



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Pavlidou, A. and Gallagher, M. and Lopez, C. and Ferrè, Elisa Raffaella (2019) Let's share our perspectives, but only if our body postures match. *Cortex* 119 , pp. 575-579. ISSN 0010-9452.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/45541/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Letter to the Editor

Running Title: Proprioception contributes to perspective-taking

Let's share our perspectives, but only if our body postures match

Pavlidou, A.^{1,2}, Gallagher, M.³, Lopez, C.^{1*}, Ferrè E.R.^{3*}

¹Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LNSC, FR3C, Marseille, France

²Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Tübingen, Germany

³Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, United Kingdom

*These authors share senior authorship

Number of words: 1583

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Anastasia Pavlidou

Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics
Max-Planck-Ring 8, 72076 Tübingen, Germany
Tel: +497071 601217

Email: pavlidou.anastasia@gmail.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Introduction

2 Knowing where our body is in space depends on the brain's ability to process
3 proprioceptive signals from the muscles, joints and tendons, and to integrate them with
4 information from other sensory modalities. Previous research has shown that conflicting
5 proprioceptive information influences the perception of our own body. For example,
6 altering signals from the muscle spindles by simultaneous vibrations of the biceps and
7 triceps tendons evoked a "telescoping of the arm towards the elbow" (Longo, Kammers,
8 Gomi, Tsakiris, & Haggard, 2009). Similarly, conflicting visuo-proprioceptive signals
9 when viewing a moving hand in a mirror gave the illusion that the other, immobilised,
10 hand was also moving, increasing motor excitability for the motionless hand (Touzalin-
11 Chretien, Ehrler, & Dufour, 2010).

12 Here we are interested in how the current position of our body in space affects
13 visuo-spatial third-person perspective-taking. When interacting with others, we need to
14 distinguish between our own and others' perspectives. Our position in space might play
15 a key role for this ability. For instance, observers explicitly instructed to judge whether a
16 glass of water is located to someone else's left or right are on average faster to perform
17 this task when they share a same body posture (Kessler & Rutherford, 2010; Kessler &
18 Thomson, 2010; Surtees, Apperly, & Samson, 2013b) or a same body configuration
19 (e.g. arms crossed: Furlanetto, Gallace, Ansuini, & Becchio, 2014) than the distant
20 person. Previous studies classified this mental process as '*level-2 perspective taking*',
21 which relies on embodied mental rotation of the self in order to identify how others see
22 the world from a different perspective (Michelon & Zacks, 2006). **Although, level-2**
23 **perspective-taking has been traditionally considered a rather deliberate mental**
24 **simulation grounded on proprioceptive signals (Kessler & Rutherford, 2010; Kessler &**
25 **Thomson, 2010; Surtees et al., 2013b) recent studies have shown that it is potentially**
26 **automatic when one person is informed of the form and perspective properties of their**
27 **partner's task (Elekes, Varga, & Király, 2016).** By contrast, '*level-1 perspective taking*'
28 reflects our understanding of what someone else can see and it is generally not
29 considered an embodied process (Kessler & Rutherford, 2010; Michelon & Zacks, 2006;
30 Surtees et al., 2013b). Furthermore, level-1 perspective-taking has been described as
31 an implicit process, which refers to the pre-reflective, automatic and effortless simulation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

of what someone else sees from their position in space (Nielsen, Slade, Levy, & Holmes, 2015; Pavlidou, Ferre, & Lopez, 2018; Samson, Apperly, Braithwaite, Andrews, & Scott, 2010; for a critical perspective on this issue, however, see Santiesteban, Catmur, Hopkins, Bird, & Heyes, 2014).

A useful measure of implicit level-1 perspective-taking in a laboratory setting is the *dot-counting task* (Samson et al., 2010). Participants are asked to make perceptual judgments about the number of dots visible from *their* egocentric viewpoint in the presence of a task-irrelevant avatar. Response times increase for trials in which the avatar “sees” a number of dots incongruent with the number of dots visible from the participants’ viewpoint. This increase in response times reflects the time taken to implicitly adopt the avatar’s perspective, referred to as *altercentric intrusion* (Samson et al., 2010). While postural effects were documented in explicit judgments about how someone else sees the environment (left/right judgment) and in explicit judgments of what is visible from someone else’s position, this has not been reported for implicit level-1 perspective-taking using the dot-counting task. **The present study investigates novel embodiment effects by measuring the contribution of body posture to implicit level-1 perspective-taking. We hypothesize a decrease in altercentric intrusions when participants adopt an incongruent body posture to that of the avatar compared to a congruent body posture.**

Methods

Forty-eight healthy participants completed a modified version of the *dot-counting task* (Samson et al., 2010). A group of 24 participants (mean age \pm SD, 24.2 \pm 4.04 years) judged whether a number presented at the beginning of each trial matched the number of balls seen in a visual scene that followed (Figure 1A). A task-irrelevant avatar oriented towards the left/right wall was shown seated in the center of a room. Participants’ body posture (facing left or right) was manipulated to either match or mismatch that of the avatar’s in the visual scene (see Supplementary Material and Figure 1B). This allowed us to investigate whether visuo-proprioceptive information about the body posture in space affects altercentric intrusion. All participants completed both body postures. For each body posture, participants completed two blocks: one

1
2
3
4 63 block where the participants and the avatar shared the same body posture (Matching
5
6 64 Body Posture) and one block where the participant and the avatar had a different body
7
8 65 posture (Mismatching Body Posture). The starting body posture and orientation were
9
10 66 counterbalanced across participants. Another group of 24 participants (mean age \pm SD,
11
12 67 22.3 ± 4.0 years) completed a version of the task in which the avatar was replaced by
13
14 68 an arrow (Santesteban et al., 2014), to exclude non-specific, visuo-spatial and
15
16 69 attentional effects on altercentric intrusion (see Supplementary Material for full details).

17 70 The Congruency Effect (CE) (Nielsen et al., 2015), i.e. the difference in response
18
19 71 times between incongruent and congruent viewpoints for each visual stimulus
20
21 72 (avatar/arrow), was estimated for both matching and mismatching body postures. We
22
23 73 also calculated the number of errors for each experimental condition.
24
25 74

26 75 **Results**

27
28 76 A mixed-model repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between
29
30 77 Visual Stimulus and Body Posture ($F_{1,46} = 12.0$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta^2_p = 0.21$; Figure 1C and
31
32 78 Supplementary Figure 2). Post-hoc analysis using Bonferroni tests revealed increased
33
34 79 CE, namely stronger altercentric intrusions, when participants shared the posture with
35
36 80 the avatar compared to when they were in different postures ($p = 0.01$; Supplementary
37
38 81 Figure 2). Altercentric intrusions were significantly stronger for the avatar than for the
39
40 82 arrow when body postures matched ($p = 0.02$; Figure 1C and Supplementary Figure 2).
41
42 83 **Critically, congruency between participants' posture and the arrow's orientation did not**
43
44 84 **modulate CE ($p = 0.45$).** No main effect of Visual Stimulus ($F_{1,46} = 1.44$, $p = 0.23$, $\eta^2_p =$
45
46 85 0.03) or Body Posture ($F_{1,46} = 0.81$, $p = 0.37$, $\eta^2_p = 0.02$) was observed.

47 86 A similar analysis applied to the number of errors revealed no significant effects
48
49 87 of Visual Stimulus, Body Posture or interaction between factors (all $F < 3.8$ and $p >$
50
51 88 0.05 ; Supplementary Figure 1). **The overall number of errors was very small and not**
52
53 89 **informative to detect significant differences.**
54
55 90

56 91 **Discussion**

57 92 Proprioception has been considered an *intrinsically somatic* signal, which senses the
58
59 93 body posture and movement in space (Proske & Gandevia, 2012). Critically,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

94 proprioceptive signals are constantly integrated with visual information to build up a
95 coherent representation of the bodily self. Here, we demonstrate that incongruent visuo-
96 proprioceptive signals between one’s own body posture and someone else’s decreases
97 the likelihood of adopting their visuo-spatial perspective. This postural effect is in line
98 with electrophysiological studies in primate studies, which showed area 5 neurons did
99 not respond to a fake arm placed in unrealistic postures. However, neurons in area 5
100 responded to the position of the monkey’s arm, even if the arm was hidden from view,
101 or if it was replaced by a fake arm located in realistic positions (Graziano, Cooke, &
102 Taylor, 2000). Similarly, in our study adopting congruent body postures significantly
103 strengthened the shared perspective between self and others. In addition, human
104 neuroimaging revealed larger hemodynamic response in the posterior parietal cortex for
105 congruent bimodal visuo-proprioceptive information about the position of the hand in
106 space (Limanowski & Blankenburg, 2016). **Critically, the posterior parietal cortex is also
107 involved in determining the spatial relations between the body and objects in its
108 surroundings, which might have been also relevant in estimating the relation between
109 body posture and the avatar’s line of sight in our task.**

110 Our task focuses on level-1 perspective-taking and shows that current sensory
111 information about the position of the body in space influences our understanding of what
112 someone else can see on an implicit level. This is in strong contrast to previous studies
113 which manipulated the body posture of participants while explicitly asking them to make
114 level-1 perspective-taking judgments as to whether or not a target is to the front or the
115 back of someone (i.e. Kessler & Rutherford, 2010). This observation however, is in line
116 with the recent finding that low-intensity galvanic vestibular stimulation applied during
117 the dot-counting task decreases altercentric intrusion, making participants more
118 “egocentric” (Pavlidou et al., 2018). Altogether, these results suggest that level-1
119 perspective-taking may be a more embodied process than previously thought (Kessler
120 & Rutherford, 2010; Surtees, Apperly, & Samson, 2013a; Surtees et al., 2013b).

121 The dot-counting task has recently been criticized that it does not provide
122 evidence of implicit perspective-taking, as both avatars and arrows have been shown to
123 redirect visuo-spatial attention to one side of the visual scene (Santiesteban et al., 2014;
124 reviewed in Heyes 2014). While Santiesteban et al. (2014) reported significant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

125 altercentric intrusions for arrow stimuli, conflicting evidence suggests that altercentric
126 intrusion arises from attributing mental states to the avatar (Furlanetto et al., 2016).
127 Importantly in our study, adopting the visuo-spatial perspective of another was only
128 observed for the avatar and not for the arrow. Thus, sharing visuo-proprioceptive
129 information may help in sharing perspectives only when the “other” is human-like and
130 does not extend to biologically irrelevant objects.

131 One might think that sharing cultural and ethnic backgrounds shapes how we
132 share the view of the world, however our results indicate that even low-level pre-
133 conscious bodily signals, such as posture, might drive whether we take another
134 person’s perspective. Hence, visuo-proprioceptive signals are not only essential for how
135 we perceive our own body, but also play an important role in influencing basic aspects
136 of social cognition.

137

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

138 **Acknowledgements**

139 A.P. and C.L. are supported by the Volkswagen Foundation (grant number 89434:
140 “Finding Perspective: Determining the embodiment of perspectival experience”). E.R.F.
141 is supported by the UK British Academy, the UK Royal Society and European Low
142 Gravity Association (ELGRA). M.G. is supported by a ESRC-DTC studentship. The
143 research leading to these results has received funding from the People Programme
144 (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme
145 (FP7/2007-2013) under REA grant agreement number 333607 (“BODILYSELF:
146 vestibular and multisensory investigations of bodily self-consciousness”).

147

148

1
2
3
4 **References**

- 5
6
7 150 Elekes, F., Varga, M., & Király, I. (2016) Evidence for spontaneous level-2 perspective
8
9 151 taking in adults. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 41, 93-103.
- 10 152 Furlanetto, T., Becchio, C., Samson, D., & Apperly, I. (2016). Altercentric
11
12 153 interference in level 1 visual perspective taking reflects the ascription of mental
13
14 154 states, not submentalizing. *Journal of experimental psychology. Human*
15
16 155 *perception and performance*, 42(2), 158-163.doi: 10.1037/xhp0000138.
- 17 156 Furlanetto, T., Gallace, A., Ansuini, C., & Becchio, C. (2014). Effects of arm crossing on
18
19 157 spatial perspective-taking. *PloS one*, 9(4), e95748. doi:
20
21 158 10.1371/journal.pone.0095748
- 22
23 159 Graziano, M. S., Cooke, D. F., & Taylor, C. S. (2000). Coding the location of the arm by
24
25 160 sight. *Science*, 290(5497), 1782-1786.
- 26
27 161 Heyes, C. (2014). Submentalizing: I am not really reading your mind. *Perspect. Psychol.*
28
29 162 *Sci* 9, 131-143. doi: 10.1177/1745691613518076.
- 30
31 163 Kessler, K., & Rutherford, H. (2010). The Two Forms of Visuo-Spatial Perspective
32
33 164 Taking are Differently Embodied and Subserve Different Spatial Prepositions.
34
35 165 *Frontiers in psychology*, 1, 213. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2010.00213
- 36 166 Kessler, K., & Thomson, L. A. (2010). The embodied nature of spatial perspective
37
38 167 taking: embodied transformation versus sensorimotor interference. *Cognition*,
39
40 168 114(1), 72-88. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2009.08.015
- 41
42 169 Limanowski, J., & Blankenburg, F. (2016). Integration of Visual and Proprioceptive Limb
43
44 170 Position Information in Human Posterior Parietal, Premotor, and Extrastriate
45
46 171 Cortex. *J Neurosci*, 36(9), 2582-2589. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3987-15.2016
- 47 172 Longo, M. R., Kammers, M. P., Gomi, H., Tsakiris, M., & Haggard, P. (2009).
48
49 173 Contraction of body representation induced by proprioceptive conflict. *Curr Biol*,
50
51 174 19(17), R727-728. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2009.07.024
- 52
53 175 Michelon, P., & Zacks, J. M. (2006). Two kinds of visual perspective-taking. *Percept.*
54
55 176 *Psychophys*, 68, 327-337. doi: 10.3758/BF03193680
- 56 177 Nielsen, M. K., Slade, L., Levy, J. P., & Holmes, A. (2015). Inclined to see it your way:
57
58 178 Do altercentric intrusion effects in visual perspective taking reflect an intrinsically
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

179 social process? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 68(10), 1931-
180 1951. doi: 10.1080/17470218.2015.1023206

181 Pavlidou, A., Ferre, E. R., & Lopez, C. (2018). Vestibular stimulation makes people
182 more egocentric. *Cortex; a journal devoted to the study of the nervous system*
183 *and behavior*, 101, 302-305. doi: 10.1016/j.cortex.2017.12.005

184 Proske, U., & Gandevia, S. C. (2012). The proprioceptive senses: their roles in signaling
185 body shape, body position and movement, and muscle force. *Physiol Rev*, 92(4),
186 1651-1697. doi: 10.1152/physrev.00048.2011

187 Samson, D., Apperly, I. A., Braithwaite, J. J., Andrews, B. J., & Bodley Scott, S. E.
188 (2010). Seeing it their way: evidence for rapid and involuntary computation of
189 what other people see. *Journal of experimental psychology. Human perception*
190 *and performance*, 36(5), 1255-1266. doi: 10.1037/a0018729

191 Santiesteban, I., Catmur, C., Hopkins, S. C., Bird, G., & Heyes, C. (2014). Avatars and
192 arrows: implicit mentalizing or domain-general processing? *Journal of*
193 *experimental psychology. Human perception and performance*, 40(3), 929-937.
194 doi: 10.1037/a0035175

195 Surtees, A., Apperly, I., & Samson, D. (2013a). Similarities and differences in visual and
196 spatial perspective-taking processes. *Cognition*, 129(2), 426-438. doi:
197 10.1016/j.cognition.2013.06.008

198 Surtees, A., Apperly, I., & Samson, D. (2013b). The use of embodied self-rotation for
199 visual and spatial perspective-taking. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 7, 698.
200 doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00698

201 Touzalin-Chretien, P., Ehrler, S., & Dufour, A. (2010). Dominance of vision over
202 proprioception on motor programming: evidence from ERP. *Cereb Cortex*, 20(8),
203 2007-2016. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhp271

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


Figure 1. Experimental setup and results. (A) Each trial started with a fixation cross (750 ms), followed by a number (1000 ms) and then a visual scene showing a 3D room (maximum time 2000 ms) containing from zero to three balls dispatched on one or two opposite walls. At the centre of the 3D room a gender-matched avatar (for 24 participants), or an arrow (for 24 other participants), was presented with a viewpoint congruent (18 trials per block) or incongruent (18 trials per block) to that of the participants. Participants had to indicate with a button press whether the number of blue balls observed from their viewpoint matched or mismatched the number presented at the start of the trial. **(B)** The experimental design is factorial combining viewpoint (congruent and incongruent) and body posture (matching and mismatching). Participants were seated on a chair that was oriented to face either the left or right side of the room. Participants' head was turned to face a computer screen where an avatar was also seated facing either the left or right side of a virtual room. For each chair orientation (facing the left or right side of the room) participants either had the same body posture with the avatar or a different one. A matching body posture with a congruent viewpoint and a mismatching body posture with an incongruent viewpoint of the participant facing the left side of the room with respect to the avatar is shown. **(C)** Box-and-whisker plots comparing congruency effect, calculated as the difference in reaction times between trials with incongruent and congruent viewpoints, when the participant and visual stimulus (avatar/arrow) had the same body posture (red box) or a different body posture (blue box). The upper and lower bound of each box represent the 75th and 25th percentiles of the distribution, and the median is represented by the thick horizontal line inside the box. The top and bottom ends of the whisker represent the 95th and 5th percentiles of the distribution, respectively. The white dot represents the mean and the black dots represent outliers.

***Credit Author Statement**

Credit Author Statement

A.P, C.L and E.R.F designed the study and experimental setup. A.P and M.G recruited participants and acquired the data. A.P performed the data analysis. A.P, C.L and E.R.F contributed to writing the manuscript. All authors approved the final version for submission.

Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Suppl. material for online publication only

[Click here to download Suppl. material for online publication only: Supplementary Material_2ndRev_Final.docx](#)