Markus Appel, David Hanauer, Hans Hoeken, Kobie van Krieken, Tobias Richter, José Sanders

The Psychological and Social Effects of Literariness: Formal Features and Paratextual Information

Abstract: This chapter explores the effects of literariness on readers' psychological and social understandings within and beyond literary texts. Literariness is introduced as (a) a function of specific textual features that create linguistic foregrounding and (b) the positioning of a text as literary through para-textual signifiers (such as non-fiction and fiction labelling). After a brief review of the history of research on literariness, we discuss empirical studies of the role of paratext (such as non-fiction and fiction labelling) in the processing of texts and connect this research to the concepts of identification and perspective taking. We introduce research on readers' responses to the formal features of narrative and highlight the role of literary techniques in the non-literary context of journalism.

Introduction

This chapter explores the effects of a range of paratextual information and of formal features characteristic of literature on readers' psychological and social understandings within and beyond literary texts. The characteristic features of literature, often termed literariness, have been tied to a range of psychological outcomes, including some of the proposed benefits of literary reading, such as increased critical understandings of self and others (Hakemulder, 2000; Kidd & Castano, 2013; Mar & Oatley, 2008). This position is not without its issues. Since its inception, the concept of literariness has been intertwined with the perceived problem that literary language and literary processing can be found in other, non-literary textual settings and as such is not a distinctive property of the literary (Jakobson, 1960). But, there is some agreement among scientific researchers of literature that literariness is activated through two mechanisms: (a) the presence within a text of a density of specific textual features that create linguistic foregrounding and (b) the sociological positioning of a text as literary through a series of para-textual signifiers, such as the name of the author or the publishing house (Hanauer, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 2018; Koopman & Hakemulder,

2015; Miall & Kuiken, 1998, 1999; Zwaan, 1996). The question posed by this chapter is the way in which paratextual information and the formal features of literature affect readers' psychological and social understandings. More specifically, the aim of this chapter is to discuss the ways in which literary effects studied within the context of literary artifacts can also have a role in non-literary situations (especially journalism).

A Brief History of Literariness

The term literariness, as a concept within the academic field of literary studies, has a history of approximately 100 years dating back to the seminal work of Jakobson (1921). As summarized by Winko (2009), the concept of literariness has played a pivotal role in literary theory as theorists of various orientations tried to differentiate literature from other forms of text and reading. The empirical research into literariness has involved three waves of research activity: linguistic, cognitive, and psychological. Initial research into literariness was formulated within a linguistic/stylistic orientation and was primarily interested in defining the forms of language that were distinctive to literary texts. This work suggested that increased levels of linguistic density and parallelism produced an effect in which the forms of the language used were drawing attention to themselves (Jakobson, 1960). This linguistic foregrounding, in which the form of the message draws attention to itself, was termed the poetic function and seen as a central aspect of literariness. In subsequent studies representing a second wave of research activity, the concept of foregrounded language was explored utilizing empirical, cognitive-psychological designs to determine what effects foregrounding has on reading processes. In a series of studies, foregrounded language was found to produce slower reading times (Hanauer, 1998a, 1998b; Miall & Kuiken, 1994; Sopčák, 2007), make certain sections of a text more striking and noticeable (Hanauer, 1998a, 1998b; Hoorn, 1997; Sopčák, 2007; van Peer, 1986), and enhance affective and aesthetic responses to the text (Miall & Kuiken, 1994; Sopčák, 2007). These types of response were found to be quite stable over different studies, suggesting direct processing effects for the type of language characteristic of literary texts. The third wave of research on literariness extended the psychological effects of literary texts to longer term psychological and sociological outcomes. Several studies have demonstrated the ability of literary texts to elicit sympathy, as well as empathy and cognitive perspective taking, in relation to the central characters (Hakemulder, 2000; Mar & Oatley, 2008). These approaches to literariness – often related to Theory of Mind (ToM) – have also been used to explain the broader values of reading liter-

ature, suggesting that people who read literature show increases in social understanding and potential development in their belief systems (Hakemulder, 2000; Kidd & Castano, 2013; Mar & Oatley, 2008; Mar, 2018a, 2018b; for a critical assessment of Kidd & Castano's work see, for example, Panero et al., 2016).

If all three waves of research on literariness are combined, a particular model of literariness emerges. Foregrounded language and parallelism give the reader a sense that they are reading a literary text, which produces a series of reading responses involving slower reading times, appreciation of striking passages, and enhanced affective and aesthetic responses. Further support for these aspects of literary reading is found in the recent Neurocognitive Poetics Model (Jacobs, 2011, 2015a). Similarly, literary reading has been shown to produce ToM outcomes of increased empathy, sympathy, and cognitive perspective-taking – and potential changes to readers' beliefs. The exact modeling of the processing relationship between these aspects of literariness is still being investigated, but the existing evidence does support the co-presence of particular textual, processing, and psychological outcomes related to literariness (Hanauer, 2018; Miall & Kuiken, 1994, 1998). An important direction for thought is that these different components of literariness, together or apart, could have critical consequences in terms of social understanding in literary reading and in other non-literary texts that utilize aspects of literariness in their writing.

While the majority of the research on literariness has been situated within the discussion of textual features, the role of paratextual information and higher levels of literary processing, such as narrative structure or character design, also play a role in leading the effects of literariness. To further complicate matters, Hanauer (2018) argues that it is possible that literariness effects occur beyond the literary text in what has been called the intermediate states of literariness. This chapter examines some of the situations in which literariness plays a processing role on reader responses and is activated by either paratextual or formal features. The interest here is not limited to the reading of literary texts but, rather, to an understanding of literary-like processing and its effects on readers across different intermediate literary situations.

Paratextual Information and the Effects of Non-Fiction versus Fiction Labelling

As described above, paratextual information is one of the ways in which literariness is activated. Accordingly, this chapter begins with a review of the studies of paratextual information. It should be noted that in real-world situations only

very rarely are readers confronted with a text without contextual information. As defined by Genette (1987), the term "paratext" relates to different forms of information that accompany the text, including the author's name, dedications, a genre label, text and pictures on the back or rear dust-jacket, or an interview with the author or director. Paratexts can be part of a book or media product (peritexts) or they can accompany a book or media product without being part of the product itself, such as an interview with the author for a TV station, additional information regarding the background of a story on a publisher's website, or information provided on the author's social media page.

It is important to remember that the formal features of a text can be ambiguous with regard to the fiction versus nonfiction distinction (Hanauer, 2018; Lamarque & Olsen, 1994) and that it is paratextual information that can indicate the category of a specific text (Eco, 1994). Regarding the distinction between fiction and nonfiction, some forms of paratexts are particularly informative: genre labels like "documentary," "biography," or "news report" indicate nonfiction; "novel," "drama," or "short story" indicate fiction. Disclaimers on the first pages of a book or the credits of a movie are further indicators of fictionality. For example, consider the following common disclaimer at the beginning of a book:

> This is a work of fiction. Names, characters, places and incidents either are the product of the author's imagination or are used fictitiously, and any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, business establishments, events, or locales is entirely coincidental. (Le Guin, 1969/2010, p. 2)

Of course, works of fiction (even works of science fiction) cannot but incorporate elements that would be considered true (e. g., in most works of fiction the Louvre would be located in Paris rather than in Moscow or Berlin). Likewise, works of nonfiction always diverge from the incidents and facts that are depicted. While the distinction can be blurry regarding content and style, it is widely accepted that different norms apply for authors of nonfiction than for authors of fiction. More specifically, when producing nonfiction, the correspondence between, on the one hand, the information and events depicted and, on the other hand, real-world events and information is of key relevance. For the creation of nonfiction, such as print news, "truth is its guiding principle" (Association of Press Managing Editors, 2019). There is no such principle when it comes to fiction. Authors may or may not portray real-life characters and events as accurately as journalists strive to do (Eco, 1994). In contrast to lies or fake stories, fictional stories are accompanied by information in the paratext that clearly indicates its unclear correspondence with real world facts and incidents (Lamarque & Olsen, 1994).

In addition, there is a developing form of research writing that uses literary forms that usually signify fictional status but that present factual research data. Laurel Richardson's (1990, 1997, 2003) sociological work, which presents interview data using poetic form, is both poetic and factual. Similarly, Rich Furman, in a series of studies and collaborations within the field of social work, has used poetry both as data presentation and collection method (Furman, 2004, 2006; Furman et al., 2006; Langer & Furman, 2004). Hanauer (2010) explored poetry writing as a research method and, in a series of studies, has used poetic (auto) ethnography to elicit and present individual personal experiences (Hanauer, 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014, 2018). What all of these research approaches have in common is that they blur the distinction between the formal features of the text (which suggest they are literary) and the paratextual specification (which states they are factual). These efforts exemplify intermediate states of literariness (Hanauer, 2018).

The distinction between nonfiction/factual and fiction/literary and its influence on audiences' processing of text has attracted a substantial amount of research. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the distinction between nonfiction and fiction is highly important to recipients. In a well-known real-world case, the writer James Frey published what was described as an autobiography in 2003, telling his tragic life story, including various prison stays and drug escapades (Rak, 2012). The popular talk show host Oprah Winfrey included the supposed memoirs in her TV book club; the book became a bestseller, sold millions of copies, and was praised by many critics as well. A short time later, however, a website revealed that almost all the events in the book were either exaggerated or simply invented. In a live interview, Oprah Winfrey accused the author of cheating millions of his readers. Subsequently, Frey lost many fans – and his publisher suggested that the inappropriate paratextual labelling of the work had real world ramifications. Later, the writer declared that he had intended to write a piece of fiction but, when the publisher asked whether the novel could be marketed as an autobiography, he had agreed.

Empirical data further clarifies the significance of specifying the status of a text through paratextual designation. In a basic study, Appel and Maleckar (2012) asked German undergraduates about their explicit expectations when they learn that a text is a piece of fiction, non-fiction, or a fake/lie story. The questions addressed expectations regarding absorption/transportation ("I can be immersed into the story and participate in the events taking place"), entertainment ("The story will be entertaining"), real-life usefulness of the story content ("The story contains information which is useful for my everyday life"), and trustworthiness ("The source is trustworthy"). Each item was followed by paratext labels (news, fictional, and fake story) together with a 5-point scale

ranging from: do not agree (1) to completely agree (5). Given the norms that guide the production of nonfiction and fiction, the former was considered to be the most useful and trustworthy, but fiction was considered to be the most engaging and entertaining. The fake/lie story elicited the lowest expectations, except for the entertainment dimension where fake was on par with nonfiction.

The influence of paratextual information on recipients' processing was further explored using experimental designs. In these studies, the same text was introduced in different ways, either as a piece of nonfiction or as a piece of fiction. In an early study, Zwaan (1991; see also Zwaan, 1994) first selected stories that could reasonably pass as a news story or a literary story. In his main experiment, the presented texts were excerpts of literary pieces by Du Perron and Geeraerts, as well as newspaper texts about a visit by Pope John Paul II, the situation in Yemen, a Rumanian political prisoner, and the 1980 coronation riots in the Netherlands. Before reading the texts, information on the genre was provided. For half of the participants, the texts were introduced as excerpts "from reports about important events which occurred in the 1980s, the excerpts coming from De Volkskrant, NRC-Handelsblad, and De Gazet van Antwerpen" (well-known Dutch or Flemish newspapers, Zwaan, 1991, p. 149). For the other half, the instruction was that the texts were excerpts "from well-known authors writing in the Dutch language, such as Harry Mulisch, Edgar du Perron, and Jef Geeraerts." Participants who read the ostensibly fictional texts had significantly longer reading times for the six texts. Further analyses of a time-based recognition task and a text-completion task showed that fiction yielded a stronger surface structure representation of the texts, reflecting a focus on stylistic aspects elicited by the supposed genre.

Zwaan (1994) discussed these results in terms of Kintsch's (1988) construction-integration model (see also Schmitz et al., 2017). In this model, two phases in text comprehension are distinguished. In the construction phase, a textbase with the concepts and propositions corresponding to the textual input and a limited number of inferred propositions is built. In the integration phase, a process of activating and de-activating ingredients of the unorganized textbase takes place. According to Zwaan (1994, p. 930), news comprehension would entail a radical integration process in which irrelevant or unimportant information is rapidly deactivated. Literary comprehension, on the other hand, would entail a far less drastic integration process so that (seemingly) irrelevant or unimportant information is kept longer in an active state. Zwaan's (1991; 1994) research speaks to the substantial influence of paratextual cues on reading speed and basic comprehension processes. More recent research using more advanced methods has found similar outcomes, as reported by researchers from an educational (Schmitz et al., 2017) and neuroscientific perspective (Altmann et al.,

2014). In the latter study, fact versus fiction labelling elicited different brain activation patterns when reading one and the same text.

Research that focused on the self-reported experience of being transported into the narrative world, however, found less of a difference with respect to paratextual variations. In their seminal series of studies Green and Brock (2000) introduced their story *Murder at the Mall* as either a piece of fiction (short story from a fiction magazine, "resemblance to real persons and places is of course coincidental") or nonfiction (journalistic account from a daily newspaper, events had supposedly occurred recently). To underscore the manipulation, the narratives were formatted differently (nonfiction: small print arranged in columns as if from a newspaper; fiction: as if from a literary magazine) and the source was reprinted on each page in bold. The story is an account of a young girl who is fatally attacked by a psychiatric patient while spending an afternoon at the mall with her family. In three studies, and a fourth using another text, there was no effect of the fact versus fiction manipulation on transportation, story-consistent beliefs, or character evaluations. In one of the studies, a third paratextual cue introduced the narrative as a dream to indicate that the text was even less founded in reality than the fictional text.[1] This dream manipulation affected neither transportation nor the other outcomes. These results are in line with research by Strange and Leung (1999) who presented a story about a school dropout. They examined engagement and beliefs about school dropouts as a societal problem. The story influenced readers' beliefs equally in a fiction and a non-fiction condition and no differences in self-reported narrative engagement were found.

Based on a more complex experimental design, however, Green and colleagues found some support for a potential influence of fact vs. fiction labels (Green et al., 2006). They presented a supposedly fictional or non-fiction speech about the design of school exams that included either weak or strong arguments. Moreover, they assessed individual differences in the need for cognition, i.e., the general motivational tendency to process information thoroughly. In none of their conditions, ascribing the speech to a nonfictional (vs. fictional) source yielded stronger story-consistent beliefs. However, a three-way interaction was found: for individuals who scored low on the need for cognition, argument quality mattered only when the speech was introduced as nonfictional. Hence, the nonfiction label might have served as a trigger to process information thoroughly for those who are not otherwise inclined to do so.

---

1 The relationship between dreams, fiction, non-fiction, and non-mediated experience is certainly more complicated; see, for example, Oatley (2011) and Miall and Kuiken (2002).

The role of individual differences in the need for cognition was further investigated by Appel and Maleckar (2012). They introduced the text *Murder at the Mall* (cf. Green & Brock, 2000) either as non-fiction, fiction, or as a fake story. The latter introduction informed readers that the author had claimed that the story was true but, when the story's degree of truth was examined, the whole story turned out to be a lie. All three paratext versions were persuasive, as shown by comparison with a control story that lacked belief-relevant information. Moreover, the fiction version was more persuasive than the text labeled as fake, and belief scores of the nonfiction group differed neither from scores of the fiction group nor from the scores of the fake group. The fiction story elicited more transportation than the fake story and the nonfiction story versions (the latter difference being only marginally significant). Need for cognition played a role as well: the difference between story-consistent beliefs in the nonfiction and fake conditions varied with need for cognition scores. There was a significant difference between nonfiction and fake on the belief measure for participants who reported a high need for cognition (one standard deviation above the mean) but not for participants who reported a low need for cognition (one standard deviation below the mean).

Another study compared critical responses to authentic soldier narratives presented in a 2 x 2 design that manipulated textual form (poem/prose) and paratextual status (fact/fiction). It was found that the poetic-factual variation of the text elicited significantly higher ratings for empathy and cognitive perspective taking than the prose-fiction version of the text (Hanauer, 2018). This result suggests that the paratextual designation of the text had an effect, but not by itself and not in the direction early research would suggest. Using Jacobs' (2011, 2015a) Neurocognitive Poetics Model, the results of this study were interpreted as indication that formal features did direct the psychological responses of literariness but that the factual paratextual designation also contributed to theory-of-mind literariness outcomes.

The preceding discussion indicates that the outcomes of research on the paratextual designation of a text and the activation of literariness responses is quite complex. Broadly, it does seem that the specification of a text as fiction directs the reader to construct a more flexible situation model and to evoke theory-of-mind responses, and that the designation of a text as factual leads to a stronger situation model, focus on the propositional textbase, and activation of autobiographical information. But this picture is complicated further when additional variables such as the characteristics of the reader or the features of the text interact with the paratextual information. The need for cognition and the use of poetic form interact with the designation of text as non-fiction, increasing the psychological processing of these texts. Thus, the activation of lit-

erariness is a complex interaction between a range of different factors including context, paratextual designation, reader characteristics, and textual features.

Identification, Perspective Taking and Contextual Information

So far, the discussion of how literariness responses are elicited from readers has been in relation to the role of paratextual information. But the response to literary artifacts is not limited to explicit paratextual information or to theory of mind effects. This section considers variables beyond paratextual manipulations and a different set of literary responses. Engagement is clearly one type of response characteristic of literature that may have significance in a wide range of reading situations. According to Oatley (1999), an audience can be engaged by a story in two ways. In the first way, the audience becomes "an unobserved observer in scenes of the lives of characters in the story world. He or she stands in their bedrooms, hovers at their dining tables, drives with them in their cars" (Oatley, 1999, p. 445). This type of engagement has been referred to as "transportation" (Green & Brock, 2000), "narrative presence" (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009), or "immersion" (Jacobs, 2015b). In the second way, which Oatley (1999, p. 445) calls "identification," the audience "takes on the protagonist's goals and plans." As a result, the audience has a stake in the character's well-being and experiences positively or negatively valanced emotions depending on the character's success or failure in reaching his or her goals. In other words, identification implies the taking of a specific character's perspective on the story events.

Identification, perspective taking, and empathy are related concepts. Healey and Grossman (2018) discuss the concepts of perspective taking and empathy. Based on previous literature, they discuss subdivisions of perspective taking and their relation to empathy. In addition, they provide neurological evidence for these distinctions in perspective taking. Healey and Grossman distinguish *cognitive* perspective taking, that is, "the ability to infer the thoughts or beliefs of another agent" from *affective* perspective taking, that is, "the ability to infer the emotions or feelings of another agent" (Healey & Grossman, 2018, p. 2). Subsequently, they define *cognitive empathy* as being able to model (in terms of cognitive representation) the other person's emotions and feelings, thereby equating it to the aforementioned concept of affective perspective taking. *Affective empathy*, on the other hand, they describe as the ability to emotionally share the other person's feelings. Each of the resulting three concepts; cognitive perspective taking, affective perspective taking/cognitive empathy, and affective empathy, are essential aspects of the nature of identification.

Understanding what a character believes and/or feels, as well as being able to share these feelings, can have important consequences for the audience's experiences and beliefs.

Cohen and Tal-Or (2017) review a number of such consequences of identification. First, they discuss research showing that the extent to which people identified with a certain character was positively correlated with the enjoyment provided by the story (e.g., Bilandzic & Busselle, 2011; Igartua, 2010). Second, they review research showing that the interpretation of TV shows may depend on whether the audience member identifies more strongly with character X or character Y (Cohen, 2002). Third, they propose that identification can have consequences for the audience's self-concept; audience members have been shown to assimilate traits of a character with whom they identified (Sestir & Green, 2010). Finally, audience members are inclined to adopt the opinions and attitudes of characters with whom they identify (see, e.g., De Graaf et al., 2012; Igartua, 2010). Identification with story characters thus can have important consequences for the extent to which people consider watching or reading a story enjoyable, for the meaning they ascribe to the story, for how they perceive themselves, and for what they believe to be true or good.

What are the factors that contribute to the audience identifying with a character? Cohen and Tal-Or (2017) review a number of such antecedents. Studies employing audiovisual stories have shown that identification with a character can depend on the company with whom one watches these stories. Depending on the co-viewer's gender, nationality, or ethnicity, people identified more or less strongly with certain characters (see, e.g., Banjo et al., 2015; Tal-Or & Tsfati, 2016, 2018). There are some studies suggesting that the level of identification is related to certain personality characteristics. More extraverted people tended to identify more strongly with characters they liked than less extravert ones (Tsao, 1996), whereas people scoring high on self-consciousness tended to identify less strongly with characters (Kaufman & Libby, 2012). In some ways, these variables are contextual and responder-based and function in a similar way as paratextual information, offering direction to the understanding of the literary information presented.

An important story-related factor that influences the audience's level of identification is the audience's perception of the character. Typically, two perceptions have been suggested as relevant to identification: similarity and likeability (Cohen, 2006). It seems straightforward to assume that audiences identify more strongly with characters they consider similar to themselves. However, the empirical evidence for this assumption is rather mixed. Cohen et al. (2018) found no effects on identification when matching the story character's gender, nationality, age, or place of residence to that of the audience. De Graaf (2014)

also failed to find identification effects when matching the living conditions of her character to that of the participants. It appears that matching demographic characteristics does not yield a higher level of identification.

On the other hand, there are studies in which matching the story character's interests to that of the audience did lead to a stronger identification with the character. Hoeken et al. (2016) developed stories in which one of the main characters was a lawyer or a general practitioner. These stories were read by humanities students as well as by, respectively, law students and medical students. Both studies found that, compared to humanities students, law students identified more strongly with the lawyer and medical students with the GP. Perceived similarity at the level of interests, training, or (future) occupation may be more important for identification than demographic similarities. It would be interesting to assess whether perceived similarities in personality between audience members and narrative characters would similarly boost identification. That is, do extraverted people identify more strongly with an extraverted character while conscientious people identify more strongly with a conscientious one? Jacobs (2019) provides an interesting venue to address this question. He used sentiment analysis to compute personality profiles for the main characters in the *Harry Potter* series. This opens up the possibility of rating the personality profile of readers and assessing the extent to which a personality match with a certain character increases the level of identification with that character (compared to other characters).

The evidence for the importance of the second driver, a character's likeability, on the level of identification is quite strong. Several studies have found a correlation between liking a character identifying with the character (e. g., Chory, 2013; Tian & Hoffner, 2010). Other studies provide evidence for the causal impact of likeability on identification as they manipulated likeability and subsequently found stronger levels of identification (e. g., Hoeken & Sinkeldam, 2014; Tal-Or & Cohen, 2010). In their review, Cohen and Tal-Or (2017, p. 143) conclude that "People tend to identify more strongly with media characters that are presented in a positive light and as having positive traits."

In relation to the research reviewed here it seems that a range of additional contextual factors influence the response to a literary artifact. These contextual variables can include who is with you during exposure to the literary artifact, issues of demographic overlap between the character and the respondent, psychological character traits of the respondent, shared interests or professions, as well as likeability of the character. Importantly, engagement with the character has the potential to make audiences assimilate characteristics and opinions of characters with whom they identify.

Formal Features of Narrative and Readers' Responses

Beyond the contextual and reader variables that affect identification, there are also formal features that influence the degree of identification. Research has shown that a storyteller's choices can guide the audience in taking a certain character's perspective. Hoeken et al. (2016) pitted the influence of perceived similarity on identification against that of story perspective. In both studies they found that participants were more likely to identify with the character whose thoughts and perceptions they were partial to. The effect of this perspective manipulation was (much) stronger than the effect of law students reading about a lawyer or medical students reading about a GP. Likewise, Hoeken and Fikkers (2014) found that students identified more strongly with the character from whose perspective the story events were experienced even if this character held opinions that went against their own.

Storytelling techniques are thus effective means to have the audience take a certain perspective. Van Krieken et al. (2017) provide a review of the various linguistic cues that prompt readers to take a certain perspective. They also specify on what dimension of identification these choices have an impact. The first of these dimensions is spatiotemporal identification: to what extent do readers adopt a character's physical location in time and space as a vantage point? Van Krieken et al. argue that subject position (e. g., "he took her to the garden" versus "she was taken by him to the garden"), as well as present tense and proximal deictics (here, now) are linguistic means to evoke spatiotemporal identification.

Van Krieken et al. distinguish a number of related dimensions of identification, namely: perceptual identification, cognitive identification, emotional identification, and moral identification. For these types of identification to arise, the audience should be privy to a character's (visual, auditory, or tactile) perceptions, his or her thoughts, feelings, and moral values. The most straightforward way to evoke these identification dimensions is to use the verbs relevant to these dimensions, such as "hearing" and "seeing" for perceptual identification, "thinking, wondering" for cognitive identification, "scared, happy" for emotional identification, and "hates, admires" for moral identification. Studies in which story perspective was manipulated to influence identification typically employed a combination of these strategies (see, e. g., De Graaf et al., 2012; Hoeken et al., 2016).

Narrativity has also been proposed as another potential moderator of the impact of stories on readers' positions (e. g., Kinnebrock & Bilandzic, 2006). In literary theory, communication science, and psychology, narrativity is used as

an umbrella term that comprises all kinds of features that distinguish narratives from other types of texts, such as expository, argumentative, or descriptive texts. Given the diversity of disciplinary and theoretical approaches to investigating narratives and their many types, it is hardly surprising that the definitions of narrativity in the literature differ in their scope, focus, and complexity. However, some aspects appear repeatedly in different definitions. Van Laer et al. (2018) distinguish between the two aspects of narrative content (what is told in a story, i. e. the sequence of events that make up a story) and narrative discourse (how the story is told, i. e. the use of literary devices such as the sequencing of events to create suspense). A similar distinction between the event structure (the events underlying a story as they happen in a presumed story world) and the discourse structure (the linguistic presentation of the events in the story) was proposed by Brewer and Lichtenstein (1982) as part of their structural-affect theory of stories. Moreover, the extant conceptions of narrativity converge on a core set of content features and associated structural features of narrativity (Ryan, 2007). None of these features is necessarily found in every story, but together they contribute to the extent to which a story is perceived as story-like. Stories describe a sequence of events that unfold over time and are causally related to one another (Onega & Landa, 2014). They are populated by agents who follow goals, interact with one another, and respond emotionally to the events that happen in the story world. In many stories, a conflict arises and protagonists are hindered in attaining their goals. This conflict can either be resolved (as in stories with a happy ending) or give the sequence of events a negative turn. Thus, narratives usually contain at least one turning point (peripety or climax) that goes along with an emotional shift (Nabi & Green, 2015). A simplified notion of narrativity derived from these considerations is that the more of these content elements that appear in the story and the better they are implemented on the discourse level through the use of the appropriate literary and linguistic devices, the higher the narrativity of a story. Thus, narrativity is not a binary concept but stories can vary in the degree of narrativity (Fludernik, 2002). Computational linguistic methods have been proposed and implemented in the Coh-Metrix tool (Graesser et al., 2004) to quantify the degree of narrativity based on linguistic features of a text (for an application to Shakespeare's sonnets, see Jacobs et al., 2017).

Previous theory and research suggests two pathways that explain how narrativity contributes to the impact of stories on readers' beliefs. First, a certain degree of narrativity enables an easy flow of comprehension of the narrative and thereby facilitates transportation into the story world. Second, a certain degree of narrativity causes readers to experience emotional shifts during comprehension.

The flow of narrativity has been explained by several core elements of narrativity. In their event indexing model, Zwaan et al. (1995) assume that readers monitor the dimensions of time, space, agent (protagonist), causality, and intentionality during story comprehension. When a break occurs on one of these dimensions (e. g., a temporal shift or a break in the causal chain of events), readers slow down because they need to initiate a new event and update its index on the dimension. The more the events in a story cohere on the dimensions, the more smoothly readers can build and update a situation model of the story content. In contrast, breaks on one and, even more so, on several dimensions make comprehension more difficult and effortful (for a review of findings, see Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998). Thus, high narrativity ensures a smooth flow of comprehension, which is a precondition for being in the experiential state of being absorbed by a story ("lost in a book"; Nell, 1988), for which Gerrig (1993) has coined the term "transportation." Transportation, in turn, is crucial for the persuasive impact of stories on readers' beliefs (e. g., Green & Brock, 2000).

Indeed, there is emerging experimental evidence for the assumption that the core elements of narrativity ensure the flow of narrative comprehension, affect transportation, and contribute to the impact of stories on readers' beliefs. For example, disrupting the temporal sequence of events decreases transportation (e. g., Gnambs et al., 2014; Wang & Calder, 2006) and an intact temporal sequence of events seems to be crucial for the impact of arguments embedded in a story context (Schreiner et al., 2018). Regarding causality, Dahlstrom (2012) demonstrated that false information embedded in the causal chain of the narrative was perceived as more truthful than information not embedded in the causal chain.

The second pathway of how narrativity might affect the psychological impact of stories is through re-experiencing the emotional shifts in a narrative. Emotional shifts are a prime structural principle of storytelling and account for much of their appeal. Nabi and Green (2015) proposed that emotional shifts also contribute to the persuasiveness of stories. Indirect evidence for this assumption comes from experiments showing that stories depicting highly emotional events (e. g., the death of the protagonist) elicit higher transportation and are also more persuasive, at least for readers with a strong need for affect (Appel & Richter, 2010). Studies testing the emotional shift hypothesis directly based on concurrent assessments of emotional responses during story reception are still scarce. In one experiment by Appel et al. (2019), recipients' growth mindset (i. e., the belief that abilities can be developed) was positively influenced by watching a short movie about a limbless man who, after suffering many hardships, eventually starts a career as a circus artist. Importantly, the persuasive

impact of the story was mediated by the amount of positive emotions that were displayed by recipients during the (happy) key scene of the movie.

As seen in the studies reviewed in this section the formal features of a literary artifact, such as story perspective and narrative structure, affect reader/viewer responses. The way perspective is constructed through linguistic cues can make a responder more likely to acquire and accept that perspective. Furthermore, the degree of narrativity leads to greater or lesser transportation into the text. Likewise, emotional shifts in the story can influence its reception.

Literary Techniques in Journalism

Prior sections reviewed the contextual, paratextual, and formal features of narrative literary artifacts and how they influence viewers' responses. Underpinning this discussion is the idea that literariness and the responses to literary artifacts are not limited to literary situations (Hanauer, 2018; Jacobs & Willems, 2019). This section discusses literary techniques found in journalism. The use of literary storytelling techniques is not restricted to fictional genres but is conventional in many non-fictional genres as well. The form, function, and effects of these techniques have been studied mainly in journalistic contexts. Although generally associated with objective reporting rather than subjective storytelling, journalism is considered to be inherently narrative (Bell, 1991; Marsh, 2010; Roeh, 1989). Nineteenth-century newspaper articles already displayed structural and stylistic features that are characteristic of narratives, specifically in their predominantly chronological ordering of the news events and in their point-of-view writing (Van Krieken & Sanders, 2016a). In the United States, this narrative style of writing developed into a full-fledged genre halfway through the twentieth century, when journalists like Tom Wolfe and Norman Mailer began exploiting the techniques of dialogue, scene reconstructions, and point-of-view writing in their articles to "excite the reader both intellectually and emotionally" (Wolfe, 1973, p. 15). This movement, which would later become known as the New Journalism, influenced the style of mainstream journalism despite being criticized for introducing subjective experiences into journalistic reporting, which, at that time, was expected to be as objective and neutral as possible (see Frus, 1994).

Today, hybrid forms of journalism combining literary techniques and journalistic conventions are common across the globe (Bak & Reynolds, 2011; Keeble & Tulloch, 2012). The use of literary techniques in journalistic texts has been ascribed a range of reader oriented functions, most notably to engage readers personally by inviting them to virtually experience distant events and situations

from up close (e. g., Peelo, 2006; Van Krieken & Sanders, 2017), to enhance their empathy with others (e. g., Aare, 2016), and to increase their understanding of reality (e. g., Bird & Dardenne, 2009; Singer, 2010). Empirical research on the degree to which these functions are met is scarce. In a recent review of studies on narrative journalism, it was found that a majority employed qualitative methodologies to analyze the characteristics of journalistic stories, with many focusing on the degree to which the subjective experiences of journalist and news character are expressed (Van Krieken & Sanders, 2019b). More systematic studies have analyzed the techniques of scene descriptions, dramatic tension, quotation, and chronological ordering in large numbers of stories (Jacobson et al., 2016; Johnston & Graham, 2012; Van Krieken & Sanders, 2016b).

Only a few studies have experimentally tested the effects of journalistic stories and their characteristics on the audience. The main focus of these studies is on two characteristics that are both related to perspective: the temporal ordering of events and the way in which news characters are depicted. First, the most salient characteristic of non-narrative news articles is the inverted order of presentation of temporally connected events, which implies that the result of the news event – hence the most recent information – is presented first, followed by the elaboration of older information (Pöttker, 2003; Van Dijk, 1988). Both fictional and nonfictional stories that are presented in this order evoke less suspense and less reading enjoyment than stories that follow a chronological ordering and reveal the outcome only at the end of the story (Knobloch et al., 2004). In processing chronologically ordered stories, readers are presented with the events as they have occurred to the character, which makes it easy to align their viewpoint with the character's viewpoint. These results are in line with the emotional shifts approach, in which the match between events in the story and readers' emotional responses appears to be crucial (Appel et al., 2019).

Several studies testing the impact of journalistic narratives have manipulated the temporal ordering of events in combination with a second genre feature, that is: the depiction of personal experiences and points of view. For example, Shen et al. (2014) compared news articles including statistical information ("informational" articles) with news articles including personal experiences ("narrative" articles). The informational articles were furthermore written in an inverted order, whereas the narrative articles were written in a chronological order. Results of their study showed that the narrative articles led to more favorable attitudes than the informational articles, both directly after reading and a day after reading. The effect on attitudes was found to be mediated by readers' empathy with the news characters and their cognitive responses, which were both stronger after reading the narrative articles com-

pared to the informational articles. Similar results were obtained in a different study, showing that narrative news stories about stigmatized groups lead to stronger empathic attitudes than non-narrative news articles, which in turn lead to more favorable intentions and behavior in terms of readers' willingness to donate money and learn more about support for the stigmatized groups (Oliver et al., 2014).

In a different approach, Van Krieken et al. (2015) compared an authentic newspaper narrative about a mass shooting with an authentic non-narrative news report about the same event. The articles, which had originally been published in Dutch national newspapers, were equal in content but differed from one another in several stylistic characteristics. Whereas the news narrative was written from the subjective viewpoints of people who had witnessed the shooting, followed a chronological event ordering, and employed the present tense, the news report was written from a detached objective viewpoint, followed an inverted event ordering, and employed the past tense. The narrative was found to elicit a stronger sense of feeling "present" at the shooting and stronger identification with the eyewitnesses than the news report. Thus, it appears that crime news narratives allow readers to experience criminal events as "mediated witnesses" (Van Krieken et al., 2015; Peelo, 2006). Earlier studies found that even implicit representation of news characters' viewpoints enhances the news texts' attractiveness (Sanders & Redeker, 1993). To reconstruct what took place within news sources' consciousness at the time of the news events is a complex cognitive task for both journalist and the audience (Van Krieken & Sanders, 2019a). It requires journalists to give a voice to their sources or to mix their voice with the sources' voice, and to represent this using subjective literary techniques, such as direct free indirect speech and thought. The subgenre of news text pragmatically limits the degree to which explicit quotation of news characters' inner thoughts is "permitted": background news stories appear to allow for more elaborate reconstruction than hard news narratives (Sanders, 2010; Sanders et al., 2012).

The effects of storytelling techniques in journalistic texts may depend on the topic and the context of the story as well as on reader characteristics. In a study testing the impact of news narratives on adolescents' comprehension of the news and their involvement, a comparison was made between (a) news narratives employing a chronological event ordering and including central characters from whose perspectives the events were explicated and (b) non-narrative news articles employing an inverted event ordering and lacking such characters (Emde et al., 2016). The narratives led to greater comprehension, but only for readers with low knowledge about the issue depicted in the text and only for one specific text (about minimum wages) but not for another (about youth pro-

tests). Somewhat similarly, the narratives led to stronger affective involvement, but this effect was also found for one specific text only (again, for the text about minimum wages).

It appears that journalistic narratives – characterized by chronological event ordering and the depiction of news characters' perspectives – have the potential to engage and persuade readers more strongly than non-narrative journalistic articles. Yet, much remains to be discovered about the exact conditions under which these effects occur, and specifically about the interaction between reader characteristics, text-stylistic characteristics, content characteristics, and cultural context (Rafiee et al., 2018). Moreover, although it appears that the inclusion of characters' perspectives is engaging and persuasive, less is known about how these perspectives are to be represented to achieve maximal impact. A recent study found no differences in engagement and persuasion between news articles including the internal perspectives of news characters and news articles including their external perspectives (Oschatz et al., 2019). In this study, internal perspectives were established by the inclusion of thoughts and emotions. There are, however, alternative linguistic expressions of an internal perspective, including verbs of sensory perception, evaluations, and tense shifts (Van Krieken et al., 2017). It is possible that such implicit expressions of viewpoints elicit different effects (Eekhof et al., 2020). Finally, many narrative features that are not uncommon in news stories, such as scene reconstructions and the use of a first-person voice, have not yet been tested for their impact on the audience (Van Krieken & Sanders, 2019b).

Conclusion

The concept of literariness has for the last 100 years been primarily used to differentiate the literary from the non-literary. But as seen in the review presented in this chapter, there is a different way of conceptualizing the importance of literariness. Rather than focusing on differentiation one could consider the ways in which aspects of literariness influence reading in a much wider range of reading contexts. This seems particularly important at a time when the status of any given text and reading situation is potentially unclear, and scientific knowledge and factual information are often designated in public discourse as fake, biased, and politically motivated. As seen in the current review, paratextual information, formal features characteristic of literary texts, transportation into a text, engagement, identification with a character, discursive narrative decisions, and perspective construction all can play a role in directing reading out-

comes – even for readers with different personal backgrounds. In addition, texts of various types are clearly integrating aspects of literariness with the aim of influencing readers beliefs and personal alignments. It is against this twenty-first-century social-political context involving the merging of fact and fiction and of literary and non-literary forms that understanding the textual and processing mechanisms by which belief and opinion are directed in journalistic prose and political discourse seems urgent.

References

Aare, C. (2016). A narratological approach to literary journalism: How an interplay between voice and point of view may create empathy with the other. *Literary Journalism Studies*, *8*, 106–139. https://dx.doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0013.4295

Appel, M. & Maleckar, B. (2012). The influence of paratext on narrative persuasion. Fact, fiction, or fake? *Human Communication Research, 38*, 459–484. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2012.01432.x

Appel, M. & Richter, T. (2010). Transportation and need for affect in narrative persuasion: A mediated moderation model. *Media Psychology, 13*, 101–135. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213261003799847

Appel, M., Schreiner, C., Haffmans, M.-B., & Richter, T. (2019). The mediating role of event-congruent emotions in narrative persuasion. *Poetics, 77,* 101385. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.101385

Altmann, U., Bohrn, I. C., Lubrich, O., Menninghaus, W., & Jacobs, A. M. (2014). Fact vs fiction – how paratextual information shapes our reading processes. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 9*, 22–29. https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss098

Association of Press Managing Editors (APME) (2019). Statement of ethical principles [Online document]. http://www.apme.com/?page=EthicsStatement

Bak, J. S., & Reynolds, B. (2011). *Literary journalism across the globe: Journalistic traditions and transnational influences*. University of Massachusetts Press.

Banjo, O. O., Appiah, O., Wang, Z., Brown, C., & Walther, W. O. (2015). Co-viewing effects of ethnic-oriented programming: An examination of in-group bias and racial comedy exposure. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *92*, 662–680. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699015581804

Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. Blackwell.

Bilandzic, H., & Busselle, R. (2011). Enjoyment of films as a function of narrative experience, perceived realism and transportability. *Communications, 36*, 29–50. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/comm.2011.002

Bird, S. E., & Dardenne, R. W. (2009). Rethinking news and myth as storytelling. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 205–215). Routledge.

Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1982). Stories are to entertain: A structural-affect theory of stories. *Journal of Pragmatics, 6*, 473–486. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(82)90021-2

Busselle, R., & Bilandzic, H. (2009). Measuring narrative engagement. *Media Psychology, 12*, 321–347. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213260903287259

Chory, R. M. (2013). Differences in television viewers' involvement: Identification with and attraction to liked, disliked, and neutral characters. *Communication Research Reports, 30*, 293–305. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2013.837041

Cohen, J. (2002). Deconstructing Ally: Explaining viewers' interpretations of popular television. *Media Psychology*, 4, 253–277. https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0403_03

Cohen, J. (2006). Identification with media characters. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of entertainment* (pp. 183–197). Erlbaum.

Cohen, J., & Tal-Or, N. (2017). Antecedents of identification. In F. Hakemulder, M. Kuijpers, E. Tan, K. Bálint, & M. Doicaru (Eds.), *Narrative absorption* (pp. 133–153). Benjamins.

Cohen, J., Weimann-Saks, D., & Mazor-Tregerman, M. (2018). Does character similarity increase identification and persuasion? *Media Psychology, 21*, 506–528. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2017.1302344

Dahlstrom, M. F. (2012). The persuasive influence of narrative causality: Psychological mechanism, strength in overcoming resistance, and persistence over time. *Media Psychology*, *15*, 303–326. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2012.702604

De Graaf, A. (2014). The effectiveness of adaptation of the protagonist in narrative impact: Similarity influences health beliefs through self-referencing. *Human Communication Research, 40,* 73-90. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12015

De Graaf, A., Hoeken, H., Sanders, J., & Beentjes, J. (2012). Identification as a mechanism of narrative persuasion. *Communication Research, 39,* 802-821. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650211408594

Eco, U. (1994). *Six walks in the fictional woods*. Harvard UP.

Eekhof, L.S., van Krieken, K. & Sanders, J. (2020). VPIP: A lexical identification procedure for perceptual, cognitive, and emotional viewpoint in narrative discourse. *Open Library of Humanities, 6*, 18. https://dx.doi.org/10.16995/olh.483

Emde, K., Klimmt, C., & Schluetz, D. M. (2016). Does storytelling help adolescents to process the news? A comparison of narrative news and the inverted pyramid. *Journalism Studies*, *17*, 608–627. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1006900

Fludernik, M. (2002). *Towards a "natural" narratology*. Routledge.

Frus, P. (1994). *The politics and poetics of journalistic narrative*. Cambridge UP.

Furman, R. (2004). Using poetry and narrative as qualitative data: Exploring a father's cancer through poetry. *Families, Systems, & Health, 22*, 162–170. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1091-7527.22.2.162

Furman, R. (2006). Poetic forms and structures in qualitative health research. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*, 560–566. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732306286819

Furman, R., Lietz, C., & Langer, C. L. (2006). The research poem in international social work: Innovations in qualitative methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 5(3), 24–34. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500305

Genette, G. (1987). *Seuils. Paris: Edition du Seuil.* (English language version: Genette, G. [1997] Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation. Cambridge UP.)

Gerrig, R. J. (1993). *Experiencing narrative worlds*. Yale UP.

Gnambs, T., Appel, M., Schreiner, C., Richter, T., & Isberner, M. B. (2014). Experiencing narrative worlds: A latent state-trait analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 69*, 187–192. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.05.034

Graesser, A. C., McNamara, D. S., Louwerse, M. M., & Cai, Z. (2004). Coh-Metrix: Analysis of text on cohesion and language. *Behavior Research Methods, 36*, 193–202. https://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BF03195564

Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 701–721. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701

Green, M. C., Garst, J., Brock, T. C., & Chung, S. (2006). Fact versus fiction labeling: Persuasion parity despite heightened scrutiny of fact. *Media Psychology, 8*, 267–285. https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532785xmep0803_4

Hakemulder, F. (2000). *The moral laboratory: Experiments examining the effects of reading literature on social perception and moral self-concept.* Benjamins.

Hanauer, D. (1996). Integration of phonetic and graphic features in poetic text categorization judgments. *Poetics, 23*, 363–380. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(95)00010-H

Hanauer, D. (1998a). Reading poetry: An empirical investigation of formalist, stylistic and conventionalist claims. *Poetics Today, 19*, 565–580. https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1773260

Hanauer, D. (1998b). The genre-specific hypothesis of reading: Reading poetry and reading encyclopedic items. *Poetics, 26*, 63–80. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(98)00011-4

Hanauer, D. I. (2010). *Poetry as research: Exploring second language poetry writing.* Benjamins. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lal.9

Hanauer, D. I. (2012a). Meaningful literacy: Writing poetry in the language classroom. *Language Teaching, 45*, 105–115. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000522

Hanauer, D. I. (2012b). Growing up in the unseen shadow of the kindertransport: A poetic-narrative autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *18*, 845–851. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800412456960

Hanauer, D. I. (2013). Experiencing the Blitz: A poetic representation of a childhood in wartime London. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*, 584–599. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800413489536

Hanauer, D. I. (2014). Being in the Second Iraq War: A poetic ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(1):83-106.

Hanauer, D. I. (2018). Intermediate states of literariness: Poetic lining, sociological positioning, and the activation of literariness. *Scientific Study of Literature*, *8*, 114–134. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/ssol.18001.han

Healey, M. L., & Grossman, M. (2018). Cognitive and affective perspective-taking: Evidence for shared and dissociable anatomical substrates. *Frontiers in Neurology, 9*, 491, 1–8. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00491

Hoeken, H., & Fikkers, K. M. (2014). Issue-relevant thinking and identification as mechanisms of narrative persuasion. *Poetics, 44,* 84-99. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2014.05.001

Hoeken, H., Kolthoff, M., & Sanders, J. (2016). Story perspective and character similarity as drivers of identification and narrative persuasion. *Human Communication Research, 42*, 292–311. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12076

Hoeken, H., & Sinkeldam, J. (2014). The role of identification and emotion and perception of just outcome in evoking emotions in narrative persuasion. *Journal of Communication, 64*, 935–955. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12114

Hoorn, J. (1997). A Renaissance perspective on the empirical study of literature. In D. Schram and G. Steen (Eds.) *The psychology and sociology of literature* (pp. 67–74). Benjamins.

Igartua, J. J. (2010). Identification with characters and narrative persuasion through fictional feature films. *Communications. The European Journal of Communication Research, 35 (4),* 347–373. https://doi.org/10.1515/comm.2010.019

Jacobs, A. M. (2011). Neurokognitive Poetik: Elemente eines Modells des literarischen Lesens (Neurocognitive poetics: elements of a model of literary reading). In R. Schrott and A. M. Jacobs (Eds.), *In Gehirn und Gedicht: Wie wir unsere Wirklichkeiten konstruieren* (Brain and poetry: How we construct our realities) (pp. 492–520). Carl Hanser.

Jacobs, A. M. (2015a). Towards a neurocognitive poetics model of literary reading. In R. Willems (Ed.), *Towards a cognitive neuroscience of natural language use* (pp. 135–159). Cambridge UP.

Jacobs, A. M. (2015b). Neurocognitive poetics: methods and models for investigating the neuronal and cognitive-affective bases of literature reception. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 9*, 186. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00186

Jacobs, A. M. (2019). Sentiment analysis for words and fiction characters from the perspective of computational (neuro-)poetics. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 6*, 53. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2019.00053

Jacobs, A. M., & Willems, R. (2019). The fictive brain: Neurocognitive correlates of engagement in literature. *Review of General Psychology*, *22*, 147–160. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000106

Jacobs, A. M., Schuster, S., Xue, S. & Lüdtke, J. (2017). What's in the brain that ink may character ….: A quantitative narrative analysis of Shakespeare's 154 sonnets for use in neurocognitive poetics. *Scientific Study of Literature 7:1,* 4-51. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/ssol.7.1.02jac

Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.

Jakobson, R. (1921). Über den Realismus in der Kunst. In J. Stiedter (Ed.), *Russischer Formalismus: Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa* (pp. 374–391). Fink.

Jacobson, S., Marino, J., & Gutsche Jr., R. E. (2016). The digital animation of literary journalism. *Journalism*, *17*, 527–546. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1464884914568079

Johnston, J., & Graham, C. (2012) The new, old journalism. *Journalism Studies*, *13*, 517–533.

Kaufman, G. F. & Libby, L. K. (2012). Changing beliefs and behavior through experience-taking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*, 1–19. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027525

Keeble, R. L., & Tulloch, J. (2012). *Global literary journalism: Exploring the journalistic imagination*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Kidd, D. C., & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science, 342* (6156), 377–380. https://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1239918

Kinnebrock, S., & Bilandzic, H. (2006). How to make a story work: Introducing the concept of narrativity into narrative persuasion [Online document]. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Dresden, Germany. http://publications.rwth-aachen.de/record/50885

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review, 95*, 163–182. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.163

Knobloch, S., Patzig, G., Mende, A.-M., & Hastall, M. (2004). Affective news: Effects of discourse structure in narratives on suspense, curiosity, and enjoyment while reading

news and novels. *Communication Research, 31*, 259–287. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650203261517

Koopman, E. M., & Hakemulder, F. (2015). Effects of literature on empathy and self-reflection: A theoretical-empirical framework. *Journal of Literary Theory*, *9*, 79–111.

Lamarque, P., & Olsen, S. H. (1994). *Truth, fiction, and literature: A philosophical perspective.* Oxford UP.

Langer, C., & Furman, R. (2004). Exploring identity and assimilation: Research and interpretative poems. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 5(2). https://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-5.2.609

Le Guin, U. (1969/2010). *The left hand of darkness.* Ace.

Mar, R. A. (2018a). Stories and the promotion of social cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*, 257–262. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721417749654

Mar, R. A. (2018b). Evaluating whether stories can promote social cognition: Introducing the social processes and content entrained by narrative (SPaCEN) framework. *Discourse Processes*, *5/6*, 454–479. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2018.1448209

Mar, R, A., & Oatley, K. (2008). The function of fiction is the abstraction and simulation of social experience. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*, 173–192. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00073.x

Marsh, C. (2010). Deeper than the fictional model: Structural origins of literary journalism in Greek mythology and drama. *Journalism Studies, 11*, 295–310. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14616700903481937

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1994). Foregrounding, defamiliarization, and affect: Response to literary stories. *Poetics, 22*, 389–407. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(94)00011-5

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1998). The form of reading: Empirical studies of literariness. *Poetics, 25*, 327–341. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(98)90003-1

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1999). What is literariness? Three components of literary reading. *Discourse Processes*, *28*, 121–138. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638539909545076

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (2002). A feeling for fiction: Becoming what we behold. *Poetics*, *30*, 221–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(02)00011-6

Nabi, R. L., & Green, M. C. (2015). The role of a narrative's emotional flow in promoting persuasive outcomes. *Media Psychology, 18*, 137–162. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2014.912585

Nell, V. (1988). *Lost in a book: The psychology of reading for pleasure*. Yale UP.

Oatley, K. (1999). Meeting of minds: Dialogue, sympathy, and identification in reading fiction. *Poetics, 28*, 439–454. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(99)00011-X

Oatley, K. (2011). *Such stuff as dreams: The psychology of fiction*. Wiley.

Oliver, M. B., Dillard, J. P., Bae, K., & Tamul, D. J. (2012). The effect of narrative news format on empathy for stigmatized groups. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 89*, 205–224. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699012439020

Onega, S., & Landa, J. A. G. (2014). *Narratology: An introduction*. Routledge.

Oschatz, C., Emde-Lachmund, K., & Klimmt, C. (2019). The persuasive effect of journalistic storytelling: Experiments on the portrayal of exemplars in the news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 1–21. Online First. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699019850096

Panero, M. E., Weisberg, D. S., Black, J., Goldstein, T. R., Barnes, J. L., Brownell, H., & Winner, E. (2016). Does reading a single passage of literary fiction really improve theory of mind?

An attempt at replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, e46-e54. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000064

Peelo, M. (2006). Framing homicide narratives in newspapers: Mediated witness and the construction of virtual victimhood. *Crime, Media, Culture, 2*, 159–175. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741659006065404

Pöttker, H. (2003). News and its communicative quality: The inverted pyramid – when and why did it appear? *Journalism Studies*, *4*, 501–511. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670032000136596

Rafiee, A., Spooren, W., & Sanders, J. (2018). Culture and discourse structure: A comparative study of Dutch and Iranian news texts. *Discourse & Communication, 12*, 58–79. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1750481317735626

Rak, J. (2012). Memoir, truthiness, and the power of Oprah: the James Frey controversy reconsidered. *Prose Studies, 34*, 224–242. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01440357.2012.751260

Richardson, L. (1990). Narrative and sociology. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 19*, 116–135. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/089124190019001006

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. Rutgers UP.

Richardson, L. (2003). Writing: A method of inquiry. In Y. S. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 379–398). AltaMira Press.

Roeh, I. (1989). Journalism as storytelling, coverage as narrative. *American Behavioral Scientist, 33*(2), 162–168. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002764289033002007

Ryan, M.-L. (2007). Toward a definition of narrative. In D. Herman (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to narrative* (pp. 22–35). Cambridge UP.

Sanders, J. (2010). Intertwined voices. Journalists' representation modes of source information in journalistic subgenres. *English Text Construction, 3*, 226–249. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/etc.3.2.06san

Sanders, J. & Redeker, G. (1993). Linguistic perspective in short news stories. *Poetics, 22*, 69–87. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(93)90021-8

Sanders, J., Sanders, T., & Sweetser, E. (2012). Responsible subjects and discourse causality. How mental spaces and connectives help identifying subjectivity in Dutch backward causal connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*, 191–213. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.013

Schmitz, A., Gräsel, C., & Rothstein, B. (2017). Students' genre expectations and the effects of text cohesion on reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing, 30*, 1115–1135. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9714-0

Schreiner, C., Appel, M., Isberner, M.-B., & Richter, T. (2018). Argument strength and the persuasiveness of stories. *Discourse Processes, 55*, 371–386. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2016.1257406

Sestir, M., & Green, M. C. (2010). You are what you watch. Identification and transportation effects on temporary self-concept. *Social Influence, 5*, 272–288. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2010.490672

Shen, F., Ahern, L., & Baker, M. (2014). Stories that count: Influence of news narratives on issue attitudes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 91*, 98–117. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699013514414

Singer, J. B. (2010). Journalism ethics amid structural change. *Daedalus, 139*(2), 89–99.

Sopčák, P. (2007). 'Creation from nothing': A foregrounding study of James Joyce's drafts for Ulysses. *Language and Literature*, 16, 183–196. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963947007075984

Strange, J. J., & Leung, C. C. (1999). How anecdotal accounts in news and in fiction can influence judgments of a social problem's urgency, causes, and cures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 436–449. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167299025004004

Tal-Or, N., & Cohen, J. (2010). Understanding audience involvement: Conceptualizing and manipulating identification and transportation. *Poetics, 38*, 402–418. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2010.05.004

Tal-Or, N., & Tsfati, Y. (2016) When Arabs and Jews watch TV together: The joint effect of the content and context of communication on reducing prejudice. *Journal of Communication*, 66, 646–668. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12242

Tal-Or, N., & Tsfati, Y. (2018). Does the co-viewing of sexual material affect rape myth acceptance? The role of the co-viewer's reactions and gender. *Communication Research, 45*, 577–602. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650215595073

Tian, Q., & Hoffner, C. (2010). Parasocial interaction with liked, neutral, and disliked characters on a popular TV series. *Mass Communication and Society, 13*, 250–269. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15205430903296051

Tsao, J. (1996). Compensatory media use: An exploration of two paradigms. *Communication Studies, 47*, 89–109. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10510979609368466

Van Dijk, T. (1988). *News as discourse*. Routledge.

Van Krieken, K., Hoeken, H., & Sanders, J. (2015). From reader to mediated witness: The engaging effects of journalistic crime narratives. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 92*, 580–596. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699015586546

Van Krieken, K., Hoeken, H., & Sanders, J. (2017). Evoking and measuring identification with narrative characters. A linguistic cues framework. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1190. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01190

Van Krieken, K., & Sanders, J. (2016a). Gruwelijke moorden, meeslepende verhalen: Gebruik en ontwikkeling van narratieve technieken in journalistieke teksten (1850-1939). In D. Van De Mieroop, L. Buysse, R. Coesemans, & P. Gillaerts (Eds.), *De Macht van de Taal: Taalbeheersingsonderzoek in Nederland en Vlaanderen* (pp. 117–130). Leuven: ACCO.

Van Krieken, K., & Sanders, J. (2016b). Diachronic changes in forms and functions of reported discourse in news narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 91, 45–59. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.11.002

Van Krieken, K., & Sanders, J. (2017). Framing narrative journalism as a new genre: A case study of the Netherlands. *Journalism*, 18, 1364–1380. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1464884916671156

Van Krieken, K. & Sanders, J. (2019a). Smoothly moving through mental spaces: Linguistic patterns of viewpoint transfer in news narratives. *Cognitive Linguistics, 30*, 499–529. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cog-2018-0063

Van Krieken, K., & Sanders, J. (2019b). What is narrative journalism? A systematic review and an empirical agenda. *Journalism*. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1464884919862056

Van Laer, T., Escalas, J. E., Ludwig, S., & Van Den Hende, E. A. (2018). What happens in Vegas stays on TripAdvisor? A theory and technique to understand narrativity in consumer reviews. *Journal of Consumer Research, 46*, 267–285. https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy067

van Peer, W. (1986). *Stylistics and psychology: Investigations in foregrounding*. London: Croom Helm.

Wang, J., & Calder, B. J. (2006). Media transportation and advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 33*, 151–162. https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/506296

Winko, S. (2009). Auf der Suche nach der Weltformel. Literarizität und Poetizität in der neueren literaturtheoretischen Diskussion. In S. Winko, F. Jannidis, & G. Lauer (Eds.): *Grenzen der Literatur. Zu Begriff und Phänomen des Literarischen* (pp. 374–399). de Gruyter. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110210835.4.374

Wolfe, T. (1973). The new journalism. In T. Wolfe & E. W. Johnson (Eds.), *The new journalism: With an anthology* (pp. 1–52). Harper & Row.

Zwaan, R. (1991). Some parameters of literary and news comprehension: Effects of discourse-type perspective on reading rate and surface-structure representation. *Poetics, 20*, 139–156. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(91)90003-8

Zwaan, R. A. (1994). Effect of genre expectations on text comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 20*, 920–933. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.20.4.920

Zwaan, R. A. (1996). Toward a model of literary comprehension. In B. K. Britton & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Models of understanding text* (pp. 241–255). Erlbaum.

Zwaan, R. A., Langston, M. C., & Graesser, A. C. (1995). The construction of situation models in narrative comprehension: An event-indexing model. *Psychological Science, 6*, 292–297. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00513.x

Zwaan, R. A. & Radvansky, G. A. (1998). Situation models in language comprehension and memory. *Psychological Bulletin, 123*, 162–185. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.123.2.162