

PERCEPTION OF THE OTHER AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SPACE

TATEVIK VATYAN

National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia
International Scientific-Educational Centre
Department of Psychology, Applicant
vatyantatevik@gmail.com

DOI: 10.54503/2579-2903-2026.1-43

Abstract

This article aims to reveal the phenomenon of the perception of the other in the context of the psychological characteristics of space. Psychological studies of the perception of the other reveal a number of areas of a person's life in which the processes of adaptation to a new environment, interpersonal relationships, "us"- "them" value orientations, etc., become relevant. Social-psychological studies indicate that the ability to adapt to a new environment quickly and to demonstrate flexibility in social relationships has become a priority for the activity and life of a modern person. In this context, a person's ideas about the Self are also transformed, and new dimensions of alienation emerge, increasingly penetrating the inner world of the person. If psychological studies of the previous century analysed the perceptions of the other mainly in the context of contacts with strangers and migration processes, now the perceptions of the other acquire shades and meanings of the psychological alienation of the person, the distortion of the I-structure. From this point of view, the socio-psychological analysis of the perception of the other is of interest from the point of view of defining and interpreting the psychological space of a person. Below are presented psychological approaches to interpreting a person's psychological space and manifestations of the perception of the other.

Keywords: Perception of the other, psychological space, anonymity, privacy, value orientations.

ՕՏԱՐԻ ԸՆԿԱԼՈՒՄԸ ԵՎ ՀՈԳԵԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՏԱՐԱԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ

ՏԱԹԵՎԻԿ ՎԱԹՅԱՆ

ՀՀ Գիտությունների ազգային ակադեմիայի
գիտակրթական միջազգային կենտրոնի
հոգեբանության ամբիոնի հայցորդ
vatyantatevik@gmail.com

Համառոտագիր

Այս հոդվածը նպատակ ունի բացահայտելու օտարի ընկալման երևույթը տարածության հոգեբանական բնութագրերի համատեքստում: Օտարի ընկալման հոգեբանական ուսումնասիրությունները բացահայտում են անձի կյանքի մի շարք ոլորտներ, որոնցում արդիական են դառնում նոր միջավայրին անձի ադապտացիայի գործընթացները, միջանձնային հարաբերությունները, «մենք»-«նրանք» արժեքային կողմնորոշումները և այլն: Սոցիալ-հոգեբանական ուսումնասիրությունները վկայում են, որ ժամանակակից մարդու գործունեության և կյանքի համար առաջնահերթ է դարձել նոր միջավայրին արագ հարմարվելու, սոցիալական փոխհարաբերություններում ձկնունդություն դրսևորելու ունակությունը: Այս համատեքստում որոշակի կերպով տրանսֆորմացվում են նաև անձի պատկերացումները Ես-ի մասին, ի հայտ են գալիս օտարացման նոր հարթություններ, որոնք ավելի ու ավելի են ներթափանցում անձի ներաշխարհ: Եթե նախորդ դարի հոգեբանական ուսումնասիրությունները օտարի ընկալումները վերլուծում էին հիմնականում անձանոթ մարդկանց հետ շփումների, միգրացիոն գործընթացների համատեքստում, ապա այժմ օտարի ընկալումները ձեռք են բերում անձի հոգեբանական օտարացման, Ես-կառուցվածքի աղավաղման երանգներ և իմաստներ: Այս տեսանկյունից հետաքրքրություն է ներկայացնում օտարի ընկալման սոցիալ-հոգեբանական վերլուծությունը անձի հոգեբանական տարածության սահմանման և մեկնաբանման տեսանկյունից: Ստորև ներկայացվում են անձի հոգեբանական տարածության մեկնաբանման հոգեբանական մոտեցումները և օտարի ընկալման դրսևորումները:

Բանալի բառեր՝ օտարի ընկալում, հոգեբանական տարածություն, անանունություն, պրիվատություն, արժեքային կողմնորոշումներ:

Introduction

The perception of the other is closely related to the demarcation of one's own space from the territory of others. Attitudes towards strangers are shaped by established boundaries. Psychological research on this phenomenon covers not only human societies, but also the animal world. Animals demarcate their territory through defecation, urination, and vocalisation, while in humans, territorial demarcation is carried out by symbolic means. Through symbols, people separate

their own territory from strangers, which leads to the formation of a corresponding perception of the other. People and animals also react differently to invasions of their territory. Animals show aggression, while humans have greater tools to respond to invasions. Studies of the phenomenon of the perception of the other are often carried out in the context of interpreting the term "personal distance", separating one's own world from strangers.

Perception of the Other

The term "personal distance" describes the distance that a person maintains between himself and other members of the group. The psychological motives for the formation and maintenance of this distance are related to the idea of the safety of one's own world. For people, space is the fact of the existence of other people, because when a child begins to move independently, open doors, he discovers for himself new territories and new people to whom these territories belong. Space would not be a problem for a person if they lived alone; therefore, space is the fact of the existence of other people, with whom a person must come to terms and take into account (Blanks, 2019).

The first personal space for a child is the distance of his outstretched hand, because when a child learns to grasp, that distance of his outstretched hand is the only space he can control without the help of an adult's help. As the child learns to move, his space gradually expands.

Even though space often means safety, it is different for humans and animals. This difference is due to the existence and significance of social roles in human society. Territorial motives are also different. For animals, these are biological needs (physical security, mating, and food), for people – social needs (social roles, demarcation of one's own and others' territories)" (Bochaver & Khlomov, 2014).

An important factor in the perception of the other is not only the separation and demarcation of one's own territory from strangers, but also the recognition of the other's territory. The perception of the other can also form in a person's inner world. This is evidenced by psychological phenomena such as anonymity and privacy. A person can alienate themselves by creating pseudonyms or literary names, or by communicating anonymously with others in the virtual world, on social networks, etc. The perception of the other opens up new opportunities from the point of view of the study of psychological space, creating a framework for understanding and interpreting the phenomenon in the psychological sciences (Blanks, 2019; Lingis, 1972).

Classifications of Interpersonal Distance

American anthropologist Edward Hall, together with linguist George Trager, studied the interpersonal distance necessary for a person to function normally. During their research, they identified 8 types of interpersonal distance, in which human senses are involved in different ways (Hall & Trager, 1953).

Later, E. Hall, developing this theory, proposes 4 classifications of

interpersonal distance, considering that 8 is too complex. The classification includes the following 4 components: intimate zone, personal zone, social zone and public zone. Each of these four has its own maximum and minimum limit.

The distance near the intimate zone is the limit for making love, when it is possible to feel the warmth of another person's body with your body. At this distance, people communicate with each other in a whisper.

The distance from the intimate zone is from 6 to 16 inches (approximately 15–41 cm). At this distance, people's heads cannot easily touch each other, but you can easily touch the other person by extending your hand. At this distance, you can see the other person's features very closely and smell their scent. This is the distance at which a person becomes nervous when strangers approach, since it is taboo for non-contact species to engage in physical contact with strangers. At this distance, people still communicate in whispers.

The distance near the personal zone is 1.5 to 2.5 feet. At this distance, the other person's features are still clearly visible, and you can touch them by extending your hand.

The distance from the personal zone is 2.5 to 4 feet. This is the distance at which you can touch the other person's fingers if they also extend their hand. This is the limit of physical dominance, because beyond this limit, it is no longer so easy to touch the other person. At this distance, the tone of the interlocutors' voices is higher than a whisper.

The distance near the social zone is 4 to 7 feet. At this distance, it takes some effort to touch the other person. The tone of the voice is so high that the conversation can be heard from a distance of 12 feet (the tone of the voice varies among representatives of different cultures). The distance between people working together is the near social distance zone. At this distance, looking down on the other person has a dominance effect, as does the conversation between a superior and a subordinate.

The distance from the social zone is 7 to 12 feet. This distance is more formal. The desks and chairs of people in important positions in offices are large and far enough to maintain this distance. From this distance, the other person's entire body is visible.

The near social distance zone is 12 to 25 feet. At this distance, it is possible to take self-defence measures in the event of danger to the person. The conversation is conducted loudly, but not at full volume.

The far social distance zone is defined of 30 feet or more. This is the distance that is maintained around important public figures. At this distance, not only is the body of the other person visible, but also their surroundings.

It is noteworthy that these standards may vary across cultures.

The mentioned standards were established by studying American society. There may be cultures and societies where any of these four interpersonal zones are absent. For example, among Arabs, there is no personal distance at all.

Almost simultaneously with Edward Hall's work "Hidden Space" (1966), the work "Privacy and Freedom" (1967) by American professor, public law specialist Alan Westin (1929–2013) was published, in which the author distinguishes four types of privacy from the point of view of law that exist in Western democratic societies (Westin, 1968). They are: solitude, intimacy, anonymity and reserve.

Solitude is the state of being separate from the group, that is, physical loneliness. However, this does not imply isolation, because a person's senses can be affected by various stimuli, such as sound, light, and smell. Depending on a person's political views and religious beliefs, they may be convinced that special services, spirits, and gods are watching them in solitude. That is, even in solitude, a person may not feel alone. Loneliness is also a state when a person is honest with himself, immersed in himself. "Loneliness is the most complete state of separation that a person can achieve" (Westin, 1968).

Alan Westin describes intimacy as part of a small unit of intimacy, separated from the group. In intimacy, a person has access to close relationships in which they are not tense. Such relationships can be between two or more people. Typical examples of an intimate unit are the relationships of married couples, friends, and even colleagues. According to the author, without intimacy, the basic need for human communication will remain unsatisfied.

The next zone, anonymity, is the state of remaining unknown in public places, among other people, and, as a result, being free there. In such a way, a perception of the other appears. When there are different people around you, none of whom know you or follow you. In such a situation, a person still feels free and does not behave as he would in an environment of familiar people, because being under constant surveillance makes a person tense. It is already clear that this type of privacy is not available to celebrities.

It is interesting that, in conditions of anonymity, people tend to be more honest than in the presence of relatives, because they receive a more objective response from the other person. In addition, by being honest with others, a person does not make himself vulnerable, because that stranger will disappear from his life the next moment.

Another type of anonymity is the publication of books under a pseudonym, when a person wants to share their ideas, but remain unknown. All these manifestations of anonymity are characterised by the author as a demand for public secrecy and privacy.

Moreover, the fourth type of privacy, as defined by A. Westin, the reserve, concerns the psychological barriers people create between themselves to hide something. According to the author, human life is mainly spent in reserve and intimacy. A person experiences the freedom of solitude and anonymity less and less throughout his life, and therefore, he needs to protect himself from others. "Even in the most intimate relationships, communication with another person is never complete, and is always based on the need to hide some parts of his own

'self' that are too personal or embarrassing to show to others." A. Westin considers reserve to be a manifestation of "social distance" and claims that it is present in any type of relationship.

American social psychologist Irwin Altman (1930) defines privacy as follows: "Privacy is the control of boundaries within which people sometimes become open and accessible to others, and sometimes closed to others" (Altman, 1977). Various circumstances condition the process of opening and closing. Irwin Altman identified three functions of privacy:

- Control of social interaction,
- Development of plans and strategies for interaction with others,
- Development and support of one's own identity.

Moreover, without privacy, it is impossible to form an individuality. "The mechanisms of privacy determine the boundaries of the individual. When the permeability of these boundaries is under the control of the person, a sense of individuality develops. However, what is vital for self-determination is not the inclusion or exclusion of others, but the control of those contacts, if desired. If I can control what is "me" and what is not "me", if I can determine what is "me" and what is not "me", and if I can see my boundaries and the area of my control, then I can take serious steps to understand and define who I am. Thus, the mechanisms of privacy help me define/determine myself" (Altman, 1978). The topic of privacy has received little attention in Russian professional literature. Privacy can be considered a phenomenon more characteristic of Western societies. However, based on Western literature and practice, psychology professor Sofia Nartova-Bochaver, in her monograph "Psychological Space of the Person" (2005), identified six areas of psychological space, including both territorial and temporal aspects, as well as social and spiritual aspects. These areas are: the physical body, space, personal belongings, habits, friends, and taste or values. Taste and values are in the same subgroup (Nartova-Bochaver, 2005).

As we see, S. Nartova-Bochaver acts in the same way as E. Hall and A. Westin did before her; she chooses the body of a person as the point of calculation. The sovereignty of the body also underlies the boundary of the space "physical body" defined by S. Nartova-Bochaver. The idea of the sovereignty of the body is as obvious as an axiom and does not even need proof. The security of the body gives a person a sense of security, and vice versa; when the body is threatened, the person cannot feel safe (Nartova-Bochaver, 2005). Security is one of the lowest needs of Maslow's pyramid, a need that everyone has. Therefore, we can conclude that the security of each person begins, first of all, with the security of his body. Any encroachment on a person's body invades their personal space and is actually violence. As a result of violence against the body, some basic human needs are frustrated, such as the need for food.

In addition, the body is the main orientator for a person in space. This is what the 20th-century German philosopher, phenomenologist Edmund Husserl

thought. “‘Here’ is the place where I am with my body, more precisely, it is my body... ‘There’ is determined by ‘here’. If there is no ‘here’, then there can be no ‘there’... ‘There’ is the place where my body is not, or rather, it is what my body is not. Therefore, the transformation of ‘there’ into ‘here’, that is, the conquest of ‘there’, means the transformation not of my body into mine, into the continuation of my body... Therefore, the transformation of not my body into a continuation of my body means that it becomes my tool” (Лекторский, 1980). Here, once again, we see how the body is the zero point of calculation.

S. Nartova-Bochaver distinguished the following functions of the body in space:

- Self-acceptance, which implies the establishment of a connection between one’s own needs and body parts,
- Establishment of a connection with the environment,
- Ensuring a reliable basic trust in the world,
- Development of subjectivity, which implies independence from the environment and its changes,
- The possibility of purposeful activity,
- The possibility of mastering space,
- The possibility of establishing a long-term and reliable attachment.

In order for us to be able to develop and expand our space, that is, to conquer "there," we first need a safe and secure "here" that will allow us to explore and discover "there." In this manner, we confirm that we differ from the others – all humans who are discovered “there”, far from us. In other words, we “create” the stranger, who, by opposing us in psychological or physical space, forms the structure of the Self.

Research methods

The research on the perception of the other is based on theoretical approaches to the definition and classification of psychological space. The perception of the other is revealed through a comparison of the definitions of the psychological space of a person in different theoretical approaches.

The selection and application of interdisciplinary methods of comparison and analysis allow us to reveal a summary picture of the perception of the other, and to highlight the patterns of its formation and the intrapersonal and interpersonal manifestations.

Functions of Psychological Space

The most obvious fact proving the need for a person to have his own space and its importance is his own home. A home is necessary for a comfortable life.

Below, we present the functions of space identified by S. Nartova-Bochaver.

- Space is an indicator of social identification, that is, it shows the status of an individual within a group.
- Space allows you to control the intensity of social contacts.

- Space allows you to control the flow of information.
- Space protects against invasion and external pressures.
- Space provides an opportunity for constructive activity.
- Space provides an opportunity for psychological recovery (Nartova-Bochaver, 2005).

The boundary of personal belongings follows the space. After the child recognises his body and masters his first personal zone, he begins to move independently, expanding his space and, of course, recognising the objects around him. Objects play a large role in people's lives. In addition to their purposeful use, which is motivated by the needs of the individual, objects also have symbolic meaning, which is vividly expressed in literature, in the epics, myths, and fairy tales of people.

Things can tell a lot about their owner. Some things are a necessity and symbolise protection, and some things are an indicator of a person's status in society. That is, in addition to their functional use, things also carry information, which requires a certain level of sensitivity to understand. For example, many of us often feel more confident when our phone is more expensive. This is a rather vivid manifestation of the connection between a person and the thing that belongs to him.

Encroachments on a person's things are perceived by him as violence. For example, answering someone else's phone call is already an invasion of his territory.

Considering the role of things in a person's life, S. Nartova-Bochaver identified the following functions:

- Things are tools,
- Things are communicative guides,
- Things are a means of self-presentation,
- Things are a means of maintaining personal and social identity,
- Things are a means of establishing contact with reality,
- Things are a resource for self-support,
- Things are markers of personal space (Nartova-Bochaver, 2005).

Things are followed by habits. Habits imply a certain sequence of actions. That is, habits help to coordinate actions, and coordinated actions provide a sense of predictability and reduce tension. It is believed that the formation of habits contributes to the creation of a friendly environment. As a result of habit deprivation, an individual's experiences can be compared to an open gestalt. Habits are especially important for individuals who have little control over their environment and therefore need to know the sequence of actions in advance. This group includes children and the elderly in particular. Respect for customs creates trust in relationships.

Habits provide a person with:

- Predictability, which reduces the level of uncertainty,

- Time–space connection, which means that the individual knows at what time of day which part of the territory will be dominant,
- Time–object connection, which means clarity about when which object will be used,
- The ability to avoid frustration caused by unfinished actions,
- Social status perception through leadership and subordination.

The so-called interruption of habits causes discomfort in the person (Nartova–Bochaver, 2005). The next thing we will talk about is social ties or friends. Social ties are about creating trusting relationships. When a person does not expect danger from their friend, they trust them. However, this type of relationship is often about choice and freedom of choice. A person must be able to decide for themselves with whom they want to create social ties. Otherwise, when a person is introduced into his life with someone with whom he is forced to communicate, or when he lives in limited conditions and cannot get acquainted with or establish contact with people of interest to him, then the person feels loneliness and emptiness. That is, the person also needs social contact. However, social contact has a norm, and both contacts above and below it are equally dangerous, as is also evident in the already mentioned “rat paradise” in conditions of overpopulation.

If a person does not have free experience of forming social contacts, not imposed by parents or other authoritative adults, then he cannot form his own attitude towards another person and thus will never achieve psychological intimacy. In addition, without creating social contacts, a person cannot know himself.

Social ties have the following functions:

- Establishing relationships of psychological intimacy,
- Starting from a certain age, also establishing sexual intimacy,
- Choosing a reference group or significant other,
- Developing self-awareness,
- Acquiring personal and social identity,
- Accepting one’s own responsibility in forming relationships with others.

The ultimate boundary of the psychological space is values. Values give a person’s existence existential meaning and guide their actions. At this boundary are thoughts, works of art, everything that arises from thought or is an idea itself. It is no secret that, in the modern world, intellectual property can be registered to protect it. This indicates that a person’s thoughts are important and that these thoughts belong to him. That is, thoughts are an important component of a person’s identification and an important part of their essence.

The boundary of values of the psychological space has the following functions for a person:

- Values provide existential self-confidence, which implies freedom, meaning of existence, and appreciation of one’s own existence.

- Provide a creative attitude towards one's own life,
- Provide a critical approach to ideological influence,
- Provide personal responsibility (Nartova–Bochaver, 2005).

If we carefully examine the components of the psychological space indicated by S. Nartova–Bochaver, we will see that the violence against the first three boundaries – the physical body, space and things – is most obvious, and the violence against the next three – habits, social ties and values – has no visible traces in material terms. In addition, if the absence of the first three can directly threaten the physical existence of a person, then the absence of the second triad does not threaten the physical existence of a person, but significantly affects the quality of his life. From the above, we can conclude that the more developed the society, the higher the level of delimitation of the psychological space of its representatives. And vice versa, the more backward the society, the lower the threshold of the psychological space of its representatives. In addition, in this scheme of psychological space, there is a hierarchy similar to that in Maslow's pyramid of needs. If a person does not have access to the lower thresholds of psychological space – the boundaries of the body and space, then he cannot claim higher thresholds, such as the boundary of social ties and values.

Even though the zones of psychological space defined by S. Nartova–Bochaver are quite extensive and include various aspects of human life, we nevertheless dare to say that this classification is not complete, and we can add one more zone: the virtual domain. In other words, along with the development of technologies, another zone is added to our psychological space, and that is virtual space.

“...We believe it is necessary and possible to distinguish the “psychological space of an individual in the Internet environment” – in cyberspace, or the “virtual psychological space of an individual” as part of the general psychological space of an individual, which will allow us to make efforts to study its features in the future” (Petrova & Shapovalenko, 2014).

Social networks are an integral part of cyberspace, creating a new field for human interaction. People spend a lot of time on social networks, especially young people. Although social networks are now so widespread that one can even talk about age-specific features. This means there are social networks more popular with older users, and others more popular with younger users. For example, young people in the West avoid the social platform “Facebook”, because their parents, grandparents and great-grandparents are there.

At the same time, it is worth remembering that this zone of psychological space has its own nuances and can be divided into distinct boundaries. Moreover, it is quite universal, as it offers a person a wide range of opportunities to fill the psychological spaces that are not available to them in real life.

For example, if in real life a person does not have access to public privacy, he can achieve it in the virtual domain by spreading his thoughts through

anonymous accounts.

Research in this field has allowed us to distinguish three important models of a person's self-concept when forming contacts in the virtual domain. These are: the real self, the representative self, and the interpretative self.

“The model of the real self is created in the real field of communication, harmonising personal and social ideas that are confirmed by life experience. The model of the representative self exists as an image shell that needs confirmation in a virtual text or image.

The model of the interpretative self lives an independent life, outside the control of the author. The text is read by someone else, which is how the virtual image comes to life” (Petrova & Shapovalenko, 2014).

The Virtual Space

From the above, we can conclude that each user presents himself in the virtual space through three aspects, but the three aspects of the “I” mentioned are likely highly individual and vary in proportion for each user. For example, people may prefer a model of their representative “I”, which in reality may have very little to do with their real “I”.

“The virtual environment has expanded the space for communication, including the mediated component, which, in contrast to direct contact between subjects, has created the illusion of freedom and independence of communication between subjects. This mediated form of communication, in contrast to the direct form of communication, has been called communication” (Fedorkina, 2015).

The fact is that communication over time is increasingly replacing real contact, which cannot help but affect a person's psychological characteristics. At the same time, in this case, there are also many negative consequences, of which it is especially worth noting that the virtual space creates a certain atmosphere of impunity, as a result of which the representative model of the user's “I” can be much more aggressive than in real life. The latter is also possible due to the anonymity allowed on the Internet. “The anonymity allowed on the Internet allows a person to experiment with different social roles and different ‘I’, without fear of negative evaluation or social prohibitions that would follow in the case of live contact” (Bochaver & Khlomov, 2014). Data obtained as early as 2005 proves the above phenomenon. The data show that a quarter of adolescents pretend to be representatives of a different gender, age or ethnicity on the Internet, falsify their political views and sexual orientation.

In other words, the ability to remain anonymous in virtual space allows people to try on different roles and reveal themselves, thereby getting to know themselves better. However, the idea of remaining anonymous and unpunished gives users, in addition to the opportunity to express themselves, the space to express aggression.

Various connections have been identified between a person's self-expression in the virtual domain and that user's real identity, which are listed below.

“Virtual self-expression in the Internet space acts as a fulfilment of unfulfilled desires in real life (for example, for power and ability, beauty, belonging, etc.).

Virtual self-presentation presents an ideal “I” that replaces the unsatisfactory real “I” in real life.

If the user is dissatisfied with any aspect of his personality (appearance, gender, age, ethnicity, social status, etc.), then virtual self-presentation and communication create an opportunity to “escape from his own body”.

Virtual self-presentation gives an opportunity to manifest the suppressed part of the individual, which is associated with disapproved aggressive, forceful or sexual tendencies.

Network identity can also be interpreted as an expression of the versatility of the “I”, as a reflection of multiple identities in modern society (Shapovalenko, 2014).

As we can see, in virtual reality, we can fill the psychological gap in real life, but this phenomenon cannot be without its negative side.

Social networks are structured in such a way that each user can share links on their wall that they consider important and worthy of attention. The information the user shares is also available to their friends. This mechanism for distributing news establishes a new system of news perception, in which friends determine the importance of information. The growing drive for likes forces users to consider whether the material is worthy of publication before sharing it. According to experts, this phenomenon poses a risk of increased conformism among users.

In addition, the focus on the user himself is increasing, which in turn infects every user with narcissism. “On Facebook, you can easily become a novelty. It forces people to behave like the media and tell stories that others will like. ...The publication of personal life and the desire for attention and recognition on social platforms go hand in hand with a powerful social trend that sociologists call “cultural narcissism” (Steinschaden, 2011). Research shows that the number of narcissists in Western society has increased. “If in 1982 only 15% of those surveyed could be called narcissists, then in 2006 this number reached 25%” (Steinschaden, 2011).

In addition to the above negative phenomena, another factor must be taken into account. It is cyberbullying. Just as a violation of ethics in real life violates the boundaries of a person’s psychological space, a violation of cyberethics violates the boundaries of a person’s psychological space in the virtual domain, which can cause serious psychological injuries. “Although the balls flying on the Internet are not real, they can still hurt” (Bochaver & Khlomov, 2014).

If in the real world it is possible to establish boundaries and show the other person your territory through physical distance, objects, closed doors, and other visible and tangible means, then in the virtual world it is much more difficult to do so. While an individual gains a new field of psychological space for self-expression

in the virtual realm, he also enters a realm where he becomes more vulnerable, because the traditional methods of protection familiar to him do not work there.

Conclusion

We conclude that the more invisible the boundaries of psychological space are, the easier it is to cross them, to invade someone else's territory, so that he does not perceive it as an invasion.

Thus, we can say that psychological space has two components: physical and psychological. The physical components of space are the key to the development of psychological space. These are personal, intimate, social, and public distances, which are based on the distance between the individual and other members of the group. Moreover, the psychological component also includes terms that acquire symbolic meaning, social ties and, of course, values. Due to the peculiarities of the formation of the physical and psychological components of space, the perception of the stranger is also formed.

Summarising the study of the perception of the other and psychological space, we can say that psychological space is the space completely under a person's control, where they feel safe and regulate the amount of contact with others. The space that is beyond control is "occupied" by others. In some cases, a person "places" himself in a stranger's space that is uncontrollable for others. This happens in accordance with the laws of anonymity and privacy. In addition to being a safe environment where a person satisfies his vital needs, the psychological space is also a space where he can satisfy needs that contribute to his development as an individual, provide opportunities for self-realisation, and protect his ego. In other words, we know the person "there" through and with the help of the "here", and vice versa.

Acknowledgment

I want to express my sincere gratitude to my scientific supervisor, PhD. Associate Prof. Anna Khachatryan, for her encouragement and invaluable support throughout the planning and development of this article. Her deep knowledge in the fields of psychology and the philosophy of perception of the other, as well as in the field of humanities more generally, contributed to an understanding of the research topic and to emphasising the perception of the other in the context of defining psychological space.

References

- Altman, I. (1977). Privacy regulation: Culturally universal or culturally specific? *Journal of Social Issues*, 33(3), 58–69.
- Altman, I. (1978). The environment and social behaviour: Privacy, personal space, territory, and crowding. *Contemporary Sociology*, 7(5).
- Blanks, D. (2019). The sense of distance and the perception of the other. *Journal of Medieval Worlds*, 1(3), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jmw.2019.130003>

- Hall, E. T., & Trager, G. L. (1953). *The analysis of culture*. American Council of Learned Societies.
- Lingis, A. F. (1972). The perception of others. *Research in Phenomenology*, 2, 47–62.
- Westin, A. F. (1968). *Privacy and freedom*. Washington and Lee University Press.
- Bochaver, A. A., & Khlomov, K. D. (2014). Психология. Кибербуллинг: травля в пространстве современных технологий. [Cyberbullying: Bullying in the modern technology space]. *Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, II(3), 177–191.
- Lektorskiy, V. A. (1980). Субъект, объект, познание. [Subject, Object, Knowledge].
- Nartova-Bochaver, S. K. (2005), Психологическое пространство личности. [Psychological Space of a Person], Moscow, Prometej
- Petrova, E. A., & Shapovalenko, A. A. (2014). Виртуальное психологическое пространство как часть общего психологического пространства личности: обоснование понятия [Virtual Psychological Space as a Part of the General Psychological Space of the Individual: Justification of the Concept], *Scientific Notes* 4(1).
- Fedorkina, A. P. (2015). Виртуальное и реальное в психологическом пространстве современного человека [Virtual and real in the psychological space of modern man], *The World of Psychology*, 4, 104–111.
- Shapovalenko, A. A. (2014). Проблема безопасности и защиты виртуального психологического пространства личности [The Problem of Security and Protection of the Virtual Psychological Space of the Individual], *Scientific Notes*, 4(1), 138–145.
- Shteynshaden, Ya. (2011). Социальная сеть. Феномен Facebook. [Social Network. The Facebook Phenomenon]

The article has been submitted for publication: 18.02.2026
Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է պայագրոթյան. 18.02.2026

The article is sent for review: 03.03.2026
Հոդվածն ուղարկվել է գրախոսության. 03.03.2026

The article is accepted for publication: 18.03.2026
Հոդվածն ընդունվել է պայագրոթյան. 18.03.2026