

Proxemics in Virtual Reality: What Should We Put to the Test in Social VR?

Robin Welsch
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
robin.welsch@ifi.lmu.de

Sylvia Rothe
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
sylvia.rothe@ifi.lmu.de

Sven Mayer
LMU Munich
Munich, Germany
info@sven-mayer.com

ABSTRACT

When approaching another user in social VR, there comes the point where we start to feel uncomfortable and intruded upon. Therefore, users maintain a personal space that is kept clear from others, much like in the real world. Although many determinants on the size of personal space have been identified, the process of maintaining and constructing a personal space in social VR is not well investigated, especially in multi-user environments. In the following, we will present the most important developments within the proxemic research field and raise opportunities and challenges for proxemics in social VR.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Human-centered computing** → **Virtual reality; Collaborative and social computing.**

KEYWORDS

Virtual Reality, Social VR, Proxemics

ACM Reference Format:

Robin Welsch, Sylvia Rothe, and Sven Mayer. 2021. Proxemics in Virtual Reality: What Should We Put to the Test in Social VR?. In *Social VR Workshop – A New Medium for Remote Communication & Collaboration, May 7, 2021, Yokohama, Japan*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

When a stranger approaches, there comes the point where we start feeling uncomfortable and intruded upon. Our feeling of an inappropriately large or short distance concerning another person can be conceived as personal space [6, 24]. While several determinants of personal space sizes have been established, the process of managing personal space in social virtual reality (VR) is not clear yet. We will present the most critical advances in the field of proxemics and VR below to motivate challenges inherent to social VR and highlight where social VR may enhance social interaction.

While proxemics in human-computer interaction (HCI) is mainly known for the interaction with ubiquitous devices, cf. [2, 4, 13], proxemics was first introduced in psychology to study the human-human interplay. Here, Sommer [20] was the first to investigate the phenomenon of personal space. He observed that schizophrenic patients chose more distant seating configurations than patients without. Later, Hall [5] described four distinct zones around the

user defined by the interpersonal distance (IPD) which replicated in numerous empirical studies [6] and persist across cultures [5, 19, 21].

Personal space is also relevant in VR. In an innovative experiment by Bailenson et al. [1], users had to move through a virtual space to report a letter on an avatar’s shirt while the minimum IPD was recorded without the user’s awareness. This method offers an unobtrusive and highly naturalistic personal space measure in a controlled environment. Note, however, that this minimum distance may not correspond to the edges of personal space as it could be influenced by target size, body alignment, or user intention. Others have used more elaborate observation approaches, such as proxemic imaging [15] or passing distance [3]; however, they principally suffer from the same measurement issues as Bailenson et al. [1]. In a more indirect approach, Welsch et al. [24] presented participants with different IPDs, and participants rated their comfort level with the interaction distances. Mean distance for the point of minimal discomfort closely resembled IPD as measured by a stop-distance task.

The stop-distance paradigm, which is widely used for other purposes in VR settings, could circumvent some of the limitations mentioned above. For example, Iachini et al. [10] manipulated an avatar’s perceived morality by pairing it with moral, neutral, or amoral descriptions. Participants produced the largest IPDs in trials with amoral descriptions, intermediate distances for neutral descriptions, and closest distances when moral descriptions were given. Furthermore, sex, age [9], personality [11], and facial expression [17] affected preferred IPD in VR.

Note that the studies mentioned above have relied on simulating a social interaction in VR. Thus, they tested only one user and did not consider the intricate patterns of communication or proxemics’ negotiation within dyadic social interaction. Therefore, they should be regarded as simulated social VR; proxemic research in virtual spaces has to put the concepts obtained in simulation to social VR, i.e., testing with two or more users.

2 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Tracking. To date, user tracking is one of the hard problems in the real world but important to study IPD, cf. Mayer et al. [14]. While with platforms like Mozilla Hubs, social VR experiences are easy to set up, these platforms are not conceptualized for user tracking or fine-grained experimentation. Thus, while the setup time is reduced to a minimum due to the missing logging capabilities, such platforms are not yet usable for conducting user IPD studies. Thus, researchers still have to implement virtual environments and user logging (e.g. [16]) to do such research which is hard for non-developers.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
“Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International” license.



Social VR Workshop '21, May 7, 2021, Yokohama, Japan
© 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

Multi-User Environment. Indeed, only a few attempts have been made to test proxemic behavior in multi-user environments. In massive-multipayer online role-playing games, players not only respect others' personal space, but they also conform to proxemic patterns of gender [27], much like in simulated social VR and real-world interactions [7].

Social Appearance & Embodiment. Simulated social VR has reliably shown that the appearance of avatars affects judgments of IPD. Sex-effects, shorter distance to female avatars as compared to male avatars [7, 9] resembling real-world social interaction appear, but also more fine-grained effects of social affordances such as sexual attraction [26] on IPD are present in simulated social VR. Additionally, body-shape and its perception seem to affect proxemic behavior [22]. However, social VR offers a new possibility to change the appearance of the self-avatar. For example, one could assume a different gender by changing one's virtual character [8]. How this affect's proxemic pattern's has yet not been explored in social VR. Moreover, while the effect of missing limbs has been studied for embodiment [12, 18], the impact in a social VR setting is not clear yet.

Trans-cultural. Social VR allows us to meet people in different places, which allows trans-cultural social exchange without travel. Much like in proxemic research that considers effects of culture on social interactions in real spaces [19, 21], proxemic research in social VR may consider how user's from different culture's make use of social space and how cultural exchange can be supported. For example, it is well known that people with a Japanese background prefer to keep larger distances to others as compared to German subjects [19], these differences may cause friction or misunderstanding in trans-cultural social interaction [5]. Social VR may enable user's with different preferences in distance to seamlessly interact by scaling the distances in social VR individually.

Individual differences and privacy. Lastly, proxemic behavior in simulated social VR can be informative concerning personality. Social anxiety [11] and psychopathy [23, 25] influence IPD, meetings with female and male avatars can differentiate sexual orientation [26] and avoidance of skinny and fat avatars increases IPD in eating disorders [22]. Therefore, proxemic patterns in social VR may enable to derive certain personality traits. This could be used to pair user's with regard to their personality or adapt the social VR but may also be exploited for other purposes that are not intended by the user. Therefore, with regard to the utility of proxemics, privacy becomes an issue to consider in social VR, especially when supplemented with other data such as dialogue in social VR, gaze, etc.

3 CONCLUSION

In summary, while many aspects of proxemics in VR have been studied in simulated scenarios. They have rarely been put to the test in social VR. Also, VR allows new ways of computer-mediated social interaction. With this, we highlighted several challenges to push proxemic research in social VR further and highlighted potentials for novel means to make use of space in social VR.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jeremy N. Bailenson, Jim Blascovich, Andrew C. Beall, and Jack M. Loomis. 2003. Interpersonal distance in immersive virtual environments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29, 7 (2003), 819–833. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203029007002>
- [2] Till Ballendat, Nicolai Marquardt, and Saul Greenberg. 2010. Proxemic Interaction: Designing for a Proximity and Orientation-Aware Environment. In *ACM International Conference on Interactive Tabletops and Surfaces* (Saarbrücken, Germany) (ITS '10). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1936652.1936676>
- [3] Mariano D'Angelo, Giuseppe Di Pellegrino, and Francesca Frassinetti. 2017. In-visible body illusion modulates interpersonal space. *Scientific reports* 7, 1 (2017), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-01441-9>
- [4] Saul Greenberg, Nicolai Marquardt, Till Ballendat, Rob Diaz-Marino, and Miaosen Wang. 2011. Proxemic Interactions: The New Ubicomp? *Interactions* 18, 1 (Jan. 2011), 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1897239.1897250>
- [5] Edward T. Hall. 1966. The hidden dimension. *Anchor Books* 14 (1966), 103–124.
- [6] Leslie A Hayduk. 1983. Personal space: Where we now stand. *Psychological bulletin* 94, 2 (1983), 293.
- [7] Heiko Hecht, Robin Welsch, Jana Viehoff, and Matthew R Longo. 2019. The shape of personal space. *Acta psychologica* 193 (2019), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2018.12.009>
- [8] Zaheer Hussain and Mark D. Griffiths. 2008. Gender Swapping and Socializing in Cyberspace: An Exploratory Study. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 11, 1 (2008), 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2007.0020> PMID: 18275312.
- [9] Tina Iachini, Yann Coello, Francesca Frassinetti, Vincenzo Paolo Senese, Francesco Galante, and Gennaro Ruggiero. 2016. Peripersonal and interpersonal space in virtual and real environments: Effects of gender and age. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 45 (2016), 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.01.004>
- [10] Tina Iachini, Stefano Pagliaro, and Gennaro Ruggiero. 2015. Near or far? It depends on my impression: Moral information and spatial behavior in virtual interactions. *Acta Psychologica* 161 (2015), 131–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2015.09.003>
- [11] Tina Iachini, Gennaro Ruggiero, Francesco Ruotolo, Armando Schiano di Cola, and Vincenzo Paolo Senese. 2015. The influence of anxiety and personality factors on comfort and reachability space: a correlational study. *Cognitive Processing* 16 Suppl 1 (2015), 255–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-015-0717-6>
- [12] Martin Kocur, Sarah Graf, and Valentin Schwind. 2020. The Impact of Missing Fingers in Virtual Reality. In *26th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology* (Virtual Event, Canada) (VRST '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 4, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385956.3418973>
- [13] Nicolai Marquardt and Saul Greenberg. 2015. Proxemic interactions: From theory to practice. *Synthesis Lectures on Human-Centered Informatics* 8, 1 (2015), 1–199. <https://doi.org/10.2200/S00619ED1V01Y201502HCI025>
- [14] Sven Mayer, Lars Lischke, Jens Emil Grønnebæk, Zhanna Sarsenbayeva, Jonas Vogelsang, Paweł W. Woźniak, Niels Henze, and Giulio Jacucci. 2018. Pac-Many: Movement Behavior When Playing Collaborative and Competitive Games on Large Displays. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montreal QC, Canada) (CHI '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174113>
- [15] Cade McCall and Tania Singer. 2015. Facing Off with Unfair Others: Introducing Proxemic Imaging as an Implicit Measure of Approach and Avoidance during Social Interaction. *PLOS ONE* 10, 2 (02 2015), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117532>
- [16] Sylvia Rothe, Tobias Höllerer, and Heinrich Hußmann. 2018. CVR-Analyzer: A Tool for Analyzing Cinematic Virtual Reality Viewing Patterns. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia* (Cairo, Egypt) (MUM 2018). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3282894.3282896>
- [17] Gennaro Ruggiero, Francesca Frassinetti, Yann Coello, Mariachiara Rapuano, Armando Schiano di Cola, and Tina Iachini. 2017. The effect of facial expressions on peripersonal and interpersonal spaces. *Psychological Research* 81, 6 (2017), 1232–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-016-0806-x>
- [18] Valentin Schwind, Pascal Knierim, Lewis Chuang, and Niels Henze. 2017. "Where's Pinky?": The Effects of a Reduced Number of Fingers in Virtual Reality. In *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play* (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) (CHI PLAY '17). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 507–515. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3116595.3116596>
- [19] Maurizio Sicorello, Jasmina Stevanov, Hiroshi Ashida, and Heiko Hecht. 2019. Effect of gaze on personal space: A Japanese–German cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 50, 1 (2019), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118798513>
- [20] Robert Sommer. 1959. Studies in Personal Space. *Sociometry* 22, 3 (1959), 247–260. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2785668>

- [21] Agnieszka Sorokowska, Piotr Sorokowski, Peter Hilpert, Katarzyna Cantarero, Tomasz Frackowiak, Khodabakhsh Ahmadi, Ahmad M Alghraibeh, Richmond Aryeetey, Anna Bertoni, Karim Bettache, et al. 2017. Preferred interpersonal distances: a global comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 48, 4 (2017), 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117698039>
- [22] Robin Welsch, Heiko Hecht, David R Kolar, Michael Withhöft, and Tanja Legenbauer. 2020. Body image avoidance affects interpersonal distance perception: A virtual environment experiment. *European Eating Disorders Review* 28, 3 (2020), 282–295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/erv.2715>
- [23] Robin Welsch, Heiko Hecht, and Christoph von Castell. 2018. Psychopathy and the Regulation of Interpersonal Distance. *Clinical Psychological Science* 6, 6 (2018), 835–847. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702618788874>
- [24] Robin Welsch, Christoph von Castell, and Heiko Hecht. 2019. The anisotropy of personal space. *PLoS One* 14, 6 (2019), e0217587. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217587>
- [25] Robin Welsch, Christoph von Castell, and Heiko Hecht. 2020. Interpersonal Distance Regulation and Approach-Avoidance Reactions Are Altered in Psychopathy. *Clinical Psychological Science* 8, 2 (2020), 211–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702619869336>
- [26] Robin Welsch, Christoph von Castell, Martin Rettenberger, Daniel Turner, Heiko Hecht, and Peter Fromberger. 2020. Sexual attraction modulates interpersonal distance and approach-avoidance movements towards virtual agents in males. *PloS one* 15, 4 (2020), e0231539. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231539>
- [27] Nick Yee, Jeremy N Bailenson, Mark Urbanek, Francis Chang, and Dan Merget. 2007. The unbearable likeness of being digital: The persistence of nonverbal social norms in online virtual environments. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 10, 1 (2007), 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2006.9984>