

sitting in a room so spatially organized was 45.0, as opposed to the mean characteristic of the arrangement of chairs C (mean 43.9) in which there were three separate groups of chairs. This difference in the estimation of the degree of interpersonal proximity was statistically significant (p less than 0.036). The arrangement of chairs type A (i.e., 9 x 9 block) was found to score an intermediate proximity rating of 44.4 and was not different in a significant way from either of the just mentioned types of spatial ecology.

In order to establish whether differences in the interpersonal proximity ratings given to people in ecologies type B and C could be attributed to the presence of aisles separating various groups of chairs, a comparison of ratings scored by the same pairs of people under two different spatial conditions was made. Ratings scored by six pairs of individuals sitting either with (a) an empty aisle between them, or (b) without such an aisle were analyzed. However, it was found that there was no significant effect of the presence or absence of an empty aisle on the way these pairs of individuals would be scored in terms of their interpersonal spacing.

A fourth analysis considered the possible joint effect of both the situation definition and the type of seating configuration. It was established (see Table 1) that when ratings given to people under conditions of the seating arrangement type A were analyzed, there were statistically significant differences between ratings given to people operating under each of the three situations. Thus, both the CHURCH and the LECTURE ROOM in the uniform and continuous seating configuration resulted in markedly higher perceptions of interpersonal proximity (CHURCH = 46.2, LECTURE ROOM = 47.5, CINEMA = 39.7). These differences were found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.001$ and p less than 0.008, respectively). Furthermore, it was found that subjects felt being placed closer to the other users of the setting when it was the context of a LECTURE ROOM than when the place was defined as CHURCH. This difference, again, was found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.036$).

In the next, type B, seating configuration it could be seen that although people in a place defined as a CHURCH tended to perceive themselves as sitting closer to all their neighbors than did users of a LECTURE ROOM (47.2 vs. 46.0 points), there was, in fact, no significant difference between the ratings in these two situations. However, both situation definitions tended to result in much stronger feeling of interpersonal proximity than it was the case with people told to be seated in a CINEMA (41.9 points). This difference between each of the first two and the third setting was statistically significant ($p = 0.036$).

Finally, it was established that despite different proximity ratings given to people placed in each of the three situations (CINEMA = 45.2, CHURCH = 44.9, LECTURE ROOM = 41.6), in the context of

the seating arrangement type C (one in which three groups of chairs were formed), these differences did not reach the significance level.

Data in Table 3 document the relationship between ratings of perceived interpersonal spacing and the objective distance which separated the observer from each of the 15 target (stimulus) persons. The data referring to various arrangements and various situations were aggregated, and the estimations of interpersonal proximity were expressed simply as a function of the number of seats separating the judged pair of setting/ecology users. It was found that over a distance of eight seats (with the observer seated at the back on the extreme right of the entire configuration of chairs), perceived proximity decreased from the score of nearly 90% to the score of about 19%. An important feature of this change in the degree of perceived interpersonal proximity as affected by the separating physical distance is that it tended to be systematically, although not linearly, related to the extent of space extending between the observer and the target (reference) person. A closer look at the data suggests that there is clear-cut regularity in the rate with which the perceived closeness decreases as the function of objective spacing. It was found that the degree of interpersonal subjective proximity between an observer and a person occupying a seat, $n + 1$, always tended to amount to 80% of the degree of proximity estimated in relation to a person seated in the chair number n .

The final analysis concerned the effect of people's placement in space relative to the observer on the degree of their subjective proximity (see Table 3 again). It was found that the sector of occupied space did have a powerful effect on the way people's proximity was judged by the subjects. Thus, SIDE placements consistently resulted in the perception of the greater proximity between the observer and target persons (overall mean, 56.6 points). This means that those seated to the FRONT of the observer (mean, 42.6 points) and those seated DIAGONALLY to him (mean, 35.5 points) were perceived as being seated at farther ranges. The effect of the use of a given sector of space in relation to the chair in which the observer is seated seemed to be even more pronounced with the increase of the physical distance between the two individuals in a given situation/ecology. Thus, the estimated proximity with respect to people seated at the first chair from the observer and to the front and diagonally to him was, respectively, 1.10 and 1.19 times lower than that estimated in relation to a person seated to the side. For people seated at the eighth (farthermost) chair, this difference could be seen to be increased to 1.94 and 5.75 times, respectively. In other words, at a distance of eight seats from the observer the subjective closeness of a person seated to the side of the observer is nearly twice as high as that for people seated at the same physical distance in front of him and nearly six times higher than that felt in relation to those sitting at a diagonal from the observer.