Miall, D. S. (2002). Literary Discourse. In *Handbook of Discourse Processes*. Art Graesser, Morton Ann Gernsbacher, & Susan R. Goldman, Eds. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 321-355.

9

Literary Discourse

David S. Miall
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

Literary reading has been a topic of inquiry among scholars of literature and educationalists for nearly three quarters of a century (Richards, 1929; Rosenblatt, 1937). Among empirical researchers, in contrast, attention to literature is quite recent, with most studies having been carried out only over the last 20 years. The literary field is fraught with controversy, however. Basic differences over the object of study militate against the emergence of a single paradigm for empirical research. Disagreement over the nature of literature centers on whether *literature* is a fundamental category of discourse with distinctive properties or a cultural formation produced during the last 200 or 300 years (e.g., Terry, 1997) and sustained by specific conventions (possibly facing extinction in the face of new electronic media). In this chapter, therefore, although it is possible to elaborate a number of specific components of literary reading that have been studied empirically, at the present stage of research a coherent account of literary discourse remains out of reach.

One notable feature of the research to be discussed is its limited attention to questions of interpretation or literary meaning. In contrast, mainstream literary criticism has traditionally been dominated by a focus on interpretation carried out within one of two main traditions: either a hermeneutic approach centered on the text or a contextual approach that appeals to major cultural formations thought to impose certain requirements on literary production and reception (e.g., gen-

der issues or the economic and social concerns of the new historicism). When considering reading outside the academy, however, an emphasis on interpretation may be misleading, as Sontag (1964/1983) argued forcefully some years ago. Although readers are at times undoubtedly concerned with understanding what they read, this should not overshadow another and perhaps more primary mode of engagement, which is to experience literature—whether to appreciate its formal qualities, be aroused by a suspense filled plot, or suffer empathically the vicissitudes of its fictional characters. To be asked to generate an explanation of a literary work, as commonly occurs in the literature classroom or in many empirical studies, is perhaps atypical of most reading situations. Yet it is clear that the demand for techniques of explanation has tended to drive research on reading, which has been dominated by the prevailing cognitivist emphasis on the processes of comprehension (Kintsch, 1998). This is considered further in the studies described later, but the limitations of this approach to literary discourse are also suggested preparatory to outlining a range of other approaches to literary reading.

The predominant questions of this chapter are: What is literary discourse? Does it result in a type of reading different from that studied in mainstream discourse processing research? Among a number of possible markers of the distinction between literary and nonliterary processing to be discussed later, empirical research suggests that literary readers form specific anticipations while reading, that the interpretive frame may modify or transform while reading a literary text, and that markedly more personal memories are evoked during reading. There is evidence for a constructive role for feeling in the reading process—a process that may be driven in part by response to stylistic and other formal qualities. First, however, the relationship between empirical research and mainstream literary scholarship should be sketched because this continues to provide an important, if problematic, context for considering literary issues and framing empirical studies. Although the gulf between literary scholarship and empirical research remains wide, three issues in particular serve to illustrate the difficulties and prospects of this relatively new discipline: history of reader response theory, role of genre, and question of whether literature has distinctive qualities.

THE ROLE OF THE READER

Although reader response study had its inception with the work of I. A. Richards (1929) in his book *Practical Criticism,* Richards's one foray into empirical study unfortunately suggested to the community of liter-

ary scholars that readers, as represented by the undergraduate students he studied at Cambridge University, were poor at discriminating between poems and badly in need of the guidance of the experienced literary critic (cf. Martindale & Dailey, 1995). The experience of the ordinary reader, in contrast to the professional reader, thus fell under a cloud—a fate confirmed 20 years later by the influential essay "The Affective Fallacy" of Wimsatt and Beardsley (1954/1946). This effectively placed an interdiction on attention to actual readers, whose responses were deemed impressionistic and relative. For example, the critic E. D. Hirsch (1967) referred to the ordinary reader's "whimsical lawlessness of guessing" (p. 204) at literary meaning—an initial first step subject to correction in the light of what could be determined about the author's intention.

When reader response criticism eventually emerged, with publications by Holland (1968), Fish (1970/1980), Iser (1978), and Jauss (1982), Holland's work was confined to developing his own psychoanalytic approach, which concentrated almost exclusively on the stories of individual readers. In contrast, Fish, Iser, Jauss, and their followers remained at the level of theory. Fish proposed an affective stylistics of readers' hesitations and errors that he considered an integral part of literary meaning. Iser, drawing on the phenomenology of Ingarden, placed reading within the reader's "horizon of expectations, " in which the text's gaps and indeterminacies called for constructive interpretive work. Jauss, who worked alongside Iser at the University of Constanz, developed a reception theory attentive to historical changes in literary reading. Although this work, offering new and suggestive theories of reading, has been influential in redirecting attention to questions about the reader, this generally consisted in postulated reader-based modes for interpreting literary texts. The study of actual readers was either neglected or actively discouraged. For example, Culler (1981) suggested that a study of actual readers would be fruitless because the critic's focus of research should be on the conventions that he considered paramount in determining all reading, whether literary or nonliterary. These conventions could be examined in the numerous interpretations already available in the professional literature on a given text.

On the one hand, then, critics such as Fish or Iser hypothesized specific reading processes based on demonstrable features of literary texts and their purported effects. On the other hand, it turned out that attention to such features was constituted from the start by conventions of reading. Because readers were thought to acquire such conventions through a process of training, usually in the classroom, professional attention shifted away from considering what individual readers might actually be doing. Among the most influential formula-

tions of this view, Fish's (1980) forceful and widely accepted assertion that the interpretive community to which a reader belonged determined any possible reading appeared to make reading a purely relativistic process. The comprehensiveness of this approach, which redirected attention away from the reader toward questions of culture and history, foreclosed attention to reading almost as soon as it had begun: The reader response project was described by one of its reviewers as “self-transcending” and “self-deconstructing, ” suggesting “that it has a past rather than a future” (Freund, 1987, p. 10).

Yet the issues raised by the reader response theorists were of considerable interest, and in various ways continue to be reflected in empirical studies of literary reading. Thus, Schmidt (1982) and his colleagues, although motivated by a research tradition quite different from that of Fish, have placed the conventions of reading at the center of their approach. They have hypothesized that literary reading depends on two conventions: (a) the *aesthetic* convention (opposed to the *fact* convention that is held to apply in regular discourse); and (b) the *polyvalence* convention (opposed to the *monovalence* convention)—that is, the supposition that in a literary context readers recognize the possibility of multiple interpretations of the same text. If reading is held to depend on the acquisition of the appropriate conventions, we might also consider the impact of literary training on reading. This issue has motivated several studies of literary expertise, where the range of interpretive strategies shown by novice and expert readers has been investigated through empirical study (e.g., Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; Hanauer, 1995a). If readers differ according to their local interpretive community, cultural differences in reading the same text should also be discernible. This topic has been the focus of empirical studies by László and his colleagues (e.g., László & Larsen, 1991).

Other approaches that develop the suggestions of reader response theory are considered in more detail later. Meanwhile, two other specific issues raised by literary scholarship should also be outlined.

GENRES

Perhaps the most significant convention dominating contemporary literary scholarship is that of genre. Although interpretation has tended to dissolve the distinctiveness of the text by relating it to underlying structures of power and desire, genre focuses attention again on the specific qualities and structures of the text. The features of a text are determined by its particular generic form. Genre, which used to be considered descriptive, is thus now considered explanatory: Genre is held to embody certain social roles that govern the relation between

text and reader. As Bawarshi (2000) put it, “genres create a kind of literary culture or poetics in which textual activity becomes meaningful” (pp. 346–347); they “constitute the social reality in which the activities of all social participants are implicated. ” Genre is said to provide an essential framework for reading. As Derrida (1980) insisted, “a text cannot belong to no genre, it cannot be without or less a genre. Every text participates in one or several genres, there is no genreless text” (p. 65). In this respect, genre can be understood as the defining context for all textual behavior, literary and nonliterary, constituting textual relations in such spheres as the university classroom (lectures, the production of assignments), the law court (speeches for the defense, instructions to the jury), as well as readers' engagements with plays, novels, or sonnets. Moreover, genre governs what Halliday (1978) referred to as the *register* apparent in any given text—that is, the semantic and syntactic features that create the communicative situation, including the stance of the participants (cf. Viehoff, 1995).

Although Bawarshi (2000) argued that the primary theoretical question is whether genre is regulative or constitutive, he gave little consideration to the possibility of variance or play within a given genre. Our response to a sonnet, for example, is a product both of our relation to its obligatory formal features as well as the distinctive semantic or formal qualities that the writer has embodied within the constraints of the form. The rules of genre allow us to specify both what is conventional and unexpected (a view that would suggest that the laws of genre are regulative). As discourse structures, therefore, genres are characterized in part by the types of story grammars or schemata they call for; they specify situation models that characterize a given literary text and enable us to make predictions about how the text is likely to unfold. In this respect, genre theory provides a potentially rich resource for more precise empirical studies of literary reading, enabling us to build on the research (which so far is not specific to literary reading) on how readers construct and monitor situation models (Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998).

Although differences between discourse types have received some attention (e.g., Zwaan, 1993), the laws of genre have received little consideration in empirical research on literature. If they exist with the force attributed to them, we might expect to find traces of their presence everywhere in the data obtained from readers. For example, when the readers studied by Brewer and his colleagues (e.g., Brewer & Lichtenstein, 1981) reported suspense only in the case of stories with appropriately ordered components, this seems to reflect genre expectations: A story that arouses suspense must also satisfy it; otherwise it is considered ill formed. Miall's (1989) study of responses to a short

story by Virginia Woolf can be seen as the hesitation of readers as they tried first one genre (a romantic story about a relationship) then another (a story about the impossibility of forming genuine relationships). In brief, empirical study, which so far has tended to take genre for granted, stands to benefit from the more detailed specifications of genre knowledge available from literary scholarship.

LITERARINESS

Empirical studies have also replicated, in foreshortened form, a debate central in literary theory until recently: whether literary texts enjoy some distinctive status or literariness. Although the term *literariness* was first coined by Jakobson in 1921 (Erlich, 1981), conceptions of literature that imply its distinctiveness from other types of text are apparent in discussions from Plato (who wished to banish literature from his Republic) and Aristotle up to Coleridge and beyond. However, recent theorists, in emphasizing the conventional nature of literary response, have dismissed the argument that literary texts are distinctive by virtue of specific features. In Eagleton's (1983) view, “Anything can be literature” or “can cease to be literature” (p. 10) depending on the doctrine currently in force. More specifically, Fish (1989) objected to the notion that literary texts contain distinctive formal features. Because formal aspects of language cannot guarantee stable meaning, as students of stylistics had tried to claim, there can be no formal aspects of language; these are an illusion.

Similar arguments have been made by prominent scholars in the empirical domain. For example, Van Dijk (1979) proposed that the cognitive processes shown to underlie text comprehension applied to all discourse including literature: “Our cognitive mechanisms will simply not allow us to understand discourse or information in a fundamentally different way” (p. 151); “therefore, we strictly deny the completely ‘specific’ nature of so-called ‘literary interpretation’ ” (p. 151). The differences such as they are are said to lie primarily in the pragmatic and social functions of literature. Similarly, the constructivist approach of Schmidt (1982) led him to suggest that locating the attributes of literariness in the surface features of texts is an “ontological fallacy”; it is “the human processes performed on such features that define the attributes in question” (p. 90).

This controversy has been framed as a contrast between conventionalist and traditionalist approaches (Hanauer, 1996; cf. Zwaan, 1993). The argument is a problematic one, however, because the two positions focus on different aspects of the reading process. Whereas the conventionalist examines reading for the effects of prior cognitive

frames, whether prototypes, genres, or schemata (e.g., Schmidt, 1982; Viehoff, 1995), the traditionalist focuses on specific text features such as meter or personification and attributes changes in readers' feelings or evaluative responses to this source (e.g., Hunt & Vipond, 1986; Van Peer, 1990). This might suggest that two different systems of response are at issue—one based on cognitive processes, the other on affective processes—and that the latter might be more appropriate for embodying what (if anything) is unique to literary processing. Perhaps the conventionalist has simply been looking in the wrong place. However, the question is not as simple as this might make it seem. Feelings are also subject to conditioning by convention, and readers' evaluations are clearly bound up with the norms imposed by a specific local culture. Thus, convention may operate here too, although in a less apparent and measurable form.

Nevertheless, some of the features said to be distinctive to literary texts may have been dismissed too readily. For example, although Gerrig (1993) agreed with the conventionalist position in asserting that "The 'look' of the language … cannot differentiate factual and fictional assertions" (pp. 100–101), he cited a short fictional extract in which a character is described surveying the people in a department store, "studying the crowd of people for signs of bad taste in dress" (p. 99). The limited omniscient narrative mode, of which this is an example, provides access to a character's mind in a way that is distinctive to fiction (one of its characteristic markers is free indirect discourse). In this respect, the feature cited by Gerrig is unmistakably literary and could only occur in another context in violation of that context's genre rules (e.g., if a journalist were to impute thoughts to a person in a news article). Another example comes from the field of poetry, where sound effects are often distinctive and measurable. As Bailey (1971) showed, compared with ordinary language, higher frequencies of a particular phoneme group can be shown to occur in poetry; it seems possible that this can influence a reader's response. Although empirical studies in this area are sparse (e.g., Tsur, 1992), phonetic features like free indirect discourse seem to be characteristic of literary discourse and deserve more careful examination. The principal issue is not their presence as such, but whether it can be shown that readers of literary texts are influenced by them in measurable ways.

THEORETICAL ISSUES

In comparison with the often divisive debates that have occurred in mainstream literary scholarship, empirical researchers have generally been preoccupied with other theoretical issues. Reviews of earlier em-

pirical work in North America (e.g., Purves & Beach, 1972) show that workers in the field were primarily concerned with improving educational practices. In her review, Klemenz-Belgardt (1981) criticized extant studies for offering poorly theorized views of both literary response and the literary texts under examination. Although the studies helped inform classroom practice, the result was an undertheorization of the nature of literary response (cf. Galda, 1983). Over the last 20 years, however, researchers have drawn on a much wider and better developed set of theoretical contexts, ranging across discourse processing theories, psycholinguistics, social psychology, personality theory, emotion theory, and psychobiology, in addition, of course, to several branches of literary theory. However, a consensus on theoretical issues has yet to emerge.

A new paradigm for research has been claimed by Schmidt and his colleagues known as the Empirical Science of Literature (ESL). ESL undertakes to widen the focus to the actions within the literary system as a whole, including producers, readers, publishers, and critics. In this way, it is argued (Hauptmeier & Viehoff, 1983; Schmidt, 1983), ESL can bring about a Kuhnian paradigm shift, establishing a scientific program of research on literature, one independent of hermeneutic assumptions. Among the theoretical bases of ESL, literary study is based on a theory of human action. It also gives up all ontological commitments—notably the view that there is an essential literariness that distinguishes literary texts. In this perspective, literature is an outcome of linguistic socialization carried out in the interests of social groups; thus, “literariness cannot be regarded as a textual property but as a result of actions of analysis and evaluation performed by subjects within an action system” (Schmidt, 1983, p. 31). Perhaps the best-known aspect of Schmidt's work has been to define literary response in terms of the aesthetic and polyvalence conventions—a claim that prompted some empirical study (e.g., Meutsch & Schmidt, 1985).

Outside Germany, however, the theoretical claims of ESL have not been generally accepted by other empirical researchers. Viehoff and Andringa (1990) asserted that the ESL model “is nearly without any psychological relevance in literary reading processes” (p. 223). Within Germany, too, the principles of ESL have been disputed: Groeben (Schmidt & Groeben, 1989) argued that Schmidt's radical constructivism has no way to assess the subjectivity of responses: Without independent descriptions of a text, any response must be accepted. Groeben is concerned that appropriate and inappropriate responses should be distinguishable, implying a normative framework for understanding. As he went on to suggest (Groeben & Schreier, 1998), Schmidt's polyvalence convention implies a norm. If readers fail to fol-

low the convention, “they are by definition not participating in the literary system, ” which is only one step from saying that literary readers “must strive for polyvalence” (p. 58).

In fact, normative conceptions of literary response seem inescapable, although they are rarely acknowledged in the studies to be discussed later. This is shown, first, by the choice of literary texts of acknowledged quality in most studies, sometimes in comparison with manifestly nonliterary texts (such as extracts from newspaper articles). Studies of response with subliterary genres, such as popular fiction, have been less common (e.g., Hansson, 1990; Nell, 1988). Second, certain qualities of literary response, such as polyvalence, personal relevance, or a sensitivity to poetic features, imply qualitatively different and hence desirable dimensions of reading. As Beach and Hynds (1991) put it in their review of the instructional research, researchers may try to avoid privileging particular styles of reading, but “an underlying assumption seems to be that developing a sophisticated *repertoire* of response options to use in a variety of reading situations should be a major goal of literature instruction” (p. 459). Third, although Halász (1995) warned, “We may be inclined to evaluate [the] literary reading process itself as a superior kind of reading, ” investigating the phenomenon for its own sake to understand its processes is but one step from valuing such processes. This step, easily taken, also leads to examining the conditions under which literary reading takes place in education with a view to improving them (e.g., Miall, 1993).

In this respect, the argument over whether literary processes are driven by socially determined conventions or innate proclivities takes on a new significance. To put it simply, is the literature teacher transmitting an agreed-on, socially sanctioned technique of reading or facilitating an inborn facility for literary experience? Although an interaction of the two processes seems most likely, strong arguments have been advanced that only the first view can be valid (e.g., Schmidt, Fish). Because traditional literary scholarship has no way to assess such an issue outside its own conflicting theoretical perspectives, the empirical study of literature, with its access to a range of powerful theories and methodologies, is well placed to play a critical role in this debate.

In the sections that follow, studies of literary discourse and literary response are placed within several different frameworks. This suggests a problem in theoretical contexts that can be said to exist on two levels. First, it is suggested that the familiar paradigm of discourse processes is necessary but insufficient as a basis for understanding literary questions. The phenomena involved in experiencing and understanding literary texts such as novels and poems constitute a larger, but still little understood, system of psychological processes within

which discourse processes play an essential, but possibly not the most important, role. This is not a new problem: Limitations of discourse theory were suggested by Spiro (1982), who contrasted it with experiential understanding, by Hidi and Baird (1986), who called for the inclusion of motivation in reading studies; and most recently by Zwaan (1999), who outlined the limitations of amodal representations in discourse theory. Empirical literary studies provide a promising field for examining some of these alternative perspectives and working toward a better formulation of their role in discourse.

Second, an important theoretical problem is revealed by a difference inherent in two kinds of empirical method. This is evident, for example, when content analysis methods, such as those of Andringa (1990) and Kuiken and Miall (2001), are compared. Although the first predetermines categories in which think-aloud data are located, the second allows categories to emerge from the data. The second method may allow for those categories (such as certain kinds of feeling or personal memories) that participate in processes distinctive to literary response, whereas its dependence on readers' verbal facility and its closeness to the text being read may make theoretical generalizations about such evidence problematic. The first method may inadvertently filter out precisely that which, from another perspective, makes the responses distinctively literary, yet the second method with its idiographic focus risks limiting its conclusions to the specific case being analyzed. The larger problem this suggests is the difficulty of capturing empirically what is distinctive to literary response, given that a specific literary text may call for a mode of response that is more or less unique to that text. Perhaps responses to different literary texts are not entirely incommensurable, but it may be difficult to establish what (if any) literary response has in common that distinguishes it from other experiences of discourse. The range of approaches to be described herein is thus an important feature of the empirical study of literature, helping to maximize the opportunities for triangulating on the significant issues. Like the blind observers in the fable about the elephant, each empirical researcher has a somewhat different conception of the object of study, and certainly none of us has yet seen the whole animal, whereas others again deny that any such animal exists.

DISCOURSE PROCESSING

Discourse Structures

Although theories of discourse processing in general are not discussed here, several specific studies are mentioned in which literary processing is at issue. Its emphasis on comprehension rather than affect gives

discourse processes both theoretical power and methodological precision, but also limits its scope in capturing literary processes (Miall & Kuiken, 1994a), as Van Dijk's discussion (cited earlier) suggests. In brief, discourse processing, with its emphasis on comprehension, forestalls attention to those features of literary response that might signal the presence of a different class of response processes. As Spiro (1982) pointed out, referring to a story by James Joyce and the comments made in it by an enigmatic priest, what is central to our experience of the story is that we cannot know what its situation is about. It could be argued that it is just those aspects that resist ordinary comprehension that trigger the response modes specific to literature, such as the emotive, evaluative, and attitudinal. Even this way of putting the issue is, perhaps, misleading if it implies that the alternative modes of response only come into play when the normal cognitive processes have broken down. It may be more plausible to postulate several systems able to operate in parallel as a review of two typical discourse studies suggest.

In one study, Van den Broek, Rohleder, and Narváez (1996) examined the role of causal connections in a story as revealed by a recall measure. Their model of story understanding proposes that at each statement the reader "attempts to establish *sufficient explanation* for each event or state that he or she encounters" (p. 187). Although 50% of the variance in recall could be explained by the causal connections they had modeled, several other factors also appeared to influence recall, such as statements describing setting, those with a strong impact due to emotion or imagery, or statements relating to the theme of the story. Thus, causal relationships were found to be a major, but not the only, component of story structure influencing recall. Their model of literary comprehension, as the authors suggested, cannot tell the whole story. In fact, although it makes use of a literary text, the findings illuminate that component of response that may be least significant to *literary* texts.

In another study, Zwaan, Magliano, and Graesser (1995) focused on literary short stories. To examine how far the theoretical components of the situation model were reflected in readers' responses, the segments of the story (its successive sentences) were analyzed for shifts in causal explanation, shifts in time and space, and propositional complexity. Analysis shows that each of the factors of the situation model contributed to predicting the time taken to read a sentence. For example, there were longer reading times when the story shifted location, requiring readers to construct another spatial setting. Such situation model components appear to be a necessary dimension of response to any narrative. In a subsequent study based on a subset of the reader re-

sponse data of Zwaan et al., Miall and Kuiken (1999) showed that reading times were predicted as strongly by stylistic features in the sentences of a story (e.g., by alliterative patterns, syntactic deviations, or striking metaphors). It might be hypothesized that only literary texts are likely to influence readers through such effects. How response to stylistic features develops, however, remains a difficult issue to examine.

Expert–Novice Differences

To the extent that literary response is more fully developed in experienced readers, the difference between novices and experts may help illuminate what is distinctive to literary discourse. Are experts merely more elaborate in their responses or are there qualitative shifts in response as readers gain expertise? Graves and Frederiksen (1991) employed a form of semantic analysis of readers' comments; Zeitz (1994) measured expertise with comprehension and memory for gist. These can be compared with two other studies by Hanauer (1995a) and Andringa (1996) based on ratings for literariness and degree of involvement.

In their study of think-aloud data from eight students and two experts, Graves and Frederiksen (1991) asked readers to describe a passage from a novel while reading. The protocols were analyzed with “discursive patterns grammar, ” a form of semantic analysis whose categories were decided a priori. Comparison showed that experts provided more complex, inferential descriptions, generating more than two and one-half times the number of comments on linguistic structures than the students. Among these, experts' comments were focused more on syntax, whereas students focused on individual word forms. In general, students tended to remain at the level of paraphrase; experts made more inferential, derived descriptions. Zeitz (1994) distinguished between what she called the *basic* representation of a literary text (e.g., what happens) and the *derived* representation (e.g., theme), and she proposed that, although novices and experts may be alike at the basic level, they would differ at the derived level. She found superior performance of skilled readers on gist level but not verbatim recall, better recognition of “multilevel sentences” (i.e., those rich in literary style, such as irony or metaphor), a greater facility in producing interpretive sentences, including references to language or themes, and more complex levels of argument in essay responses.

In the terms of Graves and Frederiksen (1991), the reading processes examined in both studies can be characterized as *goal directed:* In both cases, readers were instructed to comprehend and describe

the texts. It is not evident that the methods were appropriate for reflecting what, if anything, is distinctive to literary processing. In the first study, it is perhaps significant that up to 10% of readers' comments were discarded as fitting none of the categories (e.g., quotations from the text, comments on thought processes, and general evaluative statements). In contrast, a think-aloud study by Olson, Mack, and Duffy (1981) found that readers' comments about a story or their own understanding were infrequent, but diagnostic of those aspects of a story to which a reader was particularly attentive. Although expertise of the kind studied here significantly reflects how literary training enables readers to analyze texts and report on their features, it seems likely to differ significantly from the processes manifested by those reading for pleasure.

In two other studies, measures of appreciation and involvement by Andringa (1996) and measures of literariness by Hanauer (1995a) appear to indicate types of response in which little difference is found between expert and novice readers. Andringa manipulated story frames or narrator comments in two literary stories to vary hypothesized degrees of reader involvement. She reported that, although with greater literary expertise more complex aesthetic structures can be appreciated, emotional involvement seems to change little. Comparing undergraduate and gradate students of literature, Hanauer (1995a, 1995b) presented 12 texts for rating, of which 9 were poems. Experienced readers gave higher ratings overall, suggesting that they were able to recognize more texts as literary, and ratings for poeticity correlated rather highly across groups, whereas the ratings for literariness showed less correspondence. This suggests that training in literature has a greater influence on recognition of literariness than the ability to recognize poetry. Both studies suggest ways to discriminate expertise based on aesthetic and affective factors, but so far this line of inquiry has not been pursued further.

Beyond Discourse Processes

Other studies that go beyond the discourse processes model also suggest that affective factors may have a constructive role to play in literary response. For example, Long and Graesser (1991) found that memory for surface structure is stronger in the context of a literary story than theories of comprehension memory have suggested. In their study, readers of two short stories, who were tested for recognition of two versions of conversational sentences from the stories, gave 68% correct answers—well above chance level. Additional analyses of the sentences showed that memory was facilitated the closer the style of a sen-

tence to oral discourse, or when a sentence was high in expressive evaluation; sentences showing both oral and expressive qualities were best remembered. An affective component consistent with this was proposed by Kintsch (1980), who described cognitive interest as a factor supervening on the processes described in the standard text comprehension model. The reader of a story, in contrast to an expository text, “sets up his own control schema” based on his interests, which may differ from the event-based model of the conventional story schema. Following this suggestion, Zwaan (1993) proposed a “literary control system” (p. 31). Once a literary work such as a novel has been recognized, the control system activates a distinctive form of processing that regulates the basic comprehension processes. Kintsch suggested that “stylistic variations … serve as cues for invited inferences” (p. 94), and that these and other semantic surprises in literary texts cause the reader to make inferences about matters not stated in the text. In particular, the appearance of interesting items in the story that fall outside existing schemata invite the reader to activate or construct a schema to account for the story. Alternative processes that construct literary meaning may thus operate in conjunction with the standard comprehension processes (Miall & Kuiken, 1994a).

ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORKS OF LITERARY READING

The Literary Perspective

The reader's knowledge of a text's genre, as noted earlier, is a control condition influencing the reading process. Readers' responses are shaped quite differently according to whether a text is a poem, newspaper story, or joke. Yet the limits of genre as an explanatory factor are suggested by three studies in which genre was manipulated experimentally.

Zwaan (1991) compared the effects of placing reading in either a newspaper or literary perspective. With the help of a pilot study, six texts were chosen from newspapers and novels that could be read as either a newspaper or literary prose (texts were thus devoid of marked literary features). As expected, it was found that in the newspaper condition, readers read faster—on average about 12% faster than readers in the literary condition. In a recognition test, the literary condition readers were more accurate in identifying words that had occurred in the text just read. In a second study using the same paradigm (Zwaan, 1994), readers in the literary condition were found to have a poorer memory for the situational information in the texts than the newspaper condition readers. The study suggests that when readers think

they are engaged in literary reading, they read more slowly and form a better representation of the surface structure of the text.

Zwaan's study argues for the regulative functions of genre. Yet genre information is not invariably decisive. As Hoffstaedter (1987) showed, it cannot always take precedence over textual features. She presented 24 poems to readers in two conditions: a newspaper reading condition (modifying the layout of the poems appropriately) and a poetry reading condition. Readers were asked to make judgments of poeticity on a scale from *nonpoetic* to *poetic*. She reported that for only 10 out of 24 poems were judgments significantly different across the two conditions. For 14 of the poems, it was their poetic properties that appear to have determined the reading condition. This study shows how the text features encountered here, such as prominent metaphors, personifications, or unusual syntax, can override the supposed genre in a bottom–up fashion.

The reading framework manipulation is called into question by László (1988): A reader may be told a text is literary but not read it as such. Devising a different method, László implemented changes in the texture of an American and a Hungarian literary story to examine effects on both reading times and readers' deployment of schema knowledge. Three different versions of each story were presented: the Original version, the Insert version (where two or three key passages based on an action sequence had been rewritten in summary form), and a Script version (where the whole story was rewritten in summary form, keeping the plot structure clear). Readers of the Original and Insert versions read the stories on paper except for the critical passages (original or rewritten), which they read on a computer screen to collect reading times, after which they were asked to choose among three alternative plot continuations; they then continued reading on paper. Script readers read the whole story on computer. Both stories were about short-term romances that turned out to be unstable because of social differences, thus suggesting two themes—social and romance. László suggested that readers' expectations regarding the romance theme might stem from scriptlike cognitive structures (cf. Miall, 1989).

László reported that reading times were longest for the Original story, but shorter for the Script than for the Insert version in the case of the American story, whereas reading times for the Script and Insert versions were the same for the Hungarian. Although these results are equivocal in part, they show that the literary texture of the original stories prompted the longest reading times. However, the manipulation of the stories had no consistent influence on the plot-continuation choices—a finding that seems to show construal of the romance plot to

be a feature of the discourse level, not the literary level of processing. In this respect, the longer reading times found in both Zwaan's and László's studies can be attributed to the distinctive components of literary processing, at least part of which springs from closer attention to the surface features of texts. One may wonder what processes are occurring in literary readers during that extra time. This question is addressed next.

Polyvalence

One answer is suggested by Meutsch and Schmidt (1985). In their conception, literary reading centers on problem-based understanding. Polyvalent constructions are said to reflect the reader's response to reading problems. In their study, readers' think-aloud data were collected in response to either a poem or short literary narrative and analyzed in terms of four classes of response: (a) descriptions of, or (b) comments on the reading process, (c) references to literary conventions, and (d) anticipatory or retrospective comments on text meaning. Among other findings, Meutsch and Schmidt reported that a mean of 2.7 frame of reference changes was found per reader (more in the case of the poem than the narrative), and frame of reference changes were in general evaluated positively more strongly than they were negatively.

The conception of literary reading as problem based is questionable, however, especially the assumption of Meutsch and Schmidt that think-aloud responses are only elicited by problems during reading. Readers may be prompted to comment by interest, surprise, pleasure, and other immediate impulses while reading. In a number of instances, however, the presence of more than one meaning or a transition from one meaning to another is signaled by such comments. Thus, polyvalence appears to be a characteristic of literary reading, although not necessarily in a form that requires readers to entertain several meanings at the same time. However, the study only shows that readers deploy polyvalence during reading, not whether the polyvalence convention is a governing condition of literary reading, as Schmidt and his colleagues have proposed.

Other examples of empirical findings that tend to support the polyvalence conception are provided by Graesser, Kassler, Kreuz, and McLain-Allen (1998) and Miall and Kuiken (2001), where evidence for changes in meaning was obtained, although under rather different conditions. Graesser et al. (1998) studied changes from the normal schema for time prompted by reading Alan Lightman's (1993) novel, *Einstein's Dreams,* where each chapter offers a different deformation of time (e.g., time running backward or repeating each day). The find-

ings show that readers were able to develop conceptions of time inconsistent with their normal conception, not only polyvalently developing conceptions of time across several chapters, but also being able to assess deviation in the time schema in each chapter in relation to the normal model of time.

Miall and Kuiken (1995) asked readers of a literary short story to register shifts in story understanding explicitly while reading using a modified version of the Remindings paradigm (the paradigm is discussed in more detail later). This instructed readers to mark those segments of the story that they found striking or evocative and then describe what memories or shifts in story understanding might have occurred. The story had also been analyzed for stylistic effects. Miall and Kuiken found that the mean number of story shifts per segment reached a peak systematically at around 12 segments following a marked cluster of stylistic features. This sequence of events appeared to occur three times. This finding suggests that readers are likely to experience stylistically prompted changes in understanding several times during the course of reading depending on the style and structure of the story in question. Theoretical conceptions of shifts in understanding have also been proposed by Harker (1996) and Cook (1994). Harker portrayed literary meaning as emergent, appearing in repeated cycles of familiarization and disruption that require the reader to engage in what Harker called *reattentional* activity. Cook argued that literary texts are "a type of text which may perform the important function of breaking down existing schemata, reorganizing them, and building up new ones" (p. 10). The studies of Graesser et al. (1998) and Miall and Kuiken (2001) not only provide empirical support for this process, but also indicate some of the initiating causes for schema change.

Anticipation

The emergent nature of literary meaning suggests that readers' understandings during reading may be provisional. At the point when a shift in meaning occurs or a reader polyvalently entertains two or more possible meanings, such meanings may be held somewhat like hypotheses—provisional interpretations to be tested against incoming evidence while reading continues. The polyvalence of literature may thus predispose readers to experience a greater degree of anticipation during reading. This phenomenon was demonstrated in two studies by Olson, Mack, and Duffy (1981) and Langer (1990).

In Langer's (1990) study, think-aloud data were obtained from 7thand 11th-grade students in response to literary and expository texts.

She reported that literary reading was characterized by a forward looking and shifting context of understanding, whereas expository reading was characterized by successive and cumulative relationships to a fixed point of reference established early in reading. A similar finding was reported by Olson et al. (1981), who also studied think-aloud responses elicited by two texts, expository and narrative. In comparison with readers of the expository text, the story readers produced a number of anticipatory comments, whereas the expository text readers generated almost none. Olson et al. also collected reading time data from other readers and were able to show through multiple regression analysis that at the points where reading was longer per syllable the think-aloud readers were generating more inferences and predictions. Along with polyvalence, anticipation may thus be one of the distinctive markers of literary response. A neuropsychological model of anticipation in reading, based on feeling, has been developed by Miall (1995).

Rereading Effects

Another method for examining emergent effects during literary reading is rereading. Measures of reading, such as evaluative judgments, ratings of feeling, or interpretive statements, are taken during two or more readings and then compared. For example, Dixon, Bortolussi, Twilley, and Leung (1993) argued that the literariness of reading is more likely to appear during a second reading and developed a simple measure of literary appreciation to evaluate it. Using a literary story by Borges and a subliterary detective story, they found a marked upward shift in appreciation following the second reading of Borges, but not the detective story. In a second study, postulating that the literariness of Borges was due in particular to passages that suggest the unreliability of communication, they prepared a second version of the story in which these passages were regularized and made unproblematic in relation to the issue of communication. The same test for appreciation showed that little or no shift occurred when the manipulated version of the Borges story was read a second time.

In a more complex experimental design, Cupchik, Leonard, Axelrad, and Kalin (1998) were also able to show systematic changes during a second reading. Cupchik et al. prepared passages from four stories by James Joyce, chosen to be either emotional (showing character's actions and emotional responses) or descriptive (stylistically complex descriptions of settings and characters). After reading each passage, readers gave ratings on several text-focused judgments and several reader response qualities; they then either generated an interpretation or received one, after which they read the passages again and rerated

them. Although readers' evaluative ratings showed that the two emotional passages were preferred and were read more quickly than the descriptive passages, this effect somewhat diminished during the second reading. The ratings for complexity and expressivity of the emotion episodes diminished at the second reading. Overall, there was some evidence that the descriptive passages, at first seen as less complex and interesting, increased in significance for readers at a second reading. The authors suggested that “the language which has passed by takes on new potency, finding a meaningful role that goes beyond mere description to serve as rich allusion” (pp. 843–844). In other words, readers tend to move beyond a story-based understanding toward one focused on stylistic and evaluative components.

In contrast, Halász, Carlsson, and Marton (1991) found no reliable differences in a rereading study. Halász et al. reported that little improvement in recall occurred across four trials; in addition, readers appear not to have changed their understanding of the stories during the rereadings. They suggested that readers form a frame based on their initial impressions, which then determines subsequent readings. Unlike the first two rereading studies, however, in which affective and evaluative measures were employed, the recall task in this study may have served to concretize readers' understandings early in the process. The recall question, it should be noted, was, “Could you tell us what the text is about?” It seems possible that directing readers' efforts to a verbal report on comprehension forestalled attention to the literary qualities of the texts.

Literary Meaning

Ensuring that readers in an empirical study are engaged in a literary reading may not be entirely straightforward. In the first of a sequence of reports on studies of reading, Vipond and Hunt (1984) outlined three different strategies for reading: information driven, story driven, and point driven. They proposed that the reading of literary narratives is best characterized as point driven—a process in which the reader considers what the narrator is getting at. Among other components, they suggested that point-driven reading involves a sense of an author seeking to make a point. At the same time, construction of a point is culturally relative and in part based on expectations derived from genre—that is, what kind of story is being told. Yet they found it surprisingly difficult to locate point-driven reading at least among the student readers they studied. A questionnaire survey of over 150 readers of Updike's short story “A & P” showed that only 5% were engaged in a point-driven form of reading; most students found the story incom-

plete and without a point. Only after adopting different methods, including a nonexperimental method based on classroom discussion, did point-driven reading clearly emerge (Hunt & Vipond, 1991).

Reading for point may be an effective strategy for approaching literature, but it is not evident that literary meaning is necessarily to be captured by points. Vipond and Hunt (1984) hypothesized that the components of point-driven reading included (a) *coherence,* the attempt to connect apparently unrelated or unnecessary parts of a story; (b) greater attention to *surface* features, such as syntax or style, on the assumption that these features are motivated and contribute to meaning; and (c) the *transactional* stance, an awareness of an author in control of a narrative who has a point to make. Each of these strategies could be tested empirically, as they suggest, yet responsiveness to any of these components does not oblige the construction of an overall point. Authors may be understood to have succeeded in producing a compelling and thought-provoking narrative, such as Coleridge with "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" or Beckett in his play *Waiting for Godot,* without readers being in a position to know what the point of either of these texts may be. Readers may engage with texts in other ways yet still be reading in a literary mode: Some of these reading modes are examined in the next section.

PERSONAL READINGS AND FEELING

Implicating the Self

Literary reading may in part be distinctive for interacting with a reader's self-concept and personal goals. For example, Klinger (1978) reported a series of studies in which he found readers' current concerns (their personal and unconsummated goals at the time of reading) were reliably evoked by a literary text. In one study, readers heard excerpts from two texts played simultaneously in the reader's ears, where one of the texts was modified at specific locations to embody words and phrases known to be relevant to the individual's concerns. When readers were interrupted with a tone during one of the locations and asked to report their thoughts, readers responded with concernrelated thoughts in relation to the modified passages about twice as often as to the unrelated passages. What is not evident from this study is the nature of the relationship between the process of reading and the reader's concerns. Although we might suppose that literary reading assists readers to conceptualize and evaluate their concerns, gaining evidence of this within the confines of an experimental situation is a difficult task. The systematic influence of literary texts in calling up

personal meanings, however, has been suggested by findings within several experimental conditions.

Halász (1996) examined the frequency with which personal meanings were invoked by a literary compared with a nonliterary text. After reading each of three short sections, participants were asked to generate its accepted meaning and personal meaning. In counting the frequency of accepted and personal meaning units, Halász found that, although the expository text produced three times as many general to personal meaning units, the literary text produced almost the same number in both categories, showing that the literary text enabled readers to generate a markedly higher proportion of personal meanings. Among the personal meanings, the predominant types were actions, feelings, evaluations, and cognitive qualities (images, daydreams, intuitions, etc.).

Several studies that have examined the role of personal meaning have made use of the Remindings method or "self-probed retrospection. " Developed by Larsen and Seilman (1988) as a less disruptive procedure than think-aloud method, readers are asked to note with a marginal mark when a reminding occurs (i.e., when they think of something they have experienced). After reading, readers are asked to describe what they were reminded of at each marked passage. In a study by Sielman and Larsen (1989), the authors proposed that when comparing responses to a literary and an expository text, the literary text would involve more memories of the reader as an actor than as an observer. Using two texts—a short story and a text about population growth (each of about 3,000 words)—they found that, although a similar quantity of remindings was elicited by both texts, twice as many actor-perspective remindings were elicited by the literary text, whereas the expository text elicited more receiver remindings (memories of things read or heard about). Thus, they suggested, literary reading "seems to connect particularly with knowledge that is personal in the sense that one is an agent, a responsible subject interacting with one's environment" (p. 174). Remindings were also found to occur more frequently in the opening section of each text, but more markedly so in the case of the literary text. This suggests that readers call on specific, personal information to contextualize the world of the text.

Using the remindings method with literary and nonliterary texts, Halász (1991) also found actor role memories were more frequent in response to the literary text than either observer memories or memories of events heard about. Halász suggested that the inappropriateness of readers' existing schemata for a literary text impels the reconstrual of readers' knowledge to overcome the obstruction: Personal remindings may be a source for this reconstrual, and in turn

readers' self-knowledge may be enriched as a result. A preliminary study reported by Miall and Kuiken (1999) pointed to this possibility. Readers in a remindings study responded to Coleridge's “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner. ” Think-aloud material from one reader is analyzed. Her comments show an evolving pattern of existential concerns about death, in which the world of the Mariner in the poem and that of the reader appear to merge in the final set of comments. This convergence of the situation of the (fictional) protagonist with the concerns of the reader suggests how the encounter with a literary text can significantly alter the reader's self-understanding.

Another way to conceptualize variance in reading due to personal meaning is to consider readers' proximity to the setting and themes of a particular literary text. This may be mediated by formal features in the text such as free indirect discourse, where a third-person narrator indirectly represents a character's thoughts and feelings, bringing the reader close to the character. Dixon and Bortolussi (1996) found that by manipulating free indirect discourse they were able to bias readers toward favoring one or the other of two characters in a story. The degree of personal meaning may depend on the extent of the reader's familiarity with the culture shown in the text. In several studies by László and his colleagues (e.g., Larsen, László, & Seilman, 1991), culture was the variable manipulated. It was found that readers presented with a story from their own culture generated more personal experiences. When point of view was manipulated, however (László & Larsen, 1991), inside point of view elicited more personal experiences (sensations, affects, and images) regardless of culture of reader, suggesting that point of view has universal effects on readers.

Another form of proximity was proposed by Dixon and Bortolussi (2001). They suggested that readers of a literary text are likely to process it as if it were a communication of the narrator; thus, readers form a model of the narrator and his or her stance toward the narrative. They pointed out that some aspects of the narrator's stance are computed automatically because they are with a partner in a conversation. Other aspects, such as the narrator's view of the characters or the theme of the story, may require more deliberate processing. The reader's relation to the narrator may thus form an important component of literary reading.

Two Types of Feeling

The feelings mentioned in the previous section have been invoked by fictional representations. The feelings of readers resonate in various ways in response to characters and their settings, prompted by free in-

direct discourse or by remindings that arouse personal action memories. Yet as Kneepkens and Zwaan (1994) pointed out, building on a suggestion by Frijda (1986), readers also experience feelings about the form of the texts they read, such as appreciation for stylistic or structural features. Thus, they referred to two types of feelings: feelings aroused by fictional events (i.e., narrative emotions) and feelings in response to the artifact (i.e., aesthetic emotions).

One class of narrative feelings can be related to the textbase linked to characters and events. Thus, readers of a narrative may experience suspense or curiosity (Brewer & Lichtenstein, 1982; Brewer & Ohtsuka, 1988), feelings of empathy for a character (Bourg, 1996), or feelings aroused by major thematic concerns such as death, danger, power, or sex. However, narrative feelings can be divided into two subclasses: those directed to others in the story (altercentric) and those directed at the self (egocentric). For example, I may reexperience a feeling on behalf of a character or the events in a story may cause me to experience a feeling about myself.

Kneepkens and Zwaan (1994) also postulated a phasic model of response. They suggested that egocentric feelings are called into play when a particular literary passage seems unusual, abstract, or vague. As the story becomes clearer, however, the egocentric feelings fall away until a new episode begins. Although this proposal has not been tested directly, Miall (1988) and Miall and Kuiken (2001) reported an initial positive correlation between reading times and affect ratings at the beginning of story episodes, where the coincidence of longer reading times and higher affect suggested that readers' feelings were implicated in helping contextualize the new episode. In the story studied by Miall and Kuiken (2001), a cluster of striking stylistic features appeared to signal the onset of a new episode (an example of the role played by aesthetic feeling).

This last finding questions the suggestion of Kneepkens and Zwaan (1994) that the prevailing cognitive model of text understanding provides an appropriate framework for situating effects due to feeling (cf. Miall, 1995). This approach is taken in a study reported by Dijkstra, Zwaan, Graesser, and Magliano (1994). When reading times were collected from readers of short stories, it was found that text difficulty was a significant variable in the case of narrative emotions. For passages portraying character emotions, the more difficult stories elicited slower reading times; for less difficult stories, reading times for such passages were faster. This may not only have been because the characters' emotions were more difficult to understand as the authors suggested. It may have been that emotion felt by the reader was being used as a prompt for emergent story interpretations based on analogies in

the reader's experience. This possibility is examined more closely in the next section.

Feeling-Based Understanding

An initiating role for feeling in readers' developing understanding is shown by a study of Andringa (1990), who collected think-aloud protocols. Her primary intention was to develop a systematic method for classifying think-aloud comments. Thus, two levels of analysis were elaborated, consisting of a range of speech and reception acts. The method was applied to analyzing readers' comments on a Schiller short story. The most notable finding was that for the less experienced readers the most common sequence consisted of emotion references, followed by evaluation, then argument. Andringa commented that in most of the protocols this "seems to be a regular sequence, " suggesting that emotion "initiates, selects, and steers the way of arguing. " An example of such a sequence is provided by Andringa (slightly modified here): "[Emotion] Oh (smiles, laughs), [Evaluation] yeah, that's a little bit theatrical … [Argument] I can only say she was very stupid, that woman, because …" (p. 247). Among her more skilled readers, the more regular sequence was a reference to the text followed by a metacomment elaborating the meaning of the reference, then interpretive comments.

In a study of responses to a Virginia Woolf short story, Miall (1989) also found evidence for the constructive role of feeling. Readers rated segments from the opening section of the story either for affective intensity or importance. The first group then attempted to recall the phrases, and the second group read the whole story and then rated the opening segments of the story again for importance. Both groups provided written comments on the opening section before rating it. However, the segments in the story were previously classified as falling into one of two types: phrases describing two characters who may be about to form a romantic relationship or phrases that described the setting (emphasizing the sky and the night). The first group recalled significantly more phrases from the relationship group, although high affect ratings had been given to both types of phrase. Yet after reading the whole story, the second group shifted their importance ratings for the opening section away from the relationship phrases toward the sky and setting phrases. Because the promised relationship later turns out to be an illusion, it seems probable that readers turned to the setting phrases to reconstrue their understanding of the story. The high affect ratings given to these phrases appears to anticipate the significance they accrue later in the reading. As one

reader put it, after reading only the first section, “They will probably continue to talk and either drift apart or recognize some kind of connection and become closer. Sky and moon will somehow influence how they relate to one another” (p. 72).

In this study, readers' responses to the relationship schema can be seen as the application of familiar feelings. The feeling for setting, however, appears to have prompted new feelings for most of the readers— feelings that became more appropriate as a context for understanding the story. A similar contrast is made in a study by Cupchik, Oatley, and Vorderer (1998), who compared emotion memories and what they termed *fresh* emotions in a study of responses to short stories by Joyce. Passages in the stories were identified as either descriptive or focused on characters' emotions. After reading each of four segments from a story, classified as either emotional or descriptive, readers answered questions about the emotions they experienced and whether they were fresh or remembered. Results show that in general fresh emotions were elicited more often than emotional memories and were less pleasant, whereas emotional memories were more powerful. As expected, descriptive passages tended to evoke fewer emotion memories than fresh emotions. Over the four segments of a given story, however, emotion memories were more frequent early in the story, whereas fresh emotions became more frequent later. Similar to the findings of Miall (1989), this seems to imply a schema-setting role for emotion memories, but an interpretive role for fresh emotions.

LITERARY COMPONENTS

Imagery

Denis (1984) pointed to several effects of imagery in a review of the role of imagery in prose. In general images appear to facilitate recall of texts, although individuals with a tendency to form imagery spontaneously showed better recall than those without. It has also been found that high-imagery subjects have longer reading times than low-imagery subjects. Denis suggested that imagery enhances recall because it facilitates encoding of information in a structured form where items interact rather than remain separate. In normal reading, however, it is questionable whether readers form detailed imagery except under special circumstances. Spatial imagery was studied by Zwaan and van Oostendorp (1993) and was found to be quite poor when readers were asked to report the position of items in a setting.

Yet the occurrence of imagery in response to narrative appears to be consistent and correlate significantly with other features of response.

Goetz and Sadoski (1996), for example, asked readers to rate the strength of imagery at the different sections of a literary story. They found that readers showed a surprisingly high degree of agreement, with alpha reliability coefficients of above .90; imagery ratings also correlated consistently with ratings for affect. As the authors pointed out, their studies suggest that “visual imagery and affective, or emotional imagery” play a key role in the reading experience. Visual imagery may thus provide one, concrete matrix for registering emotional responses during reading. Other image modalities that may function in this way, such as olfactory or kinaesthetic, remain to be studied.

Foregrounding

As mentioned earlier, stylistic features have been considered a hallmark of literary language until recently. Evidence for their influence on reading is available in several studies, suggesting that contemporary critical disregard for this aspect of literariness may be premature.

Hunt and Vipond (1986) examined the effect of local features of a narrative that they termed *discourse evaluations.* Occurring at the sentence level, these are the means that narrators use to convey beliefs, values, and attitudes. It was proposed that readers notice evaluations because they stand out from the local norm of the text. Evaluations are of three kinds: discourse (unusual style), story (unusual plot elements), and telling (unusual comments by a narrator). Evaluations are held to signal the point of a narration, here taken to be the theme or meaning. Thus, evaluations are “deliberate invitations to share a meaning with the storyteller” (p. 58). Two versions of a story were prepared, in which evaluations in one version were replaced by semantically equivalent neutral statements (e.g., “they camped around the room” was replaced by “they sat around the room”). Asked to note what they found striking in the text, readers of the original version, as expected, noticed discourse evaluations more frequently than the equivalent normalized passages in the revised version.

Comparable studies by Van Peer (1986) and Miall and Kuiken (1994b) focused more closely on linguistic and phonetic features of style, termed *foregrounding* after Mukařovský (1964/1932). Van Peer (1986) examined phonetic, grammatical, and semantic features in six short poems and ranked the lines of each poem for the presence of foregrounding. For example, this opening line from a poem by Roethke, ranked high: “I have known the inexorable sadness of pencils. ” The pencils are personified; it contains an unusual word, *inexorable;* it contains repeated phonemes such as /n/ and /e/. Foregrounded features can be classed as deviations from normal language

use (e.g., a metaphor) or they constitute an unusual parallelism (e.g., use of rhyme or a repeated stress pattern). Among other tasks, readers were asked to rate the lines for strikingness. Van Peer found that the mean ratings for strikingness were strongly predicted by the presence of foregrounding. This effect was obtained whether experienced or novice readers were involved.

Miall and Kuiken (1994b) carried out a similar study with three modernist short stories. They scored each segment of the stories (roughly one sentence) for foregrounding. Readers read the stories on computer while reading times per segment were recorded. In a second reading, they rated the segments on one of four judgments: feeling, strikingness, importance, or discussion value. For each of the stories, foregrounding was found to strongly predict reading times and ratings for feeling and strikingness. This effect was also found whether readers were experienced, senior students of literature, or relatively unskilled readers. Ratings for discussion value and importance, in contrast, were not reliably associated with foregrounding possibly because segments high in foregrounding did not always coincide with the most important sections for narrative events. Miall and Kuiken (1994a) argued that structures of foregrounding, in contrast to the semantic and narrative features usually at the center of discourse processing studies, offer readers an alternative, feeling-based mode of response. Temporally speaking, as readers encounter foregrounding, they first find the passage striking. It defamiliarizes customary or accepted meanings, arousing feeling in the process. This then leads readers to engage in a search, led by feeling, for a context in which to locate the unusual meanings suggested by foregrounding. This phasic sequence of response has as its outcome the registering of a shift in understanding downstream from the moment of foregrounding (Miall & Kuiken, 2001).

Evidence for the moment of defamiliarization is provided by Hoorn (1996), who studied the electrophysiological response of readers. Hoorn proposed that event-related potentials (ERPs) would mirror the response to deviations in semantic or phonological expectations in the last word of a four-line verse. In his study, the final word was made either consistent or inconsistent with the semantic content of the verse, or an expected rhyme word occurred or did not occur, or both inconsistencies occurred together. Hoorn found reliable differences in ERPs: Phonetic deviation produced a response with significant negative shifts, N200, N400, and N700; semantic deviation produced a N400 shift (i.e., a shift at 400 msecs following the appearance of the anomalous word). Although the experimental feature studied here violates poetic form (at the level of sound or meaning), it can be considered a test of stylistic deviation (Van Peer, 1986).

Phonetic Variation

The sound of poetry is perhaps one of the most distinctive features of literariness, offering unusual rhythmic features or striking clusters of phonemes such as alliteration or assonance. Van Peer (1990) argued that literary language does more than refer to a state of affairs; it also creates a sense of significance beyond the ordinary meanings of the sentences. This forms a part of that extra level of meaning that has usually been considered aesthetic. Meter is one such device, which appears to have a double function—aesthetic and mnemonic. It enables a text to be better remembered, and it helps create the significance of the text.

In his study, a modern humorous Dutch poem with a marked metrical structure was varied by creating a second version where the metrical features were largely removed while keeping other literary features intact as far as possible (e.g., alliteration, rhyme). Readers read either the original or altered version silently and then completed two tasks. First, they made judgments on a set of 16 semantic differential ratings designed to elicit aesthetic judgments. Second, they completed a questionnaire that tested recognition and recall. The overall ratings on the semantic differential showed a significant aesthetic advantage for the original poem; readers of the original poem were also more accurate in identifying lines from the poem. However, both groups of readers performed at the same level in recalling content from the poem. The results "show the *form* of literary texts to carry specific informational possibilities in its own right" (p. 270), thus responding to a literary text is not confined to understanding meaning.

Another form of phonetic variation was examined by Miall (2001). It has been a common intuition that the sound of language supports its meaning (e.g., a narrow, front vowel such as /i/ is used to signify something small or high). Miall found that rank orderings of vowels and phonemes according to their position of pronunciation in the oral tract (e.g., from high to low or front to back) were related to several features in nonliterary texts, such as differences between groups of male and female names. They also reliably distinguished different parts of literary texts, such as Milton's descriptions of Hell and Eden in *Paradise Lost.* In a study of readers of a short story, phonemic contrasts were found to contribute to variations in reading speed and readers' ratings of story segments, suggesting that readers were sensitive to variations in tonal patterns while reading the story.

Another approach was introduced by Bailey (1971). He developed a *prominence index* for phonemes, where frequency in a given poem was used to place phonemes in rank order; these ranks were com-

pared with the ranks in a sample of standard English. He argued that higher frequency of a given phoneme was more likely to be noticed by a reader especially when a phoneme was relatively rare in standard English. This test revealed several systematic effects in the poems selected for study. In Dylan Thomas' poem “Fern Hill, ” for example, he found a prevalence of voiced over unvoiced phonemes. Although this approach has not been verified with studies of readers, a sensitivity to phonetic effects has been shown in a nonliterary context by Zajonc, Murphy, and McIntosh (1993). Other accounts of phonetic patterns in poetry are offered by Tsur (1992). These results challenge the claim of Meutsch (1989) that “we can state the irrelevance of textual qualities for the management of problems during the cognitive process of comprehension” (p. 69). It seems probable, on the contrary, that literary readers are influenced by the sound structures of a text in their effort after meaning.

PROSPECTS

The components of a future theory of literary processing may emerge from the studies discussed herein. In most of the studies, the focus is confined to one or two features of the response process, thus the findings cannot be related to a larger theory of processing except in a preliminary way. Studies that triangulate on a postulated phenomenon from a number of positions are clearly required, given the complexity and considerable variance apparent in all the dimensions of the literary process—the range of texts of different genres, the wide variety of responses exhibited by readers (although focusing on differences in interpretation may not be a priority), and the range of response processes from inferences to feeling. Magliano and Graesser (1991) are undoubtedly correct in advocating a three-pronged approach to literary understanding. This requires us to (a) make predictions based on medium-level theories about literary response, (b) analyze think-aloud data from readers, and (c) use behavioral measures such as reading times. The studies reviewed here, however, suggest that the addition of several more prongs might be required before an appropriately complex and powerful methodology is available—prongs that would be applied and coordinated within a single research program.

As the discussion has already shown, methodological questions are decided within the perspective of the researcher. Broadly speaking, literary processing has often been approached as a branch of discourse processing, with preset categories for analyzing response. However, this may deselect those features most characteristic of literary reading. A specific example of this problem lies in the type of instruction often

given to readers. For example, in the study of Graves and Frederiksen (1991), readers were asked “to provide a verbal description of the passage while reading it, commenting on its content and style, ” an instruction that appears directed to comprehending rather than experiencing the text. Similarly, the readers studied by Olson, Mack, and Duffy (1981) were told before reading that “later we would explore how well they understood each story. ” In an informal study of my own (Miall, 1986), I suggested that when asked to write freely about their responses to a poem, the first responses of readers are predominantly affective. Only later, as readers come to define their experience of the poem, do more conceptual, analytic comments appear. Finding appropriate ways to elicit information about their response processes from literary readers, devising methods sensitive to the complex and fugitive aspects of the response, will continue to present a major challenge to future researchers.

Several key questions about the reading of literature remain. First, although the limitations of the cognitivist basis of research on reading has been pointed out (e.g., Miall & Kuiken, 1994a), a number of effective studies situated in alternative frameworks are now extant, ranging from studies of personal meaning (Halász, 1996) to electrophysiological measurement (Hoorn, 1996). Thus, it is evident that a rapprochement of cognitive and alternative approaches that examine affective, self-referential, and cultural issues must be sought. This may help distinguish the boundary (no doubt a blurred one) between literary and nonliterary processes. For example, do the situation model processes demonstrated in Zwaan, Magliano, and Graesser (1995) operate in parallel to foregrounding processes (Miall & Kuiken, 1999)? Do features distinctive to literary processing displace cognitive forms of processing in some instances? Van Dijk's (1979) assertion, “we strictly deny the completely ‘specific’ nature of so-called ‘literary interpretation’, ” seems open to challenge.

Second, the problem of understanding what may be innate in literary experience calls for careful and innovative kinds of study. Although it is clear that in major respects literary reading is premised on the cultural and educational context in which a reader learns to experience literary texts, it remains to be examined how far literariness is based on features of response that are a part of the evolutionary acquirement of human beings. Given that artistic production in the visual mode is known to date from at least 30,000 years before the present, it seems probable that literary experience (first oral, then in written form) has an equally long history that may be embedded in the human genotype.

Finally, although literary reading has a prestigious past, its future has been called into question given the advent and rapid spread of digi-

tal media. Advocates for electronic forms of literature, including proponents of innovative hypertext literature, have cast doubt on the validity of literature in the printed book, yet it is far from clear whether the repurposing of literature for the electronic medium can continue to offer the same experience (Miall, 1998). Thus, it becomes more urgent to understand what literary reading is—what role it plays in the ecology of human culture and the health of individuals—before it is reconfigured or disappears in the face of new forms of electronic literacy.

REFERENCES

Andringa, E. (1990). Verbal data on literary understanding: A proposal for protocol analysis on two levels. *Poetics, 19,* 231–257.

Andringa, E. (1996). Effects of "narrative distance" on readers' emotional involvement and response. *Poetics, 23,* 431–452.

Bailey, R. (1971). Statistics and the sounds of poetry. *Poetics, 1,* 16–37.

Bawarshi, A. (2000). The genre function. *College English, 62,* 335–360.

Beach, R., & Hynds, S. (1991). Research on response to literature. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume II* (pp. 453–489). New York: Longman.

Bourg, T. (1996). The role of emotion, empathy, and text structure in children's and adult's narrative text comprehension. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 241–260). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1981). Event schemas, story schemas, and story grammars. In J. Long & A. Baddeley (Eds.), *Attention and Performance IX* (pp. 363–379). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brewer, W. F., & Lichtenstein, E. H. (1982). Stories are to entertain: A structural-affect theory of stories. *Journal of Pragmatics, 6,* 473–486.

Brewer, W. F., & Ohtsuka, K. (1988). Story structure and reader affect in American and Hungarian short stories. In C. Martindale (Ed.), *Psychological approaches to the study of literary narratives* (pp. 133–158). Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culler, J. (1981). *The pursuit of signs: Semiotics, literature, deconstruction.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cupchik, G. C., Leonard, G., Axelrad, E., & Kalin, J. D. (1998). The landscape of emotion in literary encounters. *Cognition and Emotion, 12,* 825–847.

Cupchik, G. C., Oatley, K., & Vorderer, P. (1998). Emotional effects of reading excerpts from short stories by James Joyce. *Poetics, 25,* 363–377.

Denis, M. (1984). Imagery and prose: A critical review of research on adults and children. *Text, 4,* 381–401.

Derrida, J. (1980). The law of genre. *Critical Inquiry, 7,* 55–81.

Dijkstra, K., Zwaan, R. A., Graesser, A. C., & Magliano, J. P. (1994). Character and reader emotions in literary texts. *Poetics, 23,* 139–157.

Dixon, P., & Bortolussi, M. (1996). Literary communication: Effects of reader-narrator cooperation. *Poetics, 23,* 405–430.

Dixon, P., & Bortolussi, M. (2001). Prolegomena for a science of psychonarratology. In W. van Peer & S. Chatman (Eds.), *New perspectives on narrative perspective* (pp. 275–287). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Dixon, P., Bortolussi, M., Twilley, L. C., & Leung, A. (1993). Literary processing and interpretation: Towards empirical foundations. *Poetics, 22,* 5–33.

Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Erlich, V. (1981). *Russian formalism: History—Doctrine* (3rd ed.). New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Fish, S. (1980). Literature in the reader: Affective stylistics. In *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities* (pp. 21–67). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1970)

Fish, S. (1989). *Doing what comes naturally: Change rhetoric, and the practice of theory in literary and legal studies.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Freund, E. (1987). *The return of the reader: Reader-response criticism.* London: Methuen.

Frijda, N. (1986). *The emotions.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Galda, L. (1983). Research in response to literature. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16,* 1–7.

Gerrig, R. J. (1993). *Experiencing narrative worlds: On the psychological activities of reading.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Goetz, E. T., & Sadoski, M. (1996). Imaginative processes in literary comprehension: Bringing the text to life. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 221–240). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Graesser, A. C., Kassler, M. A., Kreuz, R. J., & McLain-Allen, B. (1998). Verification of statements about story worlds that deviate from normal conceptions of time: What is true about *Einstein's Dreams?Cognitive Psychology, 35,* 246–301.

Graves, B., & Frederiksen, C. H. (1991). Literary expertise in the description of a fictional narrative. *Poetics, 20,* 1–26.

Groeben, N., & Schreier, M. (1998). Descriptive vs. prescriptive aspects of the concept of literature: The example of the polyvalence convention. *Poetics, 26,* 55–62.

Halász, L. (1991). Emotional effect and reminding in literary processing. *Poetics, 20,* 247–272.

Halász, L. (1995). President's address. In G. Rusch (Ed.), *Empirical approaches to literature: Proceedings of the Fourth Biannual Conference of the International Society*

for the Empirical Study of Literature—IGEL, Budapest, August 1994 (pp. 10–15). Siegen: LUMIS Publications.

Halász, L. (1996). General and personal meaning in literary reading. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 379– 396). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Halász, L., Carlsson, M. A., & Marton, F. (1991). Differences in recall and understanding of literary texts read several times. *Spiel, 2,* 235–262.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* London: Arnold.

Hanauer, D. (1995a). The effects of educational background on literary and poetic text categorization judgments. In G. Rusch (Ed.), *Empirical approaches to literature: Proceedings of the Fourth Biannual Conference of the International Society for the Empirical Study of Literature—IGEL, Budapest, August 1994* (pp. 338–347). Siegen: LUMIS Publications.

Hanauer, D. (1995b). Literary and poetic text categorization judgments. *Journal of Literary Semantics, 24,* 187–210.

Hanauer, D. (1996). Integration of phonetic and graphic features in poetic text categorization judgments. *Poetics, 23,* 363–380.

Hansson, G. (1990). Not a day without a book. *Spiel, 9,* 277–293.

Harker, W. J. (1996). Toward a defensible psychology of literary interpretation. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 645–658). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hauptmeier, H., & Viehoff, R. (1983). Empirical research on the basis of bio-epistemology: A new paradigm for the study of literature? *Poetics Today, 4,* 153–171.

Hidi, S., & Baird, W. (1986). Interestingness—A neglected variable in discourse processing. *Cognitive Science, 10,* 179–194.

Hirsch, E. D. (1967). *Validity in interpretation.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Hoffstaedter, P. (1987). Poetic text processing and its empirical investigation. *Poetics, 16,* 75–91.

Holland, N. N. (1968). *The dynamics of literary response.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Hoorn, J. (1996). Psychophysiology and literary processing: ERPs to semantic and phonological deviations in reading small verses. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 339–358). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hunt, R. A., & Vipond, D. (1986). Evaluations in literary reading. *Text, 6,* 53–71.

Hunt, R. A., & Vipond, D. (1991). First, catch the rabbit: The methodological imperative and the dramatization of dialogic reading. *Poetics, 20,* 577–595.

Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response.* London: Routledge.

Jauss, H. R. (1982). *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (T. Bahti, Trans.). Brighton, England: Harvester Press.

Kintsch, W. (1980). Learning from text, levels of comprehension, or: Why anyone would read a story anyway. *Poetics, 9,* 87–98.

Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klemenz-Belgardt, E. (1981). American research on response to literature: The empirical studies. *Poetics, 10,* 357–380.

Klinger, E. (1978). The flow of thought and its implications for literary communication. *Poetics, 7,* 191–205.

Kneepkens, E. W. E. M., & Zwaan, R. A. (1994). Emotions and literary text comprehension. *Poetics, 23,* 125–138.

Kuiken, D., & Miall, D. S. (2001). Numerically aided phenomenology: Procedures for investigating categories of experience. *FQS. Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 2.1 (January). http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm

Langer, J. A. (1990). The process of understanding: Reading for literary and informative purposes. *Research in the Teaching of English, 24,* 229–260.

Larsen, S. F., & Seilman, U. (1988). Personal remindings while reading literature. *Text, 4,* 411–429.

Larsen, S. F., László, J., & Seilman, U. (1991). Across time and place: Culturalhistorical knowledge and personal experience in appreciation of literature. In E. Ibsch, D. Schram, & G. Steen (Eds.), *Empirical studies of literature: Proceedings of the Second IGEL-Conference, Amsterdam 1989* (pp. 97–103). Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

László, J. (1988). Literary text, literary context, and reader expectations. In C. Martindale (Ed.), *Psychological approaches to the study of literary narratives* (pp. 205–226). Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

László, J., & Larsen, S. F. (1991). Cultural and text variables in processing personal experiences while reading literature. *Empirical Studies of the Arts, 9,* 23–34.

Lightman, A. (1993). *Einstein's dreams.* New York: Warner.

Long, D., & Graesser, A. C. (1991). Differences between oral and literary discourse: The effects of pragmatic information on recognition memory. In E. Ibsch, D. Schram, & G. Steen (Eds.), *Empirical studies of literature: Proceedings of the Second IGELConference, Amsterdam 1989* (pp. 105–109). Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Magliano, J. P., & Graesser, A. C. (1991). A three-pronged method for studying inference generation in literary text. *Poetics, 20,* 193–232.

Martindale, C., & Dailey, A. (1995). I. A. Richards revisited: Do people agree in their interpretations of literature? *Poetics, 23,* 299–314.

Meutsch, D. (1989). How to do thoughts with words: II. Degrees of explicitness in thinkaloud during the comprehension of literary and expository texts with different types of readers. *Poetics, 18,* 45–71.

Meutsch, D., & Schmidt, S. J. (1985). On the role of conventions in understanding literary texts. *Poetics, 14,* 551–574.

Miall, D. S. (1986). Authorizing the reader. *English Quarterly, 19,* 186–195.

Miall, D. S. (1988). Affect and narrative: A model of response to stories. *Poetics, 17,* 259–272.

Miall, D. S. (1989). Beyond the schema given: Affective comprehension of literary narratives. *Cognition and Emotion, 3,* 55–78.

Miall, D. S. (1993). Constructing understanding: Emotion and literary response. In D. Bogdan & S. B. Straw (Eds.), *Constructive reading: Teaching beyond communication* (pp. 63–81). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Miall, D. S. (1995). Anticipation and feeling in literary response: A neuropsychological perspective. *Poetics, 23,* 275–298.

Miall, D. S. (1998). The hypertextual moment. *English Studies in Canada, 24,* 157–174.

Miall, D. S. (2001). Sounds of contrast: An empirical approach to phonemic iconicity. *Poetics, 29,* 55–70.

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1994a). Beyond text theory: Understanding literary response. *Discourse Processes, 17,* 337–352.

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1994b). Foregrounding, defamiliarization, and affect: Response to literary stories. *Poetics, 22,* 389–407.

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1995). Feeling and the three phases of literary response. In G. Rusch (Ed.), *Empirical approaches to literature: Proceedings of the Fourth Biannual Conference of the International Society for the Empirical Study of Literature—IGEL, Budapest, August 1994* (pp. 282–290). Siegen: LUMIS Publications.

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1999). What is literariness? Three components of literary reading. *Discourse Processes, 28,* 121–138.

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (2001). Shifting perspectives: Readers' feelings and literary response. In W. van Peer & S. Chatman (Eds.), *New perspectives on narrative perspective* (pp. 289–301). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mukařovský, J. (1964). Standard language and poetic language. In P. L. Garvin (Ed.), *A Prague School reader on esthetics, literary structure, and style* (pp. 17–30). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. (Original work published 1932)

Nell, V. (1988). *Lost in a book: The psychology of reading for pleasure.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Olsen, G. M., Mack, R. L., & Duffy, S. A. (1981). Cognitive aspects of genre. *Poetics, 10,* 283–315.

Purves, A. C., & Beach, R. (1972). *Literature and the reader.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Richards, I. A. (1929). *Practical criticism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1937). *Literature as exploration.* New York: Appleton-CenturyCrofts.

Schmidt, S. J. (1982). *Foundations for the empirical study of literature: The components of a basic theory* (R. de Beaugrande, Trans.). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Schmidt, S. J. (1983). The empirical science of literature ESL: A new paradigm. *Poetics, 12,* 19–34.

Schmidt, S. J., & Groeben, N. (1989). How to do thoughts with words: On understanding literature. In D. Meutsch & R. Viehoff (Eds.), *Comprehension of literary dis-*

course: Results and problems of interdisciplinary approaches (pp. 16–46). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Seilman, U., & Larsen, S. F. (1989). Personal resonance to literature: A study of remindings while reading. *Poetics, 18,* 165–177.

Sontag, S. (1983). Against interpretation. In *A Susan Sontag reader* (pp. 95–104). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1964) Spiro, R. J. (1982). Long-term comprehension: Schema-based versus experiential and evaluative understanding. *Poetics, 11,* 77–86.

Terry, R. (1997). Literature, aesthetics, and canonicity in the eighteenth century. *Eighteenth-Century Life, 21,* 80–101.

Tsur, R. (1992). *What makes sound patterns expressive? The poetic mode of speech perception.* Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Van den Broek, P., Rohleder, L., & Narváez (1996). Causal inferences in the comprehension of literary texts. In R. J. Kreuz & M. S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (pp. 179–200). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1979). Cognitive processing of literary discourse. *Poetics Today, 1,* 143–159.

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

Van Peer, W. (1990). The measurement of metre: Its cognitive and affective functions. *Poetics, 19,* 259–275.

Viehoff, R. (1995). Literary genres as cognitive schemata. In G. Rusch (Ed.), *Empirical approaches to literature: Proceedings of the Fourth Biannual Conference of the International Society for the Empirical Study of Literature—IGEL, Budapest, August 1994* (pp. 72–76). Siegen: LUMIS Publications.

Viehoff, R., & Andringa, E. (1990). Literary understanding as interaction: Some aspects, some hints, some problems. *Poetics, 19,* 221–230.

Vipond, D., & Hunt, R. A. (1984). Point-driven understanding: Pragmatic and cognitive dimensions of literary reading. *Poetics, 13,* 261–277.

Wimsatt, W. K., & Beardsley, M. (1954). The affective fallacy. In W. Wimsatt, *The verbal icon* (pp. 21–39). London: Methuen. (Original work published 1946)

Zajonc, R. B., Murphy, S. I., & McIntosh, D. N. (1993). Brain temperature and subjective emotional experience. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 209–220). New York: Guilford.

Zeitz, C. M. (1994). Expert-novice differences in memory, abstraction, and reasoning in the domain of literature. *Cognition and Instruction, 12,* 277–312.

Zwaan, R. A. (1991). Some parameters of literary and news comprehension: Effects of discourse-type perspective on reading rate and surface structure representation. *Poetics, 20,* 139–156.

Zwaan, R. A. (1993). *Aspects of literary comprehension.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zwaan, R. A. (1994). Effect of genre expectations on text comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, Cognition, 20,* 920–933.

Zwaan, R. A. (1999). Embodied cognition, perceptual symbols, and situation models. *Discourse Processes, 28,* 81–88.

Zwaan, R. A., Magliano, J. P., & Graesser, A. C. (1995). Dimensions of situation model construction in narrative comprehension. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 21,* 386–397.

Zwaan, R. A., & Radvansky, G. A. (1998). Situation models in language comprehension and memory. *Psychological Bulletin, 123,* 162–185.

Zwaan, R. A., & van Oostendorp, H. (1993). Do readers construct spatial representations in naturalistic story comprehension? *Discourse Processes, 16,* 125–143.