

controlled interaction space (o-space). These arrangements are: "CNV"; "CVH"; "CVV"; "LVV"; "LHH"; "LLN"; "LCV"; "VVV"; "INN" and finally "CCV" (see Diagram III). There are also arrangements whose status is not entirely clear. For example, the "III" or "ICC" arrangements may, under certain circumstances, be used as F-formation arrangements. However, it should be noted that individuals standing at end positions normally do not have easy access to each other's transactional segments and all they can achieve is to overlap their transactional segments with that of the person standing in the central position. The "INZ" arrangement also cannot be regarded as a fully fledged three-person F-formation. It can best be characterized as a binary two-person F-formation in which two independent o-spaces are sustained [8].

Of course, all these arrangements are not used equally often (see Tables 1 and 2). As already noted, the frequency with which certain types of spatial configurations are selected depends very much on what people are doing and who they are in terms of their personal and interpersonal characteristics. Also, as the field observations (Ciolek 1977) suggest, the type of arrangement adopted remains in systematic relationship to the spatial context of an encounter in question. The general principle which seems to be operating is the use of more open (sociofugal) arrangements in places with clearly delineated boundaries. On the other hand, the closed (sociopetal) arrangements tend to be favored in areas which lack the positioning and placement of people in a face-to-face encounter may be viewed as an ingenious adaptive device enabling smooth and undisturbed functioning within a setting. Through this mechanism participants seem to maintain an equilibrium between their interactional space and an aliveness to their surroundings on the other hand, and the physical and social properties of the setting on the other. However, the detailed discussion of these and other aspects of spatial arrangements is obviously beyond the scope of this brief methodological note.

REFERENCES

- Aiello, J.R. and Aiello, T. The development of personal space: proxemic behavior of children 6 through 16. Human Ecology 2:177-189, 1974.
- Aiello, J.R. and Jones S.E. A field study of the proxemic behavior of young children in three subcultural groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 19:351-356, 1971.
- Aiello, J.R. and Cooper, R.E. Use of personal space as a function of social affect.

[8] This may happen for example when Mr. and Mrs. Brown accidentally run into Mr. Brown's previous wife and stop for a while, but the two ladies are not really on speaking terms.

In Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention. Washington, D.C. 1972, Pp. 207-208.

- Bakeman, R. and Beck, S. The size of informal groups in public. Environment and Behavior 6: 378-390, 1974.
- Batchelor, J.P. and Goethals, G.R. Spatial arrangements in freely formed groups. Sociometry 35:270-279, 1972.
- Baxter, J.C. Interpersonal spacing in natural settings. Sociometry 33:444-456, 1970.
- Byrne, D. et al. Behavioral indicators of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology 1:137-149, 1971.
- Castaneda, C. A separate reality: Further conversations with Don Juan. 1973. Penguin Books: Harmondsworth.
- Ciolek, T.M. Configurations and Context: A study of spatial patterns in social encounters. An unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Australian National University, 1977.
- Collet, P. Training Englishmen in the nonverbal behavior of Arabs: An experiment on intercultural communication. International Journal of Psychology 6:209-215, 1971.
- Cook, M. Experiments on orientation and proxemics. Human Relations 23:61-76, 1970.
- Dean, L.M. et al. Initial interaction distance among individuals equal and unequal in military rank. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 32:294-299, 1975.
- De Long, A.J. "The micro-spatial structure of the older person". In Pastalan, L.A. and D.H. Acrson (Eds.). Spatial behavior of older people. University of Michigan, Institute of Gerontology. Ann Arbor, 1970.
- Deutsch, R.D. Spatial structuring in everyday face-to-face behavior. A neurocybernetic model, M-ES Focus Series, No. 4, Orangeburg, N.Y.: AS,ER 1978.
- Evans, G.W. Personal space: Research review and bibliography. Man-Environment Systems 3:203-215, 1973.
- Evans, G.W. and Howard, R.B. Personal space. Psychological Bulletin 80:334-344, 1973.
- Hall, E.T. A system for notation of proxemic behavior. American Anthropologist 65: 1003-1026, 1963.
- Hall, E.T. Handbook for proxemic research. Washington, D.C. Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communication, 1974.
- Heshka, S. and Nelson, Y. Interpersonal speaking distance as a function of age, sex, and relationship. Sociometry 35:491-498, 1972.