

1  
2  
3 RUNNING HEAD: Love and control  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **Reduced Cognitive Control in Passionate Lovers**  
12

13 Henk van Steenbergen<sup>1,2</sup>, Sandra J.E. Langeslag<sup>3</sup>, Guido P.H. Band<sup>1,2</sup>, & Bernhard Hommel<sup>1,2</sup>  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 *1 Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition, The Netherlands*  
19

20 *2 Leiden University Institute of Psychology, The Netherlands*  
21

22 *3 Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, USA*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 **Corresponding author:**  
40

41 Henk van Steenbergen  
42 Wassenaarseweg 52  
43 2333 AK Leiden  
44 The Netherlands  
45 Phone number: +31 (0)71 527 3655  
46 Fax number: +31 (0)71 527 3783  
47 E-mail address: HvanSteenbergen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Abstract**

Passionate love is associated with intense changes in emotion and attention which are thought to play an important role in the early stages of romantic relationship formation. Although passionate love usually involves enhanced, near-obsessive attention to the beloved, anecdotal evidence suggest that the lover's concentration for daily tasks like study and work may actually be impaired, suggesting reduced cognitive control. Affect might also contribute to changes in cognitive control. We examined the link between passionate love and cognitive control in a sample of students who had recently become involved in a romantic relationship. Intensity of passionate love as measured by the Passionate Love Scale was shown to correlate with decreased individual efficiency in cognitive control as measured in Stroop and flanker task performance. There was no evidence that affective changes mediate this effect. This study provides the first empirical evidence that passionate love in the early stages of romantic relationship is characterized by impaired cognitive control.

**Keywords:**

passionate love; cognitive control; flanker task; Stroop task; passionate love scale (PLS)

## Introduction

Falling in love is an experience that involves very intense affective and cognitive changes including euphoria and overwhelming joy, increased arousal and energy, emotional dependency on the partner, craving for emotional union with the beloved, and obsessional thoughts about and focused attention on the special other (Fisher, 1998; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). Several theorists have proposed that passionate love – also referred to as infatuation or limerence (Tennov, 1979) – should be distinguished from another important type of love, usually referred to as companionate love (Berscheid & Walster, 1978; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986; Rubin, 1970 cf. Sternberg, 1986). Although both types of love may often co-occur, they nevertheless show different trajectories over time (Aron & Aron, 1986; Berscheid, 2010; Baumeister & Bratslavsky, 1999) and may serve different functions (Fisher, Aron, & Brown, 2006; Reis & Aron, 2008). Companionate love, on the one hand, has been associated with intimacy and commitment (Baumeister & Bratslavsky, 1999), aspects that contribute to the maintenance of long-term relationships and allowing couples to raise their children in a safe and socially embedded environment. Passionate love, on the other hand, is thought to play a central role in forming a relationship with a partner, by becoming attracted to that individual (Reis & Aron, 2008)

Although psychological studies from the last decades have substantially increased our understanding of love and its important role in human relationships (for reviews, see Berscheid, 2010; Reis & Aron, 2008), it is yet poorly understood how passionate love affects our cognitive functioning, in particular one's self-regulation in terms of cognitive control (also known as self-control or execution function; Baumeister, Schmeichel, & Vohs, 2007). Research focusing on long-term relationships and companionate love has demonstrated that cognitive control indeed

1  
2  
3 plays an important role in maintaining a good partnership (for an overview, see Vohs & Finkel,  
4  
5 2006). For example, research by Pronk and colleagues (Pronk, Karremans, & Wigboldus, 2011;  
6  
7 Pronk, Karremans, Overbeek, Vermulst, & Wigboldus, 2010) has revealed that individual  
8  
9 differences in the level of cognitive control predict a wide range of behaviors including being  
10  
11 forgiving in close relationships, staying faithful in a relationship, resisting flirting behavior with  
12  
13 a confederate, and mastering one's desire to meet an attractive person. Other studies have shown  
14  
15 that manipulations depleting cognitive resources make lovers more interested in attractive  
16  
17 opposite-sex others (Ritter, Karremans, & van Schie, 2010) and impair constructive responses to  
18  
19 their partner (Finkel & Campbell, 2001). However, it has not yet been studied what role  
20  
21 cognitive control plays in the earlier stages of a romantic relationship and how it might be  
22  
23 affected by passionate love.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 While it is not known yet how passionate love relates to self-control, many other changes  
30  
31 in cognitive functioning have already been reported. For example, passionate love involves an  
32  
33 attraction and obsession-like focus to the special other (e.g. Fisher, 1998; Hatfield & Sprecher,  
34  
35 1986). Love also accompanies huge changes in priorities and resource deployments (Reis &  
36  
37 Aron, 2008): as soon as the other becomes part of one's mental and physical life, this induces  
38  
39 reorganizations in one's self-concept (Aron & Aron, 1986), overt behavior, and relationships  
40  
41 with others (Reis & Aron, 2008), which in turn increase the experience of passionate love even  
42  
43 further (Baumeister & Bratslavsky, 1999). Given these changes, it is well possible that cognitive  
44  
45 control levels are reduced in passionate lovers. For example, taking into account the limitations  
46  
47 to cognitive resources (Baumeister et al., 2007), it could be that the obsessive nature of  
48  
49 passionate love imposes important constraints on performing well in tasks that require self-  
50  
51 control. Conversely, it might also be that low control states are responsible for the intrusive  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 thoughts and obsessive behavior characteristic for passionate love (cf. Ochsner & Gross, 2005).  
4  
5 Some authors even have interpreted such changes as cognitive impairments that passionate love  
6  
7 may share with mental disorders like obsessive-compulsive disorder (Tallis, 2005). However,  
8  
9 until now there is only anecdotal evidence for impaired self-control in lovers.  
10

11  
12       Apart from the cognitive changes that accompany passionate love, it is also possible that  
13  
14 motivational and affective changes (Aron et al., 2005) contribute to altered self-control. For  
15  
16 example, states involving elevated energy levels and increased approach motivation might  
17  
18 increase attentional focus, as has been shown by several studies using experimental  
19  
20 manipulations of desire (Förster, Epstude, & Ozelsel, 2009; Gable & Harmon-Jones, 2010).  
21  
22 Alternatively, it might be that increases in arousal (Dutton & Aron, 1974) decrease cognitive  
23  
24 control (Kuhbandner & Zehetleitner, 2011; Pessoa, 2009). Changes in affective valence have  
25  
26 also been related to changes in cognitive control (e.g. Phillips, Bull, Adams, & Fraser, 2002;  
27  
28 Rowe, Hirsh, & Anderson, 2007; but see Bruyneel et al., 2012; Martin & Kerns, 2011), although  
29  
30 a link with passionate love is not unequivocal since love usually involves both positive and  
31  
32 negative emotions (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38       In sum, several cognitive and affective/motivational factors might be responsible for a  
39  
40 possible link between passionate love and cognitive control. Therefore, in the current study we  
41  
42 investigated whether individual differences in infatuation as measured by the Passionate Love  
43  
44 Scale (PLS ; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986) are associated with differences in cognitive control as  
45  
46 measured in a standard laboratory task. The PLS was used because this questionnaire is specially  
47  
48 designed to assess passionate love. This unidimensional scale comprises the cognitive (e.g.  
49  
50 intrusive thinking; preoccupation), emotional (e.g. attraction, desire for complete and permanent  
51  
52 union, and physiological arousal), and behavioral components (e.g. service to the other,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 maintaining physical closeness) of passionate love. Given that feelings of passionate love tends  
4  
5 to decline quite rapidly over time (Berscheid, 2010; Sprecher & Regan, 1998), we restricted our  
6  
7 sample to participants who fell in love no longer than six months ago. Self-reported affective  
8  
9 valence and arousal as measured by the affect grid (Russell, Weis, & Mendelsohn, 1989) was  
10  
11 used to test for potential affective mediation. Inspired by a neuroimaging study showing that PLS  
12  
13 scores are correlated with increased reward processing when participants view pictures of their  
14  
15 beloved (Aron et al., 2005), intense feelings of passionate love were induced before self-reported  
16  
17 affect and cognitive control were assessed.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 In order to investigate the possibility of potential moderating effects, the experimental  
23  
24 design included two additional factors: Task Type and Participant's Sex. Concerning Task Type,  
25  
26 two different tasks were used to measure cognitive control: a flanker task (Eriksen & Eriksen,  
27  
28 1974) and a Stroop task (Stroop, 1992). These two classic tasks assess the individual ability to  
29  
30 attend to relevant information while filtering out distracting, irrelevant spatial and semantic  
31  
32 information, respectively. Both tasks thus require cognitive control to successfully ignore the  
33  
34 distracting information introduced by these tasks. Previous studies have already shown that  
35  
36 affective states can modulate both Stroop (Phillips et al., 2002) and flanker performance (Rowe  
37  
38 et al., 2007; but see Bruyneel et al., 2012; Martin & Kerns, 2011), although this modulation  
39  
40 might involve different mechanisms. As has been argued in detail elsewhere (Martin & Kerns,  
41  
42 2011), effects on a Stroop task may reflect response inhibition modulation whereas effects on the  
43  
44 flanker task might reflect a modulation of the visuo-spatial focus of attention. Thus, the Task  
45  
46 Type manipulation allowed us to test whether a possible link between passionate love and  
47  
48 cognitive control generalizes across the spatial and verbal domain – indicating a general change  
49  
50 in control – or whether it is domain-specific – possibly indicating different mechanisms.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Second, we included the factor Participant's Sex because previous studies have shown  
4  
5 that male and female lovers differ in various ways. For example, sex differences have been  
6  
7 reported for the experience and appreciation of passionate love (Rubin, Peplau, & Hill, 1981),  
8  
9 levels of sexual desire (Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs, 2001), and cognitive impairments  
10  
11 following mixed-sex interactions (Karremans, Verwijmeren, Pronk, & Reitsma, 2009). Because  
12  
13 any of these differences could potentially moderate the link between passionate love and  
14  
15 cognitive control, our design therefore included a balanced number of male and female  
16  
17 participants in order to test for potential differences related to participant's sex.  
18  
19  
20

## 21 22 Method

### 23 24 Participants

25  
26 Fifty-one healthy heterosexual students who had recently (at most 6 months ago) fallen in  
27  
28 love participated either for payment or course credits. Based on initial screening of the  
29  
30 behavioral data, eight participants were excluded from further analyses because of chance  
31  
32 performance (about 50% correct, i.e. they responded to the distractor rather than to the target) in  
33  
34 at least one of the experimental task blocks<sup>1</sup>. The age range of the remaining 43 participants (23  
35  
36 females; 20 males) was 18 – 27 years (mean = 20.9 years), four participants were left-handed.  
37  
38 All participants had a relationship with their beloved (mean duration = 2.8 months). The reported  
39  
40 duration of being in love ranged between 1 and 6 months (mean = 3.4 months). All participants  
41  
42 were Dutch native speakers, not color blind, and without a psychiatric history.  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 48 Tasks

49  
50 Two variants of a classic cognitive control paradigm were presented in different blocks of  
51  
52 trials. The flanker task (Eriksen & Eriksen, 1974) consisted of centrally presented target stimuli  
53  
54

55  
56 \_\_\_\_\_

57  
58 <sup>1</sup> Including these participants in the analysis did not affect the main findings reported below.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 which were vertically flanked on either side by two identical response-compatible or response-  
4  
5 incompatible stimuli. The Stroop task (Stroop, 1992) consisted of a column of five identical  
6  
7 stimuli presented in response-compatible or response-incompatible ink colors. Flanker and  
8  
9 Stroop stimuli were carefully matched by using two non-overlapping sets of Dutch color words  
10  
11 (“brown”, “gray”, “yellow”, and “red” or “purple”, “green”, “orange”, and “blue”). Using words  
12  
13 in both tasks allowed us to match the imperative stimuli as closely as possible, whereas the  
14  
15 source of the response interference is different (spatial for the flanker task, semantic for the  
16  
17 Stroop task). Each task used a counterbalanced unique set of four words. Two targets were  
18  
19 mapped to a left hand response, whereas the other two targets were mapped to a right hand  
20  
21 response.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 E-prime™ software was used for stimulus presentation and response recording. All trials  
27  
28 started with a fixation cross (randomly varying intervals of 800, 1000, or 1100 ms), followed by  
29  
30 the stimulus, which was presented until response registration or, in the case of omission, for 1500  
31  
32 ms. In half of the trials the stimuli would call for different responses (incompatible condition;  
33  
34 e.g. the word “green” surrounded by the words “yellow” in the flanker task and the word “blue”  
35  
36 printed in red in the Stroop task) whereas in the other half identical target and distracter  
37  
38 dimensions would call for the same response (compatible condition; e.g. the word “green”  
39  
40 surrounded by the words “green” in the flanker task and the word “blue” printed in blue in the  
41  
42 Stroop task). All trials were presented in an unconstrained random sequence. Stimuli appeared in  
43  
44 lower-case in Arial bold font (3.5 cm wide and 5.4 cm high) and were presented on a grey  
45  
46 background. Flanker-task stimuli used black ink color. Participants viewed the stimuli on a 17”  
47  
48 monitor from about 60 cm.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Procedure**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3 After giving informed consent, participants received task instructions that emphasized  
4  
5 both speed and accuracy. Both the flanker and the Stroop task were practiced in separate blocks  
6  
7 of 16 trials that included performance feedback. Participants then filled out a Dutch translation of  
8  
9 the PLS (a unidimensional scale that includes 30 items on a 9-points scale; Hatfield & Sprecher,  
10  
11 1986; Langeslag, Jansma, Franken, & Van Strien, 2007) and were instructed to intensify an  
12  
13 amorous mood by imagining and writing about an appropriate romantic event from their past or  
14  
15 to focus on a romantic vignette they were given. During this 10-min affect induction period,  
16  
17 participants listened via headphones to their own favorite love-related music which they had  
18  
19 brought with them. This procedure is known to evoke intense feelings of romantic love (Mashek,  
20  
21 Aron, & Fisher, 2000). Participants then performed a block of 72 trials for each task separately.  
22  
23 After a 3-min affect induction repetition, the same two blocks were presented again. The order of  
24  
25 tasks was counterbalanced across participants. Participants rated their current affective state  
26  
27 using a computerized affect grid (measuring affective valence and arousal; Russell et al., 1989)  
28  
29 occasionally provided throughout the experiment.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 Results

37  
38 Measures of interference (i.e., the “Stroop effect” and the “flanker effect”) for correct  
39  
40 reaction time (RT) and accuracy were calculated for the Stroop and flanker tasks by subtracting  
41  
42 average performance on compatible trials from average performance on incompatible trials. Both  
43  
44 tasks produced robust RT interference scores (flanker task: 29 ms,  $t(42) = 8.17$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Stroop  
45  
46 task: 38 ms,  $t(42) = 5.24$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that they successfully induced interference. There  
47  
48 was no evidence that the RT interference scores were correlated ( $r = -.071$ ,  $p = .651$ ).  
49  
50  
51

52 Interference scores were subsequently analyzed using a General Linear Model (GLM)  
53  
54 analysis in SPSS with the variables PLS score (the between-subjects continuous predictor; in  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 SPSS the “covariate” used as variable of primary interest, cf. Wildt & Ahtola Wildt & Ahtola,  
4  
5 1978, p. 52), Task Type (within subjects: flanker versus Stroop), Participant's Sex (between  
6  
7 subjects: female versus male) and their interactions as predictors.  
8  
9

10 The GLM analysis indicated that PLS scores significantly predict variation in the  
11  
12 interference effect ( $F(1,39) = 5.18$ ,  $p = .028$ ,  $MSE = 974.54$ , partial eta squared = .117). This  
13  
14 effect was independent of Task Type ( $F(1,39) = 1.252$ ,  $p = .270$ ,  $MSE = 1263.70$ , partial eta  
15  
16 squared = .031) and Participant's Sex ( $F(1,39) = .147$ ,  $p = .704$ ,  $MSE = 974.54$ , partial eta  
17  
18 squared = .004). As is illustrated in Figure 1, higher PLS scores were associated with increases in  
19  
20 the interference effect (pooled over tasks). Main effects of Task Type and Participant's Sex or  
21  
22 higher-order interactions were not observed either ( $F_s < 1.44$ ). A predictive effect for PLS score  
23  
24 was not found for interference effects measured in accuracy ( $F(1,39) = 0.26$ ,  $p = .611$ ,  $MSE =$   
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  
.004, partial eta squared = .007), indicating that the RT results could not be accounted for by a  
speed-accuracy trade off.

A separate analysis on overall RT showed that the effect of PLS on attentional  
interference could not be accounted for by a scaling effect due to RT slowing ( $F(1,39) = 1.25$ ,  $p$   
= .270). We re-ran analyses to ensure that the effects on interference were not exclusively driven  
by three particular PLS items that explicitly refer to obsessive thoughts and intrusive thinking  
(i.e., items 5, 19, and 21). A PLS sum score that did not include these items, was also shown to  
be a reliable predictor of interference effect increases ( $F(1,39) = 5.22$ ,  $p = .028$ ,  $MSE = 972.63$ ,  
partial eta squared = .118).

To test for possible affective mediation, we checked whether the effect of PLS on  
interference might have been related to self-reported affect. In order to get an estimate of the  
participant's affective state at the moment they performed the cognitive-control tasks, we

1  
2  
3 analyzed average arousal and valence ratings (9-points scale) across the four ratings that were  
4  
5 provided just before and after the completion of the task blocks. Arousal was positively  
6  
7 associated with PLS scores ( $r = .326$ ,  $p = .033$ ), whereas valence was not related to PLS ( $r =$   
8  
9  $.019$ ,  $p = .902$ ). This shows that only arousal shares some variance with PLS scores. But in order  
10  
11 to be a candidate for mediation, variations in this variable must also significantly account for  
12  
13 variations in the dependent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). However, this correlation was not  
14  
15 found in the present dataset: arousal – interference,  $r = .185$ ,  $p = .235$ ; valence – interference,  $r =$   
16  
17  $-.134$ ,  $p = .393$ . Thus, neither mood valence nor arousal could have played a reliable mediating  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 role in the relation between passionate love and cognitive control.

### 23 24 Discussion

25  
26 This study provides the first evidence for an association between passionate love as  
27  
28 measured by the PLS and reduced cognitive control as measured by standard laboratory tasks  
29  
30 (Stroop and flanker task) in a sample of students in the early stage of a romantic relationship.  
31  
32 There was no evidence for an affective mediation of this effect. Furthermore, the effect did not  
33  
34 interact with the specific task employed, suggesting that intense passionate love is associated  
35  
36 with reduced cognitive control in multiple ways. The link between passionate love and control  
37  
38 was also not moderated by participant's sex.  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Which explanation might best account for the findings we obtained? As mentioned in the  
44  
45 introduction, both cognitive and affective aspects of passionate love may be predicted to relate to  
46  
47 reduced cognitive control. However, we failed to find evidence for a strong affective mediation:  
48  
49 neither arousal nor valence was found to predict cognitive control impairment, even though  
50  
51 arousal was positively related to passionate love. Although this null-finding does not allow  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 strong inferences, it is thus possible that the effect we obtained rather reflects changes in the  
4  
5 cognitive system.  
6

7 Our finding provides an important extension to earlier work about self-control and  
8  
9 relationships. The observations of reduced control in passionate lovers contrasts with earlier  
10  
11 studies demonstrating that increased self-control is important for maintaining long-term  
12  
13 relationships (Finkel & Campbell, 2001; Pronk et al., 2011; Pronk et al., 2010; Ritter et al., 2010;  
14  
15 Vohs & Finkel, 2006). Accordingly, it might be speculated that forming and maintaining a  
16  
17 relationship requires different control settings. In other words, it could be that in the early stage  
18  
19 of forming a relationship reduced self-control might have beneficial effects, e.g. it may expand  
20  
21 the self-concept which allows incorporating the other in one's cognitive system (Aron & Aron,  
22  
23 1986). In the long-term, however, self-control may need to set in to shield and protect the new  
24  
25 relationship against potential threats (e.g. Pronk et al., 2010).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Reduced cognitive control might also account for modulations in impulsivity typically  
32  
33 associated with passionate love (Malladian & Davies, 1994; Sophia et al., 2009). Dual-process  
34  
35 models have suggested that disrupted top-down cognitive control might increase impulsive  
36  
37 action (e.g. Baumeister et al., 2007; Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009), for example in addiction  
38  
39 (Dalley, Everitt, & Robbins, 2011; Wiers, Gladwin, Hofmann, Salemink, & Ridderinkhof, 2013).  
40  
41 Indeed, some authors have drawn parallels between addiction and passionate love suggesting that  
42  
43 shared brain processes induce such impulsivity (Burkett & Young, 2012). Interestingly, it has  
44  
45 also been shown that – like impaired cognitive control (Pronk et al., 2011; Pronk et al., 2010) –  
46  
47 increased impulsivity predicts engaging in unfaithful activities while dating (McAlister, Pachana,  
48  
49 & Jackson, 2005). Nevertheless, future research is needed to illuminate the causal relations that  
50  
51 might underlie these associations between self-control, impulsivity and passionate love.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3       Although our findings of reduced control might be interpreted as an impairment in  
4  
5 cognitive functioning (cf. Tallis, 2005), it is important to emphasize that a lack of cognitive  
6  
7 control is not necessarily detrimental to all aspects of behavior. For example, it has been  
8  
9 suggested that low control states facilitate divergent thinking and creativity (Friedman & Förster,  
10  
11 2008; Hommel, 2012). From an evolutionary perspective it has been argued that creative acts  
12  
13 might be highly valuable in forming a relationship because they attract the attention of a  
14  
15 romantic partner and facilitate mating behavior (Miller, 2000). Indeed, studies that have asked  
16  
17 participants to imagine romantic scenarios have provided evidence for improved creativity and  
18  
19 reduced analytic thinking (Förster et al., 2009; Griskevicius, Cialdini, & Kenrick, 2006).  
20  
21 However, research will have to confirm whether passionate love during actual courtship is also  
22  
23 related to creativity.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29       Another important issue that warrants further investigation is the association between  
30  
31 sexual desire and cognitive control. Although some researchers have claimed that sexual desire  
32  
33 and passionate love are distinguishable because they involve different emotion systems that serve  
34  
35 different functions (Diamond, 2004; Gonzaga, Turner, Keltner, Campos, & Altemus, 2006),  
36  
37 passionate love and sexual desire typically tend to co-occur (Berscheid & Walster, 1978;  
38  
39 Cacioppo & Hatfield, 2013). Indeed, PLS scores have been found to correlate modestly with  
40  
41 self-reported desire for sexual / physical intimacy (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986) and the frequency  
42  
43 of sexual behavior (Aron & Henkemeyer, 1995). Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the negative  
44  
45 association between passionate love and cognitive control in our study is driven by differences in  
46  
47 sexual desire. For example, in a first attempt to dissociate effects of passionate love and sexual  
48  
49 desire, Förster and colleagues have shown that love- versus sex-related stimuli prime opposing  
50  
51 effects on control-related functions, with love decreasing and sex increasing local processing and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 analytic thinking (Förster et al., 2009). Thus, if anything, the effects of sexual desire on control  
4  
5 might have counteracted the negative correlation we observed. In addition, men and women  
6  
7 usually differ in their sexual desire (Baumeister et al., 2001), whereas we did not find any  
8  
9 evidence for gender effects in our study.  
10

11  
12 Future work is also required to understand how the reduced cognitive control we  
13  
14 observed is driven by neuromodulatory effects in the brain. Cumulating neuroscientific evidence  
15  
16 has suggested that passionate love, companionate love, and lust involve different neurochemical  
17  
18 systems and hormones (Cacioppo & Hatfield, 2013; Fisher, 1998; Reis & Aron, 2008). With  
19  
20 respect to passionate love, it has been hypothesized that elevated catecholamines, such as  
21  
22 dopamine, play a central role in animal and human courtship attraction. Indeed, dopamine has  
23  
24 been shown to modulate mating preference in animals (Fisher et al., 2006), and neuroimaging  
25  
26 studies on passionate love in humans have consistently found activity in the mesolimbic  
27  
28 dopaminergic reward system including the striatum (Aron et al., 2005; Bartels & Zeki, 2000;  
29  
30 Langeslag, van der Veen, & Röder, 2012). Moreover, PLS scores correlate positively with  
31  
32 activity in this region (Aron et al., 2005). It is possible that such dopaminergic modulation  
33  
34 changed the balance between striatal and prefrontal processing, which might have driven the  
35  
36 changes in cognitive control we have observed (cf. Cools, 2008).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 One limitation of the current research is that we restricted our sample to participants who  
44  
45 fell in love only recently (at most six months ago). In addition, the cognitive control  
46  
47 measurement was preceded by an affect induction procedure that involves increasing passionate  
48  
49 love. Both aspects of this study might have inflated the negative association we have observed  
50  
51 between passionate love and cognitive control. For example, passionate love usually peaks in the  
52  
53 early stage of a romantic relationship, and low levels of passionate love are likely not to impair  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 self-control. In addition, as discussed earlier, in order to maintain a long-term relationship self-  
4  
5 control is likely to become increased over time. It is also possible that the affect induction  
6  
7 method increased obsessive thoughts about and affective responses to one's imagined partner,  
8  
9 which might have contributed to the effect observed. Note however that our data did not suggest  
10  
11 affective modulation, and the effect survived the analysis that corrected for PLS items related to  
12  
13 obsessive thinking.  
14  
15

16  
17 As is inherent to all studies adopting a correlational approach, we cannot determine  
18  
19 whether passionate love is the cause or the effect of impaired control, or whether both are two  
20  
21 different expressions of the same underlying “syndrome”. Given well-known reciprocal  
22  
23 interactions between affective processes and control processes acting even at very short time  
24  
25 scales (Ochsner & Gross, 2005; Cohen, Henik, & Mor, 2011), it is unlikely that such interactions  
26  
27 can be unraveled easily. It is also possible that part of the cognitive control state measured in this  
28  
29 study reflects a more stable trait-like measure of self-control. Given that we did not measure  
30  
31 levels of trait self-control, we cannot exclude the possibility that participants reporting high  
32  
33 levels of passionate love were already low in self-control in the first place. However, a re-  
34  
35 analysis of findings from a recent study that includes individual scores of self-control and aspects  
36  
37 of passionate love measured by the Love Attitude Scale (subscales Eros and Mania) in a  
38  
39 university sample of romantic partners (cf. Vohs, Finkenauer, & Baumeister, 2011) did not  
40  
41 reveal such correlations (Vohs & Finkenauer, personal communication, July 19, 2012).  
42  
43 Obviously, it is still possible that trait self-control may predict passionate love in a sample of  
44  
45 people who have recently fallen in love.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 To conclude, our study is the first to show that high levels of passionate love of  
54  
55 individuals in the early stage of a romantic relationship are associated with reduced cognitive  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 control. Anecdotal evidence for effects of that sort have long been reported (cf. Tallis, 2005) but  
4  
5 were never investigated before. Extending earlier research showing the importance of cognitive  
6  
7 control for the maintenance of long-term relationships, our findings suggest that reduced  
8  
9 cognitive control is an important aspect of passionate love and the initial stage of a romantic  
10  
11 relationship. These findings encourage future studies to study the neural mechanism of this effect  
12  
13 and the implications of this low control state for other cognitive functions.  
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



### Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Eveline Euser, whose enthusiastic input and support were invaluable for this project. We thank Kimee van Almen, Dion Koesoemo Joedo, Faye Koolen, Erik van Loo, Tahnee Snelder, Jitske Voorham, and all other students involved in this project, for recruiting and testing the participants. This research was supported by a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to the third author.

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

## Reference List

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Aron, A. & Aron, E. N. (1986). *Love and the Expansion of Self: Understanding*  
8 *Attraction and Satisfaction*. New York: Hemisphere.  
9
- 10  
11  
12  
13 Aron, A., Fisher, H., Mashek, D. J., Strong, G., Li, H. F., & Brown, L. L. (2005).  
14 Reward, motivation, and emotion systems associated with early-stage intense romantic love.  
15 *Journal of Neurophysiology*, *94*, 327-337.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Aron, A. & Henkemeyer, L. (1995). Marital Satisfaction and Passionate Love. *Journal of*  
22 *Social and Personal Relationships*, *12*, 139-146.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator mediator variable distinction in  
28 social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of*  
29 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173-1182.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 Bartels, A. & Zeki, S. (2000). The neural basis of romantic love. *Neuroreport*, *11*, 3829-  
36 3834.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Baumeister, R. F. & Bratslavsky, E. (1999). Passion, intimacy, and time: Passionate love  
42 as a function of change in intimacy. *Personality and social psychology review*, *3*, 49.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in  
48 strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant  
49 evidence. *Personality and social psychology review*, *5*, 242-273.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation and the  
4 executive function: The self as controlling agent. In K.W.Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.),  
5 *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 516-539). New York, NY: Guilford Press.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Berscheid, E. (2010). Love in the Fourth Dimension. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61,  
12 1-25.  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. H. (1978). *Interpersonal Attraction*. (2nd ed.) Reading, MA:  
18 Addison-Wesley.  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Bruyneel, L., van Steenbergen, H., Hommel, B., Band, G. P. H., De Raedt, R., & Koster,  
24 E. H. (2012). Happy but still focused: Failures to find evidence for a mood-induced widening of  
25 visual attention. *Psychological Research*, in press.  
26  
27

28  
29  
30  
31 Burkett, J. P. & Young, L. J. (2012). The behavioral, anatomical and pharmacological  
32 parallels between social attachment, love and addiction. *Psychopharmacology*, 224, 1-26.  
33  
34

35  
36  
37 Cacioppo, S. & Hatfield, E. (2013). Passionate love and sexual desire. In *Encyclopedia of*  
38 *Human Behavior* ( New York: Wiley-Blackwell.  
39  
40

41  
42  
43  
44 Cohen, N., Henik, A., & Mor, N. (2011). Can emotion modulate attention? Evidence for  
45 reciprocal links in the Attentional Network Test. *Experimental Psychology*, 58, 171-179.  
46  
47

48  
49  
50  
51 Cools, R. (2008). Role of dopamine in the motivational and cognitive control of behavior.  
52 *Neuroscientist*, 14, 381-395.  
53

54  
55  
56  
57 Dalley, J. W., Everitt, B. J., & Robbins, T. W. (2011). Impulsivity, compulsivity, and top-  
58 down cognitive control. *Neuron*, 69, 680-694.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Diamond, L. M. (2004). Emerging perspectives on distinctions between romantic love  
4 and sexual desire. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 116-119.  
5  
6

7  
8 Dutton, D. G. & Aron, A. P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction  
9 under conditions of high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 510-517.  
10  
11

12  
13 Eriksen, B. A. & Eriksen, C. W. (1974). Effects of noise letters upon identification of a  
14 target letter in a nonsearch task. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16, 143-149.  
15  
16

17  
18 Finkel, E. J. & Campbell, W. K. (2001). Self-control and accommodation in close  
19 relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81,  
20 263-277.  
21  
22

23  
24 Fisher, H. E. (1998). Lust, attraction, and attachment in mammalian reproduction. *Human*  
25 *Nature-An Interdisciplinary Biosocial Perspective*, 9, 23-52.  
26  
27

28  
29 Fisher, H. E., Aron, A., & Brown, L. L. (2006). Romantic love: a mammalian brain  
30 system for mate choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*,  
31 361, 2173-2186.  
32  
33

34  
35 Förster, J., Epstude, K., & Ozsel, A. (2009). Why love has wings and sex has not: How  
36 reminders of love and sex influence creative and analytic thinking. *Personality and Social*  
37 *Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1479-1491.  
38  
39

40  
41 Friedman, R. & Förster, J. (2008). Activation and measurement of motivational states. In  
42 A.Elliott (Ed.), *Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation* (pp. 235-246). Mahwah, NJ:  
43 Lawrence Erlbaum.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Gable, P. & Harmon-Jones, E. (2010). The motivational dimensional model of affect:  
4  
5 Implications for breadth of attention, memory, and cognitive categorisation. *Cognition &*  
6  
7 *Emotion, 24*, 322-337.  
8  
9

10  
11 Gonzaga, G. C., Turner, R. A., Keltner, D., Campos, B., & Altemus, M. (2006).  
12  
13 Romantic love and sexual desire in close relationships. *Emotion, 6*, 163-179.  
14  
15

16  
17 Griskevicius, V., Cialdini, R. B., & Kenrick, D. T. (2006). Peacocks, Picasso, and  
18  
19 parental investment: The effects of romantic motives on creativity. *Journal of Personality and*  
20  
21 *Social Psychology, 91*, 63-76.  
22  
23

24  
25 Hatfield, E. & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate-relationships.  
26  
27 *Journal of Adolescence, 9*, 383-410.  
28  
29

30  
31 Hofmann, W., Friese, M., & Strack, F. (2009). Impulse and self-control from a dual-  
32  
33 systems perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*, 162-176.  
34  
35

36  
37 Hommel, B. (2012). Convergent and divergent operations in cognitive search. In  
38  
39 P.M.Todd, T. T. Hills, & T. W. Robbins (Eds.), *Cognitive search: Evolution, algorithms, and the*  
40  
41 *brain* (Vol. 9 ed., pp. 215-230). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
42  
43

44  
45 Karremans, J. C., Verwijmeren, T., Pronk, T. M., & Reitsma, M. (2009). Interacting with  
46  
47 women can impair men's cognitive functioning. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*,  
48  
49 1041-1044.  
50  
51

52  
53 Kuhbandner, C. & Zehetleitner, M. (2011). Dissociable effects of valence and arousal in  
54  
55 adaptive executive control. *Plos One, 6*, e29287.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Langeslag, S. J. E., Jansma, B. A., Franken, I. H. A., & Van Strien, J. W. (2007). Event-  
4  
5 related potential responses to love-related facial stimuli. *Biological Psychology*, 76, 109-115.  
6

7  
8 Langeslag, S. J. E., van der Veen, F. M., & Röder, C. H. (2012). Attention modulates the  
9  
10 dorsal striatum response to love stimuli. *Human Brain Mapping*, *in press*.  
11

12  
13 Malladian, I. & Davies, M. F. (1994). The colors of love: Personality-correlates of love  
14  
15 styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17, 557-560.  
16

17  
18 Martin, E. A. & Kerns, J. G. (2011). The influence of positive mood on different aspects  
19  
20 of cognitive control. *Cognition & Emotion*, 25, 265-279.  
21  
22

23  
24 Mashek, D., Aron, A., & Fisher, H. E. (2000). Identifying, evoking and measuring  
25  
26 intense feelings of romantic love. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 24, 48-55.  
27  
28

29  
30 McAlister, A. R., Pachana, N., & Jackson, C. J. (2005). Predictors of young dating adults'  
31  
32 inclination to engage in extradyadic sexual activities: A multi-perspective study. *British Journal*  
33  
34 *of Psychology*, 96, 331-350.  
35  
36

37  
38 Miller, G. (2000). *The mating mind: How sexual choice shaped the evolution of human*  
39  
40 *nature*. London: The Random House Group, Ltd.  
41  
42

43  
44 Ochsner, K. N. & Gross, J. J. (2005). The cognitive control of emotion. *Trends in*  
45  
46 *Cognitive Sciences*, 9, 242-249.  
47  
48

49  
50 Pessoa, L. (2009). How do emotion and motivation direct executive control? *Trends in*  
51  
52 *Cognitive Sciences*, 13, 160-166.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Phillips, L. H., Bull, R., Adams, E., & Fraser, L. (2002). Positive mood and executive  
4  
5 function: evidence from Stroop and fluency tasks. *Emotion*, 2, 12-22.  
6

7  
8  
9 Pronk, T. M., Karremans, J. C., Overbeek, G., Vermulst, A. A., & Wigboldus, D. H. J.  
10  
11 (2010). What It Takes to Forgive: When and Why Executive Functioning Facilitates  
12  
13 Forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 119-131.  
14

15  
16  
17 Pronk, T. M., Karremans, J. C., & Wigboldus, D. H. J. (2011). How Can You Resist?  
18  
19 Executive Control Helps Romantically Involved Individuals to Stay Faithful. *Journal of*  
20  
21 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 827-837.  
22

23  
24  
25 Reis, H. T. & Aron, A. (2008). Love what is it, why does it matter, and how does it  
26  
27 operate? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 80-86.  
28

29  
30  
31 Ritter, S. M., Karremans, J. C., & van Schie, H. T. (2010). The role of self-regulation in  
32  
33 derogating attractive alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 631-637.  
34

35  
36  
37 Rowe, G., Hirsh, J. B., & Anderson, A. K. (2007). Positive affect increases the breadth of  
38  
39 attentional selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
40  
41 *America*, 104, 383-388.  
42

43  
44  
45 Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
46  
47 *Psychology*, 16, 265-273.  
48

49  
50  
51 Rubin, Z., Peplau, L. A., & Hill, C. T. (1981). Loving and leaving: Sex-differences in  
52  
53 romantic attachments. *Sex Roles*, 7, 821-835.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 Russell, J. A., Weis, A., & Mendelsohn, G. A. (1989). Affect grid: a single-item scale of  
4  
5 pleasure and arousal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 493.  
6

7  
8  
9 Sophia, E. C., Tavares, H., Berti, M. P., Pereira, A. P., Lorena, A., Mello, C. et al. (2009).  
10  
11 Pathological love: Impulsivity, personality, and romantic relationship. *Cns Spectrums*, 14, 268-  
12  
13 274.  
14

15  
16  
17 Sprecher, S. & Regan, P. C. (1998). Passionate and companionate love in courting and  
18  
19 young married couples. *Sociological Inquiry*, 68, 163-185.  
20

21  
22 Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-135.  
23

24  
25  
26 Stroop, J. R. (1992). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions (Reprinted from  
27  
28 Journal Experimental-Psychology, Vol 18, Pg 643-662, 1935). *Journal of Experimental*  
29  
30 *Psychology-General*, 121, 15-23.  
31

32  
33  
34 Tallis, F. (2005). Crazy for you. *Psychologist*, 18, 72-74.  
35

36  
37  
38 Tennov, D. (1979). *Love and Limerence: The Experience of Being in Love*. New York:  
39  
40 Stein and Day.  
41

42  
43  
44 Vohs, K. D. & Finkel, E. J. (2006). *Self and Relationships: Connecting intrapersonal and*  
45  
46 *interpersonal processes*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.  
47

48  
49  
50 Vohs, K. D., Finkenauer, C., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011). The sum of friends' and lovers'  
51  
52 self-control scores predicts relationship quality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2,  
53  
54 138-145.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3 Wiers, R. W., Gladwin, T. E., Hofmann, W., Salemink, E., & Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2013).  
4  
5 Cognitive bias modification and cognitive control training in addiction and related  
6  
7 psychopathology: Mechanisms, clinical perspectives, and ways forward. *Clinical Psychological*  
8  
9 *Science, 1*, 192-212.  
10


11  
12 Wildt, A. R. & Ahtola, O. T. (1978). *Analysis of Covariance*. Beverly Hills: Sage  
13  
14 Publications, Inc.  
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 captions**

Figure 1.

Positive correlation between Passionate Love Scale scores and interference score. Given that the GLM showed that this effect was independent of Task Type, we plotted a composite score of individual interference effects averaged across the Stroop and flanker tasks.

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  
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