JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 11, 288–299 (1975)

Effects of a Violation of Personal Space on Escape and Helping Responses

VLADIMIR J. KONEČNI,[1] Lynn Libuser, Houston Morton, and Ebbe B. Ebbesen

University of California, San Diego

Four field experiments were carried out to examine the effects of a violation of personal space on the "victims'" subsequent behavior. In Experiment I, it was found that male and female pedestrians crossed a street faster than controls if their personal space had been violated (while stationary before crossing) for 10 sec by an experimenter of the same sex. The remaining experiments examined how a violation of personal space would affect the nature of the subsequent victim–violator interaction, as inferred from the victims' and controls' differential helping of the violator. It was found that, in comparison to controls, a 10-sec stationary violation of pedestrians' personal space decreased the frequency with which they returned to the violator an object he "lost" only if the object was of low value to the violator (a pencil vs keys). However, victims of a combined stationary-and-moving (while walking across the street) violation helped the violator significantly less frequently than controls, irrespective of the value of the lost object. Implications of these results for an attributional analysis of personal space phenomena were discussed.

In recent years, the work of Hall (1959, 1966) and Sommer (1969) has provided important information about the spatial aspects of human social behavior. A concept that emerged in this literature is "personal space," which refers to an "area with invisible boundaries surrounding a person's body into which intruders may not come" (Sommer, 1969, p. 26). The concept is useful in that it combines important components of notions such as territoriality, individual distance, and dominance patterns, all of which have been intensively studied by scientists from several disciplines on infrahuman and human subjects (e.g. (Altman and Haythorn, 1967; Birdwhistell, 1952; Esser, 1971; Grant, 1965; Tinbergen, 1953)). In addition, it is clear that the ways in which dyads and members of larger groups position themselves and partition space are instances of nonverbal communication understood by both immediate participants and observers.

[1] Requests for reprints should be sent to Vladimir J. Konečni, Department of Psychology, University of California, San Diego, P.O. Box 109, La Jolla, California 92037. The authors would like to thank Susan Moore and Pamela Roberts for acting as experimenters.

Copyright © 1975 by Academic Press, Inc.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

According to Sommer (1969), personal space is an individual's "portable territory," which does not necessarily extend in all directions equally (strangers are presumably allowed closer if positioned at one's sides than directly in front). There are indications in the literature that when a stranger violates a person's space, tension, discomfort, and escape may result. Thus, Sommer (1969) intruded mental-hospital patients' space by sitting close to them on benches. The almost universal first reaction of these people was to face away, become rigid, and pull in their shoulders. Within 2 min, one-third of the victims departed, whereas none of the control patients, whose space had not been violated, did; within 9 min, 50% of the experimental subjects, and only 8% of the control subjects departed. In another study reported by Sommer (1969), female students working alone at a table in a library departed much faster than control subjects when another female student occupied the adjacent chair and moved it closer to the subject. In a laboratory experiment, McBride, King, and James (1965) found that subjects' physiological arousal (measured by the galvanic skin response) rose more sharply when they were approached frontally, in comparison to a lateral approach; both of these approaches, however, produced greater GSR changes than a rear approach.

While some gross aspects of spatial behavior may be common to most, if not all, species, reactions to violations of personal space, in the case of humans, may be governed by attributions made by the victims about the violators' personality dispositions and motives. It can be expected that even a brief violation of a person's space, especially if it is relatively unwarranted, would influence the subsequent victim–violator interaction, presumably as a result of the type of characteristics imputed to the violator by the victim. Surprisingly, this important aspect of social-psychological investigation of personal-space phenomena has received very little experimental attention.

The present studies had several related, but distinct, objectives. First, an attempt was made to test the generality of earlier findings concerning escape as a response to a violation of personal space by studying the phenomenon in a different setting and using a new dependent measure. Second, an aspect of the victim–violator interaction was systematically examined, namely, the likelihood that the victim would help the violator. Presumably, helping (a prosocial behavior) should be a sensitive index of whether or not a victim has attributed negative characteristics to the violator, particularly if the helping act requires him to interact with the violator, however briefly. Finally, the present studies should contribute to the knowledge in the general area of helping by examining some of its neglected antecedents.

EXPERIMENT I

Method

Procedure and rationale. The subjects were 60 male and 60 female pedestrians, approximately between 18 and 60 yr of age, who were waiting, individually, for a light to change to green, before crossing a street in downtown San Diego, California. The study was carried out by two female and two male experimenters of average, neat appearance, all in their twenties. Except for the restriction for sex, subjects were randomly assigned to one of the following four conditions: as a subject waited on the curb to cross the street, exactly 10 sec before the light changed (the pattern of traffic-light changes had been timed beforehand), an experimenter of the same sex arrived and stood next to the subject at a distance of 1, 2, 5, or 10 feet until the light changed to green. The two male experimenters were randomly assigned to male subjects within conditions, with the restriction that they run an approximately equal number of subjects in each condition. The latter was also true for female experimenters; they ran only female subjects. The study was carried out at different times of day, at two pedestrian crossings (of equal length and width), at a single intersection. Both male and female subjects were run within a session. There were seven such sessions, conducted on different days, with the weather dry and air temperature similar on all days. Before running a subject, the experimenters stood alone some distance away from the crossing, with an observer stationed on the other side of the street. To be a subject, a pedestrian had to be alone and to come to a full stop at the edge of the crossing at least 10 sec before the light was due to change to green. After an experimenter assumed a given distance from the subject on the curb, the condition was considered valid only if no other person of either sex came to stand closer to either the subject or the experimenter than was the distance between these two in a given condition. It is important to note that the immediate area was, in fact, usually deserted, except for the subject and the experimenter, in all of the distance conditions. In about one-half of the cases, the experimenter stood on the subject's right, and in the other half on his or her left. The experimenters had practiced assuming a given distance until their accuracy was almost perfect. The distance was estimated at the level of shoulders. An experimenter never established eye contact with a subject; instead, she or he looked at the observer on the other side of the street. The experimenters simply violated the subjects' space: they did not assume a hostile or threatening posture, have an aggressive appearance, or pay any attention to the subjects. If a subject shifted away from the experimenter along the curb, the experimenter also moved, as unobtrusively as possible, to maintain the distance. The observer was able to give inconspicuous signs to the experimenter regarding the distance. After the light changed to green, the experimenter never crossed the street; instead, the experimenter appeared to change his or her mind and started to walk immediately in the opposite direction.

The main dependent measure was the speed (time in seconds) with which subjects crossed the street, i.e., reached the opposite sidewalk, which was timed by the observer. The behavior in question was very clearly defined to minimize the risk of observer bias: the stopwatch was started when a subject first stepped off the curb, and stopped when he (she) stepped on the opposite curb. While the nature of the experimental situation precluded the possibility of an observer being blind to the experimental condition, four people alternated in the role of observer, and they were only semiaware of the hypotheses. The observer also made notes about the subject's behavior while waiting for the light to change.

To the author's knowledge, the present setting and dependent measure have not been used by researchers interested in personal space. However, Ellsworth, Carlsmith, and Henson (1972) found that pedestrians crossed a street faster after being briefly stared at by an experimenter, and that drivers drove through intersections faster after the same manipulation had been carried out prior to the change of the traffic light to green. In the present

experiment, it was hypothesized that subjects whose personal space had been violated by a person standing 1 or 2 feet away for a mere 10 sec would cross the street faster than those people whose space had not been thus violated (the 5- and 10-ft conditions were essentially considered as controls). Ellsworth *et al.* (1972) felt that they had good reason to regard the stare as a "stimulus to flight" for many different species, including man, and considered the speed of walking as a good indicator of human escape. By using this dependent measure in the present experiment, prior findings of the effect of a violation of personal space on escape could be replicated and extended; in addition, a tentative connection could be established, via the dependent measure, between two quite different stimuli to flight in humans.

It is likely that a more drastic violation of personal space, such as a frontal one, may well produce some form of a "fight" response, rather than flight, in both animals and humans. Therefore, for both ethical and practical reasons, investigators of personal-space phenomena have refrained from using such a manipulation in naturalistic settings.

Results and Discussion

The main results are presented in Table 1. The experiment was treated as a 2 (Sex of Subject) × 4 (Distance) factorial, and the results submitted to an analysis of variance. (In this, as well as in all of the subsequent experiments, there were no differences due to different experimenters and different observers.) The main effects of both Sex ($F(1,112) = 6.24$, $p < .02$), and Distance ($F(3,112) = 3.41$, $p < .03$), were statistically significant, but the interaction was not ($F(3,112) < 1$). While the Sex main effect merely indicated that women tended to walk more slowly than men, the main effect of Distance was far more interesting. Inspection of the pattern of the means revealed that the closer an experimenter had stood to the subjects, the faster they crossed the street. The absence of the interaction, and the significant linear trend for the Distance main effect ($F(1,112) = 8.42$, $p < .01$; $F(2,112) < 1$, for the residual)[2] indicated that this was true for both men and women.

TABLE 1
MEAN TIME IN SECONDS TAKEN TO CROSS THE STREET BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION

	Experimenters' lateral distance from subjects in feet			
Sex of subjects	1	2	5	10
Male	7.65	8.45	9.09	9.08
Female	8.94	8.95	9.41	9.79

Note. $n = 15$ per cell.

[2] The four distances represented unequal steps on an interval scale. Therefore, the coefficients used in the tests for trend were as follows: −7, −5,+1,+11, for the means in the 1-, 2-, 5-, and 10-ft conditions, respectively. These coefficients reflect the relative magnitude of the steps.

Not a single subject (including those in the 1- and 2-ft conditions) attempted to speak to the experimenter. This finding is in full agreement with those of other space-violation (Sommer, 1969, pp. 35–36) and staring studies (Ellsworth *et al.*, 1972). Instead, subjects in the 1- and 2-ft conditions tended to display the behavior pattern described by Sommer (1969): after briefly glancing at the experimenter, they faced away and were motionless and rigid for the remainder of the 10 sec. In quite a different setting, and using a very brief violation of personal space, the present experiment extended prior findings of the relationship between this independent variable and escape responses.

While the results complement those of Ellsworth *et al.* (1972), a criticism may be directed at both of these studies with regard to the definition of "escape." There are indications that the violation of personal space raises the level of general physiological arousal (McBride *et al.*, 1965), and the same may be true of staring. From the standpoint of a general habit-strength theory (e.g. (Hull, 1943; Spence, 1956)), a high level of arousal may strengthen any dominant or ongoing response. In both the present and the Ellsworth *et al.* studies, subjects were about to cross the street anyway; thus, the greater speed of crossing of the presumably aroused subjects, while interesting in itself, should perhaps not be conceptualized as an escape response, but rather as an augmented dominant response (Ebbesen and Haney, 1972). No subject in the present study, and apparently in the Ellsworth *et al.* study, carried out "true" escape behavior, i.e., refrained from crossing altogether and left the area before the light changed. However, data are available from the present study which indicate that subjects in the close, 1-ft, condition emitted behavior which can be regarded as escape, thus validating the escape interpretation of the speed-of-crossing data. Of the 30 subjects in the 1-ft condition, 18 (eight males and 10 females) shifted at least 1 ft away from the experimenter during the 10-sec interval (the experimenters moved up again, as unobtrusively as possible). Only two of the 30 subjects in the 2-ft condition (both female) did this. None of the 60 remaining subjects shifted away. When the frequencies were summed over the Sex factor, the difference between the four Distance conditions was highly significant ($\chi^2(3) = 54.72$, $p < .001$). However, the mean crossing speed of the 1-ft subjects who had shifted away from the experimenter did not differ significantly from that of the 1-ft subjects who had not done so ($t(28) = .83$).

EXPERIMENT II

From the general framework of attribution theory, a relatively straightforward derivation may be formulated to handle the present situation: when the source of stimulation causing a person discomfort and

forcing him to escape is an identifiable other person, the former will attribute negative personality dispositions and motives to the latter. Such attributions should influence the "quality" of these two people's subsequent interaction. Specifically, if a person whose personal space has been unjustifiably violated attributes negative characteristics to the violator, then he might not wish to engage in any further interactions with that person, even though the interaction might be normative and prosocial, e.g., helping. This reasoning predicts that victims of personal space violations should be less likely to help the violator than people whose space has not been violated.

Method

Procedure. To test the above proposition, major aspects of Experiment I were replicated (including the method of randomization, the setting, etc). Sixty-two female and 61 male subjects were run in several sessions by the same four experimenters (two female, two male). As in Experiment I, male experimenters ran only male subjects, and female experimenters only female ones. There were again four experimental conditions (1-, 2-, 5-, and 10-ft). However, soon after the traffic light changed to green, each subject was given the opportunity to help the experimenter. In all conditions, the experimenter carried a jacket folded loosely over his or her arm. Hidden from the subject's view by the jacket, the experimenter held a key ring with several keys. After the light changed to green, instead of walking away in the opposite direction, as in Experiment I, the experimenter immediately started to cross the street at a very fast pace. All subjects also began to cross. When the experimenter reached a point about 5–6 feet directly ahead of the subject (in the 5- and 10-ft conditions, experimenters crossed the street diagonally to reach this point), as estimated by the observer stationed on the other side of the street, he or she received a sign from the observer to drop the keys. The experimenter did so unobtrusively and walked on at a fast pace. An onlooker presumably got the impression that the key ring slipped out of a pocket in the experimenter's jacket, and that he or she was unaware of the loss. To remain a subject, the person walking behind the experimenter had to perform the distinct behavior of looking down at the key ring after it had been dropped. This was easily ascertained by the observer. Since the key ring was dropped directly in the subject's path, only three subjects (two female, one male) failed to look down and presumably did not notice the key ring. These were in different conditions and were discarded from the analysis.

The dependent measure was the proportion of subjects in different conditions who helped the experimenter either by picking up the keys and giving them to their owner, or by verbally calling his or her attention to the loss.

Results and Discussion

The results of the experiment are presented in Table 2. As is clear from this table, neither the sex of the subjects, nor the experimental conditions, affected the frequency of helping. As much as 87% of the subjects helped, most of these by actually giving the key ring to the experimenter (of the subjects who helped, only 6% did so by calling the experimenter's attention to the key ring).

The experiment thus failed to provide support for the hypothesis that a brief violation of personal space would lead to a decrease in the likeli-

TABLE 2
PERCENT OF SUBJECTS WHO HELPED BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION

	Distance from subjects in feet			
Sex of subjects	1	2	5	10
Male	93	80	93	87
Female	73	100	93	73

Note. $n = 15$ per cell.

hood that the victim would help the violator. While such a violation leads to escape on the part of the victim, the frequency of helping remained unaffected. The high frequency of helping in all conditions may have been due to the fact that (a) the helping act was easy (not "costly") for the subject, (b) the violation was very brief and somewhat removed in time from the helping opportunity, and (c) the object lost was of considerable value to the violator. The subsequent experiments attempted to test the hypothesis in more detail by keeping the cost of helping for the subjects constant and varying the other two factors.

EXPERIMENT III

Method

Procedure. The subjects were 62 males, and the experiment was conducted by the two male experimenters who conducted Experiments I and II. The same four levels of the Distance factor were again manipulated, and the experiment was identical to prior studies in all respects up to the time when the traffic light changed to green. At this time, if the subject had been randomly assigned to the 1-ft condition, the experimenter began to cross the street at the same pace as the subject, thus maintaining the distance of 1 ft between himself and the victim until they had crossed about one-fourth of the street's width (approximately 10 feet from the sidewalk from which they started). If the subject attemped to change his direction of walking away from the experimenter during this time, the experimenter changed his path accordingly to continue to maintain the distance. After thus traveling side-by-side with the subject, on a sign from the observer, the experimenter somewhat increased his speed of walking, dropped the key ring (as in Experiment II), which usually fell about a foot away from the subject, and walked on. In the 2-ft condition, essentially the same strategy was employed: the original sidewalk distance of 2 feet was maintained for about 10 feet during the crossing, at which point the experimenter dropped the key ring (at a distance of about 2 feet from the subject). In the 5- and 10-ft conditions, the experimenter crossed the street diagonally, walking very fast, and dropped the key ring at a distance of approximately 5 and 10 feet, respectively, directly in the subject's walking path. Thus, in the various conditions, the experimenter stood 1, 2, 5, and 10 feet away from the subject before the light changed to green and proceeded to drop the key ring at the corresponding distances from the subject on the crossing. The purpose of this manipulation was to violate the subject's personal space for a longer period of time, and up to the time when the opportunity to render help presented itself. It was hypothesized that the addition of the "moving violation" to the "stationary" one would decrease the frequency of helping in the

close conditions. Even though the key ring was dropped at different distances from the subjects in different conditions, it was felt that the cost (effort, etc.) of helping for the subject would not be differentially affected, since the key ring always fell directly in the subject's path. Given the restriction that all subjects had to indicate clearly that they had noticed the key ring, the assumption that it would be easier for the subject to help when the key ring was dropped closer to him would work against the major hypothesis. Helping was again defined as giving the key ring to the experimenter, or verbally calling his attention to it.

Results and Discussion

Two subjects (one in the 2- and one in the 5-ft condition) appeared to the observer to have failed to notice the dropped key ring. This left a total of 60 subjects, 15 in each of the four experimental conditions. Only 67% of the subjects in the 1-ft, and 87% of those in the 2-ft condition, helped; in contrast, 100% of the subjects in the 5-ft, and 93% of those in the 10-ft condition, did so. The continued violation of people's personal space significantly decreased the frequency with which they helped the violator ($\chi^2(3) = 8.08$, $p < .05$). Subjects in the 1- and 2-ft conditions helped the experimenter less than those in the 5- and 10-ft conditions ($\chi^2(1) = 3.61$, $p < .06$, corrected for continuity). Of the people who helped (87% of the total number of subjects), 87% did so by physically presenting the keys to the experimenter. The remaining 13% of the helpers verbally drew the experimenter's attention to the keys; such subjects were represented in all four conditions. Note that the frequency with which the 5- and 10-ft subjects helped was remarkably similar to that in Experiment II. Clearly, as long as the keys are dropped in the subjects' path, and the owner is identifiable, the frequency of helping is not affected by the distance from the subject at which they are dropped, unless the owner of the keys had previously violated the potential helper's personal space. The social offender of this sort would not be able to enter his car or house and would have to bear considerable expense.

The hypothesis that negative personality dispositions may be imputed to a person for violating others' personal space, as inferred from the fact that the victims tended to help him less, or at least tended to minimize the interaction with him, seems to be supported. The next experiment combined the designs of Experiments II and III and attempted to obtain further evidence in support of the hypothesis by decreasing the value to the violator of the object he had lost.

EXPERIMENT IV

Method

Procedure. The study was carried out by the same two male experimenters, in the same setting, and it involved 126 male subjects randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions

in a 4 × 2 design. The first factor consisted of the four distances, described previously, at which the experimenter stood away from the subjects before the light changed. The two levels of the second factor served to combine Experiments II and III. In the Sidewalk-Only condition, the experimenter stood a given distance away from the subject before the light changed; irrespective of this distance, he dropped an object 5–6 feet in front of the subject while crossing the street, without violating the subject's personal space during the crossing (procedure identical to that in Experiment II). In the Sidewalk + Crossing condition, the distance at which the object was dropped corresponded to the standing distance before the light changed; as in Experiment III, the violation of the subjects' space was maintained during the crossing in 1- and 2-ft conditions.

Unlike the previous studies, the experimenter lost a cheap pencil instead of a key ring, in all conditions. As before, an observer, stationed on the other side of the street, directed the experimenter and noted subjects' behavior.

Results and Discussion

Six subjects, unsystematically distributed across conditions, failed to notice the pencil and were discarded. The results for the remaining 120 subjects are presented in Table 3. These results were subjected to a factorial χ^2 analysis (Winer, 1971, pp. 855–859). The overall χ^2 of 38.79 was highly significant ($df = 7, p < .001$), as were the main effects of the Distance ($\chi^2(3) = 30.04, \ p < .001$) and Sidewalk-Only/Sidewalk + Crossing ($\chi^2(1) = 5.08, p < .03$) factors, while the interaction was not ($\chi^2(3) = 3.67$). Of the people who helped, 88% did so by bringing the pencil to the experimenter.

The main effect of Distance was partly due to the fact that the results of Experiment III were replicated: when personal space was violated on both the sidewalk and the crossing, the four distances differentially affected helping ($\chi^2(3) = 24.76, p < .01$). However, the present experiment provided data which went beyond those of previous experiments. Even when the space was violated for a mere 10 sec on the sidewalk only, there was a significant effect of Distance on subsequent helping ($\chi^2(3) = 8.78, p < .05$). The significant main effect of the Sidewalk-Only/Sidewalk + Crossing factor was due to the difference between the two levels of this factor when the distances in question were 1 ft ($\chi^2(1) = 3.97, p < .05$) and 2 feet ($\chi^2(1) = 4.82, p < .03$).

TABLE 3
PERCENT OF SUBJECTS WHO HELPED BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION

	Distance from subjects in feet			
Distance maintained	1	2	5	10
Sidewalk only	47	67	93	80
Sidewalk and crossing	13	27	87	80

Note. $n = 15$ per cell. All subjects were male.

Thus, when the object lost by the experimenter was of little value to him, *both* a short and a long violation of the potential retriever's personal space decreased the frequency with which the experimenter was helped.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

For the purposes of comparison and illustration, it is useful to consider the data from Experiments II, III, and IV together. These data are presented in Table 4. Complete data from Experiments III and IV, and the data for male subjects only from Experiment II, comprise this table.

The data were treated as coming from a 4 (Distance) × 2 (Sidewalk-Only vs Sidewalk + Crossing) × 2 (Key vs Pencil Lost) design and subjected to a factorial χ^2 analysis. The overall χ^2 of 75.69 was significant ($df = 15$, $p < .001$), as were all three main effects: Distance ($\chi^2(3) = 29.61$, $p < .001$), Sidewalk ($\chi^2(1) = 3.72$, $p \approx .05$), and Key-Pencil ($\chi^2(1) = 21.12$, $p < .001$). The Distance × Key-Pencil interaction was also significant ($\chi^2(3) = 10.41$, $p < .03$), but the two other two-way interactions and the three-way interaction were not (Distance × Sidewalk: $\chi^2(3) = 5.67$, $p < .15$; Sidewalk × Key-Pencil: $\chi^2(1) = 2.66$, $p \approx .10$; the three-way interaction: $\chi^2(3) = 2.50$).

Thus, a person who loses an object is less likely to get it back from another person if (a) he had violated the latter's personal space, (b) had done so for a longer period of time and/or while moving, and (c) had lost an object of little value to himself. The significant Distance × Key-Pencil interaction was due to the fact that the frequency of helping was particularly decreased in the 1- and 2-ft conditions, in comparison to the 5- and 10-ft conditions, when the object lost was a pencil rather than

TABLE 4
PERCENT OF SUBJECTS WHO HELPED BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION[a]

Object lost	Distance maintained							
	Sidewalk only				Sidewalk and crossing			
	Distance from subjects in feet							
	1	2	5	10	1	2	5	10
Key	93[b]	80[b]	93[b]	87[b]	67[c]	87[c]	100[c]	93[c]
Pencil	47[d]	67[d]	93[d]	80[d]	13[d]	27[d]	87[d]	80[d]

[a] $n = 15$ per cell. All subjects were male.
[b] Data from Experiment II.
[c] Data from Experiment III.
[d] Data from Experiment IV.

keys. On the whole, however, the results indicate that as long as one does not violate others' personal space, he is likely to retrieve things he loses, especially those that are of relatively high value to the owner and of relatively low value for the potential finders (the frequency of helping in the 5- and 10-ft conditions was uniformly high across other experimental conditions).

Treated together, the present experiments successfully extended the prior work on personal space. Experiment I showed that a brief violation of a person's space causes him to flee, very much like staring does (Ellsworth *et al.*, 1972). However, Experiments II–IV showed quite conclusively that the violation of personal space must be regarded in social as well as biological terms. A person whose space has been violated does not simply escape from the violator; the victim presumably also imputes to the violator certain personality characteristics. These are apparently not conducive to the initiation by the victim of any sort of interaction with the violator, as exemplified by a decrease in the likelihood of the victim helping the violator in a minor way. It is possible that the staring manipulation used by Ellsworth *et al.* (1972) set off a similar attribution process, in addition to having had an effect on escape. It would be interesting to explore this possibility by examining the effects of staring on helping.

Another interesting extension of the present work would be a test of the possibility that a person whose space has been violated would become less likely to help not just the violator, but other people as well. Because of the discomfort and tension produced by the violation, and/or through a process of generalization from the violator to aspects of the setting and other people in it, victims may be disinclined to interact with (and help) people during the period immediately following the violation.

An exploratory study of this kind has already been done. The setting and the two male experimenters were those described previously. Fifteen male subjects were randomly assigned to each of two Distance conditions (1- and 5-ft). The two experimenters alternated in the following two roles: one experimenter stood at a distance from the subject required by the condition until the light changed to green, at which time he walked away in the opposite direction (as in Experiment I); as the subject began to cross the street, the second experimenter, who had been standing a little distance away, began to cross the street (starting from the same sidewalk) at a fast pace and dropped a pencil 5–6 feet in front of the subject. The violation and the pencil-drop were thus similar to those in the Sidewalk-Only condition of Experiment IV; however, a person not associated with the violator now needed help. It was found that 47% of the people in the 1-ft condition, and 67% of those in the 5-ft condition, helped ($\chi^2(1) = .54$, *ns*, corrected for continuity).

This result suggests that a violation as such does not significantly decrease the probability of the victim engaging in helping behavior in general, and thus provides further support for the hypothesis that the attribution of negative characteristics to the violator was operative in Experiments III and IV.

REFERENCES

ALTMAN, I., & HAYTHORN, W. W. The ecology of isolated groups. *Behavioral Science,* 1967, **12,** 169–182.

BIRDWHISTELL, R. L. *Introduction to kinesics.* Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, 1952.

EBBESEN, E. B., & HANEY, M. Flirting with death: Variables affecting risk taking on our nation's highways. CHIP, University of California, San Diego, Technical Report #29, 1972.

ELLSWORTH, P. C., CARLSMITH, J. M., & HENSON, A. The stare as a stimulus to flight in human subjects: A series of field experiments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1972, **21,** 302–311.

ESSER, A. H. (Ed.). *Behavior and environment: The use of space by animals and men.* New York: Plenum Press, 1971.

GRANT, E. C. An ethological description of some schizophrenic patterns of behavior. *Proceedings of the Leeds Symposium on Behavioral Disorders.* Chap. 12, pp. 3–14, 1965.

HALL, E. T. *The silent language.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.

HALL, E. T. *The hidden dimension.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966.

HULL, C. L. *Principles of behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943.

MCBRIDE, G., KING, M. G., & JAMES, J. W. Social proximity effects on GSR in adult humans. *Journal of Psychology,* 1965, **61,** 153–157.

SOMMER, R. *Personal space.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

SPENCE, K. W. *Behavior theory and conditioning.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.

TINBERGEN, N. *Social behavior in animals.* London: Methuen, 1953.

WINER, B. J. *Statistical principles in experimental design,* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Received April 9, 1974