

Self-partner inclusion predicts performance of romantically involved individuals in a body-scaled action-anticipation task.

Cédric A. Bouquet<sup>1\*</sup>, Melissa Lafleur<sup>1</sup>, Virginie Quintard<sup>1</sup>, Stéphane Jouffre<sup>1</sup>, Yannick

5 Wamain<sup>2</sup>, Yann Coello<sup>2</sup>, & Lucette Toussaint<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Poitiers, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Centre de Recherches sur la Cognition et l'Apprentissage UMR 7295, Poitiers, France

<sup>2</sup> Université de Lille, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sciences Cognitives et Affectives UMR 9193, Lille, France

10

\* Corresponding author

E-mail: [cedric.bouquet@univ-poitiers.fr](mailto:cedric.bouquet@univ-poitiers.fr)

## Summary

15 Previous research has shown that romantic relationships can lead to the cognitive inclusion of  
a romantic partner into one's own self-representation, resulting in blurred boundaries  
between self and intimate other. Recent work suggests that this self-other integration process  
encompasses the two dimensions of the self – the conceptual and the bodily self. In line with  
this, it has been proposed that romantic love is associated with cognitive states that blur or  
20 reduce the saliency of self-boundaries in the bodily domain. The present study tested this  
hypothesis by investigating the influence of the self-other integration process in romantic love  
on passability judgments of door-like apertures, an action-anticipation task that rests on the  
representation of bodily boundaries. Romantically involved and single participants estimated  
whether they could pass through apertures of different widths. Moreover, inclusion of  
25 romantic partner in the self was assessed using the Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS) scale.  
The pattern of correlation and the ratio between participants' shoulder width and aperture  
judgments did not differ between romantically involved participants and singles. However,  
our results revealed that in romantically involved participants, the relationship between  
individuals' shoulder width and aperture judgements was moderated by IOS scores. A greater  
30 inclusion of romantic partner in the self was associated with a weaker prediction of aperture  
judgment by participants' shoulder width. A similar moderating effect of the intensity of  
romantic feelings (as measured by the passionate love scale) on shoulder width-aperture  
judgment relationship was found. IOS scores, but not romantic feelings, also moderated  
aperture judgments made for another individual (third person perspective). Together, these  
35 findings are consistent with the view that inclusion of romantic partner in the self triggers  
cognitive states affecting self-boundaries in the bodily domain.

**Keywords:** romantic love; bodily self; action anticipation; self-other inclusion

## Introduction

Romantic (passionate) love, defined as a “state of intense longing for union with another” [1, p.5], is a fundamental drive associated with specific behavioral and psychological traits that differentiate it from other types of love such as companionate love or maternal love [2-5]. Importantly, research indicates that romantic love powerfully affects individuals’ sense of self [6-8]. In the present study our goal was to investigate how the self-other integration process associated with romantic love influences who we are and more specifically how it affects the cognitive representation of the physical aspect of self-boundary.

Various models of romantic love have been proposed by social psychologists [e.g. 5, 9]. Central to the current research is the “including the other in the self” approach to close relationships, which suggests that individuals incorporate aspects of their romantic partner into their own self-representation, creating overlapping cognitive structures of self and partner [7, 10-12]. This approach first rests on the premise that individuals have a fundamental motivation to expand their sense of self in order to increase their potential efficacy, so that they seek opportunities to acquire new perspectives, resources, and identities [13, 14]. Second, it is assumed that a major opportunity for self-expansion is provided by romantic relationships in which the self expands through the cognitive inclusion of the romantic partner in the self, such that the partner’s resources, perspectives, and identities, are to some extent experienced as one’s own [7, 11, 15, 16]. By fulfilling the need to expand one’s self efficacy, the experience of such self-expansion through the inclusion of partner’s characteristics into the self would promote relationship satisfaction and as a rewarding, positive experience, it may also foster the exhilaration associated with romantic love [12, 17, 18]. In sum, romantic love would involve the successful inclusion of the other in the self [12].

Supporting the model of romantic love as an inclusion of the other in the self, there is ample evidence that in romantic lovers, the existing self-representation expands by incorporating a romantic partner's characteristics, such that individuals' description of who they are is enriched by the addition of previously unshared attributes of the romantic partner [19]. Critically, including partner's characteristics into one's self content means that the representational structure of the self shares elements –or overlaps– with the representational structure of the intimate other, which results in blurred distinction between self and romantic partner [13, 20]. In line with this, studies have shown confusion between a partner's and one's own traits, interests, or attitudes [15, 20, 21; see also 22-27].

Another line of research based on the Inclusion of the Other in the Self (IOS) scale – a single-item pictorial measure commonly used to capture self-other integration [28] – confirms that romantically involved individuals demonstrate a prominent inclusion of the intimate other in the self, with participants reporting greater overlap with their romantic partner compared to with a close friend, siblings, or parents [29, 30]. Importantly, IOS scores appear to be a predictor of relationship stability over 3 months [31], confirming the functional role of self-partner integration in romantic love.

There is thus evidence for intertwined representations of self and romantic partner with respect to individuals' characteristics (attitudes, opinions, personality traits,...) that form what has been termed the conceptual or narrative self [32, 33]. The conceptual self refers to an abstract, higher-level representation of the self associating information such as personality traits, beliefs, preferences and autobiographical memories [32, 34-36]. However, current theories of selfhood argue for the existence of another dimension of self, referred to as the bodily self, which rests on body-related representations and sensorimotor processing [32, 35, 37-41].

85 Copious empirical and theoretical research suggests the existence of  
shared/overlapping representations of one's own body and that of others [38, 42-44]. A large  
body of work indeed shows that the neural networks which code for one's own bodily states  
(actions, sensations, emotions) are also activated during the observation of someone else  
90 experiencing those states [42-44]. At the behavioral level, it is also well known that people  
tend to automatically imitate others' bodily postures and states, which thus implies shared  
bodily states and corresponding motor representations between the mimicker and the one  
mimicked [45, 46]. Various theoretical frameworks suggest that these overlapping body-  
related representations of self and other would provide a first-person experience of other's  
states, and as such form the basis of understanding others and, more broadly, of social  
95 cognition processes [44, 47]. Overlapping and confounded representations of one's own and  
romantic partner's bodily states is what is expected from including other in the self at an  
embodied, bodily level. This self-partner integration at the bodily level may have social-  
cognitive consequences that would be beneficial for the relationship, such as increased liking,  
trust, mutual understanding and cooperation [48].

100 There is accumulating evidence for an embodied self-other overlap in romantic love  
[for a review, see 48]. A first line of evidence comes from neuroimaging studies that have  
revealed common activations between the processing of one's own and partner's bodily states  
[49-50]. For instance, it has been found that imagining one's romantic partner (vs. a stranger)  
in a painful situation was associated with greater involvement of the pain matrix activated  
105 when imagining one's self in the same situation [49]. Another line of evidence comes from a  
well-known study in which it was revealed that, after twenty years of marriage, partnered  
individuals tend to become physically similar [51]. This finding may be accounted for by  
reciprocal imitation of the partner's facial and other bodily expressions over time, leading

romantic partners to incorporate the bodily expressions of the other in their own body  
110 representation. A particularly interesting hypothesis has been formulated by Burris and  
Rempel [52] regarding the consequences of including an intimate other in the self.  
Accordingly, including the romantic partner in the self “is associated with a greater sense of  
the self extending beyond the default limits defined by the perimeter of the physical body”  
[52, p. 947]. More specifically, it is assumed that there exists a psychological boundary that  
115 differentiates and protects the self, including the bodily self [52, 53]. Consequently, the  
salience of the physical aspect of self-boundary should decrease in order to allow self-other  
inclusion in romantic relationships. In line with this proposal, the authors found that, as  
compared to singles, romantically involved individuals reported to feel their physical body as  
less constraining. Moreover, a negative correlation between the sense of physical vulnerability  
120 and body size (height and weight) was detected among singles, but not among partnered  
individuals [52]. Thus, these findings support the idea that due to the cognitive inclusion of  
the intimate other into the self, the representation of the bodily aspect of self-boundary gets  
less salient in romantic lovers [52]. Extending this view, behavioral studies have reported a  
blurring of the boundaries between self and romantic partner at a bodily level. For instance,  
125 romantically involved individuals have been found to demonstrate greater automatic  
imitation of their partner’s actions, as compared to a friend’s actions [54], suggesting a  
reduced ability to differentiate between the representations of one’s own and partner’s bodily  
states. Similarly, in the context of joint action, individuals take their romantic partner’s action  
into account to a greater extent than that of a close friend, confirming a reduced self-other  
130 distinction at the level of bodily self-representations in romantic love [30, 55]. Romantic love  
may thus be associated with cognitive states that blur or reduce the saliency of self-  
boundaries in the bodily domain, in a way that is compatible with an inclusion of romantic

partner in the self [48]. The aim of the present study was to further test this hypothesis by investigating whether perceptual judgments that rest on the representation of body's spatial boundaries, such as decision about potential actions, are affected in romantically involved individuals. We reasoned that if the boundaries of the bodily-self get blurred or less salient, this should affect the ability to make body-scaled action-anticipation (in that it necessitates to rely on the representation of the body's spatial properties).

To probe the ability to make body-scaled action-anticipation, we used the passability judgment paradigm [56]. In this paradigm, participants are asked to make perceptual judgments about the passability of door-like apertures (i.e. to decide whether or not the aperture is wide enough for them to pass through without turning their shoulders). Participants usually succeed in this task, choosing an aperture width allowing them to pass through it, with a safety margin. More precisely, it has been repeatedly found that these passability judgments derive from information about one's own body, especially shoulder width, such that the perceived critical aperture/shoulder width ratio (referred to as  $\pi_p$ ) is around 1.2 in human adults [56-59]. Though the passability judgment paradigm has been developed initially to assess affordance judgments in the framework of direct perception [56, 60, 61], subsequent work in cognitive psychology has treated the paradigm more as a visuo-motor imagery task resting on body-related representations. The present work adopts such a cognitive approach to the passability judgment paradigm. Within this framework, passability estimates have been proposed as a proxy to investigate the internal representation of the body's spatial properties [57-59, 62-63]. Consistent with this proposal, passability judgements are adjusted to changes in body size that result for instance from carrying an object or large clothes [64, 65].

Importantly, research further indicates that cognitive processes related to the spatial properties of the body can also be modulated by the social context and affective states [e.g. 58, 66, 67]. For instance, recent work has demonstrated that passability judgments in women were modulated by the degree of individuals' bodily concerns and self-esteem, with greater concern and lower self-esteem being associated with a larger  $\pi_p$  [59, 63]. In the same vein, it has been found that women suffering from anorexia demonstrate abnormal, increased  $\pi_p$ , as compared to controls [57, 62]. One can also consider another line of research on the representation of peripersonal space (the space around the body), which is tightly linked to the representation of the body's spatial properties [66]. Research in this area indicates that the representation of peripersonal space varies according to personality traits, affective states and social context [68-72].

Together, these findings indicate that the processes that support passability judgments are not only constrained by the body's metric properties, but are also sensitive to high-level social cognition and affective modulations. In the present study we thus used passability judgments of door-like apertures to behaviorally assess whether romantic love is associated with a blurring of the physical boundary of the body.

It is worth noting that we are not suggesting that such effects are constantly present in romantically involved individuals. It makes sense to assume that these effects, like other love-related phenomena, take place especially when interacting with the intimate other or, in the absence of the partner, when the romantic relationship schema and romantic feelings are activated, such as when individuals are reminded of their partner or their current relationship [73-75]. Following this reasoning, romantically involved participants from the present study were submitted to a priming procedure – writing a short essay – intended to activate thoughts for their partner and feelings of love [73, 75, 76]. A similar procedure directed to a friend was



180 used for singles. Although it makes difficult to disentangle the effect of status (in-love vs. single) *per se* from the effect of priming, we opted for this procedure to maximize the likelihood of obtaining the expected effects in this first attempt to demonstrate an impact of romantic love on passability judgments.

As stressed above, judging whether a door-like aperture is wide enough to pass  
185 through should be affected by a blurring or reduced saliency of physical boundaries of the body. We see two ways it could impact performance on aperture judgments in romantically involved individuals as compared to singles. First, the relationship between body's metrics and aperture judgments could be altered. In other words, the usual link between shoulder width and perceived critical aperture may be less pronounced in romantically involved participants.  
190 A variant of this prediction is that blurred bodily boundaries would make body-scaled action-anticipation more difficult, thereby leading to more cautious responses [77], which would mean a larger margin of safety (i.e. a larger perceived critical aperture/shoulder width ratio or  $\pi_p$ ) in the context of passability judgments [67, 78].

Moreover, although inclusion of other in the self is a feature of close relationships,  
195 there are still substantial variations among partnered individuals [11]. Consequently, the same should also be true of the blurring or reduced saliency of bodily boundaries, as it is assumed to be related to the self-other inclusion process. Therefore, in partnered individuals, the degree of inclusion of romantic partner in the self should modulate the relationship between shoulder width and aperture judgments. We predicted that a stronger inclusion of romantic  
200 partner in the self would alter the relationship between participants' shoulder width and perceived critical aperture. Moreover, given that self-partner integration has been linked to relationship satisfaction and passion [12, 18, 29], we also tested the moderating role of the intensity of romantic feelings, as measured by the Passionate Love Scale (PLS) [3].

To test these predictions, we had romantically involved and single individuals perform  
205 a passability judgment task in which they had to estimate whether an aperture was large  
enough to allow them to pass through (without turning their shoulder). In order to establish  
the specificity of the effects, i.e. that they relate to participants' own body (first person  
perspective or 1-PP), we also included a passability judgment task in a third person perspective  
(3-PP), in which participants had to estimate whether the aperture was large enough to enable  
210 another individual (the experimenter) to pass through. Inclusion of partner in the self was  
evaluated through the IOS scale, a common and highly reliable tool to capture self-other  
inclusion [11, 28, 79]. Finally, because the passability judgement task requires to imagine an  
action, we sought to control for potential group difference in terms of motor imagery. To this  
end, we had participants complete the Vividness of Movement Imagery Questionnaire-2  
215 (VMIQ-2), a psychometric tool assessing the ability to produce images of action [80]. The  
VMIQ-2 comprises two scales. The Internal visual imagery (IVI) scale assesses the ability to  
imagine one's self performing an action (internal imagery). The External visual imagery (EVI)  
scale assesses the ability to imagine someone else performing an action.

## 220 **Materials and Methods**

### **Participants**

One hundred and fifty-three participants were recruited. We tested as many participants as  
possible during the semester, with a minimum requirement of 50 participants per group. Our  
final sample size involved more than 70 participants per group, limiting the likelihood of  
225 obtaining a false-positive result in the between-group comparison [81]. Moreover, with this

sample size, we had a power greater than 0.85 to detect an interaction effect of medium size between Status and Shoulder width in the regression analysis [82].

All participants were students from the University of Poitiers, taking part in the experiment in exchange for course credit. Before starting the experiment, participants were  
230 asked whether they were currently involved in a romantic relationship, which was defined as “being in love” with someone and having an exclusive relationship with this person. Eighty-two participants were singles ( $M_{\text{age}} = 19.506$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.135$ ; 41 women) and 71 were currently involved in a romantic relationship ( $M_{\text{age}} = 19.728$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 1.658$ ; 41 women; mean length of romantic relationship = 23.41 months,  $SD = 18.18$ ). Romantically involved participants declared  
235 themselves as heterosexual. On the 15-item version of the Passionate Love Scale (PLS) [3], romantically involved participants reported an average score of 108.35/135,  $SD = 12.97$ , which indicates that they were on average passionately in love with their romantic partner (score above 106 [83]).

Romantically involved participants did not differ significantly from singles in terms of  
240 shoulder width,  $t(151) = -1.025$ ,  $p = .306$  (Mean = 44.828 cm,  $SD = 3.367$  vs. 44.230 cm,  $SD = 3.534$ , respectively). The IVI and EVI scores obtained in the VMIQ by romantically involved participants (mean IVI-score = 47.154,  $SD = 15.811$ ; mean EVI-score = 44.225,  $SD = 14.842$ ) were not significantly different from those measured in singles (mean IVI-score = 48.269,  $SD = 13.162$ ; mean EVI-score = 44.925,  $SD = 12.276$ ), both  $t_s < 1$ ,  $p_s > .3$ . Thus, the two groups did  
245 not differ in terms of ability to imagine actions, as indexed by VMIQ scores. No further analysis was conducted on VMIQ scores.

Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. The study has been approved by the Ethics Committee for Research Involving Humans of the Universities of Tours and Poitiers (CER-TP, n°201905RGPD). All aspects of this study

250 were performed in accordance with the ethical standards set out in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki. Furthermore, the study was conducted in accordance with national norms and guidelines for the protection of human subjects.

## Material and procedure

255 Each experimental session was individual and lasted approximately 30 minutes. Upon arrival at the laboratory, the participant indicated whether he/she was currently involved in a romantic relationship or whether he/she was single.

The session began with an induction task [75]. Participants involved in a romantic relationship were asked to recall for 45 seconds the first times they met with their partner.

260 They were then asked to write three sentences about these memories. Single participants followed the same instructions but referring to a friend of the opposite sex (they were asked to choose a friend of the opposite sex, with no further details about this relationship). Cross-sex friendship was used to match the induction condition of romantically involved participants who were heterosexual.

265 Then participants performed the first-person perspective (1-PP) passability judgment task [57, 62]. This task consisted in imagining an action without carrying it out. A video-projector connected to a PC was placed on the floor at 4m from a white wall on which visual stimuli were projected. Visual stimuli consisted in door-like apertures. Two series of increasing apertures and two series of decreasing apertures were projected. Each series consisted in a  
270 succession of apertures varying in width from 30 cm to 78 cm, with a 2 cm increment (i.e. 25 different apertures). Participants alternated between increasing and decreasing series. Half of participants started with apertures increasing in width and the other half with decreasing

apertures. Participants stood upright behind the video projector, their arms along their body, and at a distance of 4.00 m of the wall on which the aperture was projected.

275 For each projected aperture, participants were instructed to state “yes” if they thought they could pass through without rotating their shoulders and “no” if they could not. A series was terminated after two consecutive answers different from the previous ones (i.e., a transition from “yes” to two “no” consecutive replies in descending series, and vice-versa). For each series, a perceived critical aperture was computed as the mean of the two apertures  
280 width that received the last yes and first no judgment in decreasing series and the last no and first yes judgment in ascending series [60].

Then the perceived critical apertures obtained in the four series were averaged for each participant as a first dependent variable (mean perceived critical aperture). We computed a second dependent variable, the passability ratio ( $\pi_p$ ), for each participant by  
285 dividing the mean perceived critical aperture by the participant’s shoulder width [56]. By controlling for shoulder width,  $\pi_p$  reveals whether a participant overestimates/underestimates the width of the aperture required to pass through, with a  $\pi_p$  less than 1 indicating an underestimation and a  $\pi_p$  greater than 1 an overestimation.

After performing the 1-PP passability judgment task, participants performed the 3-PP  
290 passability judgment task. In this version of the task, a female experimenter (21 year old; height = 166 cm; weight = 54.5 kg; shoulder width = 39.9 cm) stood behind the video-projector, which position was the same as in the 1-PP task (i.e. at 4 m from the wall on which visual stimuli were projected). Participants were asked to stand on a mark on the floor, placed 1m meter behind and slightly to the left of the experimenter (so that participants were able to  
295 see the aperture stimuli). Consequently, participants were approximately 1 m further from the wall than in the 1-PP task. This variation was not a major issue as we were not interested

in absolute performance difference between 1-PP and 3-PP task. Then, the stimuli and procedure used in the 3-PP passability judgment task were the same as in the 1-PP task, except that for each aperture, participants were required to estimate whether the experimenter could pass through without turning her shoulder. In the 3-PP task,  $\pi_p$  was calculated by dividing the mean perceived critical aperture by the experimenter's shoulder width.

After completion of the two judgment tasks, participants' shoulders width was measured by the experimenter in a standardized manner with a ruler, the participant standing with his/her back on a wall, and his/her arms along the body. Participants were then asked to report both their height and weight, before completing the VMIQ-2.

Finally, before completing the PLS, romantically involved participants completed the IOS scale in reference to their romantic partner. The scale consists in a set of seven pairs of increasingly overlapping circles, with one circle representing the self and the other circle representing the target person (for full description, see [11, 79]). In the present study these circles were respectively labeled as "me" and "she/he". Participants were asked to select the pair of circles that best describes their relationship with their partner. The score ranged from 1 to 7, the larger the score, the greater the inclusion of partner in the self. Then, they completed the 15-item version of the Passionate Love Scale [3, 83]. No IOS measure was administered to single participants.

It is worth stressing that all participants performed the 1-PP passability judgment task before the 3-PP task. Starting with the 1-PP task was motivated by the assumption of potential carry-over effects between tasks. Because our predictions focused on the 1-PP passability judgment task, we chose to maximize the likelihood of obtaining the expected effect by avoiding potential contamination from prior performance of the 3-PP task. We are aware that,

320 conversely, because of order effects, this comes at the cost of the interpretability of the results  
obtained in the 3-PP passability judgment task.

## Results

Three types of analyses were performed on the data from each perceptual judgment task (1-  
325 PP and 3-PP). First, we contrasted, using *t*-tests,  $\pi_p$  obtained in singles with that obtained in  
romantically involved participants. Second, a factorial regression analysis was used to test  
whether participants' status modulated the extent to which their shoulder width predicted  
perceived critical aperture. Third, we conducted two factorial regression analyses in order to  
330 by (i) the degree of inclusion of romantic partner in the self, as indexed by IOS score and (ii)  
the intensity of romantic feelings, as indexed by PLS score.

Prior to the analysis of  $\pi_p$ , we checked for the presence of outlier participants (defined  
as scoring above or below 3 SD from the corresponding group mean). No participant was  
identified as outlier according to this criteria. The contrast of  $\pi_p$  in the 1-PP task revealed no  
335 significant difference between single (Mean = 1.187; SD = 0.195) and romantically involved  
participants (Mean = 1.169; SD = 0.185),  $t(151) = 0.575$ ,  $p = .565$ ,  $d = 0.094$ . Similarly,  $\pi_p$   
obtained in the 3-PP task did not differ significantly between single (Mean = 1.217; SD = 0.157)  
and romantically involved participants (Mean = 1.191; SD = 0.164),  $t(151) = 0.994$ ,  $p = .321$ ,  $d$   
= 0.161.

340 A factorial regression analysis was conducted with the perceived critical aperture in  
the 1-PP task as the dependent variable, and with Status (coded -0.5 for singles, + 0.5 for  
romantically involved), mean-centered participant's shoulder width (; i.e. the sample mean

subtracted from each individual observation) and their interaction as predictors [84, 85]. Prior to the analysis, we checked for the presence of outlier participants using the studentized residual technique ( $t$  greater than  $|2.00|$ ). Four participants were identified as outliers and removed from the regression analysis. This analysis revealed that shoulder width significantly predicted perceived critical aperture,  $b = .453$ ,  $\beta = .206$ ,  $t(145) = 2.574$ ,  $p = .011$ . The size of perceived critical aperture was positively related to shoulder width. The main effect of Status was not significant,  $b = -.749$ ,  $\beta = .056$ ,  $t(145) = -.630$ ,  $p = .529$ . The interaction between both factors was not significant,  $b = .044$ ,  $\beta = -.015$ ,  $t(145) = 0.124$ ,  $p = .902$ . The same analysis conducted on 3-PP data indicated no significant relationship between shoulder width and perceived critical aperture,  $b = .071$ ,  $\beta = .039$ ,  $t(145) = -.471$ ,  $p = .638$ . The effect of status was not significant,  $b = -1.595$ ,  $\beta = .129$ ,  $t(145) = -1.573$ ,  $p = .118$ . The interaction between both factors was not significant,  $b = -.070$ ,  $\beta = -.019$ ,  $t(145) = 0.234$ ,  $p = .815$ .

A second factorial regression analysis was conducted on perceived critical aperture in the 1-PP task, with mean-centered participants' shoulder width, mean-centered IOS scores and their interaction as predictors. One participant was identified as outlier for the regression analysis (studentized deleted residual  $t > |2.00|$ ). The main effect of IOS was not significant,  $b = 1.040$ ,  $\beta = .147$ ,  $t(66) = 1.271$ ,  $p = .208$ . The participants' shoulder width was a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture,  $b = .595$ ,  $\beta = .267$ ,  $t(66) = 2.285$ ,  $p = .026$ , but as expected, this effect was qualified by a significant interaction with IOS,  $b = -.591$ ,  $\beta = -.250$ ,  $t(66) = -2.159$ ,  $p = .034$ . We thus examined the simple effect of shoulder width for two levels of IOS scores. When IOS scores are small (mean – 1SD), shoulder width is a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture,  $b = 1.226$ ,  $\beta = .550$ ,  $t(66) = 2.953$ ,  $p = .004$ . Thus, when participants show a weak inclusion of their partner in the self, the wider the participant's shoulder width, the wider the size of perceived critical aperture. In contrast, this positive



relationship between participant's shoulder width and critical aperture is not significant when IOS scores are high (mean + 1SD),  $b = -.037$ ,  $\beta = -.016$ ,  $t(66) = -.100$ ,  $p = .921$ . Thus when participants show a high self-partner inclusion, their shoulder width does not predict significantly the size of perceived critical aperture (Fig 1A). We conducted a similar factorial regression analysis that included mean-centered PLS scores, instead of mean-centered IOS scores, as factor. This analysis revealed that the main effect of PLS scores was not significant,  $b = -.096$ ,  $\beta = -.166$ ,  $t(66) = -1.430$ ,  $p = .157$ . The main effect of shoulder width was not significant,  $b = .240$ ,  $\beta = .107$ ,  $t(66) = .895$ ,  $p = .374$ , but it was qualified by a significant interaction with PLS scores,  $b = -.046$ ,  $\beta = -.279$ ,  $t(66) = -2.369$ ,  $p = .021$ . The relationship between shoulder width and perceived critical aperture is positive and significant for low PLS score,  $b = .846$ ,  $\beta = .379$ ,  $t(66) = 2.646$ ,  $p = .010$ , while this relationship is non-significant when PLS score is high,  $b = -.366$ ,  $\beta = -.164$ ,  $t(66) = -.881$ ,  $p = .381$  (Fig 1B).

380

**Fig 1.** Moderating effects of IOS (A) and PLS (B) scores on the relationship between participants' shoulder width and perceived critical aperture width in the 1-PP task. A: Shoulder width and IOS scores interactively predict perceived critical aperture in romantically involved participants. Participants' shoulder width is a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture when IOS scores are small (mean - 1SD),  $b = 1.226$ ,  $\beta = .550$ , but not when IOS scores are high (mean + 1SD),  $b = -.037$ ,  $\beta = -.016$ . B: PLS scores also moderate the relationship between shoulder width and perceived critical aperture. This relationship is significant for low PLS scores (mean - 1SD),  $b = .846$ ,  $\beta = .379$ , but not for high PLS scores (mean + 1SD),  $b = -.366$ ,  $\beta = -.164$ .

390

We repeated these analyses on the 3-PP data obtained by romantically involved participants. The analysis including IOS scores and participants' shoulder width as predictors indicated that the main effect of shoulder width was not significant,  $b = .143$ ,  $\beta = .078$ ,  $t(66) = .658$ ,  $p = .513$ , nor the main effect of IOS score,  $b = .984$ ,  $\beta = .170$ ,  $t(66) = 1.442$ ,  $p = .154$ . However, the interaction between these two factors was significant,  $b = -.515$ ,  $\beta = -.266$ ,  $t(66) = -2.254$ ,  $p = .027$ . When IOS scores are small, shoulder width is a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture,  $b = .693$ ,  $\beta = .379$ ,  $t(66) = 2.000$ ,  $p = .050$ . Thus, when participants show a weak inclusion of their partner in the self, the relationship between participants' shoulder width and perceived critical aperture is positive and significant. In contrast, when IOS scores are high, this relationship between shoulder width and critical aperture is not significant,  $b = -.401$ ,  $\beta = -.222$ ,  $t(66) = -1.333$ ,  $p = .187$ . The same analysis conducted with mean-centered PLS scores, instead of mean-centered IOS scores, revealed no significant effect of participants' shoulder width,  $b = -.106$ ,  $\beta = -.058$ ,  $t(66) = -.460$ ,  $p = .647$ , and no significant effect of PLS,  $b = -.045$ ,  $\beta = -.096$ ,  $t(66) = -.785$ ,  $p = .435$ . These two factors did not interact significantly in the prediction of perceived critical aperture,  $b = -.031$ ,  $\beta = -.230$ ,  $t(66) = -1.820$ ,  $p = .073$ .

Complementary analyses were conducted to test for the potential influence of gender, age and relationship length on the above-described interactions between shoulder width and IOS/PLS. Because we had no specific predictions regarding how these factors may interact with our main variables (shoulder width, IOS, PLS), we conducted hierarchical factorial regressions as follows. Our critical predictors (shoulder width and IOS or PLS, and their interaction) were entered in the regression at step 1. Then, the factor Gender, or Age, or Relationship length, and its interactions with our critical predictors were entered at step 2 in order to test whether including this factor in the regression explained a statistically significant

amount of variance in perceived critical aperture. These analyses revealed that the interaction between IOS and shoulder width in both the 1-PP task and in the 3-PP task was not modulated by Age ( $ps > .543$ ), nor by Gender ( $ps > .660$ ), nor by Relationship length ( $ps > .657$ ). The  
420 interaction between PLS and shoulder width in both the 1-PP task and in the 3-PP task was not modulated by Age ( $ps > .179$ ), nor by Gender ( $ps > .316$ ), nor by Relationship length ( $ps > .791$ ).

## Discussion

425 There is accumulating evidence that romantic love blurs self-partner boundaries in the bodily domain [30, 48, 54]. Completing this view, it has been proposed that romantically involved individuals show a reduced saliency of self-boundaries in the bodily domain, in a way that is compatible with self-other integration [52]. We further tested this hypothesis using passability judgments of door-like apertures [56]. We reasoned that if the boundaries of the bodily-self  
430 get blurred or less salient, this should affect the ability to make passability judgments of door-like apertures, since this kind of action-anticipation task necessitates to rely on the representation of the body's boundaries [57, 61-63].

A first prediction was that the classical link between participant's shoulder width and perceived critical aperture would be attenuated in romantically involved participants, as  
435 compared to singles. A related prediction was that blurred or less salient bodily boundaries would lead romantically involved participants to adopt a larger margin of safety (larger  $\pi_p$ ) than singles in passability judgments [67, 78]. Our results did not confirm these predictions. Indeed, we found no significant effect of participants' status (single vs. romantically involved)

on the link between participant's shoulder width and perceived critical aperture (first  
440 prediction) nor on  $\pi_p$  (second prediction).

We further hypothesized that in romantically involved individuals, the  
blurring/reduced saliency of self-boundaries should critically depends on the extent to which  
romantic partner is included into the self. In other words, the altered shoulder width–critical  
aperture relationship, which we considered to be indicative of altered self-boundaries, would  
445 be prominent in individuals showing a strong inclusion of the intimate other in the self. In line  
with this hypothesis, the analyses of performance of romantically involved participants in the  
1-PP task revealed that the strength of the link between participants' shoulder width and  
perceived critical aperture was negatively affected by the amount of inclusion of romantic  
partner in the self, as indexed by IOS scores. Converging evidence was obtained when testing  
450 the modulatory role of PLS scores. We found that the relationship between participants'  
shoulder width and perceived critical aperture in the 1-PP task was negatively affected by the  
intensity of romantic feelings (as indexed by PLS score).

The fact that IOS and PLS scores had a similar modulatory effect on 1-PP data is  
consistent with the relationship that has been established between inclusion of romantic  
455 partner in the self and romantic feelings [12, 18, 29]. Furthermore, the influence of the  
intensity of romantic feelings, as indexed by PLS, on perceptual judgments is in line with recent  
work suggesting that the positive affective states associated with romantic love may affect  
cognitive functioning [48].

In the light of this modulatory effect of IOS and PLS scores, it is not surprising that we  
460 did not find differential patterns of correlation as a function of group (singles vs. involved) nor  
differences in terms of  $\pi_p$ . Indeed, it suggests that only those romantically involved individuals

showing a strong inclusion of romantic partner in the self or strong romantic feelings would differ from singles in the extent to which their body's metrics predict passability judgments.

The pattern of correlation between IOS scores, shoulder width and passability  
465 judgments in the 1-PP task is thus compatible with the idea that including one's partner into  
the self triggers mechanisms affecting self-boundaries in the bodily domain ([30, 48, 52].  
Moreover, it is worth noting that inclusion of other in the self was indexed by IOS score, which  
taps conceptual forms of self-representation [79], while passability judgments were used to  
probe representations related to the bodily-self. Hence, consistent with previous work, our  
470 results suggest an interaction between conceptual- and bodily-self [35, 86, 87].

Additionally, in the 3-PP task, we had participants infer the passability of another  
person, in order to assess their accuracy in making passability judgments that did not relate  
to their own body [62-63]. We found that, for the studied population as a whole, participants'  
shoulder width was not a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture in the 3-PP task,  
475 confirming that, overall, participants did not use information about their own body size to  
perform this task (or at least to a lesser extent than in the 1-PP task). From there, one may  
expect that if the moderation of romantically involved participants' 1-PP task performance by  
PLS and IOS scores was related specifically to participants' own body, these two factors should  
have no effect on 3-PP data. Consistent with this prediction, we found that PLS scores did not  
480 significantly moderate the relationship between participant's shoulder width and critical  
aperture in the 3-PP task. In contrast, IOS scores had a significant moderating effect in this  
task, such that the relationship between shoulder-width and critical aperture was not  
significant as IOS scores increased, while the relationship was positive and significant as IOS  
scores decreased. To the extent that for high levels of IOS, participants' shoulder width was  
485 not a significant predictor of aperture judgments in the 3-PP task, one may infer that in this

task, participants with strong inclusion of romantic partner in the self related – as required – to information about the other’s body instead of information about their own body. In turn, this implies that in the 1-PP task, the absence of a significant shoulder width-aperture judgment relationship found for high IOS scores cannot be attributed to a generic process affecting the processing of bodies or body-scaled action anticipation in general. More intriguing is the finding that in the 3-PP task, for lower levels of IOS, participants’ shoulder width was significantly and positively related to passability judgments. A hint to a possible explanation can be found in previous empirical and theoretical research that has identified categories of individuals who are more self-centered and less prone to self-other integration (see for instance the distinction between inclusive vs. non-inclusive identities [88] or between individualistic vs. interdependent self-construal [89]). Hence, it is possible that a weak inclusion of romantic partner into the self revealed a specific psychological profile characterized by a tendency to be more self-centered (and more prone to maintain a distinction between self and others). Such a self-centered bias in individuals low in IOS may lead them to be anchored in their self-perspective and rely on their own body when making passability judgments in the 3-PP task. This explanation is however speculative and warrants further investigation. Finally, it is important to remember that the 1-PP task was always performed before the 3-PP task. Thus passability judgments in the 3-PP task were possibly influenced by prior judgments in the 1-PP task, which calls for caution in interpreting the 3-PP data.

An important limitation of the present study is that single participants were not administered an IOS measure in reference to their friend. This prevents us from testing whether the self-other inclusion process in the context of friendship [20, 79] would have the same moderating impact as self-other inclusion in romantic couples on the link between participants’ body metric and aperture judgments. Thus, we cannot conclude on whether the

510 present findings depend on the self-other inclusion process in romantic relationships or in close relationships in general.

However, it should be noted that romantic love is associated with specific behavioral and psychological traits, such as an intense focusing on the partner, intense emotions, and sexual desire, distinguishing it from other forms of close relationship [1-5]. Moreover, 515 partnered individuals show greater cognitive overlap with their romantic partner compared to with a close friend, siblings, or parents [29, 30]. Thus, the effects of self-other inclusion in friendship may be quantitatively and/or qualitatively different from those associated with the inclusion of one's romantic partner in the self.

Furthermore, due to the correlational nature of our main finding, we can only 520 speculate about the causal link between inclusion of romantic partner in the self and blurred bodily boundaries. One possibility is that including one's partner into the self is associated with cognitive mechanisms that affect different dimensions of self-representation. As suggested by Burris and Rempel [52], the physical body plays a crucial role in psychological boundaries between self and not-self. They further suggest that the self-expansion resulting 525 from the cognitive inclusion of an intimate other in the self challenges the boundary of the self, which leads romantically involved individuals to be less focused on themselves as separate entities and show a reduced saliency of bodily boundaries. Such an effect on bodily boundaries may vary as a function of the degree of self-partner inclusion, accounting for the pattern of correlations we observed in romantically involved participants. Alternatively, it is 530 also possible that participants who demonstrate blurred or less salient self-boundaries are more prone to include their intimate partner in the self. In order to demonstrate the effect of the inclusion of romantic partner in the self on perceptual judgement of aperture passability, future research could for instance focus on romantically involved participants and use a

priming procedure aiming to strengthen or reduce the distinctness between self and partner  
535 (see for instance [52] Experiment 5) before performance of the action-anticipation task.

Another interesting line of future research is to consider the possibility of an inclusion  
of romantic partner in the self at a bodily level such that, paralleling what has been  
documented at the level of the conceptual self (see introduction), romantic lovers would tend  
to incorporate some of the partner's bodily features into their own self-content. In line with  
540 this proposal, recent work has demonstrated that the cognitive overlap between self and close  
others extends to the representation of faces [90]. Hence, an intriguing question is whether  
the degree of physical dissimilarity between self and partner –implying more or less changes  
in self-content– is associated with differential effects on self-boundaries. One way to  
investigate this question would be to examine passability judgements in romantically involved  
545 participants, while taking into account similarity with the partner's body metrics. It would be  
particularly relevant to examine whether self-partner difference in terms of shoulder width  
contributes significantly to the prediction of passability judgments.

Finally, given that no significant difference was found between single and romantically  
involved individuals, and due to the limitations described above, we consider the current  
550 findings as preliminary and calling for further research.

In conclusion, the present work adds to a growing body of work suggesting that the  
process of self-other inclusion in romantic love involves cognitive changes that encompass the  
two dimensions of the self – the bodily and the conceptual self. Previous work investigating  
bodily-self in romantic love mostly focused on self-other distinction. In the present study, we  
555 focused on self-boundaries and investigated for the first time performance on a body-scaled  
action-anticipation task in the context of romantic love. While no difference with singles were  
revealed, we found that in romantically involved participants, passability judgments were



predicted by an interaction between shoulder width and the level of self-partner inclusion.

Our findings suggest that the effects of interpersonal closeness on self boundaries in the

560 bodily domain are subtle and seem to depend on the degree of inclusion of the significant other in the self.

## References

1. Hatfield E, Rapson RL. Historical and cross-cultural perspectives on passionate love and sexual desire. *Annu Rev Sex Res.* 1993;4(1):67–97.
2. Fisher HE. The drive to love. In: Sternberg R, Weiss K, editors. *The New Psychology of Love.* New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 2006. p. 87–115.
3. Hatfield E, Sprecher S. Measuring passionate love in intimate relationships. *J Adolesc.* 1986;9(4):383–410.
4. Reis HT, Aron A. Love: what is it, why does it matter, and how does it operate? *Perspect Psychol Sci.* 2008 ;3(1):80–6.
5. Sternberg RJ. A triangular theory of love. *Psychol Rev.* 1986;93(2):119–35.
6. Agnew CR, Etcheverry PE. Cognitive interdependence: Considering self-in-relationship. In: Vohs KD, Finkel EJ, editors. *Self and relationships: Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal processes.* New York (NY): Guilford Press; 2006. p. 274–93.
7. Aron EN, Aron A. Love and expansion of the self: the state of the model. *Pers Relatsh.* 1996;3(1):45–58.
8. Rusbult CE, Finkel EJ, Kumashiro M. The Michelangelo phenomenon. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* 2009;18(6):305–9.
9. Berscheid E, Walster EH. *Interpersonal Attraction.* Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley; 1978.

10. Aron A, Aron EN, Norman C. Self-expansion model of motivation and cognition in close Relationships and beyond. In: Brewer MB, Hewstone M, editors. *Self and social identity*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing; 2004. p. 99–123.
11. Aron A, Lewandowski GW Jr, Mashek D, Aron EN. The self-expansion model of motivation and cognition in close relationships. In: Simpson JA, Campbell L, editors. *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2013. p. 90–115.
12. Branand B, Mashek D, Aron A. Pair-bonding as inclusion of other in the self: A literature review. *Front Psychol*. 2019;10:2399.
13. Aron A, Aron EN. *Love and the expansion of self: Understanding attraction and satisfaction*. Volume x. New York, NY, US: Hemisphere Publishing Corp/Harper & Row Publishers; 1986.
14. Maslow, A. H. A theory of metamotivation : the biological rooting of the value-life. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 1967;7(2):93-127.
15. Aron A, Aron EN, Tudor M, Nelson G. Close relationships as including other in the self. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1991;60(2):241–53.
16. Aron AP, Mashek DJ, Aron EN. Closeness as Including Other in the Self. In: Mashek DJ, Aron AP, editors. *Handbook of closeness and intimacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers; 2004. p. 27-41
17. Aron A, Norman CC, Aron EN, McKenna C, Heyman RE. Couples' shared participation in novel and arousing activities and experienced relationship quality. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2000 ;78(2):273–84.
18. Sheets VL. Passion for life: self-expansion and passionate love across the life span. *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2014;31(7):958–74.
19. Aron A, Paris M, Aron EN. Falling in love: Prospective studies of self-concept change. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1995; 69(6): 1102–12.
20. Mashek DJ, Aron A, Boncimino M. Confusions of self with close others. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*. 2003;29(3):382–92.

21. Aron A, Steele JL, Kashdan TB, Perez M. When similars do not attract: tests of a prediction from the self-expansion model. *Pers Relatsh*. 2006;13(4):387–96.
22. Smith E, Coats S, Walling D. Overlapping mental representations of self, in-group, and partner: Further response time evidence and a connectionist model. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. 1999;25(7):873-882.
23. Lockwood P, Dolderman D, Sadler P, Gerchak E. Feeling better about doing worse: Social comparisons within romantic relationships. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2004;87(1):80–95.
24. Mattingly BA, Lewandowski GW Jr. An expanded self is a more capable self: the association between self-concept size and self-efficacy. *Self Ident*. 2013;12(6):621–34.
25. Mattingly BA, Lewandowski GW Jr McIntyre, KP. “You make me a better/worse person”: A two-dimensional model of relationship self-change. *Pers Relationship*. 2014;21(1):176–90.
26. Slotter EB, Gardner WL. Where do you end and I begin? Evidence for anticipatory, motivated self–other integration between relationship partners. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2009;96(6):1137–51.
27. Slotter EB, Lucas GM. Validating a measure of self and partner change in romantic relationships: The Perceived Change in Relationships Scale. *Self Ident*. 2013;12(2):177–85.
28. Aron A, Aron EN, Smollan D. Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1992;63(4):596–612.
29. Acevedo BP, Aron A, Fisher HE, Brown LL. Neural correlates of long-term intense romantic love. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2011;7(2):145–59.
30. Quintard V, Jouffre S, Croizet JC, Bouquet CA. The influence of passionate love on self-other discrimination during joint action. *Psychol Res*. 2018;84(1):51-61.
31. Le B., Dove N. L., Agnew C. R., Korn M. S., Mutso A. A. Predicting nonmarital romantic relationship dissolution: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Pers Relatsh*. 2010;17(3):377–90.
32. Gallagher S. Philosophical conceptions of the self: implications for cognitive science. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2000;4(1):14–21.

33. Singer JA, Blagov P, Berry M, Oost KM. Self-defining memories, scripts, and the life story: narrative identity in personality and psychotherapy. *J Pers.* 2013;81(6):569–82.
34. Carver CS. Self-awareness. In: Leary MR, Tangney JP, editors. *Handbook of self and identity.* 2nd ed. New York: The Guilford Press; 2012. p. 50–68.
35. Farmer H, Tsakiris M. The bodily social self: A link between phenomenal and narrative selfhood. *Rev Philos Psychol.* 2012;3(1):125–44.
36. Schechtman M. The narrative self. In: Gallagher S, editor. *The Oxford Handbook of the Self.* Oxford University Press; 2011. p. 394–416.
37. Blanke O. Multisensory brain mechanisms of bodily self-consciousness. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2012;13(8):556–71.
38. de Vignemont F. Shared body representations and the ‘Whose’ system. *Neuropsychologia.* 2014;55:128–36.
39. Legrand D. The bodily self: the sensori-motor roots of pre-reflexive self-consciousness. *Phenomenol Cogn Sci.* 2006;5:89–118.
40. Longo MR. Body representations and the sense of self. In de Vignemont F, Alsmith A, editors. *The subject's matter: Self-consciousness and the body.* MIT Press; 2017. p. 75-95.
41. Tsakiris M. The sense of body ownership. In: Gallagher S, editor. *The Oxford handbook of the self.* Oxford University Press; 2011. p. 180–203.
42. Hardwick RM, Caspers S, Eickhoff SB, Swinnen SP. Neural correlates of action: comparing meta-analyses of imagery, observation, and execution. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2018;94:31–44.
43. Iacoboni M. Imitation, Empathy, and Mirror Neurons. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2009;60(1):653–70.
44. Keysers C, Gazzola V. Expanding the mirror: vicarious activity for actions, emotions, and sensations. *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 2009;19(6):666–71.
45. Chartrand TL, Lakin JL. The antecedents and consequences of human behavioral mimicry. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2013;64:285–308.
46. Heyes C. Automatic imitation. *Psychol Bull.* 2011;137(3):463–83.

47. Gallese V. The Roots of Empathy: The shared manifold hypothesis and the neural basis of intersubjectivity. *Psychopathology*. 2003;36(4):171–80.
48. Quintard V, Jouffre S, Hommel B, Bouquet CA. Embodied self-other overlap in romantic love: A review and integrative perspective. *Psychol Res*. 2020; pmid 32062730
49. Cheng Y, Chen C, Lin C-P, Chou K-H, Decety J. Love hurts: An fMRI study. *NeuroImage*. 2010;51(2):923–9.
50. Singer T, Seymour B, O'Doherty J, Kaube H, Dolan RJ, Frith CD. Empathy for pain involves the affective but not sensory components of pain. *Science*. 2004;303(5661):1157-62.
51. Zajonc RB, Adelman PK, Murphy ST, Niedenthal PM. Convergence in the physical appearance of spouses. *Motiv Emot*. 1987;11(4):335–46.
52. Burriss CT, Rempel JK. Me, myself, and us: Salient self-threats and relational connections. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2008;95(4):944–61.
53. Burriss CT, Rempel JK. If I only had a membrane: A review of Amoebic Self Theory. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass*. 2010;4(9):756–66.
54. Maister L, Tsakiris M. Intimate imitation: Automatic motor imitation in romantic relationships. *Cognition*. 2016;152:108–13.
55. Giesen C, Löhl V, Rothermund K, Koranyi N. Intimacy effects on action regulation: retrieval of observationally acquired stimulus-response bindings in romantically involved interaction partners versus strangers. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:1369.
56. Warren WH Jr, Whang S. Visual guidance of walking through apertures: body-scaled information for affordances. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*. 1987;13(3):371–83.
57. Guardia D, Lafargue G, Thomas P, Dodin V, Cottencin O, Luyat M. Anticipation of body-scaled action is modified in anorexia nervosa. *Neuropsychologia*. 2010;48(13):3961–6.
58. Morgado N, Muller D, Gentaz E, Palluel-Germain R. Close to me? The influence of affective closeness on space perception. *Perception*. 2011;40(7):877–9.

59. Wignall SJ, Thomas NA, Nicholls ME. Fat or fiction? Effects of body size, eating pathology, and sex upon the body schema of an undergraduate population. *Body Image*. 2017;23:135–45.
60. Chang CH, Wade MG, Stoffregen TA. Perceiving affordances for aperture passage in an environment-person-person system. *J Mot Behav*. 2009;41(6):495–500.
61. Gibson J. J. *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin; 1979.
62. Guardia D, Conversy L, Jardri R, Lafargue G, Thomas P, Dodin V, et al. Imagining one's own and someone else's body actions: dissociation in anorexia nervosa. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(8):e43241.
63. Irvine KR, McCarty K, McKenzie KJ, Pollet TV, Cornelissen KK, Tovée MJ, et al. Distorted body image influences body schema in individuals with negative bodily attitudes. *Neuropsychologia*. 2019;122:38–50.
64. Ishak S, Adolph KE, Lin GC. Perceiving affordances for fitting through apertures. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform*. 2008;34(6):1501–14.
65. Wagman JB, Taylor KR. Perceiving Affordances for Aperture Crossing for the Person-Plus-Object System. *Ecol Psychol*. 2005;17(2):105–30.
66. Cardini F, Fatemi-Ghomi N, Gajewska-Knapik K, Gooch V, Aspell JE. Enlarged representation of peripersonal space in pregnancy. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):8606.
67. Hackney AL, Cinelli ME, Frank JS. Does the passability of apertures change when walking through human versus pole obstacles? *Acta Psychol (Amst)*. 2015;162:62–8.
68. Gigliotti MF, Soares Coelho P, Coutinho J, Coello Y. Peripersonal space in social context is modulated by action reward, but differently in males and females. *Psychol Res*. 2019; PMID 31493049
69. Nandrino JL, Ducro C, Iachini T, Coello Y. Perception of Peripersonal and Interpersonal Space in Patients with Restrictive-type Anorexia. *Eur Eat Disord Rev*. 2017;25(3):179–87.
70. Ruggiero G, Frassinetti F, Coello Y, Rapuano M, di Cola AS, Iachini T. The effect of facial expressions on peripersonal and interpersonal spaces. *Psychol Res*. 2017;81(6):1232–40.

71. Sambo CF, Iannetti GD. Better safe than sorry? The safety margin surrounding the body is increased by anxiety. *J Neurosci*. 2013;33(35):14225–30.
72. Vagnoni E, Lewis J, Tajadura-Jiménez A, Cardini F. Listening to a conversation with aggressive content expands the interpersonal space. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(3):e0192753
73. Maner JK, Rouby DA, Gonzaga GC. Automatic inattention to attractive alternatives: the evolved psychology of relationship maintenance. *Evol Hum Behav*. 2008;29(5):343–9.
74. van Steenbergen H, Langeslag SJ, Band GP, Hommel B. Reduced cognitive control in passionate lovers. *Motiv Emot*. 2014;38(3):444–50.
75. Wlodarski R, Dunbar RI. The effects of romantic love on mentalizing abilities. *Rev Gen Psychol*. 2014;18(4):313–21.
76. Gonzaga GC, Haselton MG, Smurda J, Davies M, Poore JC. Love, desire, and the suppression of thoughts of romantic alternatives. *Evol Hum Behav*. 2008;29(2):119–26.
77. Oudejans RR, Michaels CF, van Dort B, Frissen EJ. To cross or not to cross: the effect of locomotion on street-crossing behavior. *Ecol Psychol*. 1996;8(3):259–67.
78. Franchak JM. Development of affordance perception and recalibration in children and adults. *J Exp Child Psychol*. 2019;183:100–14.
79. Gächter S, Starmer C, Tufano F. Measuring the closeness of relationships: A comprehensive evaluation of the “Inclusion of the Other in the Self” scale’. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(6):e0129478.
80. Roberts R, Callow N, Hardy L, Markland D, Bringer J. Movement imagery ability: development and assessment of a revised version of the vividness of movement imagery questionnaire. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2008;30(2):200–21.
81. Simmons JP, Nelson LD, Simonsohn U. False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychol Sci*. 2011;22(11):1359–66.
82. Perugini M, Gallucci M, Costantini G. A Practical primer to power analysis for simple experimental designs. *Rev Int Psychol Soc*. 2018;31(1):20.

83. Hatfield E, Sprecher S. The Passionate Love Scale. In: Davis CM, Yarber WL, Bauserman R, editors. *Handbook of Sexuality-related Measures: A Compendium*. Sage; 2011. p. 469–472.
84. Cohen J, Cohen P, West S, Aiken LS. *Applied Multiple Regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 3rd ed. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers; 2003.
85. Judd CM, McClelland GH. *Data analysis: A model comparison approach*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich; 1989.
86. Quintard V, Jouffre S, Paladino MP, Bouquet CA. Getting closer: synchronous interpersonal multisensory stimulation increases closeness and attraction toward an opposite-sex other in female participants. *Conscious Cogn*. 2020;77:102849.
87. Paladino MP, Mazzurega M, Pavani F, Schubert TW. Synchronous multisensory stimulation blurs self-other boundaries. *Psychol Sci*. 2010;21(9):1202–7.
88. Dambrun M, Ricard M. Self-centeredness and selflessness: A theory of self-based psychological functioning and its consequences for happiness. *Rev Gen Psychol*. 2011;15(2):138–57
89. Markus HR, Kitayama S. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychol Rev*. 1991;98(2):224–53.
90. Ketay S, Beck LA, Riela S, Bailey C, Aron A. Seeing you in me: Preliminary evidence for perceptual overlap between self and close others. *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2019;36(8):2474–86.



## Supporting information

S1 Fig. Moderating effects of IOS (A) and PLS (B) scores on the relationship between participants' shoulder width and perceived critical aperture width in the 1-PP task. A: Shoulder width and IOS scores interactively predict perceived critical aperture in romantically involved participants. Participants' shoulder width is a significant predictor of perceived critical aperture when IOS scores are small (mean - 1SD),  $b = 1.217$ ,  $\beta = .546$ , but not when IOS scores are high (mean + 1SD),  $b = -.043$ ,  $\beta = -.019$ . B: PLS scores also moderate the relationship between shoulder width and perceived critical aperture. This relationship is significant for low PLS scores (mean - 1SD),  $b = .846$ ,  $\beta = .379$ , but not for high PLS scores (mean + 1SD),  $b = -.366$ ,  $\beta = -.164$ .

