroenvironment and so forth. Typically the setting's radius seldom exceeds the limit of 100 yards (upper limit for visual access to another human being) (Ciolek, 1980).

Set-up In Schefflen and Ashcraft's (1976) terminology - a grouping or clustering of furniture and other artifacts. See also *seating arrangement*.

Sheath In Goffman's (1971) taxonomy of *territories* of self: the skin that covers the body and, at a small remove, the clothes that cover the skin.

Site Portion of a *setting*. In Kendon's (1973) terminology — any piece of more or less defined physical space which can be distinguished from another. For instance, "for some purposes the whole of the Great Hall at Euston Station, could be considered as a site, for others it would be necessary to treat restricted areas within it as separate sites" (1973:33). See also *place*.

Situation Naturally occurring constellation of social, psychological, and temporal contexts for individual or interpersonal behaviors. Situations usually have common definitions among people who report or comment on them. They always occur in physical and temporal *contexts* which can often be found to differ from each other in terms of their congruity with the structure and requirements of a given situation. Situations are made up of individual and interpersonal behaviors and transactions in the same way as sections of a book are made of sentences. A sequentially organized number of situations constitutes a “day” or a “life stage” or a “whole life” for a given set of participants. Typically as a situation one would count an entire set of contexts falling within the limit of 100 yards (Ciolek, 1980) from the individual or *gathering* or *cluster* in question.

Social distance In Hall’s (1964) taxonomy of spatial zones of *co-presence* — a belt of space stretching from 4 to 12 feet from a given person. Within this zone the presence of the other person is clear and obvious but not over-whelming. For this reason it is in this zone that the majority of the sophisticated task-oriented verbal transactions is engaged in. There are two phases of this zone: the close phase (4–7 feet) and the far phase (7–12 feet). See also *personal*, *intimate*, and *public distance*.

Social situation In Goffman’s terminology (1963) the full spatial *environment* within which people are available to mutual sensory monitoring. It may be regarded as an equivalent of the *field of co-presence*.

Sociofugal space *Environment* which suggests anonymity, avoidance, and *unfocused interaction* patterns between its regular or occasional users (Sommer, 1967). See also *centrifugal space*.

Sociopetal space *Environment* which suggests familiarity, *focused interaction*, and heightened mutual attentiveness between its regular or occasional users (Sommer, 1967). See also *centripetal space*.

Spacing Dispersion or distribution of *participation units*, human or animal, in space at a given moment in time. If the probability of finding a participation unit at any point of the area is the same for all points, the distribution is said to be random. If the probability of finding another unit is inversely related to the distance from a given individual or gathering the distribution can be called aggregated or clumped. Finally, when this probability is directly related to the separation distance one can talk about regular or even uniform spacing.

Spot Schefflen and Ashcraft (1976) write: "a microterritory, inches in diameter. Some spots are imaginary foci at which people direct gaze or voice. Some spots appear on furniture and are used for storing objects" (1976:28).

Stall In Goffman's (1971) taxonomy of individual *territories* and domains a stall is a well bounded space to which individuals can lay temporary claim, possession being on all-or-none basis.

Stance The postural form of the *body region* or of the body as a whole including the *body orientation* (address of the torso) (Schefflen & Ashcraft, 1976).

Stream A number of mobile people in *unfocused interaction* with one another moving along relatively narrow *paths* or pavements. Two to four streams or lanes can use the same pavement. See Goffman (1971: 23-50).

Surroundings In McBride and Clancy's (1976) terminology — everything in the vicinity of an animal or group of animals. Much of the surroundings may be irrelevant and unnoticed by the individual or *gathering* as much of it may fall into what has been called *b-space*.

Territorial allowance — see *domain*.

Territorial behavior In Schefflen and Ashcraft's (1976) terminology any behavior which claims, bounds, respects, delineates, challenges, defends, acknowledges, or otherwise defines a unit of space which is used, claimed, or occupied by a person or a *gathering*, or a *cluster* for a period of time.

Territorial claim — see *domain*.

Territory In the most general meaning: a particular form of bounded space that people establish between, around, and among themselves, and use and move about in (Schefflen & Ashcraft 1976). More specifically: a particular area which is owned and defended, whether physically or by means of rules and symbols which identify the area as belonging to an individual or a *group* (Rapoport, 1977).

Trajectory Imaginary line linking a sequence of *locations* occupied in succession by a mobile *participation unit*. Usually a cluster or a bunch of trajectories indicates the existence of a traffic line within a given portion of a *setting*.

Traffic line Elongated portion of space which links points x and y in a given *setting* and which is used for navigation by mobile people more often than could be expected on a chance basis alone. The presence of traffic lines or traffic routes enables us to distinguish four types of *locations* of stationary *participation units*: (a)

away; (b) side; (c) central and (d) protected locations (Ciolek, 1978b).

Transactional segment According to Kendon (1976, 1977) a chunk of space stretching in front of a person to which he has an easy and direct access in his transactions with the surrounding world. Its dimensions and shape depend on the *posture* and *activity* of the individual in question. The transactional segment is the basic *use-space* which in the case of people who are not involved in a *focused interaction* with others around is seldom entered or intruded upon by outsiders. When linked together with other transactional segments it becomes a portion of the *o-space*. Transactional segments can, for some specific purposes, be conceived and treated as being finite and fixed in their shape and extent (Deutsch, 1978).

Unfocused interaction Occasion on which people are in each other's presence and therefore, by definition, structure their behavior in orderly fashion and in relation to one another, but who did not establish an overt and joint focus of their attention or *activity* (Goffman, 19673).

Use space According to Goffman's (1971) taxonomy of individual territorial claims: the space immediately around and in front of the individual which should be respected by outsiders because of his instrumental or locomotory needs. In the case of a solitary *participation unit* the use space stretching in front of him can be conceived as his *transactional segment*. In the case of two, or more, individuals who are standing well apart and overtly interact with one another the individual use spaces form a *channel* which is constructed of their relatively short transactional segments and the space linking them.

Vertical displacement Characteristic of the spatial relationship between two individuals. It is a degree to which feet of the two individuals are removed from the same base position, from the same level. Changes in the vertical displacement are familiar social acts: for example climbing an elevated place (rostrum, podium, stage) before going to address a seated audience.

Walk away Locomotory *movement* aimed at a rapid increase in the *separation distance* between two or more individuals (e.g. during the final stages of a parting sequence) and, as such, distinct from movement which is casually addressed to some other focus of involvement (Kendon, 1976, 1977).

Zone One of the spaces or areas in a sequence of spatial belts or concentric areas in which the emotional or behavioral loadings

(valences, meanings, subjective values) change as a function of the distance from the *participation unit* in question. The valence or interaction potential, however measured, is, by definition, more or less constant in all parts of a zone and different, by definition, from the valences or potentials assigned to or detected within the remaining zones. See also De Long (1978).

REFERENCES

- Altman, I. *The environment and social behavior*. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole, 1975.
- Argyle, M. & Dean, J. "Eye-contact, distance, and affiliation." *Sociometry* 28: 289-304, 1965.
- Barker, R.G., Wright, H.F. *Midwest and its children*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1955.
- Birdwhistell, R.L. *Kinesics and context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Ciolek, T.M. "Location of static gatherings in pedestrian areas: an exploratory study." *Man-Environment Systems*, 7: 41-54, 1977.
- Ciolek, T.M. "Spatial arrangements in social encounters: an attempt at a taxonomy." *Man-Environment Systems* 8: 52-59, 1978a.
- Ciolek, T.M. "Some spatial features of the phenomenon of copresence." *Sociolinguistics Newsletter* 9 (2): 23-24, 1978b.
- Ciolek, T.M. "Spatial extent and structure of the field of copresence: summary findings." *Man-Environment Systems* 10:57-62, 1980.
- Ciolek, T.M. "Pedestrian behavior in pedestrian spaces: some findings of a naturalistic field study." In S.V. Szokolay (Ed.), *Understanding of the built environment—Proceedings of the 1981 ANZASCA conference*. Canberra: Australian and New Zealand Architectural Science Association, 1981.
- Ciolek, T.M. & Kendon, A. "Environment and the spatial arrangement of conversational encounters." *Sociological Inquiry* 50 (3-4): 237-271, 1980.
- Deutsch, R.D. *Spatial structuring in everyday face-to-face behavior. A neurocybernetic model*, M-ES Focus Series, No. 4, Orangeburg, N.Y.: ASMER, 1978.
- Edney, J.J. "Human territoriality." *Psychological Bulletin* 81 (12): 959-975, 1974.
- Evans, G.W. & Howard, R.B. "Personal space." *Psychological Bulletin* 80 (4): 334-344, 1973.
- Goffman, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books, 1959.
- Goffman, E. *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: The Free Press, 1963.
- Goffman, E. *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Goodman, P. "Seating arrangements." *Ekistics* 234: 295-299, 1975.
- Hall, E.T. "A system for notation of proxemic behavior." *American Anthropologist* 65: 1003-1026, 1963.
- Hall, E.T. *The hidden dimension*. New York: Doubleday Co., 1966.
- Hall, E.T. "Proxemics." *Current Anthropology* 9 (2-3): 83-108, 1968.
- Hall, E.T. *Handbook for proxemic research*. Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication: Washington, D.C., 1974.
- Hayduk, L.A. "Personal space: An evaluative and orienting overview." *Psychological Bulletin* 85 (1): 117-134, 1978.
- Hewes, G. "World distribution of certain postural habits." *American Anthropologist* 57: 231-244, 1955.
- Horowitz, M.J. et al. "Personal space and the body-buffer zone." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 11:651-656, 1964.
- Jacobs, J. *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House, 1961.

- Kendon, A. "The role of visible behavior in the organization of social interaction," in Mario von Cranach Ian Vine (Eds.), *Social communication and movement: Studies of interaction in Man and Chimpanzee*. London and New York: Academic Press, 1973.
- Kendon, A. "The F-Formation system: The spatial organization of social encounters." *Man-Environment Systems* 6: 291 - 296, 1976.
- Kendon, A. "Spatial organization in social encounters: The F-formation system" in *Studies in the behavior of social interaction* Cht. 5.
- Kinzel, A.F. "Body buffer zones in violent prisoners." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 127: 99-104, 1970.
- De Long, A.J. "Proxemic zones and context: An empirical analysis." In W.H. Ittelson, & Rogers, (Eds.), *ERDA 9: New directions in environmental design*, 1978.
- Lyman, S.M. & Scott, M.B. "Territoriality: A neglected sociological dimension." *Social Problems* 15 (2): 236-249, 1967.
- Lynch, K. *The image of the city*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1960.
- McBride, G. "Theories of animal spacing: The role of flight, fight, and social distance," in A.H. Esser (Ed.), *Behavior and environment: The use of space by animals and men*. New York - London: Plenum Press, 1971.
- McBride, G., & Clancy, H. "The social properties of places and things." In A. Rapoport (Ed.), *The mutual interaction of people and their built environment*. The Hague—Paris: Mouton, 1976.
- Newman, O. *Defensible space—crime prevention through urban design*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- Patterson, M.L. "Compensation in nonverbal immediacy behaviors: A review." *Sociometry* 36: 237 - 252, 1973.
- Portrous, J.D. *Environment and behavior: planning and everyday urban life*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.
- Rapoport, A. *Human aspects of urban form: towards a Man-Environment approach to urban form and design*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1977.
- Roos, P.D. "Jurisdiction: an ecological concept." *Human Relations* 21: 75 - 84, 1968.
- Sandstrom, C.I. "Proposals to phenomenological approaches in determining architectural spaces." *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 15: 81 - 88, 1968.
- Schefflen, A.E. "Some territorial layouts in the United States." In A. Rapoport (Ed.), *The mutual interaction of people and their built environment*. The Hague—Paris: Mouton, 1976.
- Schedlen, A.E. and Ashcraft, N. *Human territories—How we behave in space-time*. Englewood, Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1976.
- Sommer, R. "Studies in personal space." *Sociometry* 22: 247 - 260, 1959.
- Sommer, R. "Further studies of small-group ecology." *Sociometry* 28: 337 - 348, 1965.
- Sommer, R. "Sociofugal pace." *The American Journal of Sociology* 72: 654 - 660, 1967.
- Sommer, R. *Personal space: the behavioral basis of design*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Spiegel, J. and Machotka, P. *Messages of the body*.