The Author’s Footprints in the Garden of Fiction

Readers’ generation of author inferences in literary reading
The Author’s Footprints in the Garden of Fiction

Readers’ generation of author inferences in literary reading

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad Doctor aan
de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,
op gezag van de rector magnificus
prof.dr. L.M. Bouter,
in het openbaar te verdedigen
ten overstaan van de promotiecommissie
van de faculteit der Letteren
op vrijdag 6 februari 2009 om 10.45 uur
in de aula van de universiteit,
De Boelelaan 1105

door

Elisabeth Henrica Petronella Maria Claassen
geboren te Valkenswaard
In writing this section I searched for a phrase that would nicely capture my experience of working for many years on this book and the research that it discusses. Somehow the image of Miguel de Cervantes’s fictional character Don Quixote kept popping up in my mind. Once in a while I was afraid that I was becoming this character, who is fighting a hopeless battle without being aware of it. Luckily, it all turned out to be worthwhile. I never stopped believing in the importance and beauty of this project. However, not only my persistence helped in reaching the finish line. This book would not have been accomplished without the help and support of a few people that I would like to thank.

First of all, I owe gratitude to my promotor Prof. Dr. Dick Schram and my co-promotors Prof. Dr. Ed Tan and Prof. Dr. Elrud Ibsch. Dick, you have been my promotor and supervisor for the last couple of years and I would like to thank you for your valuable contribution to this thesis. Also thanks for the many occasions on which you provided a welcome break by dropping by my room at the VU for a chat about good food, wine and cropping herbs in the garden, often accompanied by your famous bursting laugh.

Secondly, my acknowledgements go to Ed. Being my initial promotor and supervisor during your years at the VU, you found a way to challenge me during our many discussions in the first years of the project to take the study to another level. Thank you for your support and appreciation for this multidisciplinary research, and for introducing me to the field of discourse processing.

Thirdly, I would like to thank Elrud. I am grateful for your exceptional careful readings of my texts and your ability to always point out ways in which I could improve the texts. With your vast and in-depth knowledge of literary theory you taught me an incredible lot and I want to thank you for that.

The members of my reading committee, Prof. Dr. Wilbert Spooren, Prof. Dr. Gerard Steen, Dr. Elly Konijn and Dr. Frank Hakemulder, I am grateful for your valuable comments on the manuscript. Special thanks to Wilbert, whose helpful suggestions increased readability and reduced ambiguity, and to Gerard for his excellent and stimulating comments. Elly, as well as Henri Schoenmakers and Johan Hoorn, I am indebted to you for stimulating and convincing me in the first place to continue the empirical work that I did for my thesis in Utrecht, and to apply for a PhD position. I would like to thank Frank for reminding me once in a while that my research topic is both interesting and valuable for the literary field.

For this research, data were very important. Therefore, I would like to thank all those who contributed in any way in providing the data, by reading text samples, completing questionnaires and/or sitting behind a computer screen with a response box. I also thank my colleagues at the VU and the Netherlands Graduate School of Literary Studies (OSL) who provided useful comments on the materials for the experiments. Subsequently the data had to be statistically analyzed. I would like to thank a few people for helping me in my statistical explorations and for their willingness to muse on the questions that I faced: Wilbert, Johan,
Gerben Mulder, and Hans Hoeken. I especially acknowledge Jeroen Raaijmakers’s advice on the statistical analyses of the data in Chapter 4 and 5 and I thank him for his patience when I asked him yet another question about the analyses.

A bunch of papers still does not make a book. I kindly thank illustrator Quint Buchholz, whose illustrations I very much admire, and Anne Brans from Sanssouci im Carl Hanser Verlag for letting me use the picture *Lesender Mann* for the cover of this book. I am also indebted to Arthur Herrman for finding the time to inform me about the basics of printing a book and advise me about the cover design. Norine Maniran, thanks for helping me with the grid for the cover.

I thank the Faculty of Arts of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam for offering me the possibilities and the pleasant environment to conduct my research. I would like to thank a few colleagues who helped making this period of time pleasant and enjoyable. My first roommates Kathleen Nieuwenhuisen and Peter van Dael I want to thank for the welcome and peaceful atmosphere that they offered. Kathleen, I am very grateful for your friendship and support. Life would be different without your humorous e-mail messages and your sense of perspective.

My roommates and colleagues Kathrin Lang, Valentijn Visch and Léon van Schoonneveldt deserve a thank you for talking about the struggle of a PhD, everything but work, and for the much valued laughter. Valentijn, my parsnymph, I really appreciated sharing the experience of conducting multidisciplinary experimental research as well as our enthusiasm about movies. Kathrin and Rhea, thanks for the many cups of coffee at the DE corner and our enjoyable lunches at Zap & So. My colleagues at the Linguistics department I am grateful for the many welcome and enjoyable lunch breaks in the canteen. A special thanks goes to Aleth Bolt, who helped me with the E-prime software that I used in the two online experiments (Chapter 4 and 5) and with whom I shared the occasional frustration of unexpected factors such as ‘no-shows’ of participants. I also would like to thank her for her useful comments on the first drafts of these chapters.

For the last three years I had to move my working environment from Amsterdam to Utrecht. My thanks go to all of my colleagues at the Utrecht University School of Economics (USE) who supported me and kept inquiring about my progress for the last three years that I have been working on the manuscript.

I am very fortunate to have some dear friends, to whom I am very grateful for providing me both with practical and mental support during the years that I worked on this thesis. Some of them deserve a special thank you. Olaf, thanks for your very useful comments and suggestions on how to improve my English-language texts and for more than a decade of many appreciated chats and laughs, either accompanied by “sneue bakken” in the Hema or “pilsemannetjes” in café De Bastaard. Last but not least, Liesbeth, my parsnymph, we just celebrated our 15 year anniversary of friendship. I thank you for your never-ending support and love.

My family, my mother Els and my brothers Frans and Emil, as well as Rimko’s family, I would like to express my gratitude for all your support in all its forms.

Rimko, we shared the burden of writing a PhD thesis and more. My love, thank you for your support, your humour, and your patience.
Contents

Chapter 1  Introduction
The Author: Zeus stripped from his thunderbolts?  9

1. The Death of the Author  12
2. The Resurrection of the Author  19
3. Reception aesthetics and the author  27
4. Discourse processes – the author as inference-category  31
5. Empirical research on the “author”  37
6. Taking Position  44
7. Outline of the Book  54

Chapter 2  Sharing a cab with the author
Author inferences in thinking out loud  57

1. What the think-aloud method can and cannot reveal  58
2. An exploratory study: inference categories in think aloud protocols  60
3. Protocol analysis: segmentation and coding  65
4. Results of the protocol analysis and post-reading tasks  71
5. Discussion  83

Chapter 3  Game Over
Reading as joint pretence  89

1. Fiction as joint pretence  90
2. The selection of materials: a pilot study  99
3. Experiment 1  106
4. Results  110
5. Discussion  119
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 4</th>
<th>On-line measurements of author inferences through affective priming I</th>
<th>123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Affective priming paradigm</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Selection of material: three pilot studies</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Experiment 2</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Results</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Discussion</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5</th>
<th>On-line measurements of author inferences through affective priming II</th>
<th>153</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Experiment 3</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Results</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discussion</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 6</th>
<th>Conclusion and Discussion – Looking back and forward</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 Introduction
The author: Zeus stripped from his thunderbolts?

In 1964 the Dutch writer Jan Cremer enters the literary field boisterously, that is to say on a 750 cc Harley Davidson. The cover of his book *Ik, Jan Cremer* shows a portrait of the writer sitting on his motorcycle, both legs in a Lucky Luke fashion, looking surly at the potential reader. The book – about the moral and sexual freedom artists permitted themselves in the early sixties, all described in plain terms – stirred first of all literary criticism.\(^1\) Indignant critics called Cremer a pervert and criminal, some called the book the “partly fantasised biography of a son of a bitch”.\(^2\) Whether one had read the book or not, everyone seemed to have an opinion on it. Libraries refused the book, and the right-wing farmer-politician Boer Koekoek said: “I haven’t read the book by Jan Cremer, but I think it’s a dirty, filthy and nasty book”.\(^3\) Of course, nothing sells better than a scandal; something that the publisher clearly must have foreseen since the cover showed the far from modest addition “the inexorable best seller” before even one copy had been sold. The book became something one just simply had to read, though sometimes in secret. The book seems to have had an impact not only on criticism. Criminals in police reports were supposedly referred to as Jan Cremer- types. The Amsterdam police were said to have found hundreds of copies of the book in lockers on Central Station that were left there by male commuters who had to hide the book from their wives. This turned out to be invented by Cremer himself, who, as analysis of handwriting showed, had sent in several letters to the daily newspaper *Het Parool*, all signed by different names. By now everyone knew the name Jan Cremer and to be sure he frequently called people just to ask whether they had heard of the name. Cremer exposed himself as the self made pop star. In several interviews he showed off with his “genius personality” and his address booklet loaded with famous names like Bob Dylan and Andy Warhol. As he said so himself: “I paint, I write, but publicity is my hobby”. The publicity strategy of “The terror of Holland” was not only successful in the Netherlands: in the sixties *I Jan Cremer* could be found at number seven of the American bestseller list (Schutte, 1998).

If you already knew Jan Cremer before reading the previous paragraph, you may have thought something like “I remember: that Cremer guy was quite a character”. If you did not know the author, by now you probably think something like “What a strange guy this Jan Cremer is” and you may be curious about his work. Perhaps the information you have just read has created some kind of – vague – image of the author. Would it be possible to read the book *Ik, Jan Cremer* without having that image of Jan Cremer in mind, putting all the

---

\(^1\) The expression *literary criticism* is usually used for referring both to literary theory and journalistic activities concerning literature. I prefer to use *literary criticism* for theoretical debates and research in the academic field and *literary reviewing* for journalistic activities.

\(^2\) The original Dutch phrase is “gedeeltelijk gefantaseerde biografie van een schoft” (Kempen & Schutte, 1996).

\(^3\) The original Dutch phrase is “Ik heb het boek van Jan Cremer niet gelezen, maar ik vind het een vuil, vies en smerig boek” (Schutte, 1998).
information you have just read or already knew aside? According to some literary theorists that is exactly what interpreters of literary texts should do. The author is considered as irrelevant to the interpretation of a literary text, and this view persisted in literary theory for a rather long time. At the same time the author concept remained implicitly or explicitly present in different areas of the literary field (e.g. edition philology, literary reviewing, literary historiography), and there is a remarkable discrepancy between literary theory on interpretation (where the relevance of the author was disputed) and the practice of literary reviewing (where the author has never disappeared) (Jannidis et al., 1999).

The aim of the present study is to close this remarkable gap between literary theory and other areas of the literary field by taking the reading process of readers under investigation and shed some light on what happens during the reading of literary fiction. Is the author indeed irrelevant to the interpretation of the text? Do readers follow this prescription? Or is the author as present during the process of reading as he or she is in the different areas of the literary field? In order to answer these questions I have undertaken an empirical investigation of the role of readers’ assumptions about an author’s identity, communicative intentions and attitude in the reading of literary texts. So far, little empirical research has been carried out from a literary theoretical perspective concerning to how readers process literary texts and as far as I know no empirical research is available (yet) that has investigated the role of author inferences in the reading of literature. Although some literary theorists, as we will see later in this chapter, draw general inferences about how – ideal or theoretical – readers (should) act during reading, they are not well informed about actual psychological processes that occur in the act of reading. And maybe that is not their responsibility. On the other hand, research findings in cognitive psychology, and especially discourse processing, have largely contributed to our understanding of the cognitive processes involved in reading. However, this research is first of all almost exclusively based on texts that have been constructed by the experimenters themselves instead of naturalistic texts, let alone literary texts. Secondly this research is often conducted independent of the knowledge and insights about (literary) narrative texts gained by literary theory. We still know little about how readers process literary texts, or narrative fiction for that matter, and much work lies ahead of us. I believe that a better understanding about the cognitive processing of literary texts, and more specifically the role of readers’ assumptions about the author’s identity, communicative intentions, and attitude, can be achieved by combining methods and insights from cognitive psychology on the one hand and insights and knowledge from literary theory on the other. My goal is thus to contribute to other interdisciplinary studies that have walked both sides of the road in order to achieve a better understanding of literary comprehension processes (e.g. Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003; Hakemulder, 2000; Hoorn, 1997; Miall & Kuiken, 1999; Schram, 1985; Steen, 1994; Van den Broek et al., 1996; Zwaan, 1993). I will elaborate further on my position in section 6.

The goal of the present chapter is to show how literary and cognitive theories have dealt with the concept of the author and thus to present a foundation for the empirical research which will be reported on in the following chapters. One of the claims in this chapter as well as in the remaining chapters will be that the author cannot be disregarded in the reading process of literary texts and that literary theory’s statements about the role of the author in interpretation are most of the time normative and have not been investigated empirically. Raymond Gibbs has pointed out that literary criticism does not consider the possibility that people’s assumptions about a person’s communicative intentions may be part of the reading process.

---

4 The editors of Rückkehr des Autors have formulated as the goal of the book to present possible solutions for overcoming the discrepancy.
and that it ignores the fact that these assumptions (may) constrain a reader’s interpretation of a literary text.

Too many debates about authorial intentions in literary criticism assume that consideration of a person’s intentions is only a conscious activity…[and]…ignore the constraining presence of fundamental cognitive processes aimed at – momentarily, at any rate – constructing interpretations based on what some intentional agent might have intended when creating a literary work (Gibbs, 1999: 248-260).

The current chapter is organised as follows. In the next section, *The Death of the Author*, I will first present some developments in literary criticism that contributed to the dismissal of the author as interpretive category. In the 1960s and 1970s the proclamation “Death of the Author” became some kind of slogan that nowadays still seems to function as an umbrella for several theoretical positions that dispute the position of the author in interpreting or evaluating literary texts. These positions, however, do not form a homogeneous whole; they have different conceptualisations of and groundings for their (normative) assumptions. In addition, these positions are embedded in quite different theoretical, cultural and historical contexts. Nevertheless, they all somehow contributed to a diminishing of the position of the author in literary theory, not as a theoretical concept but rather the conceptualisation of the author’s position. On the other hand other developments show that the author is very much alive, and is indeed relevant to interpretation (section 2 “The Return of the Author”). From a feminist and post-colonial perspective the author’s gender and ethnicity play an important role in interpreting the work. In reception and appreciation of literature on controversial or traumatic topics the author’s identity, authenticity and even sincerity are also taken into account.

These two sections will not present a historical chronological overview, much more, they aim at showing that, in spite of the dismissal of the author from interpretation by literary positions, some of which are still highly influential today, the author does play a role in the reception of literature (literary reviewing) as well as in a feminist and post-colonial approach of literature. In the third section I will discuss how reception aesthetics and the empirical study of literature have dealt with the concept of the author. Cognitive approaches are explicated in the fourth section, which mainly hold that authorial intentions and attitude are defined as a category of inferences that are potentially generated during the process of reading. Different positions on the likelihood of generating these inferences as well as their related constraints are discussed. In section 5 empirical investigations on the role of authorial intentions in reading are displayed. Most of the research mentioned finds its basis in discourse theory. The position of the present study, research questions, issues concerning method and definition of concepts are presented in section 6, and the last section shows an outline of the rest of the book.

---

5 For an overview of how the concept of the author has been differently defined over the past centuries I refer to Seán Burke’s collection of essays in *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern- a Reader* (Burke, 1995). Also of importance are *Rückkehr des Autors, zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs* (Jannidis et al., 1999; Minnis, 1984), *What is an Author?* (Biriotti & Miller, 1993), *The Author* (Bennett, 2005), and *Death and Resurrection of the Author* (Irwin, 2002). For a study on the changing author concept in the Middle Ages I refer to A.J. Minnis’ *Medieval Theory of Authorship* (Minnis, 1984).
1. The Death of the Author

La mort de l’auteur

Three years after Jan Cremer cruised the streets of Amsterdam in a Mercedes convertible, shouting “I Jan Cremer!”, a French theorist announced in Paris the death of the author in his essay La mort de l’auteur. This event can be considered as the most radical of four attacks on the assumption that the author is relevant for the explanation of a literary text, and these attacks have determined the debate in contemporary literature in the last decades (Jannidis et al., 1999: 11). In order to understand the implications of Roland Barthes’ essay it is of importance to take the historical and scientific-political context in which Barthes wrote his essay into account.⁶ “The traditional, humanist concept of a single, human source of all meaning was discarded amid the clamour of disturbances and manifestations against authority in all over Europe” (Biriotti & Miller, 1993: 1). The epicentre of these disturbances lies in some high-prestige academic institutes in Paris where academics like Barthes and Foucault worked at the time. “Death of the author” can be considered as mainly a political statement against the author as a simply purveyor of capitalist ideology.⁷ Nevertheless, or maybe because of this, the proclamation has had an important influence on the theoretical debate in contemporary literature.

In his essay Roland Barthes claims that the author enters into his own death as soon as writing begins: “writing is the destruction of every voice … the subject slips away” (Barthes, 1977: 125).⁸ This has always been so, he argues, but the sense of the phenomenon has varied during time. The author is regarded as a modern concept, born in the Middle Ages, and Barthes acknowledges that at this time – the late sixties that is – the author is still powerful (“he reigns in histories of literature, in biographies, interviews, magazines’); he is a product of a society that discovered the prestige of the individual (“this positivism, the epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology”) and this has influenced both the image of literature (“tyrannically centered on the author”) and literary criticism. As literary author and essayist William H. Gass stated: “When authorship is denied, it is often in order to extol certain sources or origins instead” and in Barthes’ case, we could say that the authorship of the deceased author is inherited by language itself (Gass, 1985: 270). Barthes sees a necessity to “substitute language itself for the person who until then had been supposed to be its owner” (Barthes, 1977: 126). From a poststructuralist perspective it is language itself that speaks, not the author.

The removal of the author has implications for how we ought to read texts. According to Barthes “the text is henceforth made and read in such a way that at all its levels the author is absent”. Barthes’ proclamation not only has implications on how we are supposed to read the text, but also on how we regard the text’s status. The text is no longer considered as a message of an Author-God, it is a multidimensional space, a web that ties together a multitude of citations. Finally, the author’s death has also implications for interpreting the text. This is no longer a case of deciphering, trying to find the hidden message; instead, the text has to be disentangled and the structure of it can be followed “like the thread of a stocking”. But there is nothing beneath it. Meaning evaporates, and it is in this way that literature is supposed to be

---

⁶ Some refer to this historical and political context in order to explain why the polemic by Barthes (and Foucault) seems to have been the most influential contribution to the debate (Biriotti & Miller, 1993; Jannidis et al., 1999).

⁷ For a historical view on the position of Roland Barthes and other theorists such as Michel Foucault in the sixties in Paris, I refer to Chapter 7 of ‘The Sixties’ by Arthur Marwick (Marwick, 1998).

⁸ The essay The Death of the Author first appeared in 1967 in Aspen Journal (5/6) “a magazine in a box”. In 1968 La mort de l’auteur appeared in Manteia, vol. 5.
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liberated from an almost theological activity of finding the hidden message that a God-like author has left in the text.

Texts on authorship frequently use metaphors regarding fatherhood (e.g. the author nourishes the book, the book is detached from the author) or theological concepts (God, believing, religion), and in the case of La mort de l’auteur it is not hard to see a similarity between Barthes’ declaration of the death of the author and Nietzsche’s declaration of the death of God. The question is what happens to the deceased author; has there according to Barthes been any role left for the author? William H. Gass puts it this way: “The death of the author ... signifies a decline in authority, in theological power, as if Zeus were stripped of his thunderbolts and swans, perhaps residing on Olympus still but now living in a camper and cooking with propane. He is, but he is no longer a god” (Gass, 1985: 265). In other words: Barthes got rid of the “old” author, the purveyor of capitalist ideology, the powerful Zeus. The “new” author remains an author who writes texts, but in Barthes’ terms this author no longer has the power he used to have. The writer is merely a copyist – similar to the ancient copyists that were once sublime – and is never original; his only power is to mix earlier writings.

Barthes’ well known statement “the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the author” shows that the thread of the stocking is to be followed by the reader. The reader is the place where all the quotations of the text are tied together, the reader unites the text. However, this reader is no real person: “the reader is without history, biography, psychology; he is simply someone who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted” (Barthes, 1977: 129). This implies that it does not really matter who is reading and what historical background or expectations he or she brings along when entering the text.

Foucault’s reaction to Barthes’ essay in 1969, entitled Qu’est-ce qu’un auteur?, has a similar goal as Barthes’, namely to deprive the author of his power. In short, the focus of this essay is to investigate the empty space left by the author’s disappearance and the function it releases. In Foucault’s opinion, to merely state that the author is dead, is insufficient: “It is not enough [...] to repeat the empty affirmation that the author has disappeared” (Foucault, 2002 [1979]: 12). We have to investigate the empty spaces left by the author’s disappearance. Foucault tries to moderate the historical author by stating that the author is merely a function that gives the ability to classify certain texts as works and adjudge certain specific characteristics to them. It creates the possibility of dealing with literature in a disciplined way.

The polemic by Barthes and Foucault has had an important influence on the author debate in literary scholarship, and the assertions have been used to defend for instance the autonomy of the text from a poststructuralist perspective. However, there have also been some critical notes. Peter LaMarque for instance has claimed that Barthes’ and Foucault’s assumptions on the position of the author, text and meaning are “unsupported and untenable” (LaMarque, 2002: 91). The author’s function claimed by Foucault becomes a property of the text or discourse, not a relation between a text and a person (LaMarque, 1996: 175). Some have doubted whether the ideas Barthes and Foucault displayed in their essays are well understood or interpreted: “Such a semantic maneuver is not intended to show that authors (as persons) are redundant. At best its aim is to show that relative to critical discourse, references to an author can be eliminated without loss of significant content”(ibid.). According to E.D. Hirsch Jr the shift in discussion from the author to the text is accompanied by historical reasons, not logical reasons. There is no logical necessity for the critic to banish an author in order to analyze his or her text (Hirsch, 1992: 12). As for the reader, both critic and non-critic, it remains an empirical question, in my opinion, whether readers actually read texts without consideration of the author at any point of the reading process.
Intentional Fallacy

The radical French poststructuralist contribution to the author debate was preceded by other developments in the United States (New Criticism) and Germany (werkimmanente Interpretation) that put the position of the author in interpreting (literary) texts under pressure. In 1954 New Critics William Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley published their essay *The Intentional Fallacy* in which they claimed that the author’s intentions should not be a standard for judging the quality of a work of art. Though the author has created the text (“the words come out of a head not a hat”), the judgment should be mainly based on the text itself and independent of the author’s intentions. For one thing, what an author intended, what made him write, how he felt, is (very often) not available to the critic. Furthermore, biographical information can distort the critic’s view on the poem or the novel. The critic’s view can be narrowed by what he or she knows about the author’s intentions or matters of interest, causing the critic to contribute meaning to the poem that is motivated by biographical information, but not supported by the poem itself. Therefore the “true and objective way of criticism” is criticism that bases its judgment on the literary text, and not on “author psychology". Although Wimsatt and Beardsley acknowledge that the psychology of the author can be of historical interest, and literary biography is a legitimate and appealing study, they warn for mixing personal studies and studies based upon the text itself. Again, they want to argue that the main focus of criticism, of judging and evaluating texts, should be on the text itself, including on an author’s notes; those are considered as part of the text and should be judged as text content, not as biographical notes. “Critical inquiries are not settled by consulting the oracle” (Wimsatt Jr. & Beardsley, 1954: 18).

The critic has different types of evidence for the meaning of a poem; internal (language of the text), external (biographical sources of information) or an intermediate kind of evidence (the author’s use of language, private meanings of language used etcetera), and although mixtures of evidence are possible, the main focus should be on internal evidence. Wimsatt and Beardsley acknowledge though that it is not always easy to draw a line between different types of evidence, but they remain rather vague on how biographical information can be used without falling into the trap of intentional fallacy: “The use of biographical evidence need not involve intentionalism, because while it may be evidence of what the author intended, it may also be evidence of the meaning of his words and the dramatic character of his utterance. On the other hand, it may not be all this” (p.11).

Although *The Intentional Fallacy* implicitly involves a normative argument against the inclusion of biographical information in interpreting a literary text, the main claim is about judging and evaluating the text. Seán Burke puts it this way:

> It is also important to note that ‘The Intentional Fallacy’ is more concerned with forbidding intention as a standard in the evaluation rather than the interpretation of the work. Ironically, it is this latter and largely ‘unintended’ claim that has proved most influential and has served to justify an interpretative freedom quite at odds with the claims of ‘The Intentional Fallacy’ [...] (Burke, 1995:67).

Wimsatt’s and Beardsley’s anti-intentionalist argument has had quite an influence on the discussion about interpreting literary texts, most of the time it is used to defend the autonomy of the text. However, there have also been reactions in order to defend the author, most notably E. D. Hirsch Jr. Hirsch contributed to the defence of the author in his book *Validity in Interpretation* (1967), in which he claims that a text means what an author meant (Hirsch,

---

9 The essay was first published in 1946 in the summer issue of *Sewanee*, 54.
I want to stress the normative character of The Intentional Fallacy, and agree with Peter LaMarque who formulates his statement in the following words: “They [anti-intentionalists] committed only to the normative element (author-based criticism should be dead) not to the descriptive element (it is in fact dead)” (LaMarque, 1996: 172). New Criticism did not deny that authors do have intentions or claim that readers should not be interested in authors’ intentions; rather the point made is that readers and critics should not confuse intentions of the author stated outside the text with intentions that are expressed in the text. The text should be the first focus of interpretation. William Wimsatt himself explains in 1968: “What we meant in 1945, and what in effect I think we managed to say, was that the closest one could ever get to the artist’s intending or meaning mind, outside his work, would still be short of his effective intention or operative mind as it appears in the work itself and can be read from the work” (in: Gibbs, 1999: 247).

**Narrator vs. Author**

The relevance of the author in explaining the meaning of a literary text was also restricted in the contemporary – post-WOII – German contribution to literary theory. In Germany 1958, Wolfgang Kayser asked himself who is narrating the story in a novel. Kayser is considered as one of the most important representatives of the “werkimmanente Interpretation”, a method of interpretation that originated in Germany from 1945 onwards; therefore it is understandable that an emotionally charged concept as the (Jewish) author or any ideological aspect had to be dismissed from interpretation. The immanent interpretation became dominant in Germany until the seventies, and aimed at investigating formal characteristics of literature while believing that literature was ontologically different from other linguistic utterances. Wolfgang Kayser conceives of the narrator as a specific ontological characteristic of the literary text and in his opinion contemporary literary scholarship and criticism had neglected the narrator in literary fiction and his or her relation to the reader.

In *Wer erzählt den Roman?* Kayser notices that during the past centuries different forms of narration and types of narrators have alternated (Kayser, 1958). There have been narrators that overtly present themselves to their readers, who try to gain their trust, while others tell about their past life, like a grandfather sitting in his chair telling his story to attentive listening grandchildren. Some are not always visible and seem to talk from a place hidden in the shade; we sense some movement, but cannot tell exactly who is talking. Kayser mentions for instance *Madame Bovary* in which we – at a certain point – do not hear the thoughts of the characters anymore; instead there is something or someone that tells us what Emma Bovary is thinking or even not thinking. These different forms of narration cause Kayser to pose the questions “who is telling?” and “to whom?”. He argues that both author and reader slip into a role; the author changes into a narrator, the reader becomes the one who is spoken to – a made-up reader. The beginning of the reader’s metamorphosis happens most of the time not consciously; it usually starts when the reader comes across the word “novel” on the cover of a book.

Der Leser ist etwas Gedichtetes, ist eine Rolle, in die wir hineinschlüpfen und bei der wir uns selber zusehen können. Der Beginn der Verwandlung ist uns gewöhnlich nicht bewußt; sie hebt an, wenn wir das Wort «Roman» im Untertitel eines Buches lesen oder vielleicht schon, wenn die Magie des Einbandes auf uns wirkt. (p.88) [The reader is something invented, he is a role we slip into and

---

10 In *Intention & Interpretation* (1992), edited by Gary Iseminger, the discussion continues in contributions by e.g. Hirsch (‘In Defence of the Author’), Beardsley (‘The Authority of the Text’) and Steven Knapp & Walter Benn Michaels (‘The Impossibility of Intentionless Meaning’) (Iseminger, 1992).
watch at the same time. We are usually not aware of the start of the metamorphosis; it begins as soon as we read the word «novel» in the subtitle of a book, or maybe at the moment the magic of the cover affects us.] 11

And who is the narrator?12 Kayser compares the narrator of stories in general to a father and mother who have to “transform” themselves as soon as they tell their children a fairy tale; make-believing that the prince is really saving the princess from the hideous monster. According to Kayser they have to undergo the same metamorphosis as the author when he starts to narrate.

It almost seems as if the act of reading becomes a kind of play, in which both author and reader pick up their role and enter the stage of the fictional world (see also Chapter 3 Game Over, Reading as joint pretence). The author plays the narrator of the story and the reader plays the listener or addressee. Formulated in terms of play, Kayser makes a distinction between the author and narrator of the literary text, but the author is never really dismissed from the literary stage. Unfortunately, Kayser’s distinction has commonly been explained as a dismissal of the author (Jannidis et al., 1999: 12-13). However, the distinction does indeed limit the relevance of the author as persona in explaining the text. Thoughts of a narrator cannot be seen as the direct opinion of the author. This also implies that the author is merely playing a role; he or she is more or less hidden behind the text, and can hide him or herself behind the argument that it is fiction, claiming that the words of the narrator are not his or her own. On the other hand the author chooses his or her role and therefore can be held responsible for the presented ideas and statements of the narrator. In the next section, as well as in Chapter 3, we will see that controversies in literary reception demonstrate that the author cannot always hide behind the text and its narrator.

“Implied Author”

Finally, Wayne Booth’s introduction of the concept implied author in The Rhetoric of Fiction (1961) can be regarded as another influential contribution to the theoretical debate that restricted the relevance of the author as interpretive category. Ever since Booth introduced the concept, its definition and theoretical inconsistency have been debated and criticized by both theorists of interpretation and descriptive narratologists (cf. Kindt & Müller, 1999b).13 More
recently Ansgar Nünning has discussed the concept in the context of the narratological debate about unreliable narrators (Nünning, 2005).

Booth positions his implied author between the narrator and the real, flesh-and-blood author and defines the concept in different ways, which caused criticism such as “vague” and “inconsistent”. Booth seems to apply at least two versions of the concept. On the one hand the implied author is to be thought of as a creation of the real author. When the author writes, he creates an implied version – a second self – of himself that differs from implied authors we meet in other works. “This implied author is always distinct from the “real author” – whatever we may take him to be – who creates a superior version of himself, a “second self”, as he creates his work (chap.iii)” (Booth, 1961: 151). Regardless of the type of narrator in a work, there is always an implied author: “Even the novel in which no narrator is dramatized creates an implicit picture of an author who stands behind the scenes, whether as a stage manager, as puppeteer, or as an indifferent God, silently paring his fingernails” (ibid.). Defined in this way the concept becomes a pragmatic instance, although the last quote seems to imply that the text itself creates the image. This is a second way Booth appears to define the implied author; it is the structure, the morals of the text. Finally, sometimes it seems as if the implied author is created neither by the real author nor by the text, but is said to be inferred by the (professional) reader. The implied author thus becomes an inference the reader generates based on the text. According to Booth we infer the implied author as an ideal, literary, created version of the real man, he is the sum of his own choices, and the reader’s idea of the implied author includes the inferable meanings of the events, their moral and emotional contents:

Our sense of the implied author includes not only the extractable meanings but also the moral and emotional content of each bit of action and suffering of all the characters. It includes, in short, the intuitive apprehension of a completed artistic whole; the chief value to which this implied author is committed, regardless of what party his creator belongs to in real life, is that which is expressed by the total form (p. 73-74).

Again, Booth is not really clear about the definition of this inferred implied author. Is it an ideal version of the real creator, or is it more abstract in the sense of the feeling of value the reader senses in the work and attributes to the author? And what is the relation then to the empirical, flesh-and-blood author? Aside from the inconsistency in Booth’s use of different definitions, difficulties arise when the concept is to be operationalized. How do we “percolate” the implied author out of the work, whether it is defined as the structure of the text or an author’s created second self? Although Booth thinks of the reader’s inferred implied author as a multitude of aspects, and again is not really clear on the specifics, it seems that the best opportunity to operationalize the concept is met when implied author is defined from the perspective of the reader. I will return to this in a minute.

The vagueness and inconsistency of Booth’s concept have sometimes been explained from the suggestion that Booth tried to find a compromise between two different statements, thereby (unintentionally) creating vagueness and multiple meanings. When Booth was working on his book The Rhetoric of Fiction it is said that he was, on the one hand, convinced by the critics insisting on the Intentional Fallacy, while on the other he held the opinion that literary texts present intentionally structured normative worlds that are accessible to ethical criticism. The concept “implied author” gave Booth the possibility of interpreting and criticizing the normative world of the text, without leaving the textual borders and fall into the trap of the Intentional Fallacy (Kindt & Müller, 1999a: 279-280).
More recently, Booth has offered “one more sermon on why we should all work to keep the concept alive, regardless of how we define it” (Booth, 2005: 75). Booth himself defines the concept “implied author” (IA) as an image that the flesh-and-blood person creates of himself or herself through the work: “authorial creations of IA’s” (ibid., 77). He admires poets for putting on a mask, cleansing the less admirable parts of their personalities and creating multiple selves: IA’s. The poet Sylvia Plath, for instance, Booth admires for creating – through her poem ‘Edge’ – “a wonderfully different person from the one I have met in her diaries and in some of her more careless poems” (ibid., 82). Throughout his discussion of Plath’s poem, Booth creates the impression that, in his mind, his image of Plath is without doubt the implied author that the flesh-and-blood author Plath originally intended to create through her poem. Booth seems to neglect the fact that he too is a reader and that each reader constructs an image of the author, regardless of, and probably often different from how the author wants her readers to see her. At the same time Booth frequently refers to biographical information about the flesh-and-blood-author Plath, who struggled with severe depressions during her life, and he even remarks “Just think of how differently we would read this poem if we did not know that she committed suicide” (ibid., 84). Booth’s definition of the implied author and the way he uses the concept in interpreting works (poems) remains problematic; how do we know if our image of the author meets the IA created by the flesh-and-blood author? In addition, whether readers read poems or prose differently depending on their knowledge of biographical information is in my opinion an empirical question. I hope to provide an answer to this question in this book.

In reaction to the criticism on the vagueness of the concept and the difficulties regarding its operationalisation, it has been suggested to substitute the implied author by either a concept referring to the text-external definition (“author”) or the text-internal definition (“text intention” or “working intention”). Others have suggested alternative concepts like “inferred author” (Seymour Chatman), “postulated author” (Alexander Nehamas), “pseudo-historical author” (Jorge J.E. Gracia), “urauthor” (William Irwin), “hypothetical author” (Jerrold Levinson), “apparent artist” (Kendall Walton) (Irwin, 2002). James Phelan admits the “implied author” to have some connection to the empirical author by seeing the former as an agent responsible for bringing the text into existence: “a streamlined version of the real author, an actual or purported subset of the real author’s capacities, traits, attitudes, beliefs, values, and other properties that play an active role in the construction of the particular text” (in: Nünning, 2005: 99).

From an empirical perspective, the concept “implied author” offers the best possibilities for operationalisation when it is defined as a class of inferences; the implied author then becomes a construction of the reader; an inferred or constructed author. François Jost has introduced a very useful concept of the author in relation to film that can also be applied to literature. This “constructed author” is not a link between the empirical author and the recipient, rather “the constructed author is the author seen by the spectator: through the text, through his own capacity to perceive and understand, through the author’s public manifestations, his critiques, etc” (Jost, 1995). This constructed author can have great similarities with the empirical author, yet remains a construction of the reader. Regarding author constructs Stacie Friend stresses: “Since author constructs are just that—constructs that emerge from interpretation rather than preceding it—it should be an independent question whether and to what extent facts about the historical writer should constrain their formation.” (Friend, 2003). Friend’s remark is prescriptive (“should constrain”), and I would like to add that empirical research could help to answer the question whether biographical information about the author indeed constrains a reader’s construction of an author construct (see also section 6).
In the previous section we have seen four different, more or less unrelated, contributions to literary theory that have to some extent influenced the debate about the relevance of the author as an interpretation category, which caused the author to be dismissed from interpretation or at least limited the author’s position (autonomist perspectives). These attacks are far from homogenous, but they have in common that they are normative and try to limit the domain of interpretation and that of the text. Most of the time the suggested prescriptions for the interpretation of a literary text seem unnatural and not in line with our own experiences in reading. For instance, literary critic Jane Thompkins wrote a dissertation on Melville while working under the domination of New Criticism. She said she could not mention “author” or “Melville”; instead she had to say “the narrator”. The same applied to feelings that Melville’s texts evoked - “though that was the whole reason for writing on the topic!” - because mentioning feelings meant committing the affective fallacy (Gibbs, 1999: 246).

In summary, the interpretation of a literary text based on biographical information or the presumed author’s intention has not had much methodological support in hermeneutic theories in the last fifty years. Nevertheless, the author does play a role in literary theories on interpretation, even when he is considered to be irrelevant, and the biographical author is never ignored as the creator of the text. Most theoretical assumptions are normative and prescriptive (the author should be dismissed from interpretation), instead of descriptive (the author plays no part in the interpretation). In the next section we will see that the author’s identity, authority, ethnicity and personality are indeed of importance to developments in contemporary literary scholarship and the position of the author in the literary field.

2. Resurrection of the Author

Feminist and postcolonial approaches

The death of the author can be considered as a development of political liberation; it also meant an attack on the humanist subject (male, canonised etcetera) and its implications in racism, sexism and imperialism. However, the irony was that “just when new voices were being heard (black, female, margins), the author’s death denied authorship precisely to those who had recently been empowered to claim it” (Biriotti & Miller, 1993: 6). The fact is that when the author “died” it did not really matter who had written the text, let alone what was the author’s identity, gender or ethnicity. Questions such as “Can a male writer write about a female character?” would consequently become irrelevant.

Feminist literary criticism includes both the study of women writers (gynocritics), and the examination of representations of women in standard literary works and neglected works by women writers. These representations are studied for what they reveal about the author who deployed them and the culture in which that writer worked (Baym, 1995). Questions regarding the author’s gender are thus of importance to a feminist approach to literature; it does matter that Madame Bovary is written by a male author, and it is for instance of interest to investigate the narratological freedom Emma Bovary is given by Flaubert, in order to make claims about the representation of women characters in novels by male authors. For example, 19th century female authors are of interest to gynocritics, because these women were compelled by necessity to pass themselves off as males in order to have their work published.

The death of the author had therefore seemingly consequences for feminist criticism, foreclosing the question of identity for all and especially women writers. How did feminist critics deal with the author’s death? Some critics borrowed the French (male) theory to declare the death of the female author, in order to – in their opinion – liberate feminist criticism from the tendency to supply biographical information about an author to the text.
(e.g. Toril Moi (Walker, 1990)). Others doubted whether the death of the Author and the subjective agency with him should also hold true for women writers, since “women have not the same historical relation of identity to origin, institution, production, that men have had” (Miller, 1993: 23). In other words: the male author was declared dead, the female author was still very much alive. Cheryl Walker argued for a new concept of authorship, holding somewhere between the position that the author is the originating genius, creating aesthetic works outside of history, and the text is autonomic position. Although she is not clear on the specifics of such a middle position, she dismisses the “text is autonomic” position: “my own brand of persona criticism assumes that to erase a woman poet as the author from her poems in favour of an abstract indeterminacy is an act of oppression” (Walker, 1990: 571).

As we have seen in the first section, Barthes stated that the death of the author meant the birth of the reader. As feminist criticism, and especially the empirical subfield, also focuses on the female reader, the announcement of a new born reader should have sounded like music to the ears of feminist scholars, such as Nancy Miller who “changes the subject” by shifting the focus from author to reader. However, Barthes’ reader is no person: “the reader is without history, biography, psychology”, which implies that it does not really matter who is reading and what gender the reader belongs to. Especially the empirical reader and his or her readings and constructions, for instance the construction of the narrator’s gender, should be of importance to feminist research. Think for instance about questions feminist research is interested in, such as “Does the reader tend to attribute the determinable sex of the empirical author to the omniscient or unnamed first-person narrator?” or “Does the reader’s perception of male-female relations in the text tend to influence the reader’s attitude towards the empirical (or implied) author?”.

14 These are all questions relating to the flesh-and-blood reader who has indeed a history, biography and psychology. Monika Fludernik sees an opportunity for empirical studies of literature “to [help] clarify some of these issues” (Fludernik, 1996: 360).

Similar remarks apply to post-colonial criticism in which especially the notion of “the double, or divided or fluid identity” of the postcolonial writer is of importance (Barry, 1996: 195). The identity of the author is of importance to both the postcolonial author, who may attempt to articulate and celebrate his cultural identity and even reclaim it from the coloniser through the literary work, and the author of the colonizing culture who may be accused of justifying colonialism through the work via images of the colonised as an inferior people, society and culture. In both cases the author’s cultural identity is of importance in the reception of the related literary works.

15 At this point, we will leave the discussion at this. What is of importance to the present study is that the death of the author and its implications for the author (and reader), have not restrained feminist and post-colonial criticism from focusing their research on the author’s identity, gender and ethnicity. It is worth stressing that in feminist and post-colonial criticism, or more generally in Gender Studies and Cultural Studies, the author functions as a category of valuing the literary works.

14 In “The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction”, by Judith Fetterley, the author claims that the - American - reader is indeed affected by the male bias in American literature. Readers therefore have a responsibility, she claims, to be critical towards these texts and especially with regard to the representation of asymmetrical relations of power between men and women (Fetterley, 1978).

15 Also see, for example, The Empire Writes Back: Theories and Practice in Post-Colonial Studies by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (Ashcroft et al., 1989).

16 The outlay as pictured above is by no means a complete overview of the developments in feminist and post-colonial approaches of literature as much as it presents all the implications of the death of the author (for more on this issue I refer to (e.g. Barry, 1996; Walker, 1990).
“Neuere Zugänge wie etwa Gender studies oder Cultural studies setzen ebenfalls vielfach ein Wissen über den Autor voraus – welchen Geschlechts er oder sie ist, welcher Herkunft – und handhaben den Autor entsprechend offensiv als Wertungsinstanz” [Newer approaches such as Gender Studies or Cultural Studies likewise often assume knowledge about the author – the author’s gender and origin – and consequently use the author similarly decisive as judgmental authority] (Jannidis et al., 1999: 11).

The author as “Wertungsinstanz” is best shown in cases of reception in which the author’s identity and authenticity are at stake. As we shall see in the next section, aspects such as ethnic background are of importance in the reception and evaluation of literary texts, especially when the fictional world represents moral dilemmas and more specifically traumatic historical events, such as the Holocaust. The history of literary criticism knows several scandals in which the author’s identity was questioned, and in some cases this was due to the fact that the author turned out to be not the victim he or she claimed to be (false identity).

False identities

Pablo Picasso once said: “Art is a lie that makes us see the truth”. To some extent writing fiction is always an act of lying; the author invents a world in which appear – most of the time – made-up characters. However, there is a difference between fiction as an accepted lie, and the author who lies about his or her identity, or more generally: about the author’s personal life. According to a normative approach to literature that disregards the author in the interpretation of literary texts, one could say: “Who cares if the author is telling lies?” since what the author intends is thought to be irrelevant. This position, however, appears untenable, especially when the fictional work of the author concerns representations of traumatic historical events.

An interesting example of an author telling lies about his life is the Dutch writer Boudewijn Büch, who deceased in November 2002. Most of Büch’s novels and poems are said to have a shared theme; namely that of the loss of a little boy. This theme is prominently present in his most famous novel *De kleine blonde dood* (Little blond death). In interviews Büch himself spoke very frankly, and sometimes in tears, about the grief over the loss of his baby son, a loss that gnawed at him with a sickening pain. A framed picture of the blond little fellow embellished his buffet until the writer’s death. Close friend and journalist Mark Blaisse remembered Büch once visited him at his home. Just after the writer had entered the living room he asked the journalist to turn over the frames with photos of his young children. Büch said it reminded him too much of his deceased son (Kagie, 2004). After Büch died it became clear that the boy’s death was a fiction that Büch created himself. The boy actually existed but was not Boudewijn Büch’s son; instead, he was the son of a couple Büch knew very well. Now well over thirty years old Boudewijn, named after Büch, has told the true story to a journalist who published a book a few years ago entitled *Boudewijn Büch. Verslag van een mystificatie* (Boudewijn Buch. Report of a mystification). The made-up story and the parallels of this fiction with the overall theme of Büch’s novels have clearly influenced the interpretation of the writer’s literary works, especially since Büch was eager to point out the

---

17 This view that fiction is an accepted lie has, however, been “outdated”. See also Chapter 3, section 1.
18 Written by Rudie Kagie and published at Prometheus (2004).
parallels between his life and his novels himself. Knowing something about Büch the person defines our experience of Büch the writer.

Nevertheless, the outcome of the author’s lie has not caused a scandal, presumably because Buch was said to be suffering from pseudologica fantastica, a disorder in which a person cannot distinguish reality from fantasy. The discussion around Büch was at least nothing like for instance the made-up identity of a young Australian writer of Holocaust fiction, Helen Darville alias Demidenko, who made everybody think she was an Australian immigrant from the Ukraine whose family had suffered severely under the Stalin regime, and collaborated with the Nazi’s, which led to a mass murder of the Jewish citizens. Her novel The Hand that Signed the Paper, which tells a similar story from the perspective of a young Australian girl with an Irish-Ukrainian background, received two prestigious prizes. The novel was praised for its “powerful literary imagination, coupled with a strong sense of history” (Rigney, 1998: 136). When the writer turned out to be an impostor, a public outrage was the result. Helen Demidenko - Darville was accused of inaccuracy in presenting the historical facts (“historical fabrication”) and her intentions were called into question: “The author is afraid to write a non-fiction apologia for the Ukrainian genocide, lest she be rightly ostracized, smuggles her views into the mouths of her characters” (ibid., 142). Sue Vice has discussed several cases of Holocaust fiction that caused controversies, and she notices that “Purposeful schemes and unwitting errors are ascribed to the authors of Holocaust fiction as if that figure [Barthes’ Author] has never died” (Vice, 2000: 3). Obviously, normative approaches to literature that claim the irrelevancy of the author as interpretive category seem untenable. Several issues are at stake here that are somehow related to authorship and which apparently play an important role in the reception (interpretation and evaluation) of literary works. I will shortly discuss three aspects that are closely related in the discussion (authority, authenticity and accuracy), and will return to this issue more in depth in Chapter 3 where I will discuss the implications for theories of fiction.

First, there is the question of authority which “appears to be conferred on a writer if they [sic] can be shown to have a connection with the events they are describing; this obviously means that the writer’s biography must be transparently available for all to know” (Vice, 2000: 4). In other words: is the author telling a story in which the presented events in the fictional world are authentic; are these events related to the writer’s experience? Authenticity seems to be measured by the attitude of the author to the narrator, and, especially in the case of Holocaust fiction is closely related to sincerity. Is the author an authentic victim and not just someone who wants “bumming a ride on the Holocaust” (ibid.)? There are differences in degree of importance that is attributed to the authenticity of the presented events in De kleine blonde dood and The Hand that Signed the Paper. In the case of Büch, readers and even Büch’s close friends and family first thought that the writer was indeed telling a personal story, based on experiences he was still suffering from. The little blond boy in De kleine blonde dood had to be Boudewijn Büch’s deceased son and the represented events seemed authentic, as was confirmed by Büch himself. The suggestion of authenticity may even have contributed to readers’ emotional experience in reading this tragic story, for example: This is horrible and it actually really happened! There was no reason for readers to question or distrust the writer’s authority, mainly because the death of a child is a personal

---


20 David Greason supposedly said this in one of his articles for the Herald Sun (Giannopoulos, 1998).
traumatic experience, not a shared one. For that reason we cannot decide whether the experience is presented *accurately*. Even if we would have had some doubt about the *authenticity* of the story (stories), we would have had a hard time figuring out the true history of the events. Therefore, we as readers can or could do nothing but trust Büch in claiming authority, authenticity and accuracy. Now that we know Büch has created both the fiction in his novel and in his head, it seems impossible to read his novels in the same way as we did when we still believed that the stories were based on Büch’s own traumatic experience.

As Demidenko suggested that her novel was based on personal experience, her authority as well as the authenticity of the presented events was not questioned. Again, we as readers were willing to trust Demidenko in telling an authentic and accurate story. The exposure of her lies caused much more rumour than the exposure of Büch’s lies. The most important reason for this is that the subject matter of Demidenko’s novel refers to a traumatic experience, the Holocaust, that is part of our cultural memory and that is largely shared. Therefore the writer’s lying about her identity had far more consequences. Not only turned Demidenko from a witness to an outsider – whom readers automatically treat with suspicion concerning the motives (Vice, 2000: 4) – she had deliberately deceived her readers by making them believe that she was telling a story based on her own family background and experiences. It was for good reasons that the writer’s sincerity was called into question, as is illustrated by the critic who accused Demidenko of smuggling her own questionable views into the mouths of her characters. There is of course a paradox here, since fiction by definition means inventing a fictional world – both the reader and author participate in a game of make-believe. One could say that Demidenko as a writer of fiction is free to invent a fictional world according to her ideas. However, Demidenko positions her story in a historical frame of traumatic events, thus automatically restricting her freedom of inventing. Seemingly, most theories of fiction fail to explain the responses that Demidenko’s work of fiction raised, and – as Ann Rigney has aptly put forward – a theory of fiction should take contextual factors into account (Rigney, 1998). I will elaborate further on fiction and contextual factors in Chapter 3.

Cases such as the Demidenko and Büch controversies illustrate the importance of the empirical author and his or her presumed intentions in the reception of literature of traumatic events; it seems that these intentions have to be sincere and transparent. Especially when the author is an outsider, instead of a victim or witness, the author’s motives in writing a novel become important. There is no reason for readers to question the intentions of an author as long as the story reveals no inaccuracy in the representation of the historic events. If so, the author must have some justification, e.g. an aesthetic intention. Phillip Roth, for instance, in his novel *The Plot against America* (2004), deliberately presents historically inaccurate facts in order to conduct an experiment of what would have happened if Charles Lindbergh had run for president in 1940, defeating Franklin D. Roosevelt. In reality, Lindbergh was an isolationist and very opposed to the U.S. getting involved in the war raging in Europe at the time. He had visited and spoken glowingly about Hitler's regime and blamed Jewish interests for pressuring the country to take sides against Germany. Roth’s novel was praised for being “creepily plausible”, for the credibility of the characters and “the authentic voice” of the narrator (called Philip Roth) (Arensman, 2004; Bergman, 2004). However, Roth’s story is not authentic, for one because the story did not – entirely – take place, and secondly because Roth’s relatives have not been victims of the Nazi regime. Some mentioned that Roth “mythologized his own childhood” and argued that “phony victimhood is the sentimentality of our time”, but nevertheless the novel did not raise a controversy (Bergman, 2004).21 Possibly because some

---

21 *The New York Times* contributor Paul Bergman even says: “Isn’t there, in the end, a touch of sentimental fakery here – a suggestion that Roth, the scourge of everything false, has dressed himself up as someone else entirely, as the kind of Jewish writer of our time who, in childhood, really did survive the fascists and Nazis of
thought that Roth’s motive in writing the novel was: “if we learn from it, [it] might save us from a calamitous future” or in the current Bush era “as either a warning about the dangers of isolatism or a warning about the dangers of the Patriot Act and the threat to civil liberties” (Kakutani, 2004; Morrison, 2004). Not only authors who depict collective traumas have drawn special attention of critics and readers, religion has always been a rather delicate subject, especially when holy books such as the Bible or Koran are made ridiculous. The most extreme example is of course Salman Rushdie’s Satanic Verses which was banned on the basis of accusation of blasphemy in e.g. India, South Africa, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Indonesia, and Qatar, and which was reason for Iran’s spiritual leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini to set the death sentence on its author Rushdie. In the Netherlands both authors Gerard Reve (Ezeltjesproces) and Willem Frederik Hermans (Ik heb altijd gelijk) were accused of blasphemy in 1968 and 1952 respectively and both authors defended themselves by saying that they were not the ‘I’ from the story.22 These examples are, of course, somewhat extreme and concern controversies in which authors sometimes are even put on trial or threatened to be killed. Nevertheless, these examples raise the question whether issues such as the author’s authenticity - and related sincerity - are also taken into account when we encounter authors of narrative fiction in general, including non controversial fiction. In Chapter 3 I will outline some theoretical assumptions on the author’s sincerity and the reader’s trust in the author in the reading of fiction, and I will provide some empirical support for these assumptions.

Profession: writer and personality

Another issue of the author-as-a-person plays a role in the reception of his or her work and that is the author’s image – the persona. Demidenko contributed to her image as Ukrainian immigrant by appearing at interviews in ethnic costume. She is even said to have signed her books with Ukrainian inscriptions, and performed Ukrainian songs and dances (Gunew, 1996). This image did not fail to strengthen the belief that the author’s story was authentic, and that the author herself had authority by presenting a story based on her family’s experiences. It is thinkable that readers find it hard to resist this image when reading Demidenko’s novel. Boudewijn Büch for his part created his image by becoming a television personality; he made television programs about his travels around the world, talking enthusiastically about all the hidden treasures he had found. He was also a regular guest in the Dutch talk show Barend & Van Dorp, where he almost always showed one of his collected valuables. Furthermore, he performed in a commercial for rice, altogether creating an image of a slightly neurotic, though in a way charming, collector and globe-trotter. In this section I will discuss how nowadays it is common and important that the author presents himself in the media and sells his “product”. For readers it seems hard to resist striking images (and voices) of these personality authors when reading the author’s novels.

---

22 In 1952 the Catholic Minister of Justice instructed the Public Prosecutor in Amsterdam to charge Hermans with intentionally offending the Catholic community. In the lawsuit against W.F. Hermans, however, the Public Prosecutor argued that it could not be readily deduced that the author shared his character’s vision, therefore it was not held proven that the defendant had intended to hurt a community [Catholic community] (Goedegebuure, 1989). See the website http://www.willemfrederikhermans.nl/titels/titel.php?id=herm014ikhe01, retrieved February 22, 2007, for a list of articles about the lawsuit that appeared in the Dutch press between 1951 and 2005(!).
The romantic image of a writer wandering through his study for hours, now and then scribbling some sentences on a piece of paper, while chewing on his pipe and wiping some ashes of his dressing-gown is long gone. Nowadays the writer is more similar to a salesman or a television personality, or as Peter Nijssen phrased it “a modern minstrel” who wanders about from one event to another (Nijssen, 1994: 692). Due to several (mostly technical) developments in the past centuries, such as the invention of typography, printers, rise of publishers, growth of middle classes, newspaper as mass medium, the personal lives of writers had already severely changed, but with the rise of pop culture and mass media in the sixties, the writer’s holiness evaporated. In a modern time literature had to be liberated from its isolation and writers had to come out in the open, talk to people and show their personality. Publicity became the new ideology, and according to some the critic was subsequently thrown from his throne by the author:

Eerst kwamen de interviews, verlucht met een foto van de schrijver. Daarna de gesprekken voor de radio. Tenslotte verscheen de schrijver op de televisie. De criticus is dus verdrongen door de auteur, die tegenwoordig de taak op zich neemt zijn “produkt” persoonlijk te “verkopen”. (First there were the interviews, illuminated by a picture of the writer. Then the radio talks. Finally the writer appeared on television. The critic is thus superseded by the author, who nowadays undertakes the task of “selling” his “product” personally”) (Nijssen, 1994: 692).

The influence of the media is far from modest; whether a writer is successful appears to depend on how well he or she acts in the media circus and publishers are eager to market their books and writers as good and fast as possible. The lifetime of books has become shorter, the production of books has enlarged and the competition is getting more intense (Brandt & Schutte, 1996). Publishers have to act fast, and they know of course that attention generates sale. So they arrange an interview, organize a lecture or succeed in putting their writer in a chair at a television show. And thus nowadays writers provide a package deal of more or less literary circus acts; they read from their work, give interviews to newspapers, radio and television, autograph in book stores, chat in all kinds of discussion panels, do commercials, attend dinners and charity events and the list goes on. Peter Nijssen ironically suggests that there are even writers who sing, present, perform, tell jokes and play indoor football on demand. “En wees er maar zeker van dat deze variëteit-artisten service op maat geven. Geen klantvriendelijker mens dan de hedendaagse schrijver” (And you can bet that these music-hall artists provide tailor-made service. No customer-friendlier human being than the contemporary writer) (Nijssen, 1994: 694). In the Netherlands we have all round writers such as Joost Zwagerman, Ronald Giphart and Arnon Grunberg who, when they are not working on a new novel, are television hosts, frequent guests at daily talk shows, do commercials, write articles and columns and so on. But who can blame them; it sure pays of. All three are famous writers and their books sell very well.

Susanne Janssen has conducted empirical research on the influence of literary criticism (both journalistic and academic reviewing) on the reception of literary works. One of her findings is that the literary critical reception of a work partly depends on how the author has presented himself or herself in the literary domain by participating in side-lines such as publishing in literary magazines (Janssen, 1991: 199-201). Not only can the author generate more sale of his work or earn something on the side (so-called “moonlighting”), he can also

---

23 Although, once the author had descended from his ivory tower and wandered around in the public domain, mass media fed the author’s holiness by treating some authors like pop stars (e.g. Jan Cremer).

24 See for instance www.bestseller60.nl. This is a weekly list of 60 bestsellers that is based on sales figures of more than 350 diverse Dutch book stores.
influence the reception of his or her works. Janssen has focused her research on critics, not on non-expert readers, but it is not hard to imagine that the public activities of a writer must have some influence on the reception of non-expert readers too. As Dick Schram has pointed out, one can distinguish between pre-reception (interest and motivation), reception (cognitive and emotional processes) and post-reception (effects) (Schram, 1991), and it seems reasonable to assume that readers’ knowledge about and attitudes towards an author may influence all aspects of reception. Imagine the busy reader who wanders around in a book shop looking for a book. He or she has a hard time choosing a book from the enormous amount of supply and at every corner he finds a cardboard writer smiling at him. The interest for a particular writer or the motivation to read a particular book can be awakened by the positive impression a writer makes in for instance a television show.25

Readers can thus be helped to choose “new friends” and that is of course exactly what the publicity machine is aiming at (e.g. Dan Brown or J.K. Rowling is a very popular “friend” nowadays). During reading – we are now talking about reception in terms of cognitive processes – it is very likely that the image of a writer influences the way we interpret and value a literary text (as we shall see in Chapter 4 and 5). I myself can remember how enthusiastic I was when I first read The New York Trilogy by Paul Auster during college. I wanted to get to know this author better; therefore I started reading more of his work. Because some of his books have main characters named Paul and who often have a profession as a writer (e.g. Hand to Mouth), I felt I got to know Auster better. Of course I had already seen a picture of the writer on the cover of his book, but when I saw an interview with him, this moving and talking Auster illuminated the image I already had. This upgraded image was definitely present when I read one of his latest novels, thereby creating a kind of intimate atmosphere. Of course a picture on the book cover or a moving and talking (!) image can also ruin the magic. I myself have for instance a hard time ignoring my lively image of Harry Mulisch when I read one of his books, especially when he (his narrator) tries to impress me with one of his complex theories of “the world”. Mulisch’s frequent appearances on the television screen have clearly influenced my image of the author and, although I value his work, it is hard to ignore that this Mr. Know-it-all is getting the credits for it.

In the first section of this chapter I have explained that some literary scholars have dismissed the author from the interpretation of texts, because we have no access to the author’s intentions (intentional fallacy). However, the rise of mass media has some interesting consequences; it gives the author the opportunity to react to criticism on his or her work, explain his poetical position or rectify misinterpretations.26 According to Susanne Janssen critics assume that an author of some stature integrates his or her view on the function and nature of literature into his or her works. Authors therefore in general can influence the reception of their work to a large extent by supplying statements on their own work or on literature. These are considered as central themes of the work that reflect the author’s vision on reality, literature and authorship (Janssen, 1991: 30). In other words: the author can share his or her intentions in writing a particular work with a broad audience and thereby is able to influence the reception. There is however a downside to the publicity strategy; readers tend to expect authors to appear in the newspaper and especially on television as part of their profession.27 “Are you a writer? But I haven’t seen you on television. Are your books in the

---

25 Research has shown that the two key factors readers consider in their choice of books are the author’s identity (who is the author) and their familiarity with the author (Leemans & Stokmans, 1991).

26 Already in the 18th century authors could correct misinterpretations (Lang, 2004). However, because of the rise of mass media in terms of television, and nowadays internet, writers can reach a much larger public of (potential) readers.

27 Another consequence is that, if writers are involved in a controversy related to their work or person, a broad audience is easily met. For instance, the ‘Houellebecq –trial’ in September 2002 was extensively reported on on
top-ten list?” There is a nice example of how authorship these days seems to be inextricably tied to appearing in public. In 1994 Dutch newspapers speculated whether writer Frida Vogels could be a fake because she did not collect the literary prize Libris Literatuur Prijs she had won in person. The fact that she kept her place of abode in Bologna a secret only contributed to the presumed mystification, some journalists thought (Nijssen, 1994: 693).

It is a tough competition. Writers have to distinguish themselves and their personal names become a brand that has to be sold. “Have you already read the latest Dan Brown?” A brand often accompanies an image. Michel Houellebecq is almost always portrayed in a cloud of puffed out cigarette smoke, wearing somewhat smudgy clothes. He has the image of an eccentric, intelligent, rebellious person, perfectly in line with the contents of his books. Harry Mulisch seems to wear a suit and choker most of the days, and he always carries or smokes a pipe. Again the sophisticated image is in line with the intellectual novels of the writer. Some authors even go as far as following the rules of publicity marketing in the extreme; every time they have a new product this will go along with a new image. Nobel Prize for Literature winner Elfriede Jelinek tuned her image to every peak of her oeuvre. The 1998 exhibit *Echos und Masken* in the Literaturhaus Salzburg that was dedicated to Jelinek lined her appearances up: four wigs each in front of a different novel (Verbij, 1998). Her first novel *wir sind lockvögel baby!* (1969) was accompanied by a long teenager hairdo with a fringe. The novel that became Jelinek’s breakthrough, *Die Klavierspielerin* (1983), was accompanied by a short, prim hair-style that suits a person that is living – like the main character – under her mother’s wings. Jelinek’s novel *Lust* (1989) caused a scandal and was judged as pornographic. This book was accompanied by put up hair with a single pigtail; the hair-style Jelinek wore in a photo shoot, taken at the novel’s publication, in which she was portrayed in chains and leather. Finally, *Die Kinder der Toten* (1995) went together with two pigtails, a beret and a white parrot on her arm (Verbij, 1998).

In this section I have intended to show that there is a remarkable paradox: in literary theory the author has been declared dead, while in different areas of the literary field such as literary reviewing as well as in some literary theories or approaches to literature the author is very much alive. These positions are in a way extreme, yet, they seem to be still in effect nowadays. In the next section I return to the analytical interpretative frame in literary theory; *reception aesthetics*. Representatives of reception aesthetics have not so much suggested that the author should be dead, i.e. dismissed from interpretation of literary texts, much more, they aimed at investigating the interaction between text and reader. It is important to notice though that reader does not refer to the individual, empirical reader, rather it is a function of the text or it refers to a more abstract collective of readers.

3. Reception aesthetics and the author

Hans Robert Jauss, one of the representatives of the *Konstanzer Schule* (Constance School) of *Rezeptionsästhetik* (reception aesthetics) formulates the merits of reception theory as follows: “In short, it renewed the question of what aesthetic experience could mean when viewed as a productive, receptive and communicative activity” (Jauss, 1990: 53). Although this statement might imply that reception theory included author, text and reader as part of this communicative activity, reception aesthetics in the 1960s was mainly interested in the interaction between text and reader. It is by this ongoing dialogue between reader and text...
that the meaning of the text is to be constructed. Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser are the most well known theorists that have largely contributed to reception theory in Germany and in the United States. They differ however in their aims and perspective related to reception theory. Jauss’s explicit aim was to refine the rules for the historical understanding of literature while Iser’s aim was to analyze the process of reading in terms of the interaction of reader and text.

Jauss conceives of the literary text as a score (“eine Partitur”) that has to be actualized by readers time and again. He introduces the concept of Erwartungshorizont (horizon of expectation), the set of expectations against which the reader interprets the text. This concept is based on Gadamer’s statement that historical objectivity is an illusion because our judgment is conditioned and limited by our historical perspective (Horizont). The interpretation of a text therefore involves a fusion of horizons (Horizontverschmelzung); the imaginative merging of the interpreter’s horizon with that of the text. Jauss’ horizon of expectations is not available in objective form, neither to the recipients (e.g. readers, critics) nor to authors of a literary work.

One may ask what role, if any, the author has in reception theory, especially when the horizon of expectations is defined as a dynamic concept that is inaccessible to the reader or author. First of all, by reader Jauss does not refer to the empirical reader, rather his object of investigation regards the literary public as a collective. From the collective he isolates the professional reader who, if one reads his historical interpretations of, for instance, Baudelaire’s work, turns out to be Jauss himself (Jauss, 1982). As for the author, Jauss remains unclear on what exactly is his status or position, and even on whether the author is considered a theoretical construct or equals the historical author, i.e. the empirical author. However, the historical author does seem to have a function in Jauss’s theory of reception, and we will discuss this in relation to what Iser has called indeterminacy (Unbestimmtheit) of the text.

According to Iser (1970) all literary texts are “open” and contain gaps (Leerstellen) that have to be filled by the reader. “The openness of fictional texts can only be eliminated by the act of reading” (Iser as quoted by Fokkema & Ibsch, 1995: 146). Indeterminacies can be filled in with meaning by the ideal reader. Jauss shares Iser’s conception of indeterminacy but he views the concept in historical-collective rather than in individual terms. “He admits that the open structure characterized by indeterminacy makes new interpretations continually possible.”

from the new concept of an aesthetics of reception (Rezeptions- und Wirkungsaesthetik). It required the history of literature and the arts to be seen henceforth as a process of aesthetic communication in which the three logically distinguishable entities – author, work and recipient (reader, listener or observer, critic or audience) – participate in equal measure” [my italics].


30 The essay is entitled “The Poetic Text within the Change of Horizons of Reading: The Example of Baudelaire’s ’Spleen II’.”
But on the other hand he maintains that limits are placed on the sheer arbitrariness of interpretations by the historical conditions of question and answer” (Jauss as quoted by Fokkema & Ibsch, 1995: 146-147). It is here that the author may have a function, namely to prevent historically inadequate interpretations (Jannidis et al., 1999: 20).

Iser’s interest lays primarily in the interaction of text and reader; the author seems to be of no importance here. Hannelore Link on the other hand interprets Iser’s indeterminacy of the text not in terms of resulting from the formal nature of the text (as Iser does), but exclusively as a conscious strategy of the author (Link, 1980 [1976]). It would be interesting to investigate empirically whether readers interpret specific “gaps” in the text as a deliberate strategy of the author. Do they regard certain empty places as an invitation of the author to “solve” the mystery, much like a detective looking for clues? For empirical research we need the flesh-and-blood reader, thus, the empirical reader. However, Iser’s reader is in the first place a function of the text, an ideal of how a reader should act. Therefore some have criticized reception aesthetics for merely suggesting to refer to models of reading (for instance Iser’s interaction between text and reader) while their reader remains a theoretical construction. “In accordance with the hermeneutic tradition, the notions of reader and of reading construction were applied as an instrument for text interpretation” (Andringa, 1994: 2267).

Norbert Groeben (and Siegfried Schmidt) criticized the predominantly text-based analysis of literary reception theories and claimed instead to do empirical reader research. The aim was to increase the verifiability and empirical testability of literary interpretation. In order to reach this goal the idea of the autonomy of the text had to be abandoned. In the 1970s a lot of discussion is going on in German literary theory about methodology. To Norbert Groeben it is clear that the so-called werkimmanente Ästhetik (work immanent aesthetics) is a paradigm in crisis and the question arises in what direction a shift in paradigm should take place. The solution that Jauss offers (a reception aesthetic paradigm) is unacceptable from a methodological point of view: Groeben indeed goes along with Jauss to the point that the reader should be included in literary research, yet he has the empirical reader in mind:

...die Rezeptionsästhetik ... ist nur die hermeneutikinterne Antwort auf die ungelöste Methodenkrise der Literaturwissenschaft – wenn auch innerhalb des hermeneutischen Ansatzes sicherlich die zur Zeit wichtigste Antwort […]. Gleichzeitig aber entsteht für die Literaturwissenschaft durch die interdisziplinäre Einbettung in andere Wissenschaften wie die Linguistik und Sozialwissenschaften eine ‘revolutionäre’ Dynamik: und diese weist eindeutig auf eine Empirisierung hin!. […]reception aesthetics … is merely the hermeneutic answer to the unsolved crisis in the methodology of literary criticism – and for the time being also the most important answer to the hermeneutic framework […]. At the same time a ‘revolutionary’ dynamics is developing for literary criticism because of the interdisciplinary embedding in other sciences such as linguistics and social sciences. And this points without doubt to an ‘empiricalisation’!] (Groeben, 1977).

Groeben sees an opportunity for literary studies to function as a subdiscipline of an empirical social science of communication. In empirical studies one has to respect intersubjectivity and

---

31 Reader Response Criticism is often regarded as the Anglo-Saxon version of reception aesthetics as both have the same point of departure, namely the interaction between text and reader. However, Reader Response Criticism is interested in the individual, empirical reader. Most notable representatives are Norman Holland and Stanley Fish, who are both interested in the empirical reader because of their background in didactics and psychoanalysis.
testability; in an empirical study of literature this should be accomplished by using “perceptible” data; that is, data relating to the empirical reader such as reader characteristics or reception processes (ibid.).

In the context of the current study it is interesting to see which role the empirical author has in an empirical study of literature. Groeben himself – in reply to Hannelore Link’s statement that in order to achieve an adequate reception one has to reconstruct the authorial intention (Groeben, 1970: 45-46) – argues that the reconstruction of authorial intentions can hardly be theoretically justified; a literary text can mean more or less than an author intended. In addition, it raises the question on what data a construction of authorial intention should be based (ibid., 47). Only human acts can be empirically investigated (mainly in sociology and psychology), such seems impossible for intentions. Furthermore, literature is subject dependent; an author cannot code invariable meanings into a text, since attribution of meaning is dependent of continually changing modes of consciousness; this holds both for the author’s writing process and for the reader’s reading process (Jannidis et al., 1999).

It seems strange that an empirical study of literature, at least in the definition of Groeben, seems to dismiss the author and his or her intentions altogether from the empirical stage of research. Siegfried Schmidt does acknowledge that the author is part of the literary system (Produktion), but he does not test his claims empirically. As I will try to make clear in section 6, an empirical approach of authorial intentions is possible if these are regarded as assumptions made by the empirical reader. For instance, we can take the concept of horizon of expectations and specify this in line of Karl Robert Mandelkow as readers’ expectations regarding the period, work and author respectively, with the aim of disclosing certain dominants of reception (Fokkema & Ibsch, 1995: 148). As we will see from the findings of experiments that I conducted – especially those reported on in Chapter 3 through 5 – it is possible to manipulate readers’ expectations of the author and thereby influence their reception process. Notice that from the perspective of the reader it is irrelevant whether a perceived communicative intention of an author is in line with an original intention of the historical author. What is of importance here is the question whether readers’ assumed communicative intentions of an author play a role in the reading process involving literature. An empirical approach, and especially a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary one, offers the opportunity to bypass the heated discussion that has been dominating literary theory for a long time and investigate whether real, i.e. empirical, readers agree with the normative belief that the author should be or is dismissed from interpretation.

An empirical approach to an author’s presumed communicative intentions as part of the reading process touches upon the discipline of cognitive psychology and theories on discourse processing. Both disciplines do not shy away from studying intentions and perception of these. In order to answer the above-mentioned question, I think it is necessary, or perhaps almost insuperable, to define reader’s assumptions about the author during the process of reading from a cognitive psychological, or discourse processing, perspective. Therefore, the next section will outline some of the theoretical implications of a cognitive approach to the generation of communicative intentions in discourse processing.

---

32 Schmidt and Zobel (1983) have tried to investigate empirically personality variables of German writers. This turned out to be difficult, for one because one group of participants started to question the test itself as well as the way some of the items were formulated (Groeben, 2001; Schmidt & Zobel, 1983).

33 See also Els Andringa’s criticism on Schmidt’s concept of the literary system: “Bestimmte Gattungen, aber auch bestimmte Handlungen werden von der Definition des literarischen Systems ausgeschlossen, die dadurch einen normativen Charakter erhält. Als Handlung bliebe zum Beispiel die durchaus übliche Suche nach Parallelen zwischen einem Werk und der Biographie eines Autors unbeachtet, weil sie nicht in das Bild der Ästhetischen Konvention hineinpassen würde” (Andringa, 2000).
4. Discourse processes – the author as inference-category

Consider the following passage that is taken from the novel *Life of Pi* by the Canadian author Yann Martel.\(^{34}\) The novel is about a young Indian boy, named Piscine, whose parents own a zoo. Curious as he is, this boy one day enters a catholic church and he starts having a conversation with Father Martin who tells him a story.

And what a story. The first thing that drew me in was disbelief. What? Humanity sins but it’s God’s Son who pays the price? I tried to imagine Father saying to me, “Piscine, a lion slipped into the llama pen today and killed two llamas. Yesterday another killed a black buck. Last week two of them ate the camel. The week before it was painted storks and grey herons. And who’s to say for sure who snacked on our golden agouti? The situation has become intolerable. Something must be done. I have decided that the only way the lions can atone for their sins is if I feed you to them.”

“Yes, Father, that would be the right and logical thing to do. Give me a moment to wash up.”

“Hallelujah, my son.”

“Hallelujah, Father.”

In order to understand this text excerpt readers have to infer more information than that is explicitly mentioned. First of all we have to recognize that the story Father Martin must have told is the passion of Christ. Secondly, when we read “Father” we might interpret this as Father Martin. But it seems odd that Father Martin would know so much about animals in a zoo. We have to infer that “Father” refers to Piscine’s father. Throughout the book Yann Martel uses a capital letter every time Piscine mentions his father, which makes it less easy to generate the appropriate inference (Father = father of Piscine). The same applies to the information about the zoo. In order to understand this excerpt we again have to connect information – the parents of Piscine own a zoo – mentioned earlier in the book to this specific fragment. At the sentence and word level we have to resolve each instance of “it” and “another” to the correct referent.

Discourse-processing theories assume that readers generate different types of inferences during reading processes (e.g. Graesser et al., 1995; Graesser et al., 1994; Keenan et al., 1990; Magliano & Graesser, 1991; McKoon & Ratcliff, 1992; Singer, 1994). Roger Schank even called inference the “core of the understanding process” (Singer, 1994: 479). It is assumed that as we proceed through the text, such as the passage about Piscine, we draw on our background knowledge to identify relations that are implied by the text.\(^{35}\) In order to make sense of the text we have to generate different types of inferences that are necessary to establish a coherent mental representation of the text. Discourse theorists agree that this mental representation has different levels: the *surface code* preserves the exact wording and syntax of the text, the *text base* contains the explicit propositions, and the *situation model* can be compared to a mental micro-world that contains the characters, spatial layout, and actions and so on.\(^{36}\) Important to the present study is that some theorists distinguish a fourth level: the *communicative context model*, “representing speech acts and their underlying intentions, as well as other information about speaker, hearer and context” (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983).

---


\(^{35}\) Cf. Iser’s assumption that readers have to fill in the gaps in a text (*Leerstellen*), see previous section.

\(^{36}\) The text base is said to contain also a small number of inferences that are needed to establish text coherence, such as anaphoric inferences (Graesser & Tipping, 1998).
Unfortunately Van Dijk and Kintsch do not elaborate on this model in theoretical or empirical detail, and no explicit theory about how context constrains the production and comprehension of discourse has been developed yet. Van Dijk, however, has made an effort to examine how contexts, i.e. subjective interpretations of context by discourse participants, constrain discourse production and understanding (Van Dijk, 1999, 2004, 2006). I will explain more about Van Dijk’s theoretical assumptions about context models as well as how readers of literature may construct context models during reading in section 6 Taking position.

“Author intent and attitude”

The term inference refers to the information that is activated during reading, but that is not explicitly stated in the text (Van den Broek, 1994: 556). We can generate all kinds of inferences. In the example taken from Life of Pi, for instance, we have to generate anaphoric relations (them in “...I feed you to them” anaphorically refers to lions) and causal inferences (we have to infer that because the lions have killed animals, Piscine has to be fed to them, even if this seems a strange, though humorous, logic). Based on the entire passage we can also infer that Yann Martel wants to show us how bizarre the story in the Bible actually is when one comes to think of it. This would be a type of inference that Joe Magliano and Art Graesser have called Author’s intent (Magliano & Graesser, 1991).37 They present a taxonomy that contains eleven inference categories, some of which are of particular interest to literary studies such as theme, reader emotions and author’s intent.38 Unfortunately these inferences have not been addressed by most psychological theories of inference generation and should deserve more attention from psychologists (Magliano et al., 1996). According to Magliano and Graesser, readers are assumed to generate author intent inferences “when they infer the point that the author is making” (ibid., 211). In the 1994 article by Art Graesser, Murray Singer and Tom Trabasso, this category of inferences is described as “the author’s attitude or motive in writing” and the text that elicits this inference is “the entire passage” (Graesser et al., 1994: 375).

The taxonomy is related to the constructionist theory which makes decisive predictions about which knowledge-based inferences are generated on-line during the comprehension of narrative text. The constructionist theory seems to be the only theory on discourse processing that explicitly includes author intent inferences. It embraces the search after meaning principle which assumes that readers attempt to construct a meaning representation that successively addresses the reader’s goals, is coherent and explains why actions, events, and states are mentioned in the text.39 The theory predicts that, under most processing conditions, some specific types of inferences are generated on-line: causal antecedents, superordinate goals and character emotion, and there is empirical support for this prediction (Graesser et al., 1994).40

Unfortunately, the theory does not offer a decisive prediction for author intent and attitude inferences. The writers themselves acknowledge that readers are expected to generate inferences about the author’s intent and attitude, because “it explains why an author expresses particular clauses in the text or why the author wrote the text” (Graesser et al., 1994: 382). Nevertheless, they mention several reasons for being pessimistic about the likelihood that

37 Though intent and intention refer to the same, I prefer to use the more commonly used phrase intention.
38 These inferences are also called knowledge-based inferences. “Knowledge-based inferences require access to world knowledge in addition to the linguistic elements in the text. Specifically, knowledge-based inferences are directly inherited from the knowledge structures that are relevant to the text” (Magliano et al., 1996).
39 In Graesser, Bertus & Magliano (1995) this principle is called effort after meaning. The authors emphasize that the principle “involves effort, not necessarily an achievement” (Graesser et al., 1995: 302).
40 “The constructionist theory predicts that superordinate goals and character emotions are normally generated on-line because the reader attempts to achieve global coherence”(Graesser et al., 1995: 304).
these inferences will be generated on-line. First, they think that there rarely is a rich pragmatic context that anchors the communication between author and reader and furthermore the author normally is invisible to the reader. Thus, they say, there is very little information to support such inferences. However, when there is a rich pragmatic context, such as “a letter to a friend” or “a politician writing a story”, readers are predicted to generate on-line inferences about author intent and attitude. Second, readers may fail to achieve a globally coherent interpretation of the text, and “establishing a globally coherent message is presumably a prerequisite or corequisite of computing author intent and attitude” (ibid.). Third, people normally do not construct author intent and attitude in everyday life, so this may not be an overlearned cognitive skill.

I am not really convinced by these arguments. First of all, as we have seen in the second section of this chapter, readers, and especially literary readers, may very well have rich information about a text’s or novel’s author. Due to television performances, interviews, biographies and so on, readers can have all sorts of information available that can support inferences related to authorial intent or attitude. Of course the pragmatic context is not as rich as is for instance the context in a telephone conversation with a friend, but reading a book may sometimes be like reading a letter from a friend or listening to a story that is told by a familiar person. As I will explain in Chapter 3, reading a fictional text is based on an agreement between the author and the reader (joint pretence) which creates a pragmatic context that anchors the (temporal) communicative situation.

The second reason that Graesser et al. (1994) mention is that readers possibly fail to establish a global coherent interpretation of the text. However, their category of author intent and attitude inferences is ill-defined; it corresponds to the gist of the text, the puny statement of a text’s theme. Of course, in order to say what an author may have intended in terms of a theme, a reader has to have some kind of globally coherent interpretation of the text. However, it is possible that readers generate inferences that relate to the author’s intentions and attitude based on a single sentence or clause. These may trigger author inferences, and the extra information provided by these inferences may be permanently retained in memory (encoded) or only used to temporarily aid comprehension (merely activation). For instance, remember the word “snacked” in the sentence “And who’s to say for sure who snacked on our golden agouti?” taken from the Life of Pi – passage. Yann Martel could have chosen to write “who ate our golden agouti”, but by using “snacked” he adds a humorous effect to the sentence. It seems plausible that readers recognize or at least assume a humorous intention by generating the appropriate inference. Graesser et al. (1994) themselves after all do mention that author intent and attitude inferences explain “why an author expresses a particular clause in the text”. In the case of fictional narratives for that matter this phrase could also be replaced by: the inference explains why the author has his or her character or narrator express etcetera. Furthermore, it may very well be that inferences related to author intent and attitude, contribute to a local and global coherent meaning representation of the text instead of the other way round, as Graesser et al. (1994) even seem to imply themselves. They present a processing model for the constructionist theory “in order to clarify what cognitive mechanisms would be involved in the production of inferences” (p.380). There are six production rules that model the process of explanation and the establishing of global coherence. One of these production rules “generates inferences that explain why statements are explicitly mentioned in the text”. The cognitive process that occurs is described as “explain[ing] why the writer mentions S [explicit statement S]” (p.381). In other words: these inferences seem to explain why a writer explicitly mentions a statement in the text and they are generated in order to establish global coherence.

Linda Flower argues in favor of a broader definition of authorial intent (Flower, 1987). Unfortunately she does not elaborate on how this definition should be extended.
As for the last reason Graesser et al. (1994) mention, there is support for the idea that perceiving or attributing communicative intentions to human and nonhuman behaviour is part of our everyday life experience, and we do so in order to understand the world around us (e.g. Dennett, 1987; Heider & Simmel, 1944). It is likely that the attribution of communicative intentions to an author of a text is overlearned, or routine if you like, and therefore it seems reasonable that readers automatically and unconsciously infer communicative intentions while reading texts. However, these are all empirical questions and unfortunately, so far, not many researchers – both in the field of discourse processing and literary studies – have addressed these questions empirically. I will return to this more extensively in section 6.

The constructionist theory is one of several theories that involve inference generation during comprehension of narrative text. However, it is the only theory in the field of cognitive theory that explicitly includes “author intent and attitude” as a class of inferences that are potentially generated during the reading of narrative text. Most theories on text comprehension agree that inferential processes during reading are central to the study of discourse comprehension and that the concept ‘inference’ refers to information that is activated during reading, but that is not explicitly stated in the text. However, the question what types of inferences readers normally construct during the process of comprehension has stimulated debates in cognitive science. I will briefly describe the most influential positions.

There is one extreme position, called the promiscuous inference generation hypothesis according to which readers would encode all classes of inferences while reading a (narrative) text. A reader is supposed to construct a detailed mental representation of the text – about the characters, spatial layout, setting, actions etcetera – including the pragmatic exchanges between the author and the reader. Cognitive scientists, however, do not believe that the promiscuous inference generation hypothesis is plausible; there would be a serious computational problem if all inferences were generated in real time (Graesser & Tipping, 1998). The other extreme position is the text-based model that – in its most stringent version – predicts that readers do not generate any knowledge-based inferences during comprehension (Graesser et al., 1994: 383). A somewhat less extreme position is offered by Roger Ratcliff and Gail McKoon who, as a radical alternative to the promiscuous inference generation hypothesis, proposed a minimalist hypothesis. The theory predicts that in the absence of specific goal-directed strategic processes, comparatively few inferences are generated on-line (automatically encoded); only those that are needed to establish local text coherence and those that are based on information readily available in working memory. In case of local coherence breaks, readers can generate inferences strategically. The minimalist hypothesis denies that comprehenders create globally coherent structures or situation models, unless their goals facilitate such constructions. Ratcliff and McKoon make no predictions about what types of inferences could be strategically generated on-line, but one could imagine that local coherence breaks, such as deviations from text norms, may cause readers to infer author intent. Furthermore, the reading of literature, or any text, may imply a default process: a goal-directed strategic process focused on the construction of an authorial intention or a message. If so, the predictions of the minimalist hypothesis would not hold true, since they are only valid in the absence of these processes. Several other objections have been raised concerning
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42 Cf. (Blakemore & Decety, 2001; Sabbagh, 1999).
43 This question is closely related to methodological issues (Keenan et al., 1990). Karl Haberlandt formulates the relation as follows: “Theories and methods in cognitive science depend on one another; in reading research too, methods serve theoretical goals while research paradigms are based on theoretical assumptions” (Haberlandt, 1994).
44 Although Magliano & Graesser (1991) state that a text-based model predicts that “readers are capable of generating only referential bridging inferences” (Magliano & Graesser, 1991: 212).
the minimalist approach’s assumptions, the main objection being its denial that readers inferentially construct a global situation model (e.g. Singer et al., 1994).  

**Literary comprehension**

It is important to point out that the majority of the studies mentioned thus far did not investigate inference generation in the context of literary texts. The presented discourse processing theories make predictions about inferences that are expected to be generated during the reading of narrative text. Theoretically text refers to all kinds of text types, ranging from a short story to a newspaper article to even a single sentence. In most studies, though, texts are artificial, experimenter-generated texts. The most significant reason for experimenters to construct text stimuli themselves is to maintain maximum control. However, as Paul van den Broek, and his colleagues Rohleder and Narváez have explained, the use of these so-called textoids has important implications for the validity of any conclusion about reading and communicative discourse. For instance, the author’s intentions in these generated texts are usually limited to simply creating a text that has certain properties, while from a psychological theoretical perspective

...the obvious absence of intentions, purposes or hidden meanings on the part of the author are likely to affect the comprehension process in which the reader will engage ... As a consequence, a description of the cognitive processes during reading that is based on experiments with nonnaturalistic texts only will be an impoverished one because it is likely to omit central inferences that the reader makes about the author’s purposes and consequently about inferences that are generated in response to the textual information itself (Van den Broek et al., 1994).

This could be an explanation for the fact that author inferences thus far have not had much theoretical and empirical attention from the discourse field; the interest is with other types of inferences that can be demonstrated more easily, preferably by using experimenter-generated texts. Furthermore, these texts do not invoke readers to get involved in, for instance, moral implication which, as the results of the experiments reported on in Chapters 4 through 6 will show, may trigger readers to generate author inferences.

Since the focus of the present study is mainly on literary texts, it is necessary to consider whether there are specific qualities of literary texts and what effects these may have on the processing of such texts. Rolf Zwaan for instance claims that “contemporary models of text comprehension are not well equipped to account for the comprehension of literary texts” (Zwaan, 1996: 241). One of the reasons is that these models presuppose that texts are “considerate”, while literary texts often are deliberately constructed to be “inconsiderate” (ibid.). The terms inconsiderate and considerate are often used in the context of education and especially in relation to the reading of textbooks and the development of reading skills. Considerate texts are defined as those that possess text-based features such as elements of text organization, explication of ideas, control of conceptual density, incorporation of instructional
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45 Other theories that can be mentioned are the node-activation models, event focus model, current-state selection strategy, prediction - substantiation models (Graesser et al., 1994; Magliano & Graesser, 1991); as well as the event-indexing model (Zwaan et al., 1995) and the landscape model (Van den Broek et al., 1999). All of the theories mentioned have different predictions about what inferences are generated on-line, but none of these theories explicitly include inferences related to the author of a text.

46 For a discussion on the reasons and ramifications of experimenter-generated texts I refer to (Magliano & Graesser, 1991).
devices that facilitate information gathering (e.g. Schumm et al., 1991). Inconsiderate texts do not have these features and usually require a much greater effort from their readers than considerate texts. Literary texts may contain several devices that distort the comprehension process in order to produce an aesthetic and emotional experience in the reader. Russian formalists like Viktor Šklovsky called this quality of literary texts “estrangement” (Shklovsky, 1965). In prose one can think of literary devices such as flash back and flash forward, unusual narrative perspectives and open endings. Furthermore, literary texts usually are considerably more complex than non-naturalistic texts; they contain multiple protagonists with different intentions and goals, they have strongly interwoven causal chains and are characterized by many unexpected turns (Van den Broek et al., 1996).

The fact that literary texts often are inconsiderate in the sense that they are deliberately incoherent and ambiguous is expected to have consequences for the way readers process these types of text. As mentioned before, most models of text comprehension assume that texts are considerate; for instance, the main point of a text should be clear from the outset of a text. In contrast, the main point of a literary text is sometimes revealed at the very end of the text, such as, for instance in Borges’ *Everything and Nothing*, or often is not explicitly stated at all. Rolf Zwaan proposes a model that does take inconsiderateness into account; his main assumption is that readers develop a cognitive control system for specific types of discourse. In case of literary texts he assumes that experienced readers develop a literary control system by reading literature and through training in high school and college, and this control system monitors the comprehension of inconsiderate text. Zwaan has conducted several experiments to test the hypothesis that readers use a literary control system during the reading of literary texts. In these experiments two groups of readers were asked to read text fragments that were taken from literary novels and newspapers. However, each group received different information on the genre these fragments were supposedly representing: literature vs. newspaper (e.g. Zwaan, 1993). Remember that discourse theorists generally assume that readers construct a mental representation of the text that includes a surface level, text base and situation model. Zwaan found that the inconsiderate character of literary texts affects the construction of all three representation levels, as well as reading time. In short, he found that readers in the literary condition read slower, constructed a stronger surface structure representation, remembered causally unimportant information better and constructed a weaker situation model than readers in the news condition. These results suggest that “there may be a literary mode of text comprehension” (Zwaan, 1996: 250).

In line with Zwaan’s assumption that literary texts differ from non-literary texts, i.e. newspaper articles, in their degree of inconsiderateness and consequently the processing involved, Paul van den Broek et al. conclude that “…both intuitive analyses of literary text and recent results of experimental studies of reading of literary texts suggest that inferential activities are considerably more extensive during the reading of naturalistic texts than during the reading of experimenter-generated texts” (Van den Broek et al., 1994). One of the reasons is that literary texts are often more interesting and longer which causes readers to get more involved in the fictional world, in other words these texts require a relative high reader involvement. Furthermore, natural texts “…frequently provoke a unique literary experience such as the perception of closure, aesthetic appeal, and moral implication, which directly depends on and therefore encourages inferential processes” (ibid.).

It is important to keep in mind that the theoretical discussion in literary scholarship that I outlined in the first sections is approached very differently by discourse psychology, namely from an empirical perspective.

“The Intentionalist Fallacy may be a sin in the arena of literary criticism, but it is not a worry of the discourse psychologist. Discourse psychologists can postulate
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the existence of goals, attitudes, and beliefs in the minds of writers and readers, and then perform empirical tests on the existence of such knowledge states.” (Graesser et al., 2001b)

In summary, most discourse theories hardly address the types of inferences that are of importance to the study of literature, such as author intent inferences. Most importantly, only the constructionist theory considers author intent and attitude as a class of inferences that readers potentially generate during the reading of narrative texts (Graesser et al., 1994; Magliano & Graesser, 1991) and specifically literary texts (Magliano et al., 1996). Unfortunately there hardly is any theoretical elaboration considering author intent inferences or empirical research investigating the role of readers’ assumptions on communicative intentions and attitude of the author in the reading process. Given the theoretical assumptions about author inferences that have been presented in this section, and assuming that readers can potentially generate this class of inferences, the question whether author inferences play a part in the reading process, and if so, what role or function they have, is an empirical one. In the next section I will present empirical research in which the communicative intentions of an author are (somehow) taken into account.

5. Empirical research on the “author”

In the previous sections we have come across several claims about the position of authorial intentions in the interpretation of literary texts on the one hand and in cognitive processes that occur during the reading of (literary) texts on the other. Remember, for instance, Roland Barthes who declared the Death of the Author and suggested that “the text is henceforth made and read in such a way that at all its levels the author is absent”. Several comparable claims have been made by theorists on how literary texts should be read, but there has hardly been any empirical research on how readers actually read literary texts, let alone on whether they are able to or willing to dismiss the author from the reading process.

The few empirical studies that are available investigated readers’ assumptions on communicative intentions of the author (e.g. Gibbs et al., 1991; Pfaff & Gibbs, 1997). Other empirical research regards reading strategies of which one strategy is related to authorial intentions (Vipond & Hunt, 1989) as well as studies that are positioned in an educational context (Beck et al., 1996; Haas & Flower, 1988; Nolen, 1995; Paxton, 1997). However none of the work mentioned has investigated the position or function of readers’ presumed authorial intentions in the comprehension of (complex) literary texts. I will briefly discuss the available research.

Authorial intentions in reading satirical stories

Kerry Pfaff and Raymond Gibbs investigated to what extent ordinary readers are aware of authorial intentions when they read satirical stories (e.g. Gibbs et al., 1991; Pfaff & Gibbs, 1997). They presumed that in order to understand the point of satire readers require some assessment of what an author intends to communicate. In the first experiment the goal was to get a general idea of how readers think about authors of satirical stories and how readers’ perceptions of the author and the story change in the light of new information about an author’s intent. Participants read five satirical fairy tales such as a story about three little pigs who live in harmony with their environment until one day along comes a big, bad wolf with expansionist ideas. After reading a story participants had to write down the point of the story and were asked whether they questioned what the author was trying to do and how they would describe the author. Next they were given information that the stories were intended to be
satirical critiques of political correctness. Participants then reread the stories and answered the questions again. Pfaff and Gibbs found that 92% of the participants reported points that referred to the author’s intentions (allegorical and satire), but only 23% recognized that the author had satirical intentions and that the object was political correctness. Not surprisingly, only when participants were explicitly told that the stories were intended as satires of political correctness did they tend to mention satire in their answers. Pfaff and Gibbs concluded that readers may not recover the satirical intention or the correct object of satire, but “they still try to construct a coherent picture of the author and what he might have intended” (p. 55).

In the second experiment Pfaff and Gibbs explored which cues readers use in interpreting an author’s satirical intent. Participants had to read a single satirical story, answer the same questions as in the first experiment plus some questions regarding the readers’ perceptions of the story in terms of how funny, poetic, and satirical they considered the story to be. After this, participants were informed that the stories were intended as satirical critiques of political correctness and were asked to what degree they were aware of this and what cues led to the belief that the author was poking fun at political correctness. Participants overall rated the story to be satirical and “repeated use of politically correct terminology and blatant exaggeration in the story were the most recognizable cues to the author’s purpose” (p.59). Interestingly, Pfaff and Gibbs found that “the events and description that the satirist uses are sometimes taken as sincere expressions of his or her view” instead of the object of satire. Possibly, reader’s own views and morals can sometimes bias them and are subsequently projected onto the author.

The goal of the third and last experiment was to examine how both readers’ knowledge about an author’s attitudes and opinions on the one hand, and readers’ own opinions and attitudes on the other affect the way they interpret satire. Participants were asked to adopt one of three political positions – conservative, liberal or neutral – and were told that the author also embraced one of these positions. Readers who were conservative themselves and thought the author was conservative as well were expected to be more inclined to interpret the story as poking fun at political correctness than for instance liberal readers who thought the author was liberal as well. After reading a story participants were asked to judge to what extent the author might have intended a presented point of the story such as “The point was to make fun of imperialists”. The results showed that “readers use the information about the author to constrain their judgments about the meaning of the stories” (p.63). Results of a separate analysis on the point “to satirize political correctness” showed that readers thought it significantly more likely that a conservative author intended to satirize political correctness than when the author was liberal. Together these results are said to support the idea that readers often draw specific inferences about author intent when they read satirical stories and that information about an author is used to interpret these texts.

What is specifically interesting about these findings is that readers seem to use information about the author to constrain the number of possible interpretations of the text. Perhaps author intent inferences, in a more general sense, function as a constraining principle in interpreting (literary) narrative texts. As Gibbs has stated, “Readers’ interpretations of texts depend on their inferences about a hypothetical author found in the linguistic conventions and artistic practices at the time the author wrote the work, as well as in publicly available knowledge of how the text was created” (Gibbs, 2001: 262). Others have also suggested that certain factors such as readers’ assumptions about the original historical context limit the number of possible interpretations of a (literary) text (cf. Levinson, 1992). In the context of literary theory, i.e. reception aesthetics, Robert Jauss attributed the empirical author with the

47 Ansgar Nünning suggests something similar from an author’s perspective in the context of unreliable narrators: “...(implied) authors, impose multiple constraints on the ways in which narrators are processed” (Nünning, 2005: 104).
function of limiting a text’s meaning by historical fixation: “…der Autorbezug dient aber (mindestens) zur Ausgrenzung historisch nicht adäquater Rezeptionsergebnisse” (Jannidis et al., 1999: 20). I will elaborate on the constraining function of context, which includes the author as well as social-cultural features, in section 6.

Finally, I would like to remark that Pfaff and Gibbs seem convinced that the author of the text samples they used in their study intended to poke fun at political correctness. Of course, the title ‘Politically Correct Bedtime Stories’ gives away something. In addition Pfaff and Gibbs refer to the author’s preface in which he explicitly formulates his intentions. Still, usually, and supporters of the Intentional Fallacy would agree on this, it is very difficult to determine whether and when readers have grasped the author’s original intention, especially since authors themselves are not always clear, or honest, on their original intentions (see the subsection false intentions), or their intentions change over the course of time. Besides, authors of post-modern fiction have frequently displayed explicit intentions or directions on how readers should approach or read the text, such as “this story is based on true events”, which are at least to be taken with some suspicion. However, the point is that readers do infer intentions, whether or not these may be guessed right or wrong. Nevertheless Pfaff and Gibbs’ findings provide an interesting contribution to the empirical research on author (intent) inferences in the reading of narrative texts.

Authorial intentions in understanding metaphors

Another empirical study in which it is assumed that understanding of (literary) discourse demands some recognition of a speaker’s or writer’s intention is conducted by Raymond Gibbs, Julia Kushner and Rob Mills (1991). Authorial intentions are thought to have an important role in readers’ comprehension of metaphors. In three experiments Gibbs et al. investigated the effect of authorial intentions on the interpretation of metaphorical, literal and anomalous statements. Participants were presented with a random list of metaphorical (e.g. “A smile is like a magnet”), literal (“A stream is like a river”) and anomalous (“A library is like a suburb”) comparisons. They were either told that the comparisons were composed by famous 20th century poets or by a computer program called CHAOS that randomly generated the statements from a list of different words. The first experiment assessed the meaningfulness participants attributed to the different comparisons on a scale from 1 (not very meaningful) to 7 (very meaningful), given the information about one of the authorial agents. The results showed that metaphorical and literal comparisons were considered more meaningful when they were supposedly written by 20th century poets than when they were generated by a computer program. No differences were found for anomalous comparisons. Gibbs et al. concluded that “the implied presence of an intentional agent (the poets) clearly facilitated participants’ interpretations of the metaphorical and literal statements”. However, it is the degree of meaningfulness, not facilitation that is measured.

The second experiment examined facilitation of judgment of the comparisons. Participants were presented different types of comparisons and had to judge as fast as possible whether the presented comparison was meaningful or non-meaningful. Speed is supposed to indicate or reflect the degree of facilitation of judgment. The prediction was that metaphorical statements in the poet condition would be easier to judge as meaningful compared to the computer condition, while anomalous statements were expected to be judged faster as non-meaningful in the computer condition. Readers were expected to be looking longer for an intention in the poet condition; “there must be a reason why the poet makes this comparison”. Results showed that readers indeed were faster in judging metaphorical statements in the poet condition than in the computer condition. Interestingly, it took readers longer to judge literal comparisons when these were presented in the poet condition than in the computer condition.
Furthermore, readers were equally fast in judging metaphorical and literal comparisons as meaningful when these were presented in the poet condition. These results indicate that when statements are thought to be written by a poet, i.e. an intentional agent, readers expect the statements to be meaningful even though these statements do not seem meaningful at first sight, for instance a literal statement such as “A stream is like a river”.

The third experiment investigated whether readers produce more varied meanings or interpretations for the comparisons when these are supposedly written by an intentional agent (poet) than when these are generated by an unintentional source (computer program). Participants were asked to read each comparison and “to think about what the poet or computer possibly meant when writing each comparison” (p.23) and to write down as many interpretations they could think of. Results showed that more interpretations were produced when comparisons were presented in the poet condition than when these were presented in the computer condition. Most interpretations were produced for metaphorical comparisons and least for anomalous comparisons. Obviously computer programs do not mean anything, because they are inanimate and therefore cannot have intentions. That is the very reason Gibbs et al. included this condition. Nevertheless, participants apparently have come up with possible interpretations for the computer generated comparisons, since the mean number of interpretations in the computer conditions exceeded zero. The results show that we can easily attribute intentions, even to non-intentional agents such as a computer (cf. Dennett, 1987). In addition Gibbs et al. make the interesting prediction that “as people become increasingly familiar with authors, and learn more about their biographies and the cultural-historical context in which they write, readers’ interpretations of metaphors should be even more tightly and immediately constrained”. It would be interesting to test this prediction in the context of literary texts, for instance, investigate whether knowledge about an author’s personal life, such as in the Demidenko case (section 2), constrains readers’ interpretations of an author’s (literary) text.

“Author-driven” reading strategies

In 1984 Douglas Vipond and Russell Hunt presented three forms of reading, one of which was called point-driven reading; readers are supposed to read with the expectation that an author has intended the text to contain a point. Vipond and Hunt regard this form of reading especially useful for reading literary texts48; although they acknowledge in their 1989 article: “In practice, the different types seldom or never exist in pure form; they often overlap or succeed one another during a given instance of reading” (Vipond & Hunt, 1989: 157). Point-driven reading differs from both information-driven reading, which is directed at acquiring information from the text, “to carry something away from it” (ibid.), and story-driven reading, which tends to emphasize plot, character and event and is supposed to neglect the specific discourse that is used to describe the events in the story world. It is important to note that Vipond and Hunt assume that readers who read in a story-driven way do not infer author intent. They “would not find it necessary to construct a model of the author: the story seems to exist, and can be enjoyed, quite independently of any implied author” (Vipond & Hunt, 1984: 269). Unfortunately, Vipond and Hunt do not test this assumption empirically. The same argument is applied to information-driven reading. For instance, they argue that reading a bus schedule does not require seeing the “text” as a pragmatic gesture. I think that a person

48 Although their view is that there is no such thing as literary texts. “It is unlikely that there are any textual properties that are unequivocally associated with literariness (Pratt, 1977). In any case, we consider it more useful to regard ‘literary’ as a way of reading rather than a property of texts” (Vipond & Hunt, 1984: Note 1). Presumably any text can be read in a literary way. However, empirical research has shown that the range of texts that readers accept as literary is actually constrained (Zwaan, 1993).
waiting for a bus ("a reader") who wants to know what time the bus is arriving has to recognize in the first place that the table he or she is looking at is a bus schedule. Recognizing the table as a bus schedule means that the "reader" has inferred that this table is put there by the bus company with the intention to inform passengers. Because this is common knowledge and part of our taking a bus schema or script it may seem that people just read for information, but that does not mean they do not infer communicative intentions.

Vipond and Hunt draw empirically testable hypotheses from the assumption that readers normally read stories in a point-driven way, meaning that readers "attempt to assemble a pragmatic frame in which a point can be successfully constructed" (ibid.). Each form of reading is considered to be made-up of a set of characteristic (unconscious and unintentional) strategies. Point-driven reading is characterized by coherence, narrative surface and transactional strategies. A reader who reads in a point-driven way presumably will try to construct a global speech act and consequently will attempt to establish global coherence. Vipond and Hunt hypothesize that this reader therefore will tend to delay closure and hold information longer in working memory and make more effort to integrate apparently unrelated details, while story-driven and information-driven readers are expected to reject uninteresting or seemingly irrelevant information rather soon (cf. Zwaan, 1996). Narrative surface refers to the way a story is described, such as the point of view, tone and diction. Point-driven readers are expected to be more sensitive to stylistic features, and thus have a better memory for them. These readers are expected to explain narrative surface in terms of authorial intentions, whereas story-driven readers would not notice stylistic features at all, "or, if they were noticed, would be taken as evidence of the author’s carelessness or incompetence" (p. 271). The last type of strategy (transactional strategies) rests on the assumption that point-driven readers implicitly realize that the text is an artifact that is constructed by an author who has certain intentions. Consequently, these readers – as opposed to story-driven and information-driven readers – are likely to notice discrepancies (ironies) between “the implied values and beliefs of the author as against the values and beliefs of the characters" (ibid.). Since story- and information-driven readers do not recognize these ironies, they are expected to have a serious problem when dealing with literary texts.

It is important to notice that Vipond and Hunt have not tested the above-mentioned hypotheses empirically. In their 1989 article they report the results of an experiment they conducted in which they investigated how the three mentioned modes of reading are affected by the factors reader, text and situation. They stated that:

...a reading event can best be understood as a transaction between a reader and a text, where the nature of this transaction is profoundly influenced by the situation in which the reading occurs ("situation" here includes at least the reader’s understanding of the concrete situation, of the social context, and of any task demands that may be relevant) (p.158).

The three reading types I have mentioned earlier (point-driven, story-driven, and information-driven) are regarded as three types of reader-texts transactions. Vipond and Hunt predicted that if situation affects the likelihood that a given mode or type will predominate, readers will read in a point-driven way when “the task encourages them to perceive the text as consistent with a concrete pragmatic context” (ibid.). Strangely enough “pragmatic context” is not defined – as we have seen earlier – in terms of authorial intent (the author has intended the text to contain a point); they remain vague on the specifics of such a context. The
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49 Vipond and Hunt refer to a short story by John Updike in which the character-narrator uses non-standard diction, grammar and tense. Story-driven readers, they argue, would not see the difference between the narrator/character and the author, thus perceived irregularities in the discourse would be ascribed to the author.
operationalisation of “task”, however, does reflect a far more different pragmatic context than a context in which the text is regarded as an artefact made by an author with motives and intentions in writing this text. The task that is supposed to encourage readers to read in a point-driven way is a letter from a reader of the story that is presented to the participants, in which this reader displays what point he or she has derived from the story. The experimenter introduced the letter as something the participant “might find helpful in thinking about the story” (p.160). In other words: readers might be encouraged to read the story with the idea that it contains a point. However, they are not encouraged to read the story as something that is created by an author who had motives in writing this story. Even stranger is the task readers in the story-driven condition received; before reading they were told “only the title of the story, its author, and her nationality [my italics]”, which explicitly refers to the communicative context. Nevertheless, of importance is that the assumptions of Vipond and Hunt on point-driven reading are promising and of interest to the current study. Unfortunately, so far they and others have not tested their assumption that point-driven readers will explain narrative surface in terms of authorial intentions.

“Author-driven” reading in an educational context

Another line of work is positioned in the environment of the classroom and is directed towards encouraging readers to assume a more active role in reading, thus increasing their involvement, enjoyment and interest in both reading and the related classroom topic (Beck et al., 1996; Nolen, 1995; Paxton, 1997). It is assumed that this can be accomplished by regarding reading as a dialogue between the reader and the author of a text. Isabelle Beck and colleagues, for instance, have developed Questioning the Author (QA), “an instructional intervention that focuses on having students grapple with and reflect on what an author is trying to say in order to build a representation of it” (p.385). The intention behind questioning the author is to “depose” the authority of the author and to show that the author is only human and therefore fallible. Readers would thus not immediately doubt their competences when the text is raising comprehension difficulties, rather they would question the author and the ideas in the text and consequently achieve a deeper understanding. QA encourages a dialogue between reader and author on the one hand and readers in the classroom on the other, by instructing the teachers to ask questions such as “What is the author trying to tell you?” and “Why is the author telling you that?”. Special queries have been developed for narrative texts. Questions such as “What is the author doing here? How did the author create humour/suspense/sadness etcetera.” help the reader to recognize authors’ techniques. QA has been implemented in 1992 in two classes with fourth graders at a small parochial school: one social sciences class and one reading and language arts class. Results of this longitudinal research showed that constructing meaning and monitoring increased significantly. However, students in the social sciences class seemed to have benefited more from QA than students in the language and art classes. It is beyond the scope of this section to go into the results in detail, but the research illustrates vividly that reading a (narrative) text can be regarded as a dialogue between reader and author through the text, and readers can be trained to read with this in mind. Nevertheless, the research addresses the idea that the author should play a significant role in the reading of texts, but cannot answer the question whether communicative intentions play in the reading of (literary) texts, or what role these intentions play.

The final two examples of empirical work in which readers’ presumptions about an author are involved are conducted by Richard Paxton (1997) and Susan Bobbitt Nolen (1995).

---

50 Although the writers acknowledge that there remains uncertainty about the extent to which these results are due to students’ experience with QA, since there was no control condition.
They showed that visibility of an author’s presence in a textbook text – mathematics and history respectively – encourages the reader to get involved and stimulates a critical and interested attitude. This sometimes, as Paxton concludes, even had the effect of enlizing students for the discipline of history, as well as for historical research. Paxton presented his participants two text versions; one was taken from a history textbook written by authoritative anonymous authors. The style of the text reflected this authority, for instance through the “unelaborated, straightforward style giving little or no clue as to point of view or personal opinions concerning the history under discussion” (Paxton, 1997). Paxton wrote a second text version in which he changed some elements from the original version that were supposed to increase the visibility of the author’s presence in the text, such as the type of narrator (“I”), addressing the reader, and using *attitudinal metadiscourse* (e.g. saliency such as “still more critical”). Paxton expected that students who read a history textbook written by a visible author would make frequent references to the author and hold mental conversations with the person they imagined the author to be. Participants had to read both texts and share anything that came to mind (i.e. the think-aloud method). After reading each text they were asked several questions regarding the mental image of the author and the established author-reader relationship. Results showed that when participants received the text with the anonymous author “Students simply pursued the written page, mutely attempting to glean the “important facts”, while gaining neither interest nor particular insight into the participant at hand, nor the discipline as a whole”. A visible author, however, caused the students to be “easily engaged in mental conversations with the visible author, or more precisely, the person they imagined the author to be” (ibid., 246). More on this research will be mentioned in the next chapter when the results are reported on of a first explorative study on perceived authorial intent during the reading of literature that is basically quite similar to Paxton’s study. For now, I want to stress that the texts that were used by Paxton do not concern (literary) fiction, which means that the author is able to address the reader directly. This is not the case in fiction where it is at best the narrator who addresses the reader, not the author.\(^5\)

In summary, relatively little empirical research has been done regarding the generation of author inferences during the reading of narrative texts. Hunt and Vipond’s hypotheses about point-driven reading strategies are promising and challenging, but have not been tested in line with their definitions as expressed in the 1984 article. Pfaff and Gibbs are the only ones that tested hypotheses concerning (on-line) generation of author inferences. However, their definition and operationalisation of author inferences is rather limited and the texts they used are clearly interesting because of their layering (satire), yet, it would be a useful addition to the discussion from a literary theoretical perspective to test their predictions on author inferencing using more complex (literary) fictional texts. As Gibbs has stated concisely:

Debates about intentionalism will continue on as they have for the past 50 years in both the humanities and cognitive sciences. Yet, determining the exact role that assumptions about authorial intentions play in text understanding requires scholars to explore several hypotheses (Gibbs, 2001).

---

51 In Nolen (1995): “Crismore (1984) defines metadiscourse as “discourse about the discourse; it is the author’s intrusion into the discourse … to direct … readers … so that they will know how to ‘take’ the author” (p. 280). *Attitudinal* metadiscourse is used to “implicitly signal … attitude toward the content structure … and toward readers.” (p. 281)” (Nolen, 1995: 48).

52 Unless we consider the (implied) author speaking to us through his or her text on a higher communicative level (Clark, 1996) (see Chapter 3, section 2).
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These hypotheses touch upon important questions such as whether assumptions about authorial intentions play a significant role during the act of reading, for instance, in terms of a constraining device, or whether they function only as a motivation of valuing certain texts or as a reason to attribute a certain meaning to texts when readers consciously reflect on them. Furthermore, the hypotheses concern reader-specific factors, such as expertise and motives that may be involved in a reader’s assumptions about an author’s intentions, as well as sociocultural factors. The employment of appropriate on-line and off-line methods is called for to explore these ideas and test – some of – these hypotheses (Gibbs 2001: 78). I will return to these issues in the last chapter of this book.

6. Taking position

Motivation

The previous sections intended to show that assumptions in literary theory and literary criticism about the author’s role in the reading of literary fiction are normative and so far these assumptions have not been tested empirically. Furthermore, these assumptions seem to form a remarkable discrepancy with the prominent position the author holds in the literary field which includes, among other things, reviews, media performances and book marketing. In addition, controversies about literary works, in which the author has repeatedly been questioned about his or her communicative intentions in writing the particular work, as well as the author’s identity, authenticity and sincerity, show that the author is far from being dead in reception processes, such as valuing and interpreting a work of fiction. This discrepancy or paradox has yet not been solved. Several questions have been addressed throughout this chapter that, in my opinion, are empirical questions that can be answered by conducting empirical research. We still know little about how readers process literary texts, and in particular what role readers’ assumptions about an author, e.g. his or her identity, communicative intentions or attitude play during the act of reading. As I proposed at the beginning of this chapter, I believe that a better understanding can be gained about these issues if we combine the knowledge and insights from literary theory and the methods and insights from discourse processing about reading processes. In this section I will propose a preliminary framework that includes the best of both worlds and that can function as a basis for the empirical work that will be reported on in Chapter 2 through 5.

The basic elements of the framework that I propose are author, text and reader. These three key elements can be positioned in a more general – linguistic – communication model in which a sender (author) sends a message (text) to a receiver (reader) in a particular context (e.g. Jakobson, 1960). The theoretical discussions about interpretation of literary texts that I discussed in the first sections of this chapter all emphasize a different element of this model, e.g., autonomist positions focus on the text and reception aesthetics on the reader. In addition, literary communication can be viewed from a more sociological perspective as well; as a communicative system that is historically and socially embedded and which constitutes the production and reception of literary texts, as well as the texts themselves as objects of literary communication (Schmidt, 1973). Issues such as the way the author positions him- or herself in the literary field, e.g., the writer as a modern minstrel or as a television personality, but also controversies around a writer’s false identity (§ 2), fit into this literature-as-communicative-system view.

Discourse processing theories are based on the same general communication model (sender-message-receiver), yet, discourse processing and literary studies take different perspectives towards this model. The main difference is that discourse processing assumes
that, in written discourse, successful comprehension is achieved to the extent that there is harmony between the author’s intended meaning of the text, the explicit text, and the reader’s constructed meaning of the text. In other words, information has to be successfully transmitted from author to reader (Graesser et al., 1994: 374). As we have seen in the beginning of this chapter, this position is rather problematic from the perspective of literary theory (e.g. Intentional Fallacy). Furthermore, as mentioned in section 4, literary texts often contain devices (e.g. foregrounding, multiple communication layers and unexpected turns) that distort the comprehension process and frustrate the construction of a global coherent message, but at the same time these texts may achieve an aesthetic and emotional experience in the reader. The model cannot account for more complex texts such as literary fiction in which communication occurs at different ontological levels, e.g., between characters in a story world. In short, the model includes the three key elements that are involved in literary communication but the possibilities for applying the model to this specific communication situation seem rather limited. In addition, the model cannot tell us much about what happens if readers are involved in literary communication and how they process literary texts that conventionally include different communication layers.

A narratological communication model, which is based on this general communication model, can be more helpful. Figure 1.1 shows the narratological communication model that Bortolussi and Dixon have used in their work and which, in turn, is based on work of Bruce (1981) (in Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003: 67, Figure 3.1). The model includes a number of participants that communicate at different ontological levels. First, we have the author and the reader which are both part of the world outside the text (extratextual). These are the empirical, flesh-and-blood persons such as ourselves and the many authors we encounter on book covers, on television, in book reviews, interviews, signing sessions etcetera. Second, the narrative includes a narrator who tells the story to an explicit or implied audience, conceptually referred to as the narratee. Both narrator and narratee are considered to be part of the narrative world (intranarrative). Between the extratextual world and the narrative world remains a level which is referred to as extranarrative and intratextual. This is the level that includes the concepts implied author and implied reader. For theoretical reasons that I mentioned in the first two sections of this chapter the empirical author has to be distinguished conceptually from the implied author.

![Figure 1.1 Communication model with concern to narrative discourse, including the participants and levels of communication that may be involved.](image)

First of all, it is important to mention that this model does not show so much what communicative levels readers potentially construct cognitively as they read narrative fiction. Moreover, the model is used by narratologists to define the nature and locus of the different participants, mainly the narrator and characters, in the narrative. Now, I want to return to my initial goal, which was to propose a framework that can function as a basis for empirical research into the role of readers’ assumptions about an author’s communicative intentions and
attitude as part of their reading process. Starting from the above-mentioned narratological model, the crucial question is how readers process this model and its different communicative levels cognitively. For instance, do readers construct the complete model, that is: do readers maintain independent representations of the author, implied author, and narrator? Or do readers make no clear distinction between a narrator and an implied author, or not even between an author, implied author and narrator? If so, under what conditions?

Bortolussi and Dixon have addressed more or less the same question in their work *Psychonarratology* (2003) in which they aimed at providing a conceptual and empirical basis for the study of cognitive processing of narrative fiction (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003). More specifically, they assume that readers must create a mental representation of the person that seems to utter the words of the narrative text: the narrator. Bortolussi and Dixon (BD) assume that readers construct a mental representation of the narrator as if he were a communicative partner. Consequently, readers are assumed to attribute all conventions, i.e. Gricean conversational postulates, which are involved in non-fictional communication. The most important postulate is that the narrator is assumed to be cooperative: “…we argue that readers assume that the narrator is cooperative, and based on that assumption, draw narratological implicatures concerning the narrator’s mental state and intended message” (p.21). Although BD acknowledge that readers, in addition, may also construct a representation of the implied author and that readers often cannot make a clear distinction between the two, their framework exclusively focuses on the narrator. Nevertheless, they seem to need the implied author concept, which they label *represented author*: “In trying to understand the reason for the use of a narrator with a given set of characteristics, readers are likely to infer the existence of a creative figure with a set of goals and plans. This is the represented author” (p. 76). Unfortunately, they do not further explore or investigate empirically the relation between the two concepts.

While their work is promising and an important contribution to the interdisciplinary research on cognitive processing of narrative fiction, it inevitably raises some issues. One of them is that their definition of *narrator*, especially in relation to the concept of the implied author, is not always clear. For instance, BD suggest that the function of the implied author “can be inferred from the information that is selected for presentation in the text and the choice of the manner in which it is told” (p. 66). This seems also true for the (impersonal) narrator, who “must select information from the story world and decide to present it in a particular way” (p. 65). Exactly how readers can discriminate between an implied author and a narrator, or whether they conflate the two in their mental representation, remains an unanswered question, and the lack of a clear distinction between the two concepts consequently affects the empirical studies as well. Their operationalisation of the concept *narrator* is sometimes puzzling. For instance, in two of their experiments items in the questionnaire refer to “the writer” while BD’s predictions and conclusions are related to “the narrator”. In effect, BD cannot determine whether readers have actually processed the narrator and/or the implied author and whether readers have constructed separate mental representations. In sum, the narratological model seems a good basis for empirical investigation of readers’ cognitive processing of narrative fiction as part of a communication situation that involves a reader and an author. A clear definition of the concepts that are involved in the framework is nevertheless crucial for both the discussion and validation of hypotheses through empirical investigation.

Aims and objectives

With the present study I intend to contribute to the understanding of cognitive processing of narrative fiction, and in particular literary fiction (e.g. Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003; Zwaan,
More specifically, my goal is to gain a better understanding of what role readers’ assumptions about an author, e.g. his or her identity, communicative intentions, and attitude, play during the reading process, and under what conditions readers construct (separate) mental representations of the empirical author, the implied author and the narrator. I thus hope to solve the remarkable discrepancy that I presented in the first two sections of this chapter; between literary theoretical positions that disputed the author from interpretation and other positions and areas of the literary field in which the author is considered relevant for interpretation (e.g. feminist and post-colonial positions, literary reviewing). In addition, the little empirical research that is available on author inferences (see section 5) suggests that text devices such as irony or satire may provide good possibilities to measure readers’ assumptions about the author, i.e. author inferences. My aim is to contribute to this body of work by including a textual moral dimension in the experiments (Chapters 3 through 5). I intend to achieve these goals by constructing a preliminary framework based on knowledge and insights from literary studies and discourse processing, and by conducting empirical research. The materials in the experiments that will be discussed in the following chapters are almost exclusively drawn from original literary texts as opposed to artificial experimenter-generated texts (cf. section 4). This way I hope to investigate the processes that are involved in literary communication, instead of somewhat impoverished processes that lack central inferences that readers make about the author’s purposes (Van den Broek et al., 1994). In addition, the methods that are used in the experiments originate from the cognitive psychological field, more specifically discourse processing, and these methods have mostly proved to fit the study of reading processes.

Sharpen the terminology

Before I set forth the main questions and assumptions of this book, first let me sharpen the terminology. First of all, the notion reading process needs some elucidation. Reading can relate to different stages or processes, such as the moment-by-moment process of comprehension, but it may also refer to elaborate interpretations, for instance, gained through close reading. It is important to the present discussion about authorial intentions in both literary criticism and cognitive psychology, to explicate what exactly I am talking about when I refer to reading or reading process. I borrow Raymond Gibbs’s idea of the stages that are involved in our understanding of language in general to sharpen the different interpretations of reading (Gibbs, 1999: 100 ff.). Gibbs distinguishes four key parts that lie along a continuum of processes that are involved in understanding in general, and which are not to be considered separable aspects of the process: comprehension, recognition, interpretation and appreciation.

Comprehension refers to the immediate moment-by-moment process of creating meaning for utterances. This process involves analysis of linguistic information (phonological, lexical and syntactic) and is thought to be automatic; operating within the time span of a few hundred milliseconds up to a few seconds at most (cf. Hoorn, 1997). Recognition refers to the conscious identification of the first products of comprehension. Gibbs mentions a reader’s recognition of an utterance as metaphorical or ironical as an example of recognition. Recognition, at least in the context of metaphorical and ironical utterances, thus seem to involve a reader’s recognition and understanding of multiple levels or layers; an utterance can have a meaning on more than one level. In addition, recognition – of metaphorical or ironical utterances – also seems to involve the assumption of a speaker’s or author’s intention. I will return to this in Chapter 3. Interpretation refers to the analysis of early products of comprehension, “to the various late products of understanding that may or may not be intended by speakers/authors”, and it usually involves conscious reflection on
what a text, author or speaker means (ibid., 101). Finally, appreciation refers to an aesthetic judgment given to a product, e.g. a literary work, and like recognition, Gibbs considers appreciation not as an obligatory part of understanding a linguistic meaning. One of the reasons is that readers or listeners can understand the meaning of an utterance without attributing a label “metaphor” or an aesthetic judgement to it. Gibbs has a point when he states that critics and theorists often mistakenly assume that their theoretical considerations about one temporal moment of understanding can be generalized to account for all aspects of understanding. This has important implications for the discussion set forth in the previous sections.

Determining the role of communicative intentions in interpreting language depends partly on which aspect of the temporal experience of understanding scholars most closely study. Philosophers, linguists, anthropologists, and literary theorists have focused their attention on the later products of conscious interpretation and have not generally concerned themselves with quick, unconscious comprehension processes. Cognitive scientists, especially cognitive psychologists and psycholinguists, have usually focused on the fast “on-line” mental processes that occur during the first several seconds of linguistic processing. (ibid., 102).

My assumption is that readers’ consideration of an author’s communicative intentions may be part of both the early moment-by-moment process, if I trust in empirical work that shows that communicative intentions are crucial in understanding language (e.g. Blakemore & Decety, 2001; Sabbagh, 1999; Tomasello et al., 2005), and the later products of understanding, such as interpretation and appreciation (cf. § 2). The fact that readers can consciously interpret a text without referring to what they think the author may have meant, does not mean that these assumptions are not part of the early comprehension process. Moreover, the fact that discourse processing models do not account for inconsiderate texts such as literature, and experimenters have almost exclusively used experimenter-based texts, does not mean that readers of naturalistic texts do not generate inferences about an author’s communicative intentions as part of their immediate comprehension process.

Now, let us return to the original goal of this subsection, which was to sharpen the definition of reading and reading process. I believe that it will be difficult to make a clear distinction between Gibbs’s aspects of the reading process; where does comprehension end and interpretation begin? Both are positioned on a continuum for a reason; it implies that the reading process is an ongoing process in which different stages will interchange. As for our focus of interest, it could be that author inferences occur during the first few milliseconds of comprehension, but that these inferences will only be measurable in post-comprehension stages, such as interpretation. For reasons of clarity I will make a distinction between comprehension in Gibbs’s definition on the one hand and understanding on the other. Understanding will refer to all the post-comprehension aspects of the reading process, i.e. recognition, interpretation and appreciation (cf. Steen, 1994). In this study both the fluent, spontaneous comprehension process (comprehension) and the cognitive representations that result from it, as well as readers’ occasional elaborations on an author’s presumed intentions, will be taken into account (understanding). However, it does not include issues concerning elaborate interpretations of literary works for instance gained through close reading or other sophisticated interpretive strategies (cf. Zwaan, 1996: 4). I will clarify the focus of investigation, whether that is comprehension, understanding or both, in each chapter and in each experiment. Roughly, the first two empirical studies (Chapter 2 and 3) concern
understanding and the last two experiments (Chapter 4 and 5) focus on the comprehension process, although post-reading tasks involve understanding as well.

The second phrase that needs to be clarified is readers’ assumptions about an author. Because the main focus of this study is on cognitive aspects of reading, i.e. the moment-by-moment reading process, reader’s assumptions about an author are defined in cognitive psychological terms, more specific: author inferences (see section 4 of this chapter). The term inference refers to the information that is activated during reading, but that is not explicitly stated in the text (Van den Broek, 1994: 556). Unlike definitions of author (intent) inferences that are offered by cognitive psychologists (e.g. Graesser et al., 1994; Magliano & Graesser, 1991), which are exclusively related to “the author’s attitude or motive in writing” or “the point that the author is making”, I opt in favour of a somewhat more comprehensive interpretation. For one, as we know from literary theory, interpretations of the concept author vary from a purely textual entity, which can be the image an author creates of himself in the text, such as Booth’s implied author, through the flesh-and-blood author, to name a few (see section 1, “Implied Author”). I believe that different sources of information related to the concept of the author can be activated during reading, which implies that different types of author inferences can be generated. Depending on the function – e.g. to establish local or global coherence, contribute to an image of the (implied) author as part of a context model – these inferences may refer to the point the author is making, his intentions in writing, but also to biographical aspects, the author’s ideological or moral stance, aspects related to genre conventions and so on.\(^{53}\)

I will investigate the following two sources of information: 1) text-external information and 2) text-internal information. Text-external information includes, in the first place, general frames of reference derived from everyday experience, which we call referential frames (cf. Nünning, 2005: 98). These frames include culturally agreed upon moral and ethical standards, linguistic conventions, social norms etcetera, and they depend on the reader’s knowledge and experience. Secondly, this category specifically includes literary frames of reference, such as general literary conventions, conventions and models of literary genres, intertextual frames of reference (cf. ibid.), as well as biographical information or information about the socio-historical context in which the text was written. Moreover, these frames depend on the reader’s knowledge and experience. For instance, the information that Jan Cremer frequently called people to make sure that everyone had heard of him, or reactions to his novel, are classified as biographical information within the literary referential frame. To provide another example, some have asserted that literature should disturb, confuse and astonish people, and provide them with new views and ideas (e.g. Etty, 2005). If readers share this idea, this ‘information’ would be regarded as being part of a literary referential frame that includes knowledge of genre conventions, in this case the genre of literature. The same can be said of conventions that relate to the genre of fiction such as the presumption that fiction involves a joint pretence between author and reader, as will be exemplified in Chapter 3.

The second category, text-internal information, refers to textual elements that give away, or in any case may refer to an author’s selection, choice, or artistic goal. One can think of plot developments, a particular style, use of metaphors or irony, or more generally those instances which can be classified under the concepts foregrounding (e.g. Miall & Kuiken, 1999; Mukařovský, 1964; Peer, 1986; e.g. Shklovsky, 1965), evaluation points (Vipond & Hunt, 1989), or inference invitations (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003). Also, from the reader’s

---

\(^{53}\) As Sean Burke has pointed out aptly, several notions are involved in the issue of authorship: “Notions of the self, creativity, psyche, origin, source, theology, onto-theology, agency, free will, determinism, consciousness, causality, gender, cultural identity, objectivity, subjectivity, ownership, authority (scarcely to exhaust the list) are implied not only by the question of authorship but also by theories of the absence, death or disappearance of the author” (Burke, 1995: xvi).
point of view, text elements that refer to a certain scientific or technical state of knowledge or cultural, historical context (intertextual references) can point towards the author, or at least towards the cultural and historical context in which the author is embedded at the time of creating the literary work. Together with the structure, norms, unfolding narrative, and characters and narrator(s) of the respective work itself, these instances can create an image of the (implied) author in the reader’s mind, i.e. become part of the reader’s personalized mental representation of the communicative context.

In an ideal situation, the first information category, i.e. text-external information, would, in psychological terms, trigger so-called top-down processes. This means that readers build an image of the author, regardless of the information in the text. I would categorize these inferences as relating to the empirical author, which implies that readers can only generate these types of author inferences when they have (biographical) information or knowledge about the empirical author. The second information category, text-internal information, would be the basis for bottom-up processes; readers create a mental representation of the text and author, regardless of text-external information, such as biographical information. If readers generate inferences with regard to the author based on the text alone (and do not have any information about the empirical author), these inferences will be categorized as implied author inferences. In practice, for that matter, the two presented categories of information sources are probably difficult to separate and bottom-up and top-down processes most likely interact during the process of reading. Certain elements in a novel may trigger biographical or conventional knowledge which, subsequently, can be used to draw further inferences during the course of reading. For instance, one participant of the first empirical study that I conducted (see Chapter 2) inferred at some point during reading that the genre of the text at hand could be labelled as “horror” (bottom-up). He then thought of Stephen King as a well known author of horror and used this image and related information about the empirical King throughout his further reading (top-down).

This example shows that knowledge about generic conventions, from the perspective of a reader, can be closely tied to assumptions about a text’s author. Generic conventions are assumed to initiate a (literary) control system that can select and activate particular reading strategies, such as point-driven reading. In addition, theme, message or point can relate to an author’s presumed communicative intentions. Thematic inferences are considered to reflect a main point or moral of the text, a global message, such as “haste makes waste”, and refer to the entire text passage (Graesser et al., 1994). Although the theme and the point or moral of a text are clearly related, I would propose to use separate definitions; an author can touch upon or presumably discuss a certain theme such as ‘free will’, but in my opinion, the point or moral reflects the author’s presumed stance or position towards a theme, e.g., ‘there is no free will, the human being is captured in its historical, social and biological context’. Possibly the generation of thematic inferences can – eventually – point to an (implied) author. So far, however, “very little research has examined global inferences, such as themes, points, morals, and attitude of the writer” (Graesser et al., 1997b: 184). It is thus an empirical question whether readers can discriminate between a theme and point that constitutes the author’s stance towards a certain theme or conflate the two into, for instance, a text’s point or theme, e.g. ‘this text is about…’ etcetera. I will not explicitly address this question in the present study; however, in the discussion of the results of the first empirical study (Chapter 2) I will shortly touch upon this issue.

This leaves us with two terms that may need some elucidation: literature and reader. Literature conventionally refers to prose, poetry and drama, and a definite definition is hard to find. It usually regards texts that are qualified as literary in literary criticism and general usage in a certain community, and in this study I will define literature likewise. Although it would be very interesting to investigate the role of readers’ assumptions about a poet’s intentions in
the reading process of poetry, the definition of literature in this study is restricted to prose. This has two reasons. In the first place, prose has a broader public of readers and attains – through its authors – more attention in various forms of media than poetry.\footnote{The Dutch ‘Stichting Marktonderzoek Boekenvak’ collects the number of books (fiction and non-fiction) that have been sold weekly in the Netherlands. In the top 100 lists hardly any poetry can be found (http://www.marktonderzoekboekenvak.nl/frame-top100-lijsten.htm). Although there seems to be a positive development in the Netherlands towards poetry and its poets due to e.g. organization of poetry slams, Nacht van de Poëzie (Poetry Night), and popular poets such as Jules Deelder and Ingmar Heytze who perform regularly in the media.} Second, in cognitive psychology most empirical knowledge has been gained about the comprehension and reading process concerning narratives (prose) (cf. Zwaan, 1993). The materials which were used in the empirical studies that are reported on in this book mainly concern literary fiction, although occasionally non-literary fiction has been included as well. If so, this is specified.

The term reader refers to the empirical, flesh-and-blood reader. With regard to the narratological model that I presented in Figure 1.1, the implied reader and the empirical reader are theoretically distinct, because the implied reader is theoretically the reader or audience that seems implied by the implied author. In processing terms Dixon and Bortolussi therefore assume that this implied reader is embedded in the reader’s mental representation of the implied author (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003: 77-78). Whether readers construct separate mental representations of themselves, the implied reader and even the narratee and under what conditions are empirical matters that lie beyond the scope of the present study. Except for the first empirical study and a pilot study (Chapters 2 and 3 respectively) readers that participated in the reported empirical studies concern non-expert readers, i.e. expert readers such as teachers of literature, literary critics, and occasionally students of literature, were excluded from participation. The main reason is that expert readers are thought to use different reading strategies than non-expert readers (e.g. Graves & Frederiksen, 1991). Moreover, results of both the first empirical study (Chapter 2) and a pilot study (Chapter 3) showed that expert readers seem more reluctant to share their thoughts about the author’s intention and his or her identity as part of the intentional fallacy or the-author-is-dead-paradigm.

Questions and main assumptions

The main question that will be addressed in this study is whether we can find evidence for readers’ generation of author inferences at various levels of processing, i.e. comprehension and understanding. Author inferences in this sense may relate to both the empirical and the implied author as part of a mental representation of the communicative context. More specifically, the question will be if readers construct separate mental representations of the empirical author, the implied author, and the narrator, and if so, under what conditions. The assumption that will be central to this book, and which will be operationalized and empirically tested, is that readers’ inferences concerning an (implied) author’s identity, intentions, and attitude are part of the reading process involved in literary texts. Moreover, psychological theories and empirical research assume that when people engage in everyday communicative activities an understanding of another person’s intentions is crucial (e.g. Clark, 1996; Dennett, 1987; Heider & Simmel, 1944). Although reading a novel is obviously different from face to face communication, for instance, because the reader and author are usually not both present at the time of reading, I believe that readers make presumptions about an author’s intentions and attitude as well as an author’s identity or persona and do so as part of the reading process.
These assumptions in fact concern the communicative context in which the reader and author are engaged when the reader reads an author’s text. Discourse theorists assume that readers do not only construct a mental model of what happens in a text (a situation model), but also build a model of the communicative event in which they participate, which is called the context model, communication level, or pragmatic model (cf. Graesser et al., 1997b; Van Dijk, 1999; Zwaan, 1993). Although linguists, discourse analysts and psychologists generally assume that context crucially influences the structures and processing of spoken en written discourse, context models have long been neglected in the psychology of text processing and have only recently gained theoretical attention (Van Dijk, 1999, 2004, 2006). In short, context models are subjective interpretations of the context by discourse participants, such as readers and authors, and these models supposedly “…exercise the crucial overall and local control over all processes of discourse production and comprehension…” (Van Dijk, 1999: 124).

Context models are believed to have a certain structure that consists of schematically organized categories that allow language users to quickly analyze and define social situations. Basic categories are the setting (time, location and circumstances) and events, which include participants (their characteristics such as gender, age etcetera, their roles and their mutual relations), actions and discourse (e.g. genre), and cognition (e.g. opinions and emotions). The overall category that controls all other category information is the social domain of which a situation is part, such as politics, law, and education or, in our case, literature. The particular domain regulates knowledge about typical settings (e.g. reading literature), typical participants (e.g. readers and authors), typical genres (e.g. novels, romance, thrillers), and so on. Finally, intentions are presumed to be a prominent component of context models and “…define the overall, strategic goal-directedness of discourse, or the ways people understand it. This also means that, both for participants and analysts, understanding talk as (inter)action involves attributing intentions to the actors” (Van Dijk, 2006: 171).

Relevance is the criterion that determines whether a category is included in the model; participants do not construct just any context model, but they only include properties of the communication situation that are relevant to them. What is relevant is defined in terms of selective focus and “subjective interpretation of some social constraint as defined by the participants” (Van Dijk, 2006: 163). This latter social constraint is related to the mutual knowledge or common ground of the participants.

The context model such as described by Van Dijk is a general model that accounts for different discourse types and media. Van Dijk, for instance, is particularly interested in the construction of context models in news production and understanding. As far as I know, so far, no attempts have been made to investigate context models that are specific to the reading of literature, or to investigate what the components or factors would be that constitute such a context model. However, my assumption is that from the reader’s perspective a context model would consist of the category participants in terms of representations of the Self, assumptions about an (implied) author’s characteristics and identity, as well as assumptions about common ground, i.e. mutual knowledge and – possibly based on these assumptions – an (implied) author’s presumed intentions and attitude. The reading of literary fiction is grounded on authors’ and readers’ mutual knowledge about conventions of fiction, other literary conventions, and the socio-historical and cultural context in which the author and his or her readership is situated. As for fiction conventions, it is assumed that authors and readers mutually or jointly pretend that the events in the text are actually taking place. For instance, if an author, say Haruki Murakami, introduces a character named Johnny Walker who turns out to be a ruthless killer, a reader – that is familiar with the name – will not think that the
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55 Van Dijk argues that context models are comparable to what he and Walter Kintsch earlier called control system: “In fact, I assume that much of what Kintsch and I earlier called the ‘control system’ is in fact carried out by context models” (Van Dijk, 2004: 10).
Scottish whiskey brand uses the picture of a killer as their brand icon. This reader will most likely understand that Murakami is introducing a fictional character as part of the mutual knowledge that authors and readers jointly pretend that the events in the fictional world are actually taking place. Murakami implicitly tells his readers “Let’s pretend that there exists a character named Johnny Walker who is the person that is pictured on the whiskey bottle”. Readers therefore have to assume that Murakami on his part assumes that his readers are familiar with the brand icon as part of the common ground or mutual knowledge (this actually refers to the implied reader, cf. Figure 1.1). Without an account of context that includes mutual knowledge about fiction conventions authors would have to explain first that there is only make-believingly a whisky icon that kills people, and without this knowledge readers would have a hard time understanding why the author would tell such a story. The context model constrains the number of possible inferences that readers can generate in a given situation. Besides, it is when this supposedly mutual knowledge is not completely shared or accepted by its participants that controversies may occur. The fatwa against Salman Rushdie for his novel *The Satanic Verses* is probably one of the most extreme examples. I will elaborate on this idea of *joint pretence* between authors and readers in Chapter 3. For now it is important to signal that mutual knowledge defined as “shared beliefs in a community”, is a crucial component for context models, and readers need this knowledge for an ongoing update of the context model (Van Dijk, 2004: 10). I will discuss the relevance of mutual knowledge or common ground between reader and author as part of the reader’s mental context model more extensively in Chapter 3 *Game over, Reading as joint pretence*.

Pragmatic agents, such as the narrator and writer as well as the narratee and reader, are assumed to be part of the communicative context in which the text is embedded and consequently can end up in a reader’s mental presentation of that context (*context model*). Furthermore, it is generally agreed upon that reader’s constructions of a narrative text’s characters (their goals and actions, traits) are part of the situation model (e.g. Graesser et al., 1997b; Graesser & Wiemer-Hastings, 1999; Zwaan, 1996). In addition, I assume that a reader’s mental construction of an *implied author*, including possible assumptions about this author’s communicative intentions and attitude or presumed common ground, will also be part the reader’s context model.

The question is whether readers maintain different mental representations of the empirical author, the implied author, and the narrator and under what conditions. One could imagine that both reading proficiency in terms of development of a literary control system (cf. Zwaan, 1993) and the type of narrator can affect the degree to which readers create separate representations. To provide an example, narratology places – heterodiegetic, third-person – narrators on a continuum between the extreme positions of covertness vs. overtness, with the overt omniscient narrator such as Austen’s narrator in *Emma* on the one end and the covert narrator who is limited to rendering the speech and thought tags of characters such as “he said” on the other end of the spectrum. These two types of narrators would appear to require two different types of representations; the overt narrator might be more similar to a reader’s representation of a character, while the covert narrator could be represented by a voice at most. Perhaps less proficient readers – that is, readers with little narratological knowledge – could easily merge this “voice” with their representation of the (implied) author as part of their context model. Although narrator visibility was not taken into account, Graves and Frederiksen provided empirical support that professional readers employ different reading strategies than non-expert readers; professional readers use multiple, specific reading strategies in order to create a context in which author, text, and reader are positioned and “interact” (Graves & Frederiksen, 1991). In addition, Graesser et al. suggest that some pragmatic agents may be less salient, if not invisible to most readers. Results of an empirical study showed that readers under normal reading conditions do not construct third-person
narrators, whereas first-person narrators are more salient to readers than normal character agents (Graesser et al., 1997a). It would be interesting to see whether the narrator’s and author’s voice become merged in a mental model if readers assume that the text at hand is autobiographic. Or whether the voices will be separate representations in such a model if readers assume that the author uses a narratological voice that is distinct from his or her own for some purpose. In the experiments that I conducted and which will be reported on in the next chapters, the relation of these two voices, as well as narrator visibility have been taken into account.

7. Outline of the book

The next chapter (Chapter 2) will report on the findings of a first exploratory study in which readers were asked to think out loud while reading a narrative (literary) text, without knowing anything about the text’s empirical author, context or genre. The aim of this study was to examine how readers process narrative texts, both literary and non-literary, and to what extent communicative participants of the narratological model (Figure 1.1), especially the implied author, will be cognitively represented by readers. Furthermore, some conditions were taken into account that assumedly affect the generation of author inferences. First, text samples included relatively salient and non-salient narrators, secondly, an instruction was used that may activate a point-driven reading strategy as opposed to information-driven, and finally reader expertise was varied, as professional readers may have a better development of a literary control system and thus may be better equipped to process different communication layers as opposed to non-expert readers. Methodologically, the question was whether generated author inferences can be potentially revealed by the think-aloud method. Results of the study showed that it was difficult to identify obvious author inferences because reader responses often concerned conflations of the implied author, narrator, and/or text point or theme. Furthermore, most of the remarks that readers generated during reading involved the actions and characters in the fictional world. It is presumed that readers may have generated inferences that concern an implied author’s intention and attitude during reading, but did so more or less automatically and unconsciously as part of early moment-by-moment comprehension processes. Post-reading responses seem to provide support for this assumption, since these indicate that readers have constructed a representation of the implied author and his intentions. It is reasoned that if that is the case, more sensitive on-line measurements are called for. In addition, the conflations in the readers’ responses mean that we will have to find a way to be able to discriminate between readers’ responses that refer to the implied author, narrator, and the story’s theme or point.

Chapter 3 explores the unique characteristics of the reading of fiction; reading a work of fiction means that the author and reader follow a mutual agreement in which it is assumed that both jointly pretend that the events in the story world actually take place. As I discussed earlier, this conventional knowledge is part of the author’s and readers’ common ground or mutual knowledge, which is an important element in the construction of the context model, i.e. the reader’s mental representation of the communicative context. Theories of fiction that embrace the communication model will be discussed, as well as how theories of fiction deal with moral and ethical issues in literary fiction. The reason for including moral and ethical text dimensions is that these may offer a possibility to stimulate or force readers to construct separate mental representations of a text’s narrator and implied author. Based on the above-mentioned mutual agreement between author and reader, and in the absence of any biographical or contextual information that states the contrary, my premise is that readers by default assume that the implied author is morally acceptable. Consequently, readers are assumed to be able to discriminate between, for example, an immoral narrator and a
presumably morally acceptable implied author. Hypotheses that deal with readers’ default assumptions about an implied author’s moral or ideological stance were tested in a pilot study and an experiment. In short, the experiment tested whether violation of this assumption triggers readers to generate inferences regarding the implied author’s identity, intentions and attitude, i.e. moral stance. Texts were, again, presented without any information about the empirical author. Results showed that readers of texts with morally questionable actions or views that are represented by the text’s narrator questioned the implied author’s moral or ideological position, although no convincing support could be found for the generation of inferences regarding the author’s intentions or identity. Furthermore, the findings indicated which specific text segments triggered readers to question the implied author’s moral stance, and together with the above-mentioned results, provided a preliminary basis for conducting on-line measurements of author inference generation.

Chapter 4 discusses an experiment that investigated whether readers generate inferences with regard to the empirical author and the implied author as part of their comprehension process, i.e. the moment – by – moment process as opposed to post-comprehension processes. In line with the previous chapter predictions were tested that relate to whether readers can discriminate between the narrator’s and implied author’s moral stance. However, this time readers were provided with biographical information about the empirical author that either was in conflict or consistent with the narrator’s and/or implied author’s moral stance. The chapter discusses the theoretical background of an on-line measurement that is frequently used in cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics in order to measure the generation of particular inferences during the reading of texts. Both possibilities and limitations of this so-called affective priming paradigm are discussed, and the method, procedure, and results of a first on-line experiment are presented. Using the affective priming measurement the experiment tested whether biographical information about the empirical author affects the reading process. This should be reflected in an affective priming effect as well as in reading times. For instance, conflicting information, i.e. between what readers derive from the text (the implied author and/or narrator) and from biographical information, should result in longer reading and response times. Results show that the information about the empirical author affected to some extent reading times, however priming effects were only found for the text samples. The biographical information appears not to have affected response times. Results of measurements of author evaluation before and after reading the texts, however, indicate that readers’ mental representation of the implied author which is based on text-internal information may have affected their initial mental representation of the empirical author that was based on biographical information.

Chapter 5 reports the findings of a replication of the experiment discussed in Chapter 4. Based on the results of this first on-line experiment, some alternations were made to the design and the materials, i.e. biographical information was adjusted. The information was presented as an article from a literary magazine and details were added that concern the author’s identity and social role, and his position in the literary field. Findings show neither effect of the author and text primes on response latencies nor on reading times. However, post-reading measurements of author information indicate that readers constructed a mental representation of the empirical author that included the most important aspects of the biographical information that they received before reading. In addition, the results suggest that readers’ representations of an author concept are the product of a complex process of top-down and bottom-up processing between text-external (biographical) and text-internal information.

Chapter 6 will discuss the results of the empirical studies in light of the theoretical discussions in the literary and cognitive psychological field, the available empirical work, as well as the presented position taking, which are all discussed in the first chapter. Also some
reflections will be presented in prospect of future research on – the position and function of –
the author as concept in the literary reading process.
In the previous chapter we have seen that discourse processing theories assume that readers potentially generate different types of inferences during the reading of texts. One of these inferences are author intent and attitude inferences. Readers supposedly generate these inferences in order to explain why an author expresses a particular clause in a text, or why an author is telling a story. I assume that readers are able to generate several types of author inferences that can concern the (implied) author’s identity, intentions and attitude, depending on the related information source such as biographical or conventional information or text-internal information. As I explained in the previous chapter, my assumption is that readers construct a mental representation of the communicative context that is involved in the reading of texts, and author inferences presumably contribute to this so-called context model. In theory, readers can construct a mental model that resembles the communication model that I presented in the previous chapter. This model embodies both the communication level between an (implied) author and a reader (context model) and communication levels that are part of the story world that is represented in the text (situation model). The question is how readers process narrative texts and what elements and levels of this communication model readers include in their mental representation. Do readers generate author inferences as part of their reading process and do these contribute to their construction of a context model? Or do readers only generate inferences related to the narrator of the text? Are both the author and narrator perhaps merged into one mental representation? What conditions may affect the generation of author inferences? Does narrator visibility, for instance, help readers to construct different mental representations of the narrator and (implied) author?

The current chapter reports a first attempt to answer some of these questions. An exploratory empirical study was conducted in order to achieve a global impression of how readers process narrative texts, i.e. what types of inferences readers generate and how these relate to the different communicative participants and levels of the communication model. More specifically, two questions were addressed: do readers generate author inferences during the reading of narrative text, and if so, how can these inferences be revealed, i.e. measured? Furthermore, some conditions were taken into account that assumingly affect the generation of author inferences. As for the second question, one way of identifying or exposing a corpus of inferences that readers generate as they proceed through the text is to collect verbal protocols (e.g. Magliano & Graesser, 1991). A frequently used method to collect these verbal

---

1 Magliano and Graesser (1991) have advocated a method for studying inferential processing during comprehension of (literary) text, that consists of three prongs: (1) theoretical predictions, (2) collection of verbal protocols, and (3) collection of on-line behavioural measurements. “The three-pronged approach coordinates theories of discourse processing, verbal inference elicitation methods (e.g. thinking aloud and question answering), and online behavioral measures. The theories provide a principled foundation for making predictions regarding what kinds of inferences should be generated online. Verbal inference elicitation methods are used to..."
protocols is the *think-aloud method*: readers read texts and are asked to verbalise their thoughts out loud as they read. The collected protocols provide information on readers’ mental activities during the reading process. Therefore, the think-aloud method seems to provide good tools for our current purpose, which is to measure generated author inferences and other types of inferences during the reading of narrative text. What are the benefits and limitations of the think-aloud method? I consider this question in the next section. The second section addresses specified questions and the method of the conducted study. The results will be presented in the third section, and the fourth section will discuss the results in relation to theoretical, conceptual, and methodological concerns as well as related consequences for further research.

1. **What the think-aloud method can and cannot reveal**

In finding out what readers do during the reading of (narrative) texts, researchers have used several methods. Some of them yield measures of post-reading comprehension, such as having readers summarise or retell a story. Disadvantages of post-reading methods are that the data may not only reflect processes that occurred during the reading, but also processes between the reading and post-reading tasks, or even processes initiated by the task itself. For instance, when a reader is asked about a character in the text after he or she has read the story, the question may encourage the reader to think about the character while such thoughts never occurred during the reading. Another problem is that readers tend to forget what they thought, felt etcetera while they were reading a text, since these states can be very transient in nature.

Think-aloud protocols differ from these post-reading methods in the sense that they are obtained *during* the reading instead of after the complete text has been read. Generally, readers are asked to read a text – sentence by sentence, clause by clause, or per paragraph, section or chapter – and verbalise their occurring thoughts. The collected protocols are usually transcribed first and then analysed on whatever is the focus of the study involved. Tom Trabasso and Joe Magliano, for instance, used verbal protocols to investigate what kind of inferences occurred (explanatory, associative or predictive), what informational bases were used to generate these inferences, and what memory operations were involved (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996). In order to analyse the transcribed protocols they constructed a protocol analysis that can reveal the kinds of inferences that are potentially generated on-line, as well as the related information bases and memory operations. This is the analysis I will use for the current study, and which I will clarify in the next section.

However, first I would like to discuss what think-aloud protocols supposedly can and cannot reveal about reading processes. An important review of verbal-protocol methods in general, and the think-aloud method in particular, is found in the work of Ericcson and Simon (Ericcson & Simon, 1993). The content of think-aloud protocols is said to reflect what is available in working memory, is accessible to consciousness, and is codeable in language. Furthermore, think-aloud protocols supposedly show how the available information is used in an *effortful* search for meaning during comprehension (Magliano, 1999; Trabasso & Magliano, 1996). In addition, think-aloud protocols are said to expose conscious, strategic empirically uncover potential inferences. Finally, online behavioral measures provide rigorous methods for assessing empirically whether particular classes of inferences are generated online (Magliano, 1999).

2 Trabasso and Suh (1997) offer an evaluation of these post-reading methods. Also see Gerard Steen (1991) for a review of methods of verbal (and non-verbal) data collection that are currently used in the empirical study of literary reading (Steen, 1991; Trabasso & Suh, 1997).

3 Another method to collect verbal protocols is the Question-Answering Method (Magliano, 1999).

4 This is in line with an important assumption of the constructionist theory, namely that readers attempt to construct a meaning representation that meets their goals, is coherent and explains why actions, events and states are mentioned in the text (see Chapter 1, section 4).
processing. At the same time this implies that these protocols “do not disclose much about the automatic, associative mechanisms that make that information available…” (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996: 256). In another line of argument, Debra Long and Tammy Bourg argue that readers, in thinking aloud during reading, construct a text representation that they use to “tell a story” about their understanding instead of providing a veridical report of their underlying mental processes (Long & Bourg, 1996). This story, however, does reveal important information about processes that are involved in text comprehension as well as those involved in constructing a message that is to be understood by the experimenter.

Generally, think-aloud methods have been used to reveal inferences and mental operations that occur during comprehension (Suh & Trabasso, 1993; Trabasso & Suh, 1993; Trabasso & Suh, 1997). In these studies, “it is assumed that thinking aloud reveals a subset of processes or outcomes of processes that occur during normal reading” (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996: 263). Of course, thinking aloud while reading is not similar to normal (viz. silent) reading. The protocols can both underestimate and overestimate the processes involved in text comprehension. Thinking aloud in experimental settings usually implies a reader who communicates, tells a story if you wish, with a (passive) experimenter. Consequently, thinking aloud may motivate the reader to communicate more than what normally occurs in silent reading. Readers can elaborate on their thoughts and explanations, or the interventions may introduce new reader goals. The verbal protocols may thus overestimate the processes that are involved in normal, silent reading. On the other hand, protocols may underestimate the processes: working memory has its limitations and thinking is possibly not always conscious and expressible in language. These inexpressible or transient thoughts and processes may thus not be made visible by the think-aloud method. At the same time, other thoughts may be available and expressible in language, but are not reported because the reader is influenced by pragmatic rules of conversation, for instance, Grice’s maxim of relevance, which states: only say things related to the current topic of the conversation.

At this point it remains an empirical question whether author (intent and attitude) inferences are generated on-line and to what extent these inferences come to consciousness of the reader during the reading of texts. However, if Magliano and Trabasso are right in assuming that verbal protocols do not reveal much of the automatically, transient cognitive processes, and if readers generate author inferences automatically and unconsciously, it is fair to say that these inferences presumably will not occur (frequently) in verbal protocols. On the other hand, if readers are very much aware of their search for an author’s intentions and attitude, and author inferences are part of strategic processing, as for instance Hunt and Vipond have claimed, these inferences are expected to be found in verbal protocols. Here we touch upon the distinction that I mentioned in the previous chapter (section 6) between two stages in the reading process, namely comprehension on the one hand and post-comprehension or understanding on the other. The question is whether author inferences are part of the early moment-by-moment process of comprehension, the later products of understanding, or both. Consequently the question is whether a method such as the think-aloud method is able to measure inferences that are generated during comprehension. I will return to this issue in the last section when the results of the empirical study are discussed.

Finally, every intervention of the reading process is, of course, constraining and intrusive. Some psychologists and theorists in the literary field therefore advocate the study of pure and uninterrupted processes. They assume that, by asking a reader to think aloud, the nature of the process under investigation may be changed. However, Trabasso and Suh refer to a study by Ericsson that showed that “think-aloud methods were unobtrusive with respect to the processes being studied” (Trabasso & Suh, 1997: 532). Nevertheless, some caution with regard to generalisations of results obtained by the think-aloud method would not be amiss (cf. Steen, 1994). On the other hand, I agree with Trabasso and Suh:
All of these intervention procedures are constraining and intrusive. The reader will, of necessity, engage in activities that might not occur during silent reading. However, we must keep in mind that each procedure is informative. They [sic] all reveal something about what readers can, could or do understand, react to, and learn during and from the reading of a text (Trabasso & Suh, 1997: 531). The next section reports the focus and method of an exploratory study in which participants verbalised their thoughts as they were reading a narrative text. Results are reported on in section three and discussed in section four.

2. An exploratory study: inference categories in think-aloud protocols

In order to assess whether readers generate author inferences during the reading of a narrative text, an exploratory study was conducted. As I mentioned earlier, my aim was to achieve a global impression of what type of inferences readers generate during and after the reading of narrative texts and how these inferences relate to the different elements and levels of the communication model. I was particularly interested in whether readers generate author inferences that contribute to a mental representation of the communication context, i.e. the context model.

In addition, I wanted to explore whether certain factors affect the generation of these author inferences. For instance, as I reported on in the previous chapter, results from empirical studies have shown that visibility of the text’s narrator may cause readers to engage in mental conversations with the author of mathematical and historical text book texts (Nolen, 1995; Paxton, 1997). It would be interesting to investigate whether narrator visibility affects readers’ generation of author inferences in the reading of (literary) narrative texts. Do readers construct separate mental constructions for the (implied) author and the narrator if the narrator is visible and prominent in the text? Furthermore, I wanted to explore whether certain reading strategies stimulate the generation of author inferences. Hunt and Vipond stated that readers can read in a point-driven way, which means that they read with the expectation that the author has intended the text to contain a point. As such, it seems plausible that this reading strategy, as opposed to information-driven and story-driven reading strategies, will stimulate readers to generate (more) author inferences. Finally, results from empirical research have shown that expert readers are able to use multiple, specific reading strategies in order to create a context in which author, text, and reader are positioned and “interact” (e.g. Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; Haas & Flower, 1988; Shanahan, 1992; Vipond & Hunt, 1989). Graves and Frederiksen observed considerable differences between the think-aloud protocols of expert readers (English professors) and non-expert readers (students) reading an excerpt from The Color Purple. The professors were more aware of the relationship of the author to the reader of the text, as well as the author’s intentions. “The experts viewed the text as a result of deliberate choices made by the author, with their perceptions of these choices affecting their understanding of the text” (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995). Given the main focus of research – whether readers generate author inferences during the act of reading a narrative text – and taking the afore-mentioned empirical findings into account, the following questions are central to the current exploratory study.

---

5 Paxton and Nolen used non-fictional texts in which the narratological narrator and the author are one and the same, whereas in fictional texts the narrator and author differ ontologically. Nevertheless, it is an empirical question whether readers signal the theoretical difference between the two.
SHARING A CAB WITH THE AUTHOR

1. What type of inferences do readers generate with regard to the communication model when they are reading a narrative text?
2. Do readers generate author inferences during the reading of a narrative text? More specifically, when readers think aloud during the reading of a narrative text, do they report author inferences?
3. Do narrator visibility, reading strategies and reader expertise affect the generation of author inferences, and if so, in what way?

The next subsection will report the materials, participants and procedure of the study.

Method

Materials

Four short narrative texts were used as stimuli: *Everything and Nothing* (1962) by Luis Jorge Borges, a fragment from *The Dead* (1969) by James Joyce, a fragment from *The Talisman* (1984) by Stephen King and Peter Straub, and a fragment from *Voorspel* (Prelude) (1969) by Dutch historian Lou de Jong. The texts contain approximately 677 words, are all written in the 20th century, and they all tell more or less a rounded story. The texts were presented in Dutch (translation) and the name of the author and the title of the text were deleted, so that participants would not be triggered to generate different inferences based on their knowledge about the empirical author or the particular work. This has an important implication, namely that readers – initially – will process the text in a bottom-up fashion, whereas if they would have been informed about the identity of the empirical author top-down processing would be expected as well. This also implies that readers can exclusively generate implied author inferences instead of empirical author inferences as well, unless they – think that they – recognize the text sample and the related empirical author.

In short, the narratives tell the following stories. *Everything and Nothing* is a short literary story about a person who fears to be nobody. After he shares his fears with a friend, he realises that he is not like other people, and feels that “an individual should not differ in outward appearance”. He tries to solve the problem by reading literature, and eventually he becomes an actor in a theatre. On stage he performs several characters through which he experiences a temporary illusion of being someone. But the moment he leaves the stage, he – again – is nobody. He then sells his theatre and returns to his place of birth where he becomes a poet. At his death he stands in front of God and presents Him his problem, on which God answers that He too is no one and many persons.

The fragment taken from *The Dead*, a literary novel, presents two sisters who are nervously waiting for the arrival of Gabriel McConner and his wife. When the two arrive, the ladies go upstairs. Gabriel follows the maid Lilly whom he had known since she was just a little girl. They have a short conversation in which Gabriel informs about Lilly’s wedding plans. Lilly reacts rather curtly and Gabriel flushes. He gives her a trifle for Christmas and while Lilly grumbles, Gabriel joyfully says “Christmas, Christmas”, and nearly dances as he goes upstairs.

The fragment taken from *Voorspel*, which is the first of twelve volumes that cover the Dutch history between 1940 and 1945, illustrates how Hitler comes into power. The excerpt starts with the moment Hindenburg has resigned and Von Papen appoints Hitler Reichskanzler. According to De Jong, Von Papen underestimates Hitlers’ obsession and should have known what was going to happen: Hitler had accomplished several anti-Semitic goals before he was appointed as Chancellor. Although there is scepticism, Hitler is said to
receive much support from the German people, until the empire that once was thought to be invincible collapses.

Finally, the fragment taken from *The Talisman*, a fictional narrative that is often classified as belonging to the genre of fantasy/horror, is about a young boy named Jack who is addressed by two men in a car. At first notice they seem familiar to him. The men ask him the way to a hotel and he points out the route. One man wants to reward Jack by offering him a roll of candy. Although he remembers the warnings of his mother, he accepts the candy. Suddenly he is grabbed by the arm and the second man is moving towards him. To Jack’s horror, the arm that holds him seems to be turning into a claw, and the eyes of the man are turning yellow. Before Jack can be dragged into the car, a front door is opened somewhere in the street, and a man is shouting to let go of the boy. Jack is released and the men flee into the car and move away with great speed (see the appendix for all four texts).

I selected these particular texts based on the criterion *narrator-visibility*, as I discussed in the beginning of this section (Nolen, 1995; Paxton, 1997). In short, Nolen and Paxton assume that a visible narrator may engage readers into a conversation with the author of the text; in their case these texts concerned non-fictional texts. Certain textual factors may point to the presence of the narrator, which are coined by the term *attitudinal metadiscourse*. Examples are *emphatics* (e.g. without a doubt) that signal the degree of certainty of an assertion, *saliency* (e.g. still more critical), which indicates the importance of an idea, *evaluatives* (e.g. unfortunately), which indicate the author’s attitude toward a fact or idea, and *hedges* (e.g. the record is *unclear*), which indicate the degree of uncertainty. Attitudinal metadiscourse reveals the narrator’s presence so to speak as well as his or her attitude towards the events (cf. Paxton, 1997).

It could be that a “present” narrator will trigger readers to construct two separate mental representations: one of the (implied) author and one of the narrator. On the other hand it is also possible that readers merge the narrator and author into one single mental representation, especially since they have no information about the empirical author’s identity or the text’s genre. This remains an open question. In any case, both Borges’ and De Jong’s text have visible narrators, and both texts contain so-called *attitudinal metadiscourse*. Borges’ narrator, for instance, becomes especially visible towards the end of the text when he tells us: “History adds that…”, which gives the impression that the narrator calls on historical facts. Although the two texts differ with respect to genre – Borges’ text belongs to the genre of fiction and De Jong’s text is taken from a history textbook – De Jong’s is not an exemplary historic text. De Jong uses a rather personal, participative narration style, which is very different from the anonymous, authoritarian texts that Paxton signalled in the history classrooms. Paxton showed that these more personal texts with visible narrators stimulate students to engage into a critical dialogue with the author. De Jong uses, for example, evaluatives in phrases such as “…deze bezeten politicus (hoe vaak al?) zijn vertrouwden opzij [had] geschoven…” (“...this possessed politician (how many times already?) had brushed aside his confidants...”), or “…zich [...] met de gemakzuchtige hoop vleide…” (“...flattered himself with idle hope...”).

Joyce’s text and Straub and King’s text, on the other hand, have no clear, visible narrator. Joyce is famous for his showing rather than telling style of presentation, which means that there is little or no narratorial mediation and overt presence of the narrator (e.g. Booth, 1961). In *The Dead* Joyce is showing us the atmosphere at Christmas Eve; the conversations and interactions between people give us an impression of what is going on. More and more, you feel that the house lodges some subtle tensions; the characters are not as cheerful as we would expect them to be on a festive eve. Nothing is explicit, and this also holds true for the narrator, who seems to be directing us silently from the wings of the story world. Straub and King’s story, on the other hand, is supposed to be a thriller or horror story.
The reader is expected to be absorbed into the character’s world and experience the tension of the story as well as its characters’ actions and feelings. The narrator must remain rather invisible in order to keep this illusion alive.

These four narrative texts were used as the stimulus material. I decided to add some points to each text at which participants could pause for a moment to verbalize their thoughts. Jill Olshavsky instructed her participants to start reading a text, pause at several marked points in the text, and then verbalize their thoughts (Olshavsky, 1976). Results of a pilot study that she conducted showed that this method has two benefits: first, participants responded more than when they were given the opportunity to think aloud whenever they feel like it. Secondly, the reading process went off more smoothly than when the experimenter had to interrupt the reading, or when participants had to decide themselves when the occurring thoughts were to be verbalised. Therefore, the texts of the present study were marked at several points in the text. These points were more or less equally distributed over the text and at positions where the text allowed a break, i.e. at the end of a sentence or paragraph.

Further materials consisted of a short questionnaire that included items with regard to text evaluation and reading behaviour. Also, two different instructions were formulated: one intentional and one neutral. The intentional instruction told participants that after reading the text, they would be asked to state what they thought the author had intended with the text. The neutral instruction informed participants that after reading, they would have to give a summary of the text. The first instruction was expected to stimulate readers to read in a point-driven way or according to the search after meaning principle (cf. section 4 and 5 of the previous chapter), the second was expected to trigger a more information-driven strategy. Both instructions (in English) are included below.

Instruction

You are about to read a short text. This text is an excerpt taken from a longer text. During the study I will be exclusively listening, I cannot answer questions about the text’s content, because this study is about what you think. There are no wrong or correct answers and you are not tested for knowledge. Your personal thoughts and opinions are of importance. Read the text in the way you would normally read, but take your time, it is alright to reread the text.

I would like to ask you to share your thoughts whenever you reach a black mark in the text. Just like you did a moment ago during the practice trial. Again, what you think or what is your opinion, is of importance. Everything you say or ask is relevant.

1. Neutral instruction
   After you have read the text I will ask you to give a summary of the text.
2. Intentional instruction
   After you have read the text I will ask you to give a summary of the text as well as what you think the text’s writer has intended by writing this text.

Participants

Eight non-expert readers and four expert readers participated. The non-expert readers were first and second undergraduate students from the Faculty of Arts of the VU University
Amsterdam. Their age ranged from 18 to 24. The expert readers were staff members of general and comparative literature at the VU University Amsterdam and Utrecht University respectively. Their age ranged from 34 to 50. Participants were paid 50 guilders to participate in the study.

PROCEDURE

Ericsson and Simon recommend a practice session; by these means participants can get used to verbalising their thoughts and at the same time feel more at ease with the setting (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). For that reason I included a practice session in which participants read a short fairy tale, Queen Bee (De bijenkoningin), by the Grimm brothers. Before this session participants were told that they were about to read two short stories, the first of them being a fairy tale. They were asked to read the story, pause at the indicated marked points in the text, and report anything that came to mind. It was stressed that this first session was just a practice session, and participants were invited to indicate any uncertainty about the procedure. After this session, participants were asked if any issues about the procedure remained unclear. If there were no questions left, participants were presented with one of the two instructions on paper. While the experimenter read the instruction, participants could read along. Next, one of four narrative texts was presented and participants were asked to start reading silently and at their own pace, and verbalize their thoughts at the indicated points. All sessions were individually conducted and each session was taped on a tape recorder.

After reading the text, all participants were asked first to put the text aside and give a summary of the text they had just read. The idea was to investigate whether – and if so, how often – presumed authorial intentions were mentioned in the summary, even if the task was to give a summary of the text. In this way, I hoped to get an impression of spontaneous reported (in the summary) versus forced reported (by asking about them) author inferences. Also a point of interest was whether the intentional instruction had stimulated readers to construct presumed authorial intentions, which were ideally reflected in the summary. Second, all participants, independent of instruction, were asked to express what they thought the text’s author had intended. Third, participants were asked to point to passages or sentences in the text that, to their opinion, pointed to the author’s intent. If necessary, participants were asked to elaborate on their answers. Next, participants were presented with several statements on a card that referred to the degree of author visibility: had participants during the reading experienced a person or, for instance, merely a sense of guidance? Statements varied from “I perceive no writer, I only perceive the text” to “I notice that there is a writer behind the text that I am reading, and I have a clear image of the writer” (see the appendix for all statements). After participants had chosen one of the statements, they were told that the following task could possibly be experienced as difficult, and participants were invited to say so if that was the case. Participants were asked: “Suppose you share a cab with the writer of the text you have just read. How would you describe this person to me?” These tasks – both the statements and the cab-task – were constructed in order to learn more about the relation between on the one hand generated author (intent) inferences during reading, and, on the other hand, the constructed image of the author that participants reported after reading.

Finally, a short questionnaire was presented with items regarding evaluation of the text, reading behaviour, and general questions or remarks participant wanted to share.

---

6 Except for one participant who was a student from the Faculty of Arts of Utrecht University.
7 Nolen (1995) used a similar task. She asked participants to think aloud after each paragraph of the text while they imagined to be sitting in a cab with the writer of the text. Students were thus somewhat forced in an imaginary communicative situation with the author. Paxton (1997) adapted the task and asked readers after reading the text to describe the author if they should meet him on a bus.
idea was to get a global impression of the participants that participated, such as their reading preferences and reading frequency, and secondly, to compare the selection criteria of the texts with the reported text evaluations, such as literary qualities, narrator visibility, and complexity (the questionnaire is included in the appendix). Participants were randomly assigned to a text and one of two instructions, so after the practice session each participant read one of the four texts. Figure 2.1 shows the procedure schematically, as well as the distribution of the participants.

![Figure 2.1 Procedure of the study, * for each 2 participants: 1 non-expert and 1 expert reader.](image)

**A first impression**

The study was carried out in June 2000 at the VU University Amsterdam. Sessions varied from 25 minutes to an hour, which already displays a variety in participants’ readings and reporting. All participants evaluated their participation as pleasant and fun; this also goes for the method of thinking out loud. Some participants reported that, at first, they had to get used to the procedure, but this had changed after the practice session.

As for post-reading tasks, participants seemed to experience no difficulties in giving a summary of the text, but some found it somewhat difficult to state the author’s intention. Nevertheless, all participants could come up with some possible intention. Furthermore, pointing out in the text to passages or sentences that cued this possible intention caused no difficulties at all. With respect to the statements, it turned out that participants – sometimes after a short moment of thinking – could easily choose a statement that reflected their experience of an author’s presence during reading. The ‘sharing a cab’- task seemed difficult for participants who had experienced a sense of guidance instead of an author-person during reading. Surprisingly, however, all participants, including the ones who did not experience a person, could picture a lively, sometimes detailed, image of the author. After the whole session, participants were given the opportunity to evaluate their participation verbally or ask any questions that came to mind. Many participants wanted to know the name of the author of the text that they had read, some had already been curious about the author’s name and identity during reading or when performing the post-reading tasks. The experimenter revealed the name of the author and the title of the story after the session was completed.

**3. Protocol analysis: segmentation and coding**

In order to analyse the protocols and be able to answer the questions that I formulated in the previous section, the raw protocols that are collected on tape have to be transcribed first and then segmented. Furthermore, a coding scheme has to be constructed that is first of all based on discourse processing models about inference generation as well as on the communication model of the previous chapter. Secondly, the coding scheme has to relate these models to the
segmented protocols. This section reports the transcription and segmentation of the protocols as well as the construction of a coding scheme. Section 4 will discuss the results of the protocol analysis.

**Transcription and segmentation of the protocols**

Thoughts that participants reported during and after reading were taped on a tape recorder. The verbal protocols were transcribed, i.e. typed out as verbatim as possible, and presented in detail in a transcript: all pauses, doubt, repetition of words and letters are included. Pauses are marked as (..) with two or more dots, depending on the duration of the pause. Next, the protocols were segmented and segments were numbered. Van Someren, Barnard and Sandberg suggest a number of criteria according to which protocols can be segmented: “the combination of these pauses and the linguistic structure provide a natural and general method to segment a think-aloud protocol” (Van Someren et al., 1994: 118). They also suggest to segment a written protocol while listening to it, because “segmentation becomes more difficult and less reliable when it is done on the basis of the written text only” (ibid.). The segments, parts of which are displayed in the appendix, were then coded according to a coding scheme that includes different types of inferences and their corresponding information bases.

**Defining inference categories and setting up a coding scheme**

As I mentioned in the previous section, Tom Trabasso and Joe Magliano (1996) have constructed a useful model of protocol analysis that reveals the kinds of inferences that are potentially generated during reading. Their approach is unique because it allows an assessment of the inferential content of think-aloud protocols (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996). According to the model, segments can have different functions; they paraphrase, explain, associate, predict, or provide metacomment. The functions *explain*, *associate*, and *predict* are related to three categories of inferences (see Table 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>backward oriented, provide reasons why story events and actions occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>concurrent, provide elaborative and descriptive detail (what, how)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive</td>
<td>predict</td>
<td>forward oriented, provide consequences of narrative events and actions (what happens next)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first category, *explanatory inferences*, includes inferences that are “backward oriented in the narrative timeline with respect to a focal sentence and provide reasons why a story event or action has occurred” (Magliano, 1999: 62). The second category contains *associative inferences*, which are characterised as inferences “concurrent in time with respect to the focal sentence and typically provide elaborative and descriptive detail (e.g. the age of a character, the size or colour of an object, or an instrument used to accomplish an action)” (ibid.). The last category, *predictive inferences*, refers to inferences that are “forward oriented in narrative time with respect to the focal sentence and provide the consequences of narrative events and actions” (ibid.). Explanatory inferences, according to Trabasso and Magliano, provide answers to *why* questions, associative inferences to *what, how*, and *where* questions, and
predictive inferences provide answers to questions regarding causal consequences (*what happens next*).

Two categories do not belong to the realm of inferences: *paraphrases* and *metacomment*. A paraphrase is defined as: “a transformation of the focal sentence that preserves its gist or meaning … while thinking aloud, a reader can also repeat verbatim the focal sentence … or produce part of the original sentence …” (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996: 266). Unfortunately the writers do not provide a definition or description for metacomment. One could imagine, though, that this category includes thoughts that refer to the reading process itself, such as “I am trying to determine what the story is about”, or the experimental setting as, for instance, in “okay, I’ll proceed” or “I’ve arrived at the second dot”.

For the purpose of the current study, a coding scheme was constructed which included Trabasso and Magliano’s three categories of inferences (explanatory, associative, and predictive) as well as the categories *paraphrase* and *metacomment*. Because Magliano and Trabasso make no distinction between the different objects of inferences, categories for the *object* of inferences were added to the coding scheme. These categories relate to levels (and domains or worlds) of the communication model that is presented in the previous chapter and include *story world*, *text*, *actual world*, and *author*. *Story world*, for instance, relates to the world that is presented in the story and which includes the participants, i.e. characters, setting (time, location, and circumstances), events and actions. *Text* includes references to a text section, sentence, clause but also the text’s genre, a theme or figurative language such as metaphors. In addition, references to the text’s narrator are included in this category as well, because all text samples in the study include a heterodiegetic third-person narrator that does not take part in the story world. The *actual world* refers to the world in which the reader is situated, the communicative context in which he or she is involved, but also references to conventional knowledge, opinions and emotions are included in this category (cf. section 6, chapter 1). Finally, *author* includes references to the (implied) author, his or her intentions, attitude, or characteristics. So, an explanatory inference may function to explain why something in the story world occurs, such as “He must find himself pretty important because he gives presents and all” but it may also function to explain why something occurs in the actual world, or on the textual level, such as “that implies that the perspective is in retrospect”. It may also explain, for instance, why an (implied) author has described a character extensively.

Figure 2.2 displays a fragment taken from a transcribed protocol. The participant is reading Borges’s text and has just finished the fragment before the ending paragraph:

> At times he would leave a confession hidden away in some corner of his work, certain that it would not be deciphered; Richard affirms that in his person he plays the part of many and Iago claims with curious words 'I am not what I am'. The fundamental identity of existing, dreaming and acting inspired famous passages of his.

> For twenty years he persisted in that controlled hallucination, but one morning he was suddenly gripped by the tedium and the terror of being so many kings who die by the sword and so many suffering lovers who converge, diverge and melodiously expire. That very day he arranged to sell his theatre. Within a week he had returned to his native village, where he recovered the trees and rivers of his childhood and did not relate them to the others his muse had celebrated, illustrious with mythological allusions and Latin terms. He had to be 'someone: he was a retired impresario who had made his fortune and concerned himself with loans, lawsuits and petty usury. It was in this character that he dictated the arid will and testament known to us, from which he
deliberately excluded all traces of pathos or literature. His friends from London would visit his retreat and for them he would take up again his role as poet.\(^8\)

Let us have a look at Figure 2.2. When we want to code the segments, the first question that has to be answered is whether the utterance is an inference or not. It may be helpful to consider whether the participant is explaining, associating, or predicting: whether the utterance provides an answer to a *why*, *what*, *who*, or *what happens next* question. For instance, Figure 2.2 shows that the participant paraphrases (segment 7), and then says: “so he must have been a poet before” (segment 8). This segment is coded with an E for explanatory inference (first column), because the participant is providing an explanation for what he reads in the text. If the type of inference is identified, the second question is: What object does the inference refer to? In the previous example the participant provides an explanation that refers to a character of the story world. Therefore, the segment is coded with SW for story world (second column). If the answer to the first question would have been “No, the utterance is not an inference”, then it would consequently have to be coded with a code from the category *Other* (third column). This category includes *paraphrase* and *metacomment*. The easiest way to decide whether the utterance regards a paraphrase is by looking at the text. If the utterance is neither a paraphrase nor an inference, it has to be a metacomment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. uhm (...) ja soms liet hij in een verborgen hoekje van zijn werk een</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bekentenis los</td>
<td>AUT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1# uhm (...) well <em>At times he would leave a confession hidden away in some</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corner of his work</td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. volgens mij bedoelen ze daar mee dat uh (.) dat ie in de rol van een</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bepaald personage uh uh woorden uitspreekt die eigenlijk zeggen wat ie</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echt zelf voelt maar die dan tegelijkertijd niet zijn eigen woorden zijn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maar toch die van het personage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2# I think they mean with that uh (.) that he in the role of a certain character uh uh says words that actually tell what he really feels himself but that are at the same time not his own words but that of the character after all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. dus je kan 't gerust zo zeggen omdat uh niemand d'r achter kan komen</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat hij dat zelf denkt en voelt</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3# so you can easily say it in that way because uh no one will find out that he thinks and feels that himself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. uhm uh op een gegeven moment krijgt ie dus genoeg van van dat leven (.)</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en dan gaat 'ie terug naar huis (.)</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4# uhm uh at a certain point he becomes fed up with that life (.) and he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returns home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. uh wat ik trouwens in eerste instantie niet begreep was dat ie zelf een</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theater had want hij verkoopt 't nu ineens (.) uhm (.)</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5# uh by the way what I didn't understand initially was that he owns a theatre because now he all of sudden sells it (.) uhm (.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ja en hij hij wordt dichter</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6# yes and he he becomes a poet</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. maar hier staat <em>hij hernam zijn rol als dichter terwijl (.) dat ja</em></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7# but here it says he would take up again his role as poet while (.) that yes
8. dan moet ie dat eerder dus ook geweest zijn (lange pauze)
8# then he must have been that before (long pause)
9. en wat daar de ja waarom ie dan dichter wordt of dat dan dan is
9# and what the yes why he then becomes a poet or already is
10. omdat ie dan wel z’n eigen gevoelens moet uiten (.)
10# because he has to express his own feelings then (.)
11. dat dat weet ik niet
11# that I do not know

The category metacomment includes remarks that are actually questions a reader asks himself about the text, events or participants in the story world, or about the reader’s own thoughts. Contrary to inferences, these metacomments do not answer why, what, how, or what happens next questions, instead they constitute or represent these questions, e.g. I wonder why/how etcetera. These remarks, however, are not always formulated as a specific question, rather, they can be an unfinished question or something the reader wonders. For instance, the participant says in segment 9: “and what the yes why he then becomes a poet or already is”. This utterance is not an inference in the sense that it does not provide an explanation, association or prediction, nor is it a paraphrase, and therefore it has to be a metacomment (code META in the third column). The next question is what kind of metacomment the utterance is referring to. Metacomments can be further distinguished into reflection upon the reader’s own thinking and reading process (code REFL), why questions (QWHY), how, what, and where questions (QWH), open predictions (OP), remarks referring to the setting viz. participating in an empirical study (EXP), and the reader’s emotional experience (RE). In the current example the participant explicitly wonders why the character has become a poet, instead of providing an answer to the question. Therefore, this segment is coded META for metacomment and QWHY for a why question; the participant is actually asking for an explanation. See Figure 2.3 for more examples of segments that are coded with META. Finally, a code No code is included for segments that express thoughts that are hard to understand and therefore difficult to code, such as “has a bit more uh [??] hard to tell but a bit” (heeft wel meer uh [??] kan je niet zeggen maar beetje wel). No Code can be found in each of the columns.

**SPECIFICATIONS OF META CODES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SEQUENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| REFL | hoe moet ik het zeggen  
# how do I say this  
van nou ja wat hebben we wat zijn dat allemaal voor een mensen en wat is er aan vooraf gegaan  
# well what do we have what are all those people and what proceeded it  
uh en wie zijn ze eigenlijk er worden wel allemaal namen genoemd maar uh wie ze zijn (.)  
# uh and who are they really there are all names being mentioned but uh who they are (.)  
hm ben wel benieuwd wat die Gabriel voor een rol in het hele verhaal speelt  
#hm wonder what kind of role this Gabriel will play in the whole story  
ja ik ben bij de volgende stip aangeland maar (.)  
# yes I have reached the next point but (.) |

9 There is some similarity between actual world inferences that may call upon readers’ referential frames such as opinions and emotions and metacomment that relates, for instance, to readers’ emotional experience. However, the difference between inferences and metacomment, at least sensu Magliano and Trabasso, is that the first category provides an answer to a question whereas the second category constitutes that question itself.
Of importance to the current study are segments that concern inferences (coded INFER) that refer to the (implied) author. These segments are coded in the same way: first with a code for type of inference (column 1), and subsequently with a code AUT for author intent and attitude inferences (column 2). Notice that an author inference can belong to all three types of inferences: explanatory (e.g. when the character said that, I think the author wanted to…), associative (e.g. this metaphor/ these words here/ I think the author selected that word in order to…), and predictive (e.g. I think that later on in the story it will be made clear why the character took…). If we look at segment 2 in Figure 2.2 we see that the participant says: “I think they mean with that uh…”. Because the participant is giving an explanation for a sentence from Borges’ text (segment 1) the segment is first coded with E for explanatory inference. Next, the object of the inference has to be identified and in this case the participant is explicitly referring to persons who have meant something with the text. For some reason this participant uses the plural form. In any case, these persons have to be the ones responsible to the text, i.e. the implied author(s).

If the segment is coded with AUT for author, an additional code can be given in the fourth column for one of two sub-categories: weak author inferences (code AUT-) and strong author inferences (AUT+). An example of the first is: “now the reader is clearly given information from which the reader can infer that the others’ actions were unwise”. Here the participant mentions that information is given thereby implicitly referring to the implied author, who (in this case, because the participant has no knowledge about the empirical author) ultimately is the one who provided this information. One clue for signalling these weak author inferences is when participants use the passive voice in relation to verbs that express actions, such as “is given”, “is provided”, “is described”, “is written” without referring to the related subject. Strong author inferences are found in segments in which a subject – in the linguistic sense – is explicitly mentioned in combination with verbs like mean, intent, describe, and want. A good example of this type of author inference can be found in segment 2 of Figure 2.2, which I mentioned before: “I think they mean with that uh (..) that he in the role of a certain character uh uh says words that actually tell what he feels himself but are at the same time not his own words but that of the character after all”. More examples of segments that are coded with AUT will be given in the results section.

To summarize, segments in the protocol can be coded with a code for the type of inference (first column), the object of inference (second column), and if the segment is not an inference it has to be either a paraphrase or a metacomment (third column). Metacommments can be further distinguished into subcategories (fourth column). Inferences that relate to the author can be further distinguished in weak or strong author inferences (fourth column) and finally a code No Code is attributed to segments that do not provide enough information to be coded and can be found in each of the four columns.

Coding of the protocols: procedures and intercoder reliability

Independent encoders were first thoroughly instructed and then they scored the protocols according to the coding scheme that I discussed in the previous subsection (the instruction and coding scheme are included in the appendix). In order to disambiguate the contents of the protocols and reduce doubts towards appointing the codes, the encoders were provided with
the narrative texts (cf. Ericcson & Simon, 1993: 287). After the encoders had coded a sample (20%) that was taken from the total amount of protocols, the reliability coefficient between the encoders appeared too low (K = 0.48). In order to limit the loss of codes that are used for statistical measures, Van Someren et al. (1994) suggest that encoders discuss over the codes that they do not agree upon, or introduce a third encoder who will cut the knot (which will revalue kappa to 1.0). I chose to re-examine the scored protocols more thoroughly first to see which codes caused most disagreement between the encoders. The examination revealed that the encoders generally agreed mostly on assigning codes for the object of an inference, and least on codes for type of inferences; disagreement occurred in 25 out of 59 cases or 42%, especially for codes that referred to explanatory and associative inferences. A relatively high percentage of disagreement was also found for the attribution of additional codes for metacomment (30 out of 39 or 77%). Because I am more interested in the object of the inference than the type of inference, I decided to replace the codes for the inference categories – E for explanatory, A for associative, and P for predictive – by the code INFER for inference. In addition, I ignored the specifications for metacomment. The reliability coefficient for the codes INFER, META as well as the codes for object of inferences was calculated again, and this time the agreement between encoders was acceptable (K = 0.72).

After recoding the inference categories with a code INFER and deleting the additional codes of metacomment, encoders appeared to have generally agreed upon whether a segment should be coded as inference or metacomment (86 out of 99 or 87%). As for the objects of an inference, encoders agreed in 48 out of 59 or 81%, and disagreed in 11 out of 59 or 19% in attributing a code SW, AW, TE or AUT after they agreed that the segment should be coded as inference (INFER). I will discuss instances that caused disagreement about the inference’s object in the next section. These are interesting as they show at which points the coding scheme possibly does not successfully relate the discourse processing and communication models to the segmented protocols.

4. Results of the protocol analysis and post-reading tasks

With exception of the protocols of the practice session, the data will be discussed in order of appearance during the sessions. In the first two subsections I will discuss the analysis of the verbal protocols that were collected during the reading of the narrative texts. The subsequent subsections will present the results of the analysis of the post-reading tasks.

Results of the protocol analysis

The overall results show that under these new conditions, e.g. code INFER, most utterances could be coded according to the coding scheme (1% regarded No Code). Furthermore, most of the segments concerned inferences (61%) and these inferences were most frequently related to the story world (58%) and least to the (implied) author (5%) (Figure 2.4 and 2.5).

10 Van Someren et al. (1994) do not provide any solution for a situation in which only one of two encoders attaches a code. In Claassen (1999) it was therefore decided to include a code ‘no code’ for these instances (Claassen, 1999). For example, when encoder 1 attaches code INFER and SW to a segment and encoder 2 attaches META; this means that encoder 2 did not provide a code to the first column (INFER). In these instances a code ‘no code’ is inserted. The same holds for encoder 1; ‘no code’ is inserted in the column Other. In this way the number of attributed codes in the columns is balanced and the number of empty cells is limited.

11 Inter-coder reliability between me and the individual encoders was 0.84 and 0.77 respectively. See the appendix for the specifics. For details on the followed calculation procedure see (Van Someren et al., 1994: 128-133).

12 The protocols with regard to the fairy tales will not be discussed.
When we look at the specifics on the distribution of the code AUT (Table 2.2), we see that expert readers generated more author inferences than non-expert readers (12 inferences by 4 experts and 7 inferences by 8 non-experts). Furthermore, the neutral instruction surprisingly resulted in more generated author inferences than the intention instruction, and both the text by Joyce and De Jong triggered relatively most author inferences. However, the numbers are relatively low, therefore, conclusions can only be speculative. For instance, 5 out of the 7 author inferences that were generated while reading the text by James Joyce were generated by one and the same expert reader.

---

13 Most of the inferences were explanation based (73%), 22% concerned associations and 5% predictions. Most of the metacomment-codes (40%) concerned reflections on the reading and thinking process (see the appendix for details). As mentioned above, in order to achieve acceptable inter-coder reliability, specifications of metacomment and inference-types were excluded from the protocols that were coded by the two encoders. These percentages are based on the protocols that I coded myself, as the inter-coder reliability between me and the individual coders turned out to be satisfactory (see note 11).
The reported author inferences differ in degree: as discussed earlier the coding scheme distinguishes between strong and weak author inferences. Strong author inferences ideally would be displayed in protocol segments that include a reference to the implied author with a pronoun such as in “there he creates actually a beautiful a beautiful image”. The protocols show only few of these strong author inferences and these all are expressed by one and the same expert reader that read a sample of James Joyce’s text. Interestingly, these instances exclusively occurred after she recognized the text and its empirical author because she had once studied this text and its author for professional purposes. Protocol samples that can be coded as a weak author inference can be found merely incidentally but more often than strong author inferences. A segment such as “the way it is written is so detailed”, for instance, is a weak author inference, because it refers to the fact that the text is written, but the subject – reference to the implied or empirical author – is lacking.

However, the protocols also show segments that are strictly speaking text inferences, in the sense that they are referring to the text level, but in some way refer to an (implied) author’s selection or choice. Since texts do not have intentions, these text inferences display a particular intention that eventually can only be attributed to the (implied) author. For instance, when a participant says: “those are all things that (…) in an unobtrusive way give a bit of an impression of Gabriel”, she is referring to the text as an intentional agent that gives an impression of a character. The same goes for a participant who notices that colours seem to be of importance. Here too, the text seems to be considered as an intentional agent that has – for some unknown purpose – attributed different colours to characters and props. Referential frames, in particular literary frames of references, are of importance here, such as knowledge about conventions and models of genres (cf. section 6, previous chapter). These frames seem to be triggered by text-internal information. In the above-mentioned examples these are text instances that can be classified as foregrounding or evaluation points; i.e. stylistic variations in a text that in some way form a deviation with the text’s norm or with general linguistic norms. For instance, in Joyce’s text the character Gabriel is extensively described and participants noticed this. The same goes for the use of colours in the text by King and Straub; because the participant notices a repetition of the use of colours, he seems to think that this may be of importance later on in the text. These instances all point to a particular selection or choice of the text’s implied author, yet, the participants do not refer explicitly to this implied author.

In practice, therefore, these segments are sometimes hard to code, because they seem to include participants’ conflations of different elements and levels of the communication model (cf. section 6 of the previous chapter). Figure 2.6 shows a sample of the protocol.
segments that caused disagreement between the two encoders about which object of inference the segment relates to (see the appendix for all instances). For reasons of clarity I have included the context in which these segments occurred. Segment 5.2 is a good example of an ambiguous protocol sample; the participant notices that in the text sample Hitler is spoken of in very grand words (in Dutch: “d’r wordt heel groots over hem gesproken”), but by whom is not clear as a referent is lacking. Therefore we can only speculate to whom or what the participant is referring; the implied author, the narrator, the text as intentional agent, or even the characters in the story world, hence the disagreement between the encoders (SW or TE). The same is true for segments 4.2 and 4.5, although the word described would imply a level outside the story world. Still, there seems to be a conflation of different elements and levels of the model.

Even instances that seem strong author inferences at first, on second thought are rather conflations of – at least – an implied author and a narrator. In the first two examples below, for instance, does someone or they refer to the text’s implied author or the text’s narrator? And the last three examples, which are coded as weak author inferences, because a subject is lacking, also appear conflations of an implied author and narrator, except maybe for the way it is written which refers to an extratextual level. Interestingly, that specific inference is generated by an expert reader that recognized the text and its empirical author.

In addition, there are instances in which a participant refers to the text’s narrator that should be classified as text inferences, since the narrator – at least the type of narrator in the samples – is theoretically part of the text level. However, if a participant says: “Eventually it is implied uh we specifically the narrator and you the reader have been right...”, he places both the narrator and the reader on the same communication level (cf. Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003). As this specific participant is an expert reader, it could be the case that he feels reluctant to refer to the (implied) author because he knows about the intentional fallacy as part of his profession.

All in all, participants seemed to have generated few explicit author inferences, and most author inferences turn out to be rather ambiguous because it is not clear whom or what the participants refer to; they seem to conflate the implied author, narrator and/or the text as intentional agent. This also applies to instances in which a participant refers to the text’s theme or point, but again, without referring to an implied author, e.g. “…it has something to do with uh with your with discovering yourself and finding that uh in what others have to say about in what you read...” instead of, for instance, “the author seems to discuss discovering yourself” etcetera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>Position (point, nr)</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>COD. 1</th>
<th>COD. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>hm ben benieuwd wat die Gabriel voor een rol in het hele verhaal speelt</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td># hm wonder what role that Gabriel plays in the whole story</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>die uh wordt zo beschreven en gedaan ennuh</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># he uh is so described and done and uh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ja toch vanaf het begin af aan eigenlijk uh (...) ja (...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># yes actually from the beginning really uh (...) yes (...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.6: Sample of protocol segments that caused disagreement between encoders about the object of an inference.

Factors instruction, text and reader expertise

In order to explore whether the factors instruction, reader expertise and narrator visibility affected the generation of author inferences and other types of inferences, I used a loglinear analysis to analyze the data. Table 2.3 summarizes the data, and Table 2.4 summarizes the results of the loglinear analysis. As Table 2.3 shows, I have merged the data of the individual participants in four conditions. The reason is that analysis of the data of individual participants would cause cell frequencies to be too low to conduct statistical analyses. By merging the data, however, I choose to ignore possible correlations between the different factors.

### TABLE 2.3
Frequencies for Object of Inference by Instruction and Reader Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Readers¹</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Non-experts</td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>Non-experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>35 (32.5%)</td>
<td>71 (73%)</td>
<td>62 (70%)</td>
<td>61 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>49 (45.5%)</td>
<td>16 (15%)</td>
<td>19 (22%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>24 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The number of participants in the instruction/expertise conditions was respectively: experts/neutral instruction (2), non-expert/neutral instruction (4), experts/intention instruction (2), and non-experts/intention instruction (4).
TABLE 2.4
Summary of loglinear analysis (Expertise, Instruction, Object of inference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial $X^2$</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE<em>INSTRUCT</em>OBJECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.549</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTIS*INSTRUCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.9280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTIS*OBJECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.211</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCT*OBJECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.760</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.9598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.3378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>252.500</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loglinear analysis shows that the data are best described with a model containing a three-way interaction (partial $\chi^2 = 25.55$, $p < .001$), two two-way interactions (partial $\chi^2 = 24.21$, $p < .001$ and partial $\chi^2 = 19.76$, $p < .005$ respectively) and one main effect (partial $\chi^2 = 252.5$, $p < .001$). The three-way interaction suggests that the combination of object and expertise is different between the two instructions. In order to explain this three-way interaction, I conducted two separate Chi-square analyses for the two instruction conditions. The results show significant results for the Neutral instruction (Expertise × Object) ($\chi^2 (3, N = 205) = 34.42$, $p < .001$) as well as for the Intention instruction (Expertise × Object) ($\chi^2 (3, N = 187) = 13.45$, $p < .01$). Table 2.3 can help to interpret these results. Obviously, in the neutral instruction condition expert readers generated relatively many text-inferences (35 out of 108 or 32.5%), while non-expert readers generated relatively many story world inferences (71 out of 97 or 73%). In the intentional instruction condition expert readers also generated relatively many story world inferences (62 out of 88 or 70%), while non-expert readers generated relatively many inferences that refer to the actual world (24 out of 99 or 24%). However, as I mentioned before, because I merged the data, some caution in interpreting the results should be exercised. For instance, expert readers who received the intentional instruction read either the text by King and Straub or Borges. These texts seem to have generated overall relatively large numbers of SW inferences (see Table 2.5); therefore, there could be a correlation between expertise and text, or between text and instruction as well. In addition, Table 2.3 also shows that most generated inferences concern the story world and least the author, which is reflected in the main effect of Object that I found in the results of the loglinear analysis (partial $\chi^2 = 252.500$, $p < .001$).

Finally, the frequencies of generated inferences per text sample were examined. Table 2.5 shows the frequencies of the different objects of inferences for the four texts, regardless of instruction or expertise. When we consider the frequencies per text and compare these with the qualitative data the protocols provide, a few things can be remarked.

---

14 The Text × Instruction × Object of Inference – matrix for the non-expert readers shows too many cells with frequencies smaller than five (>20%). Tabachnick and Fidell argue that all expected counts must exceed 1 and less than 20% has to be smaller than 5 in order to conduct a loglinear analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).
When we take a look at the inferences that refer to the story world, we notice that the text by King and Straub has generated relatively many SW inferences (75%). This makes sense because – as mentioned before – the reader is expected to be absorbed into the character’s world, and experience the tension of the story and its characters’ actions and feelings. The reader’s focus is directed at the events that take place in the made-up world, such as “what is happening to Jack?”, and hence the relatively frequent inferencing about the story world. If we take a closer look at the protocols we see that these participants are mostly trying to understand what is going on in the story world, in terms of who are the characters and what are their intentions and motives.

De Jong’s text on the other hand has generated – relatively – many text inferences and also a relatively high number of inferences that refer to the actual world. The protocols show that the participants tried to appoint a genre to the text and sometimes seemed to struggle with their choice of genre: “is it a sort of informative text or ... more like a story … a kind of history about how Hitler...”. This doubt is mainly due to textual markers, such as exclamation marks or strong words that the narrator uses in order to express his opinion, as is reflected in participants’ responses such as “there are obviously some value judgements on certain characters” and “the terms are getting more violent”. Furthermore, the text by De Jong is about a history that the readers share with the author, therefore participants frequently referred to their knowledge about World War II in order to identify the narrator’s and/or implied author’s stance, hence the relatively high number of AW inferences. This was especially true for the expert reader.

Borges’s text generated a large number of actual world inferences, although there are also quite a number of generated story world inferences. The protocols indicate that the participants sometimes were struggling with what is said in the text, hence the story world inferences. For example: “because now it appears if he has found something and then God also turns up and just like that God that says in a way it uh actually uh the same so uh (...) yes the much being the many and uhm and uhm being no one well yeah (...).” In addition, they sometimes, and one participant in particular, tried to understand what is said by referring to their personal world and referential frames, for example what they know about poets or actors, hence the relatively many actual world inferences. One participant said: “it’s about an
uhm actor and that is someone who obviously has trouble with uhm identity uhm”. And another participant said: “so I think that other people use stage also in their daily lives, you don’t have to be an actor but (.) just to pretend you really yeah yeah sometimes you don’t know things about yourself but then you can solve that by uh certain stage like things”. The text appears to challenge or invite readers to reflect on themselves and their idea or definition of identity.

Joyce’s text generated relatively many text inferences. The protocols show that participants do not have much trouble with understanding the text; moreover they wonder what the purpose is of showing the events and characters, and what the characters’ motives are. In other words, participants puzzle more about why certain things are presented to them than what is being told or shown in the text. Inferencing takes place on a textual level; participants are looking for clues. For example one participant said: “yes the purpose is not totally clear yet (...) also that snow that uh (...) that it well yes (...) will probably be a factor then that that will return in the story”. Another participant said: “Hm I wonder what part that Gabriel plays in the whole story he is being uh so described and done and uhm yes really from the beginning actually uh (...) yes (...)”.

The texts by Joyce and De Jong appear to have generated relatively most author inferences. In the case of Joyce’s text these inferences are almost exclusively related to the way Gabriel is described, as for instance in “is he being described totally extensively in ten lines” and “and you see how it is actually written is such detail”, or the inference is related to an appreciation of the detailed description, as in “there he actually creates a beautiful a beautiful image”. De Jong’s text generates in particular author inferences that concern the stance of the person who has written the text towards the historical facts that are being described. As I mentioned before, De Jong’s text can be characterized by attitudinal metadiscourse that shows a visible narrator, and obviously most participants have noticed this, as for instance in “the first sentence says the fatal month January ’33 uh that is a kind of qualification that is given uh”. However, these inferences are actually conflations of pragmatic and textual factors, e.g., implied author, narrator and text as intentional agent, or in any case these inferences are ambiguous.

Finally, based on Nolen and Paxton’s findings I would have expected that the factor narrator visibility would affect the generation of author intent inferences or text inferences that refer to metadiscourse (see section 2). However, as Table 2.5 shows, texts with a visible narrator did not generate substantially more author intent or text inferences than texts with a non-visible narrator. As for literary texts, there were no obvious results compared to non-literary texts. Besides, non-literary texts included a historic text and a horror/fantasy text which differ in a number of ways, therefore, interpretation of these results has to be limited.

**Results of the analysis of the semi-structured interviews**

**Summaries**

Generally, summaries “display readers’ ability to evaluate the structure of a narrative” (Trabasso & Suh, 1997: 530). In the light of the present study I was interested whether the summaries – besides the text’s structure – included spontaneously reported author’s intentions. Generally, the summaries that participants provided after reading the text differed in the amount of words that they used on average; Joyce: 215, Borges: 451, De Jong: 179 and King & Straub: 246. The provided summaries of both the text by Joyce (A) and the text by King and Straub (D) contain the setting (waiting for Gabriel vs. Jack sitting in the street) and the following sequences of the story. Two participants who read Joyce’s text (both non-expert readers) wondered why certain elements are not explained in the text, indirectly referring to
the (implied) author’s selection and choice of omitting. For instance, “why [Gabriel is embarrassed] isn’t told”; [someone they are afraid of that he will come home drunk] nothing is heard of him in this piece”. The summaries that were given of Borges’s text (B) were relatively long, which was caused by expressed doubts such as “maybe I didn’t get that”, “that’s still unclear”, and interpretation and reflection, e.g. “well those are opinions that other people...”.Remarkably, all three participants included a moral or theme in their summaries: “eventually, the conclusion is, I think”, “So actually uhm (...) well that it isn’t bad and that God himself has created his world by dreaming”; “the end is open it isn’t said...”15 One participant said: “that is the summary of the story and at the same time a moral maybe yes”. Finally, summaries of De Jong’s text (C) were especially characterised by readers’ explication of the structure of the text; “well it starts” “in the middle of the story” “at the end of the story”, “last bit”. Furthermore, two of the three participants typified the genre at the beginning of their summary; “like a sort of history” “a sketch of a political situation”. Indirectly, the genre reflects an author’s intention – in this case to tell the history about the Hitler. All in all, only the summaries of Borges’s text explicitly convey the text’s moral, which can be understood as – an explicit clue for – the presumed author’s intention.

PERCEIVED AUTHORIAL INTENTIONS

After participants had given a summary of the text, they were asked what they thought the author had intended with the text. The answers that readers provided refer to the (implied) author as a person, to the intention or intended effect, and sometimes in terms of a message or warning. Participants who read the text sample by Joyce (A) sometimes found it hard to define an intention and reported that the author is merely showing a situation, the character’s appearance and personality. One participant inferred that the author wants to show us what is going on; “apparently by the things these people do by changing colour and what they say he wants to indicate what is going on and why they do the things they do”. Participants who read Borges’s text (B) almost immediately defined a presumed intention while referring to the author; “I think that the writer states exactly the way the story ends that ... the last passage ... includes the conclusion of the story the moral”; “well I think that he equals a poet to God because God creates a world of his own just like a poet does”, or they formulated an intention in terms of a message to be learned: “that we learn something about the identity of a human being”. Maybe not surprisingly, participants who read De Jong’s text about the history of Hitler (text C) all formulated a presumed intention in terms of a warning or lesson to be learned; “that you always have to be cautious not to assume that it all will turn out right”; “Uhm learn the lesson of the past”; “I think that this writer means with this that because of your despair you tend to trust other people but that it not always turns out right”. Participants who read the text by King and Straub (text D) inferred more of less that the author wanted to tell a thrilling story with perhaps a lesson to be learned. One participant (expert reader) tried to assign a genre in order to frame the presumed intention: “I think it is about uhm the threat of a certain category of adults with the literary associations of a horror”. The other two participants – non-expert readers – found it difficult to formulate an intention “because it could be that he wants to write a thrilling story ... or because in another part of the story ... showing how dangerous these men are”, and eventually came up with a lesson: “showing that despite of the fact that you know something is wrong you do it nevertheless ... it could easily have turned out badly” and “it seems intended to well look it isn’t all black and white”. In sum, almost all participants were able to formulate a presumed author’s intention which was often already explicitly or implicitly present in the protocols, although without an explicit

15 Original text: “d’r wordt niet gezegd”.

79
reference to the text’s (implied) author. Therefore it seems that readers have built some representation of a possible authorial intention during the reading of the texts. I will elaborate on this in the discussion section when I discuss the results in relation to observed reading strategies that are similar to what Hunt and Vipond called point-driven reading.

TEXT CLUES

Participants were asked to point to segments or sentences in the text that triggered them to construct the presumed author’s intent. Generally, participants pointed to segments that supported their idea of the (implied) author’s intention. Remarkably almost all participants referred to a passage by heart, without pointing it out in the text, which could indicate that readers did construct some idea of the author’s intention during reading and included particular passages in their mental representation of the text and context (situation and context model) that “struck” them and contributed to the presumed intention. In short, as I mentioned before, participants of the text written by James Joyce referred to a passage in which character Gabriel is extensively described, and this matches up to their presumed author’s intention of describing a situation in order to show us what is really going on beneath the surface. All three readers of Borges’s text pointed to the last paragraph in which the moral of the story is presented. Additional fragments that were mentioned functioned as support for the participant’s idea of the author’s intention, e.g. I am not who I am was mentioned because that sentence relates to the moral that is presented at the end of Borges’s text in which God says: Neither am I anyone; I have dreamt the world as you dreamt your work, my Shakespeare, and among the forms in my dream are you, who like myself are many and no one.

Participants who read the text sample written by De Jong all thought that the author intended to warn readers, and marked text segments that supported this presumed intention, for instance As if those were not politically the three most important positions! Finally, participants who read the text by King & Straub reported elements that supported the author’s intention of either writing a thrilling story, for example the eyes that change colour, the cold laughing, the claw, or warning readers; his instinct told Jack not to reach his hand, to go away, but he did reach the hand and grabbed the candy role. Some of these segments were already mentioned during the think-aloud session.

All the above-mentioned segments or sentences that participants reported as having triggered them to construct an author’s intention, in a way fall into the category of foregrounding or they can be regarded as evaluation points. The description of Gabriel, the last paragraph of Everything and Nothing that reveals a moral, sentences that include a judgemental comment or a certain perspective on the matter, surprising elements such as the claw, the cold laugh, the eyes that turn yellow in the segment taken from The Talisman are all deviations from the local norm of the text. They are foregrounded and readers’ attention seems to be drawn to these instances. Readers’ evaluation of these sentences or segments is very likely the outcome of a more complex process. Possibly, readers processed the text not only in a bottom-up fashion that is based on text-internal information, because as soon as readers have a vague idea of what an (implied) author’s intention could be (cf. Levinson’s hypothetical intention), readers can look for support for this idea in the text (top-down processes). There are instances in the protocols that show this interaction between bottom-up and top-down processing. To provide an example, one participant – an expert reader – signals during the reading of De Jong’s text that the text includes some judgemental comments, after which he broaches a hypothesis for himself – which generates a top-down process – that becomes explicit in the verbal protocol when he says that “the expectation that there is a certain perspective in retrospect over the text of someone who thinks he knows better is
becoming extremely clear in this uh fragment”. Certain sentences support this reader’s hypothesis and therefore struck him.

**Visibility of the author**

Participants were asked to choose from five statements that potentially expressed their experience of an author’s presence during their reading. These statements ranged from “I do not experience a writer, I only experience the text” to “I notice that there is a writer behind the text that I am reading, and I have a clear picture in my head”. The reported answers differed roughly with the text that was read. As I mentioned before, Nolen and Paxton both found that texts with a visible narrator cause readers to be engaged in a mental conversation with the person they imagined the author to be. However, they used non-fictional texts which means that the narrator and author are one and the same person (Nolen, 1995; Paxton, 1997). Although the narrator and the (implied) author are theoretically and ontologically different in fictional texts, a visible narrator can perhaps help the reader in constructing an image of someone who tells the story. This may be the narrator or the (implied) author depending on whether readers can make the distinction between the two.

Joyce’s text has no overt narrator; nevertheless, all participants perceived a writer behind the text and two participants even had a clear image of this writer. One participant clearly felt the presence of someone who wants to tell him a story; “like there’s someone sitting in a comfortable chair”. Another participant thought there was a writer behind the text “who very consciously presents this in that particular way”, but could not come up with the author’s purpose. Borges’ text has no obvious, present narrator, until the last paragraph (*History adds that…*). Participants reported that during reading they felt that they were directed in some direction; which direction appeared at the very end of the text; “in the beginning it isn’t clear at all what the text is about and uh not until the end you get that you are directed in a certain direction”. The text by De Jong has a clear and present narrator. Nevertheless, only one participant – the expert reader – reported to have a clear picture of the author; “in the sense that I’ve got a feeling what he is getting at … I sense that I am being directed … a certain manipulation”. The other two participants – both non-expert readers – reported that the text is merely a history and the author tells a story that is familiar, therefore these participants did not experience an author; “this is more like telling a story and you know the images from the television, of course, that he is standing on a balcony and these people who are cheering well uh you can picture that so you do not think about a writer”. While reading the text by King and Straub, which has no visible narrator, participants felt that it is not totally clear who the author is, but he definitely is directing the reader in a certain direction. One participant – an expert reader – thought about a category of authors based on genre knowledge; “a modern uhmm thriller-like book […] that is a category of authors, but not a specific one”.

In sum, it seems that most participants felt the presence of an author who wants to tell them a story for some – unknown – purpose (Joyce), or participants felt that the author directed them in a certain direction; Borges led them to the moral at the end of the text, King and Straub led readers towards the unravelling of the story by creating suspense throughout the fragment, and De Jong directed his readers towards a moral or lesson to be learned. Interestingly, the non-expert participants regarded the text by De Jong as merely a historical representation, and therefore experienced no author. Apparently referential frames such as genre conventions are of influence, and perhaps the images that this text evokes, such as

---

16 Although one of these two participants, the expert reader, recognised the text and its corresponding empirical author, and reported that, based on photos, she had a very clear image of the author.
Hitler standing on the balcony in the Wilhelmstrasse in 1933 watching the parade, are so well-known from film and television that they dominate the reader’s feeling of an author’s presence.

SHARING A CAB WITH THE AUTHOR

Participants were told to imagine that they had to share a cab with the author of the text and were asked to picture the image of this person to the researcher. Although some participants, as I mentioned in the previous subsection, did not experience the presence of a writer during reading, or at least had no clear image of this person, all participants easily reported a more or less detailed image of the (implied) author. It seems that participants inferred associations based on the text as well as from their own experience, i.e. referential frames such as cultural knowledge and (conventional) knowledge about authors. For instance, Joyce was pictured as someone who wants to impress people by the way he is dressed and by his knowledge, and who wears a bowler and a dark coat. One participant said that he would not know what this writer would say to him in a cab, since it was not clear to him what the writer had intended with the story. Jorge Luis Borges on the other hand was pictured as “a kind of worn out theatre-like person ... in a long, dark, a bit greasy coat and a big hat” or “a bit of an intellectual type”, someone who would hold profound conversations. Lou de Jong was pictured as a man in his forties who thinks the matters in life through – an intellectual, educated person. The expert reader thought of the writer as a history teacher “with firm shoes and jeans that slip down a bit”. King and Straub’s text resulted in some interesting images of the presumed (single) author. One participant, the expert reader, pictured a slick person, but at the same time was aware of projecting the character in the white suit onto the author. Therefore, he corrected himself and reported: “American, mid-life and pretty normal”. Surprisingly, it turned out that this image was derived from a picture of Stephen King that the participant saw the other day; he was surprised to see that this writer actually turned out to be more like an average guy than someone you might expect to find in his works. Another participant ended up with associating the author with her Christian aunt who she thought was just as annoying and lecturing. The third participant thought that the author was either a “very lugubrious little fellow” or “an ordinary man in a suit that arrives at six and then reads his children a story, and wants to make it as thrilling as possible but with a happy ending of course, otherwise they [the children] cannot sleep”. Although the participants hardly generated author inferences during reading, for instance, compared to the number of generated story world inferences, apparently, they all have constructed a more or less detailed mental representation of the implied author. In addition, two participants most likely constructed a mental representation of the – presumed – empirical author based on biographical information. How can we explain this seemingly gap between on-line and off-line processing? I will return to this issue in the discussion section.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire contained items relating to reading behaviour, such as reading motivation, reading frequency and genre preference, as well as items concerning evaluation of the texts. Results show that reading in general is motivated by several aspects that were evaluated to be of importance: relaxation (by 80% of the participants), to learn something (70%), immerse oneself in a book (70%), enjoying the style (90%), reading is part of general education (40%), to discuss the story with others (50%) and because the theme is interesting (90%). Most

17 This participant had trouble distinguishing between the first-person narrator and the writer: “yes I mix them up a bit I think”.
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participants spend approximately between one and five hours per week on reading narrative books. Genre preferences concerned most frequently novels, poetry, drama and non-fiction. Selection of a book appeared to be based on the book cover (40%), whether a book has recently been published (40%), the theme (100%), the (famous) author (100%), whether the book has a film or theatre adaptation (40%), and the book jacket (60%).

As for text evaluation, participants who read text A (Joyce) agreed on that the text was not complex, was literary, did not show a visible author’s intention and evoked no clear image of the author. Participants who read text B (by Borges) generally agreed on that the text was complex, literary, contained a visible authorial intention and provided a clear image of the author. Participants who read text C (by De Jong) generally agreed on that the text was not complex, was literary, and contained an author’s intention that is perceptive for readers, but does not provide the reader with a clear image of the author. Finally, participants who read King and Straub’s text (text D) agreed that the text was not complex, not literary, showed no visible author’s intention and gave no clear image of the author. These experiences are in line with the selection criteria that I presented earlier. The complete list of items and specifics on the results are included in the appendix.

5. Discussion

This exploratory study intended to answer two questions; one was what type of inferences readers generate with regard to the communication model when they read a narrative text, and the second was whether readers generate author inferences during the reading of narrative text or more specifically whether readers report these inferences when thinking out loud. In addition, I examined whether narrator visibility, reading strategies and reader expertise affect the generation of these inferences, and if so, in what way.

Did readers generate author inferences?

As for the first question, the results indicate that most inferences were explanatory elaboration of the situation model followed by text inferences, and only few author inferences were generated. The protocols showed only incidentally explicit – strong – author inferences and these expressed a certain admiration for the way the text was written, such as “there he creates actually a beautiful image”. Interestingly, these inferences were generated by an expert reader after she had recognized the text and its empirical author, due to her professional interest in that author. Whereas she first tries to comprehend the story and the textual context, recognition seems to result in activation of contextual information and a constructed situation model – and perhaps a previously constructed representation of the implied and empirical author Joyce – from memory that helps her to create a coherent text representation. This information also appears to constrain the number of possible inferences and offers room to signal and interpret details by referring to conventional knowledge as well as the communication level between author and reader (cf. Chapter 1, section 6). Besides the few obvious instances of strong author inferences, the protocols included weak author inferences, such as “the way it is written is so detailed” that refer to the fact that the text has been written but lack a referent such as “the writer”.

Furthermore the protocols included text inferences that in a way point to an (implied) author’s selection or choice in constructing the text, for instance why a particular clause, sentence or segment could have been selected. For example “…are all things that in a discrete way somewhat provide an image of Gabriel”. In addition, the protocols show that literary frames of reference such as conventions and models of – literary – genres and referential frames that relate to thematic knowledge are involved in the generation of text inferences as
Examples from the protocols are “that will be a factor that will return in the story”, “first sentence…could be the beginning of a short story”, “I think that we are moving towards a moral here”, and “I’m not sure what kind of story it will be…an informative text or rather a narrative”. These comments in a way all relate to the text’s construction and although the implied author is not explicitly mentioned, it is the (implied) author who has chosen to present the text in this particular way. In practice these ambiguous inferences were hard to code; the coding scheme obviously could not translate the levels and elements of the communication model well to the protocols. The reason is that these ambiguous segments seem to include participants’ conflations of different levels and elements of the communication model, i.e. the text’s implied author, narrator and in some cases text intention, theme or point, such as “it has something to do with…” or “…Hitler is spoken of in very grand words”. What does it refer to? By whom of what is Hitler spoken of; by the implied author, the narrator, or the text as intentional agent? Even some of the few strong author inferences were ambiguous. For instance, “that expectation of some kind of perspective that covers the text [,.] perspective in retrospect of someone that thinks to know better (…)”, actually is a participant’s conflation of the text’s implied author and narrator. Apparently, the think-aloud method is not well equipped to distinguish between readers’ verbal accounts of the implied author, narrator or text as intentional agent.

Interestingly, although readers hardly generated explicit author inferences during the reading process, they could all give a more or less detailed image of the implied author after reading. Furthermore, readers could all come up with a presumed implied author’s intention which was often already implicitly or explicitly verbalised in the protocols. How can we explain this apparent gap between on-line and off-line processing, i.e. comprehension and post-comprehension? Possibly, readers have somehow unconsciously constructed an image of the implied author and built some representation of a possible authorial intention during reading. If this is the case, the fact that only few author intent and attitude inferences were found in the protocols can be a shortcoming of the method. After all, think-aloud protocols are supposed to reflect what is accessible to consciousness, codeable in language and reflect what is available in working memory (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Consequently, verbal protocols may underestimate the reading process, because thinking is not always conscious and expressible in language. However, there may be cues for cognitive activity present in the protocols without the contents of this activity being verbally expressed by the reader. For instance, some argue that pause duration reflects the cognitive effort needed to retrieve mental representations (Schilperoord & Sanders, 1997). The protocols indeed show some instances in which readers hesitate or pause before verbalizing a thought that displays an author inference or an inference that seems a conflation of the implied author, narrator and/or intentional text inference. One non-expert reader, for instance, first paused and then verbalised her thoughts concerning a possible authorial intention: “uhm (…) yes at times he would leave a confession hidden away in some corner of his work I think that they mean with that uh (,) that he pronounces words in the role of some kind of character which truly express what he feels himself”. The duration of the pause and the hesitations may indicate that she is trying to explain – and formulate – what the (implied) author wants to express with this specific clause. Other examples can be found in the protocols as well, such as “and it is uh that it has something to do with uh discovering yourself and finding that uh in what what others say about it in in what you read and uh and uh well discovering yourself (..) I’m trying to the theme well determine well what the text is about”. Perhaps the think-aloud method interferes with the reading process in the sense that both trying to comprehend the text and report the thoughts that occur puts heavy demands on the working memory. I will return to the methodological implications of the results in a minute.
First, I would like to mention a few things about reading strategies. The previous example showed that the reader tried to understand the text by assuming that the implied author must have had some particular meaning or intention (“I think they mean with that”). If we take a closer look at the protocols, there are indications that readers used a reading strategy that is point-driven rather than story-driven. Although the implied author is mentioned only incidentally and even then seems conflated with the text’s narrator or text as intentional agent, readers seem to have read with the assumption that the text has some kind of point, intention or message. As we have seen in section five of the previous chapter, Russell Hunt and Douglas Vipond hypothesised that readers who read in a point-driven way will try to construct a global speech act and therefore tend to delay closure and hold information longer in working memory, make more effort to integrate apparently unrelated details, be more sensitive to stylistic features and signal discrepancies between the implied values and beliefs of the author as against values and beliefs of characters. The protocols show that readers tend to set up a hypothesis about what the point or intention could be and try to find evidence in the text or call on their background knowledge in order to support or dismiss the hypothesis. One example of this strategy is a reader who verbalises her thoughts while reading Borges’ text: “Well I think that it is about someone uh (.) can never know how another person thinks or feels and uh (…) let’s see why (…) yes that that friend he uh (.) tries to tell to how he feels who uh (.) who is surprised (.) and uh (…) yes so he gets the feeling that he is different…” (underscores are mine). The protocols also show instances that are in line with Hunt and Vipond’s expectation that point-driven readers tend to delay closure and generate predictive inferences about apparently unrelated details. One reader who read Joyce’s text, for instance, said: “this snow that uh (…) that uh (.) I suppose will be a factor that will appear again in the story” and an expert reader who read King and Straub’s text said: “but that will be revealed later why it is of importance to mention that it’s a couple of houses further down”.

As for stylistic features that Hunt and Vipond mention, these seemed to be signalled, or at least mentioned, only by expert readers, who – as the quantitative results of the protocol analysis showed – generated relatively many text inferences. Only expert readers mentioned the narrator in relation to verbs such as “convince” or “describe”, and signalled narratological perspective. Finally, observed discrepancies between values of the author and characters, which Hunt and Vipond regard as characteristic of point-driven reading, were not mentioned, which can be due to the fact these texts did not contain specific morals that could be in conflict with those of the author – as assumed by the reader – or the reader. However, as I mentioned earlier, readers appeared to have compared their referential frame with what is presented in the text. This was most obvious in the texts by De Jong and by Borges. In the text by De Jong the author’s perspective on historical facts was set alongside the reader’s own perception and knowledge. Borges’s text is not so much about ethical issues, but more about philosophical themes such as identity and personality: are we who we think we are. The protocols showed that readers of Borges’s text used their referential frame against which they, in a way, tested the ideas in Borges’s text: do I agree with what is being said about identity? I will return to this issue in the next chapter when I discuss theories of fiction based on a mutual agreement between author and reader, and in chapters 4 and 5 when I report results of experiments in which discrepancies between the morals of the narrator and that of the implied and/or empirical author play an important role.

---

18 Only two non-expert readers occasionally noticed the style (“Yes it’s especially uh the style that (.) me uh well actually emerges that it it a bit uh well chatty”), but they did not relate this to the implied author.
What effect did the factors have on inference generation?

The main aim was to explore whether factors such as reader expertise, narrator visibility and reading strategy affect the generation of author inferences. However, the inclusion of several factors in the study and an attempt to manipulate reading strategy may have given the impression of putting some implicit hypothesis to the test. This was not my intention; the idea was to explore whether readers would be more inclined to generate author inferences when some “mental buttons” would be pushed as for instance with the instruction: are readers of an intentional instruction more willing to read in a point-driven way and generate author inferences? The results indicate that some of the factors may indeed have been of influence to the generation of author inferences. Reader expertise seemed to be of influence, since expert readers generated most author inferences. As the results of the loglinear analysis showed, this was especially when expert readers were given a neutral instruction. This seems rather strange, since it was hoped for that the intentional instruction would trigger readers to read in a point-driven way and consequently generate author inferences. Possibly, readers have disregarded the instruction, and read in their own way, or the instruction did not trigger point-driven or story-driven reading. Another possibility is that the instructions asked readers to perform cognitive processes that are not in line with the demands of the text. For instance, the text by King and Straub seems to be intended to thrill its readers and the focus is on the exciting events in the fictional world. To accomplish this effect, evoking fear or excitement in the reader, the “hand of the author” who constructed this world has to be invisible. An instruction to focus on the author’s intention therefore conflicts with the demands of the text. As I have mentioned before, the protocols show indications that most readers read in a point-driven way, which could indicate that point-driven reading – reading with the expectation that the text is written with some purpose – is a default reading strategy (cf. Gibbs, 1999). As for narrator visibility, it appeared to be difficult to interpret the data and compare the data for the different texts, since the frequencies for author inferences were rather low for all texts. However, results of post-reading tasks highlighted one text in particular that readers uniformly considered to contain a clearly visible authorial intention, which was explicated as a moral in the last paragraph of the text; that particular text was Everything and Nothing by Luis Jorge Borges.

In sum, the protocols have shown that the reading process may involve rather complex interactions between bottom-up and top-down processes that seem to be motivated by a point-driven reading strategy; readers are supposed to read with the expectation that an (implied) author has intended the text to contain a point. Although I did not find many author inferences in the verbal protocols, it is possible that readers generated implied author inferences during reading, but did so more or less automatically and unconsciously as part of their comprehension process. That could explain the fact that readers were able to formulate a presumed intention, point out to passages in the text that contributed to their constructed authorial intention, and describe their image of the implied author without considerable efforts. These tasks should be rather difficult for readers if they did not generate any author inferences and construct no context model, but – as some theories suggest – were immersed into the story world and did not perceive anything but the events, setting and characters of the text (Gerrig, 1993). If that was the case readers should have read in a story-driven way and the protocols should have shown exclusively statements related to the story world. Instead, the protocols indicate that readers seem to have read in a point-driven way, which means that they assumed that the text is written with some purpose and contains a point or message. This is interesting, because apparently readers do not need to know something about the author’s identity in order to make presumptions about the author’s intention. Readers assumed an
implied author’s intention, even though they had no idea who the empirical author could be because the texts were presented without any biographical or contextual information. At the same time readers were able to construct a rather detailed image of the implied author. Apparently the cognitive representation of the implied author includes an intentional element, e.g. this text is written by someone with a certain purpose. Furthermore, it is likely that this mental representation of the implied author has already been processed during reading. However, I cannot exclude the possibility that this representation has – partly – been constructed during post-reading processes, for instance, from associations that are related to the characters in the text or to the presumed intention.

Methodological and conceptual implications

The results of this study have methodological and conceptual implications. First, conceptual improvements are called for. As stated before, Graesser et al.’s (1994) category of author intent and attitude inferences is ill-defined; it exclusively corresponds to the gist of the text, “the author’s attitude or motive in writing” (Graesser et al., 1994). Readers are considered to generate these inferences “when they infer the point that the author is making” and the text that elicits this inference is the entire passage. Results of the current study show that the concept is more subtle than just the “point” the author is making. For instance, readers can clearly sense the presence of an implied author who directs his or her readers in a certain direction or is manipulating them, without knowing the author’s purpose yet. Nevertheless, these readers can be said to generate author intent and attitude inferences, e.g. “I think [sense] that we are leading uh to a uh point here”. In this study I did not provide the participants with biographical information about the author, but one can imagine that if that would be the case other types of author inferences (empirical author inferences) could be generated as well as I will show in the next chapters.

In addition, the definition of the concept inference itself, i.e. information that is activated during reading but that is not explicitly stated in the text, may also be too narrow, at least in the way that Trabasso and Magliano used the concept in their protocol analysis (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996). They distinguish between inferences that either explain, associate or predict, and provide answers to why, what, how and what happens next questions. Consequently, comments or positions that refer to the (implied) author, but that do not provide an answer to a question rather constitutes the question itself, should strictly be regarded as metacomment and not as an inference. However, if a reader would have said “I wonder why the author described Gabriel so extensively” the reader does use information that is not stated in the text and relate this to the context model, i.e. the implied author. It could be that this reader delays closure and holds this particular information longer in working memory with the expectation that later on in the text it may become clear why Gabriel is described in so much detail (cf. point-driven reading strategies and literary control system in Chapter 1). As mentioned before, these instances seem conflations of several levels and elements of the communication model that are relevant to the present study and which should not be ignored based on a limited definition of inference.

Furthermore, a more precise distinction between author inferences and text inferences would be useful. As we have seen in section 3, text inferences sometimes imply an intention, a choice or selection. For example, predictive inferences such as “The colour of the eyes is described in detail, something is going to happen with the eyes” may be understood constructions of strategies of an editorial intelligence. Strictly speaking, the – heterodiegetic – narrator includes the textual level, therefore textual characteristics as narrator-type should be studied for their potential to make the (implied) author visible in the text and influence both the reader’s perception of authorial intent and the reader’s representation of the (implied)
author (cf. Paxton, 1997). Hunt and Vipond’s suggestion of discrepancies between the author’s and narrator’s morals is another point of interest that deserves attention. I will elaborate on this in the next chapter.

Secondly, methodological improvements are called for. Apparently the think-aloud method is not fit to discriminate between inferences that unambiguously refer to the implied author and those that do not, e.g. refer to the text’s narrator. The next chapter will therefore elaborate on a way to force readers more or less to distinguish between these different levels of the communication model by creating a discrepancy between readers’ presumed morally acceptable values of the implied author and those of the text’s narrator. Furthermore, results of the reported study indicate that author inferences may be generated automatically and cannot be revealed through the think-aloud method. More specific short-lived author inferences may thus be measured using more appropriate experimental techniques. Chapter 4 and 5 will show how on-line measurements can – potentially – reveal these (short-lived) author inferences.
Chapter 3  Game over
  Reading as joint pretence

Suppose we read the following words:

I had been sick for a long time. When the day came for me to leave hospital, I barely knew how to walk anymore, could barely remember who I was supposed to be. Make an effort, the doctor said, and in three or four months you’ll be back in the swing of things. I didn’t believe him, but I followed his advice anyway. They had given me up for dead, and now that I had confounded their predictions and mysteriously failed to die, what choice did I have but live as though a future life were waiting for me?

It is fairly possible that these words are verbalized by someone who shares his or her experience with some gathered friends, or by someone who has put his or her thoughts in a letter to a close friend. In both cases the “I” obviously would be identical to the person who verbalizes the words. However, in this case the quoted words are expressed by an invented person called Sidney Orr, who narrates the story in Oracle Night, a novel written by Paul Auster (Auster, 2003). This is typical for written fiction: authors tell their readers a story but they do not normally address the (implied) reader directly. Instead, they introduce narrators and characters who indirectly or directly express intentions that do not necessarily have to be theirs. The authors themselves are hiding in the wings of the fictional stage on which the events of the story are taking place. This has implications for the way readers encounter and read fiction as well as for their “relation” with the (implied) author. In this chapter I will argue that readers and authors of fictional texts make an implicit mutual agreement. This joint pretence or game-of-make-believe, which means that the author and reader jointly pretend that the events in the fictional world are taking place, is conventionally based on default assumptions by the reader regarding the (implied) author’s intentions and moral or ideological position: when the reader accepts the author’s invitation of joint pretence, he or she presumes that the author is sincere, to be trusted, and has morals and values that are not questionable. Normally, readers of fiction are hardly aware of this assumption, because their trust or pact with the author is not challenged. However, the trust the reader grants the author is put under pressure when the author invites his reader to imagine a fictional world that the reader takes to be morally deviant. The joint pretence or game of make-believe is likely part of the mutual knowledge or common ground between the author and reader as part of the communication situation, and which is believed to constrain a reader’s subjective interpretation of the context (context model) as well as the comprehension process that is involved in reading (cf. Chapter 1, § 6). I will elaborate further on these assumptions in section 1 in which I discuss the reading of fiction from a linguistic perspective, which states that language use, including the reading of fiction, is actually a form of joint action: speakers and listeners, as well as writers
and readers, perform their actions in coordination. Section 2 reports the results of a pilot study that was conducted in order to select stimulus material for an experiment in which predictions regarding the default assumption concerning the implied author and its violation through morally disputable text content, i.e. an immoral narrator, were tested. The method and results of this experiment are presented in section 3, and the last section discusses the results and the implications for further research.

1. Fiction as joint pretence

There seems to be something special about the genre of fiction; it creates a world in which logical rules and laws of nature do not necessarily have to apply, while at the same time it hides its creator and its readers behind the scenes of the fictional world. The reader agrees to his and the author’s hiding, because it contributes to the reward he receives, which is – emotional – pleasure and entertainment, and maybe even cognitive gain, in witnessing exiting, thrilling, dramatic or even horrific events that take place in a fictional world. At the same time the reader can witness these events safely, knowing that he or she never really is going to be hit by a gigantic spaceship, cheated on by the love of his life, or killed by a monstrous creature. So there definitely seems to be a treat in reading fiction. By getting immersed into a make-believe world, investing time and cognitive and affective effort in figuring out how the story unfolds, the reader hopes to get some positive result for his investments (cf. Tan, 1996). The question is, however, where does that leave the author? If I would have said that the words at the beginning of this chapter were verbalized by someone called Paul Auster, you would have assumed that this person told a true personal story. But the moment we learn that Auster is the inventor of a piece of fiction, we automatically seem to change to some kind of – reading – frame in which the words are no longer verbalized by Auster, but by someone, a narrator, who we later in the text get to know as Sidney Orr. How do we approach the genre of fiction and account for its reading? Are there any rules that readers have to be aware of, and what clues, if any, point to reading a text as fiction? But most important for the current issue is the question what role the author has in the reading of fiction, and what implications the reading of fiction has for readers’ constructions of a mental representation of the author as part of their context model.

In the next two subsections I will set forth some of the main theoretical assumptions of a sociolinguistic approach of fictional discourse (speech act theory), and a psycholinguistic approach of fiction as a special form of communication (joint pretence). In addition, I will touch upon the limitations of these theoretical assumptions as well as the implications for the relation between the reader and author, especially when moral and ideological issues are involved.

Speech act theories

For a long time literary theory and philosophy have approached fiction mainly as a textual category, focusing on characteristics that are determined by the text’s relations to the world, such as reference and truth value (Currie, 1990). The central question was not so much what determined fictional reading, but rather what is fiction as opposed to non-fiction. At the same time there is some discussion though about the so-called ‘paradox of fiction’: do readers experience real emotions or make-believe emotions, do readers temporarily forget that they are reading or watching a piece of fiction, or do they so make-believingly? See for instance Chapter [II] of (Carroll, 1990). I follow Tan and others’ position that readers do have real emotions when engaging into fiction (Tan, 1996).

1 There is some discussion though about the so-called ‘paradox of fiction’: do readers experience real emotions or make-believe emotions, do readers temporarily forget that they are reading or watching a piece of fiction, or do they so make-believingly? See for instance Chapter [II] of (Carroll, 1990). I follow Tan and others’ position that readers do have real emotions when engaging into fiction (Tan, 1996).

2 Here and in the rest of this subsection author can refer to the implied author, the empirical author or both, unless this is specified in the text. In the empirical studies (pilot and experiment) author refers to the implied author unless biographical information is taken into account. If so, this will be specified in the text.
time these approaches implicitly and explicitly made assumptions about the reading of fiction (Schram, 1998). Since the mid seventies, however, the focus has been shifted towards an approach of fiction in terms of readers’ processes concerning fictional texts (ibid., 84). Supposedly of influence to this shift were theories that are concerned with language use, such as a theory of speech acts. The basic emphasis of this theory is on, as the name already implies, language as an act of communication. Each utterance (a speech act) is considered to have three levels which can be illustrated by the following example. If a bartender in a bar says “the bar will be closed in five minutes” he performs a locutionary act of saying that the bar will be closed, but he is also getting his guests and barflies to recognize his meaning that the bar is about to close (an illocutionary act). At the same time he is getting these people to believe that the bar is about to close in order to have them leave (a perlocutionary act) (Austin, 1962). According to John Searle, understanding the speaker’s intention is essential in capturing the utterance’s meaning. In other words, the meaning of an utterance is strongly related to the illocutionary speech act (Searle, 1975).

The issue is that fictional discourse poses a problem for speech act theorists such as Searle, because the category of fictional utterances does not obey the rules that apply to everyday speech, such as ‘be truthful and sincere’. If speakers do not follow these rules they are considered to be lying, saying things that are false, mistaken, or pointless etcetera. The writer of fiction, on the other hand, is what some have called “a licensed liar”; in terms of truth value he is obviously lying. Truth value as a criterion for deciding whether a text is fiction or non-fiction therefore does not seem to hold good. The question would be then whether there are two separate classes of illocutionary acts involved in fiction and non-fiction. Searle rejects this possibility by arguing that according to this view we would have to learn a new set of meanings to words in order to understand a work of fiction and that is, obviously, not the case. The words taken from Oracle Night could occur both in fiction and non-fiction without the meaning of the words being changed, and in both cases we would have no trouble in understanding the words. Instead, Searle argues, fiction contains the same utterance acts as non-fiction; however, fiction implies another ball game: it is a language game with a separate set of conventions. And now it gets interesting for our purpose: “It is the performance of the utterance act with the intention of invoking the horizontal conventions that constitutes the pretended performance of the illocutionary act” [my italics] (ibid., 327). In other words, the difference between fiction and non-fiction lies within the speaker’s (writer’s) intention to pretend; he or she pretends to perform an illocutionary act.

Searle’s theoretical claims have received critical reactions, for one by Gregory Currie, who agrees with the idea that fiction is determined by the writer’s intention, but who rejects Searle’s arguments in favour of what he labels “Pretence Theory” (Currie, 1990). Currie argues that an author of fiction is not pretending to assert: “On the contrary, the author is performing a genuine communicative act that is not merely the pretence of some other act, assertive or otherwise” (ibid., 13). Where Searle denies that there are different illocutionary acts involved in fictional acts and non-fictional acts, Currie argues that there are indeed two kinds of illocutionary acts; the writer of non-fiction performs the illocutionary act of asserting, the writer of fiction is performing a fictional act. This can be formulated as: “What the author of fiction does intend is that the reader take … a certain attitude towards the propositions uttered in the course of his performance” (ibid., 18). This attitude is ‘make-

3 Pretending is a type of behaviour; therefore one could say that it already implies an intention. Accidentally pretending is impossible, but pretending can become deceivable if participants of the communication are not aware of the pretending, as could be concluded from the Demidenko-case (Chapter 1). Cf. Searle who claims that pretence is inherently intentional (Searle, 1979: 65).
believe’, a term Currie borrows from Kendall Walton (Walton, 1990). So in accordance with Currie’s line of argument, Paul Auster would intend us to make-believe that the story as uttered is true, and according to Searle Auster would pretend to assert that he was held in hospital and so on.

Schram (1998) argues that theories on language acts contributed to a shift in focus on fiction in the literary theoretical field from relational characteristics, such as reference and truth value, towards fictional reading (Schram, 1998). Speech act theories indeed stress that all language acts, including the writing of fiction, are communicative acts, but the focus is still strongly on truth value and reference. This is what causes problems for Searle and Currie in their effort to explain the difference between fiction and non-fiction. Both conclude that the act of fiction has to do with the writer’s or speaker’s intention; for Searle this means ‘pretending’ and Currie’s position seems to meet what Grice called a reflexive intention. However, what both positions, and perhaps speech act theories in general, seem to have in common is under-exposing the role of the reader. Currie literally says that “fiction has nothing to do with the reader’s response” (Currie, 1995). As Herbert Clark has argued pithily it seems “as if the official portrait of a wedding included a groom but no bride”, by which he means that the terms (e.g. speech act, illocutionary act) explain what speakers do, but comparable terms for what listeners do are not included in a speech act theory (Clark, 1996). Linguistic communication to Searle and others is like writing a letter, dropping it in the mail, and not bothering whether anybody receives, reads or understands it, Clark argues. To him language use is not unilateral; on the contrary, it is a form of joint action in which it takes two to tango – almost literally since he makes a striking comparison with dancing. Ginger Rogers and Fred Astaire, he says, can dance separately but the sum of these two individual acts would not make the waltz; instead “waltzing is the joint action that emerges as Astaire and Rogers do their individual steps in coordination, as a couple” (ibid., 3). Clark holds that, like dancing, all language use is a form of joint action that emerges when two or more individuals – an ensemble – perform individual acts in coordination.

_Fiction is like waltzing: it takes two to tango_

In order to perform joint actions participants have to coordinate, and they manage this by calling on their shared background in which the actions are rooted (common ground, cf. Chapter 1, § 6), by coordinating between what the speaker means and the addressee understands (speaker’s meaning) and through the use and recognition of signals (signalling). In the bartender episode, for example, the bartender and his guests share a common ground that contains, for instance, shared knowledge that ordering drinks is no longer an option when the bar is about to be closed, and that it is time for guests to go home. In uttering the words “the bar will be closed in five minutes” the bartender intends his guests to recognize his intention of informing them, and urging them to leave, and the guests have to recognize this intention. The bartender gives his guests a signal by saying that the bar is about to close, but he could also have signalled by turning off the music and switching on the lights. If the guests would not recognize this signal as part of a joint action, the bartender would have to opt for another signal to have his communicative partners recognize his intention.

Reading a novel apparently differs from face-to-face conversations, in the sense that an author and his readers are not physically present; they are remote in time and place (cf. Clark, 1996: 363; Dixon & Bortolussi, 2001). This obviously limits their options to achieve a “successful” communication. Nevertheless, they indeed perform a joint action, but a kind of joint action that is characteristic to all “nonserious language”, and which Clark calls joint

---

4 Although Currie disagrees with Walton at least on one point: Walton denies that “we can define fiction itself in terms of the author’s intention concerning our make-believe” (ibid.).
pretence (Clark, 1996). This can be illustrated by the following example. Imagine that a friend tells you a joke or a story. What he actually does is inviting you to join him in imagining a world in which the events that he describes actually happened (joint pretence). In telling the joke, Clark says, the joint pretence is that the friend is a reporter who is telling the reportee (you) about something that actually happened. Both participants join in the pretence by taking a certain role. An author does much the same: if we stick to the fragment taken from Oracle Night, Paul Auster invites us to join him in pretending that there is a world in which a person called Sidney Orr tells that he had been sick for a long time. In a way Auster pretends to be Sidney Orr and we pretend to be the listeners Orr addresses his story to (cf. the communication model in section 6, Chapter 1). According to Clark, “all fiction requires joint pretence” and although writers of novels do not explicitly announce that they want to tell us a story, we recognize the invitation because “we know the literary conventions for novels” (ibid., 362 and 363). Of course, a book cover that says “a novel by…” or just plain “novel” also functions as a signal that readers are expected to recognize as an invitation from the author in joining the pretence.

In the act of pretending the participants – here: the author and reader – jointly create a layer on which actions in the fictional world take place. This phenomenon is what Clark calls layering, and it is thought to be a feature of all types of stories and common to all “nonserious actions” (ibid., 353 ff.). By telling a joke or a story, or teasing someone – “You’re such a genius” to someone who is obviously not –, the speaker is taking actions at two layers: on the surface he is making an assertion, which is a nonserious action (layer 2), yet beneath the surface he is pretending to assert and this is a serious action (layer 1). The listener, on the other hand, is invited by the speaker to join him in imagining the actions of the second layer, whereas the joint pretence is rooted in the first layer. In my opinion the concept of layering provides a solution for the discussion I described earlier, namely whether the author of fiction is asserting or is merely pretending to assert. In line with Clark’s argument, one could say that at the basic layer the author is – as Currie justly argued – taking a serious action, “a genuine communicative act” and that is pretending to assert. On the subsequent layer the author is making an assertion in the role of a narrator, and this is a nonserious action. In joining the author to pretend and thereby recognizing his intention to do so, readers perform actions at different layers. If we take the example from Auster’s novel, the following layers can be distinguished:

Layer 2  Sidney Orr is telling his narratees an autobiographical story.
Layer 1  Paul Auster and his readers jointly pretend that the events in layer 2 are taking place.

We join Auster in pretending that the events in layer 2 are taking place, and the pretence is that Auster is Sidney Orr and we are his narratees. This mutual agreement between Auster

---

5 This is regardless of whether the reader knows something about Auster the empirical author. If not, he or she assumingly will join the implied author Auster in a joint pretence.

6 Authors can pile layer upon layer in their texts on which actions take place, while readers, on their part, continue the joint pretence by constructing another layer in their text representation. Paul Auster, for instance, creates several layers in Oracle Night. Main protagonist and narrator, Sidney Orr, is writing a novel about a person who is reading a manuscript of Oracle Night, a story about a person who decides to change his life drastically after he has survived an accident. Auster thus creates at least three layers on top of the basic layer. The fun in reading this particular novel is that slowly striking similarities begin to evolve between these different layers that seem to challenge the rules of causation.

7 Clark suggests that literary theorists distinguish another layer of communication that is involved in reading fiction, which includes the “implied author” and “implied reader” (both concepts are borrowed from Wayne Booth). This layer is placed upon the basic layer (which includes the actual author and readers) and is thought to be crucial to understand the author’s tone, irony, and other rhetorical effects. How this is supposed to be established in the act of communication is not discussed (cf. Chapter 1, § 6). Because I take the perspective of
and his readers is rooted in layer 1, which is the basic layer on which further layers are piled. The actions involved in the joint pretence take place in at least two worlds or domains of action, with each domain in principle being a complete world that is characterized by its participants, roles, time etcetera. So, in the example taken from *Oracle Night*, we can distinguish two layers and each layer contains a world or domain of action. The first and basic layer consists of both Auster and his contemporary readers who inhibit a domain that could be called our everyday world of the 21st century. The actions of the second layer seem to take place in a domain that resembles 21st century New York. Although states and events in layer 2 (the make-believe world) may correspond to states and events in layer 1 (the “real” world), access to layers is supposedly asymmetrical. Sidney Orr knows nothing about Paul Auster, at least that is the pretence. However, it seems plausible that readers may export a fictional action to the domain of the first and basic layer in order to infer something about Auster the empirical or the implied author, depending on whether readers have biographical knowledge. For instance, readers could export the struggling of Sidney Orr in writing a novel in order to infer something about the writing experience of Paul Auster, the empirical or implied author.

I will return to this in the next subsection.

Joint pretence depends, like all joint actions, upon coordination between the participants: by calling on common ground, such as certain referential frames, presuming communicative intentions, and by signalling. As mentioned before, fiction as joint pretence obviously differs from everyday conversations, for one because author and reader are physically distant at the time of reading. Still, I believe that the joint pretence creates a pragmatic context that anchors the – temporal – communicative situation in which the author can coordinate with the reader by signalling, and whereas the reader has to recognize these signals as such, which means that he has to attribute communicative intentions to these signals. For instance, a shift in perspective can function as a signal for the reader to create a subsequent layer or move from one layer to another. Furthermore, Graesser et al. have suggested that authors may intentionally compose special features in the language or plot that help readers to keep track of the various characters’ knowledge of significant episodes (Graesser et al., 1999). Authors can also coordinate by making an appeal to the common ground between them and their readers. For instance, Paul Auster presents a domain in the second layer (the make-believe world) that resembles the domain of the first and basic layer (21st century New York), and by calling on common ground he helps contemporary readers in creating the second layer. Furthermore, by providing his readers with props, such as a detailed description of Sidney Orr’s study which is “hardly bigger than a closet”, Auster invites his readers in jointly pretending that the events in the fictional world are real: the props help

---

8 For a more detailed and a helpful account of the degree of accessibility of these textual actual worlds (TW) from the actual world (AW), see Ryan (1991). In this book she presents a taxonomy of accessibility relations (Ryan, 1991: 32 ff.).

9 Because I know that the empirical author Auster lives in New York and I myself in the middle of the Netherlands, our domains differ for instance in place and language.

10 On page 108 of Oracle Night, for instance, Sidney Orr, is writing a novel about someone called Nick Bowen and says: “...and when I glanced down at the page in front of me, I realized that I was lost, that I didn’t know what I was doing anymore. I had put Bowen into the room. I had locked the door and turned out the light, and now I didn’t have the faintest idea of how to get him out of there”. Paul Auster’s works explore the nature of identity and fate and because he often introduces protagonists in his works that are struggling in writing a novel or a piece of fiction, it is very tempting to interpret passages such as the one that I quoted, as personal experiences of Paul Auster the writer, or at least the implied author Auster. Even more since he – the empirical author Auster – frequently talks about the process of writing and being a writer in interviews.
READING AS JOINT PRETENCE

Readers to imagine a vivid, detailed fictional world. At the same time these props and the calling on a common ground give a feeling of intimacy with the (implied or empirical) author (cf. Booth, 1961).

Maybe coordination is even more crucial in performing a joint pretence because actions can occur at different layers with different domains, participants, and places etcetera. In conversational story telling, speakers and listeners are co-present, therefore all aspects of coordination, such as signalling, negotiating communicative intentions, and calling on common ground, are relatively easy to accomplish. However, because authors and readers of fiction are not co-present at the time of reading, and readers have to keep track of all the layers and movement between these layers, recognition of the author’s – implicit – presumed signals seems to be of importance. Furthermore, these presumed signals can function as a constraining device in the sense that they tell readers what information is relevant to include in a representation of the text. Recognition of these signals as such, in turn, is part of the reader’s context model, which is believed to represent the communication context and presumed intentions are supposedly a prominent component of this model. Whether the reader is aware of the author’s signalling as part of their coordination in performing a joint pretence is, however, an empirical matter. Possibly coordination in joint pretence is so conventionalized that readers are not conscious of doing so. Just like dancing together smoothly; if you are used to dancing with a partner, you are hardly aware that the joint action emerges from your mutual coordination. Maybe the reading of fiction works much the same way – especially if readers are familiar with an (implied) author because they have read other works as well.

“Let’s pretend” – limits to the game of make-believe, entering the “Moral laboratory”

Clark’s concept of joint pretence is in essence a mutual agreement between author and reader that emerges when the reader accepts the author’s invitation to join him or her in the pretence. This idea of an agreement between author and reader is not exclusively found in Clark’s theory (1996). For instance, Barbara Foley characterizes the reading of fiction “as a contract designed by an intending author who invites his or her audience to adopt certain paradigms for understanding reality” [my italics], a position that Peter Rabinowitz embraces (Foley in Rabinowitz, 1998: 23). Kendall Walton’s concept of a game of make-believe implies that there are two participants, one of which invites the other in joining the game by saying “Let’s pretend…” (Walton, 1990). Again, the reading of fiction involves an author’s invitation and a reader’s acceptance of this invitation, and thus creates an implicit mutual agreement. Mary-Louise Ryan calls this the fictional pact, which is concluded when readers accept the author’s invitation to follow in his or her relocation from the actual world to the textual universe (Ryan, 1991). Even Richard Gerrig’s metaphor of reading as being transported into another world, can be interpreted as an author’s invitation to the reader to join him on a journey, and the reader’s acceptance thus creates an agreement between the two (Gerrig, 1993). All these concepts refer to an author’s invitation to jointly play a game, go on a journey, pretend, adopt a certain paradigm or frame, and whenever the reader accepts this invitation an implicit mutual agreement is in effect.

An author can invite his readers in imagining all sorts of fictional scenarios (“let’s pretend…” or “imagine a world in which…”), and when we, readers, engage in the make-believe that contemplation of these scenarios invokes, we seem largely unconstrained in what we take to be factual or possible. We can easily imagine a world in which a boy and his schoolmates fly around on broomsticks for a game of Quidditch, or a world in which a Hobbit

11 The term moral laboratory is borrowed from Hakemulder (1998).
named Frodo becomes invisible once he wears a particular ring. For the sake of entertainment we can even imagine that the world is flat. However, we seem to encounter impediments when we are asked to imagine fictional worlds that we take to be morally deviant. This is the problem David Hume posed in his essay ‘Of the Standard of Taste’ (1757), and which Tamar Szabó Gendler labels the puzzle of imaginative resistance (Gendler, 2000; Hume, 1985 [1757]). How can we account for the fact that we have a much easier time to follow an author’s invitation to imagine that animals can talk, than follow an invitation to imagine that murder is right? It is not that we are unable to imagine moral judgments that are sharply divergent from those we ordinarily make, rather, Gendler argues, we seem to be unwilling to accept the invitation to do so. A sense of unwillingness to imagine judgments or ideas that we find morally or ideologically repugnant is often shown in controversies around novels, as for instance appears from a review on Michel Houellebecq’s Les Particules élémentaires:

This is a vision not only of someone who despairs of the human condition, but also, the reader of this repellent book is reminded, of someone who wants us to believe that the psychotic Bruno is a “pretty typical” human being (Kakutani, 2000).

What seems to happen here is that the critic has constructed an implied author that has a view on things that the critic obviously does not want to embrace. Subsequently, the critic seems to attack the empirical author Houellebecq, which is similar to what happened in the trial against Houellebecq (and Reve and Hermans for that matter, see Chapter 1). Why do readers seem to be so wavering in imagining a fictional world that deviates from moral standards or judgments, when one could think “it is just fiction: who cares?!”? Gendler argues that whether or not we are inclined to respond with imaginative resistance depends on why we think we are being asked to imagine morally deviant scenarios or situations. Readers might ask for what purpose the author invites them to imagine a world in which it is justified to kill people for fun, or in which the Holocaust is regarded as a hoax. The moral claims we make are categorical in nature, she says, meaning that they hold true in all possible worlds. Fictional moral claims – being part of a possible world – therefore clamour for exportation to the actual world, and for that reason readers are “…unwilling to follow the author’s lead because in trying to make that world fictional, she is providing us with a way of looking at this world which we prefer not to embrace” (ibid., 79). Gendler’s suggestion, nevertheless, does not quite explain our unwillingness to join the author any further in the journey into the fictional world, since we could just ignore or reject the author’s invitation to reflect on our world and move on. Or couldn’t we, because that ruins the game, and it frustrates our transportation to a fictional world? Although I cannot fully solve the puzzle of imaginative resistance, I feel that the unwillingness that we sometimes experience in joining the author in his imagination shows that reading fiction is not free of engagement; the game of make-believe does have limits. We somehow seem to be afraid that the fictional moral propositions can affect our ethical awareness, or, as Kendall Walton formulated:

Adopting even in imagination a moral view that I reject in reality, allowing myself to think and feel in imagination as though my convictions were different from what they actually are, might change my moral orientation; it might in this sense ‘pervert the sentiments of my heart’, even if it doesn’t change my convictions. (Walton, 1994: 34)

It may be the fear of the possibility that these imaginings encourage us actually to subscribe to it that causes our unwillingness or our hesitation at least, to follow the author in his invitation
to imagine situations or fictional worlds that deviate sharply from our moral, ethical or ideological judgments.\textsuperscript{12}

The conviction that fictional narratives can affect the reader’s ethical awareness both positively and negatively has been firm throughout the ages. As for the presumed negative impact of fiction, Plato, for one, warned in \textit{The Republic} against the harmful effects of art, and nowadays especially computer games and movies are thought to potentially affect viewers and gamers deleteriously.\textsuperscript{13} The very fact that censorship exists, implies that literature is thought to affect its readers. In a positive sense, fiction, and literary fiction in particular, is thought to encourage readers to bring home some cognitive or affective gain from their journey (e.g. Miall, 2002).\textsuperscript{14} Others believe that literary fiction can especially influence readers’ ethical awareness (e.g. Booth, 1988; Nussbaum, 1990), and there is a small body of empirical research that has investigated these effects (e.g. Hakemulder, 1998; Schram, 1985). Results show that there is something at stake when readers accept the author’s invitation to join him or her in a game of make-believe. In short, Hakemulder showed that literary fiction can have an effect on social perception and the reader’s moral self-concept, although it appeared to be difficult to pin-point textual factors that generate this effect. Schram’s study explored the view held by literary scholars that literature offers the opportunity to explore the new and unknown without fear, that is, that new and strange content loses its potential threatening character when presented in literature. The study investigated whether more and less dogmatic readers differ from their reactions towards texts with controversial content, i.e. about a pederast. Results showed, among other things, that in terms of ethical-affective reactions, dogmatic persons feel more aversion towards stories with controversial content than less dogmatic persons.

But even if there is, or were, no real threat of being affected by the morally repugnant ideas in novels, readers may still feel unwilling to share this view with the author just for pretence or make-believe. In both cases readers may wonder \textit{why} they are being asked to imagine a fictional world in which such immoral or ethically unacceptable ideas or actions are presented. Questions can be raised such as “for what purpose should I imagine a world in which…”, or “what does this author want?”, or “is this still fiction, or is the author abusing fiction in order to present his view on matters, putting words into the mouth of his fictional creations?” Readers may feel fooled by the author by inviting them to a seemingly innocent game of make-believe. After all, in order to experience and enjoy this game of make-believe, readers have to transport themselves into a fictional world and get immersed (Gerrig, 1993; Ryan, 1991). They invest in this game with the expectation of being rewarded emotionally and cognitively, by reaching a sense of closure (cf. Tan, 1996). Therefore, once a reader agrees to join the author in the pretence or play a game of make-believe, the mutual agreement implies that the reader grants the author some trust. By presenting the work as fiction the author commits himself to the agreement, which means in essence that what is presented as fiction is merely pretence, because “…there is no firmer doctrine in the poetic tradition than the doctrine that fiction makers do not lie in the act of making fiction” (Currie, 1995: 37).\textsuperscript{15} On the readers’ part the agreement generates certain expectations concerning the

\textsuperscript{12} In social psychological terms, fear is supposed to motivate a person to seclude oneself from the new and the unknown (Milton Rokeach in Schram, 1985: 140 and 141).

\textsuperscript{13} Another interesting, historic, example is the fear of nineteenth-century critics that the novel \textit{Jack Sheppard}, which tells the story of a young criminal, would have people involved into criminal affairs and pollute their morals (Lang, 2004).

\textsuperscript{14} A few years ago, in 2004, a special issue of \textit{Poetics Today} was devoted to “How Literature enters Life” and presented a body of (empirical) work on changes in readers effected by reception of narrative fiction such as poetry, novels, and movies.

\textsuperscript{15} It should be stressed that readers voluntarily and consciously step into a created illusion, so there is no delusion involved. Delusion would be the issue if you hear a story in which the storyteller heroically rescues a
author that are based on trust and generic conventions. For one, the author is expected to pretend to assert at the basic layer (layer 1), which means that readers by default have to put trust in the author and presume that the author is sincere, to be trusted, and has morals and values that are not questionable. This is what I call the default assumption of good behaviour: readers assume by default that the author will not attempt to convince them of beliefs that oppose their norms and values (cf. Morton, 1998). Readers probably do not mind if the author interferes with their system of believes, as long as he will not ask or force them to agree to a diametrical view on matters. In the words of Tamar Gendler: readers do not want to feel invited to imagine a fictional world through which the author provides a way of looking at their world that they do not want to embrace.

When exactly readers will feel this is an empirical matter. Generic conventions possibly influence the reader’s expectations regarding the author. Based on conventional knowledge, readers of literary fiction, for instance, may expect that an author challenges them to reflect on ethical issues. These readers, therefore, may go a long way in maintaining that the author who expresses anti-moral views does so in order to reach an artistic goal, for instance, to have their readership investigate its proper belief system. They may even expect the author to distance himself from established belief systems, because this is regarded as a literary norm. Of course, some readers may also have very specific expectations about an author, because they have knowledge of the author’s works (earlier constructions of an implied author) and statements (of the empirical author outside his works); e.g. readers of Michel Houellebecq will expect that their belief system and their values will be challenged. In general however, I expect that readers of both literary and “ordinary” fiction will trust the author to be reliable by default. That is, the author will invite the reader to play a game of make-believe, and in this game it is allowed to introduce immoral fictional agents, but the author will not try to convince the reader of an immoral belief system. This default assumption is much in line with a more general default assumption that people (e.g. readers) generally use: “in the absence of evidence to the contrary each component of mutual knowledge is present” (Morton, 1998). Peter Dixon and Marisa Bortolussi use a similar default assumption regarding readers’ stance towards narrators: “in the absence of information to the contrary, readers assume that the narrator’s position is consonant with other aspects characters and events in the story” (Dixon & Bortolussi, 1996: 409). My prediction is, therefore, that as long as there is no reason to doubt the intentions of the author the agreement holds. However, the trust the reader granted the author is under pressure in case of immoral behaviour of or worldviews presented by a narrator and/or a character, without the presence of any disapproving commentary in the text. The joint pretence is presumably put on hold or abandoned, because it is not really clear whether it is still pretence or maybe bitter reality the author wants to present. The reader may wonder whether it is still worth to grant the author any trust, or what reward, if any, he will receive if the author turns out to be untrustworthy.

Assumptions and Predictions

In sum, the following assumptions and theoretical considerations were discussed in the previous subsection.

1. The reading of fiction involves a joint pretence which is a mutual agreement between author and reader.

lady from a man who tried to rob her. If it turns out that the storyteller made the whole story up, you would be deluded, and feel angry towards the storyteller for fooling you. But in the case of fiction, readers are not deluded, because – when the text is presented as fiction – they know beforehand they are going to experience an illusion.
2. This mutual agreement is based on trust the reader grants the author, i.e. readers’ expectations that the investment is worthwhile (default assumption of good behaviour).

3. Authors may invite their readers to imagine all sorts of fictional scenarios and readers easily accept this invitation.

4. However, readers feel unwilling to follow the author’s invitation in imagining morally, ethically, or ideologically repugnant fictional worlds.

5. The author’s invitation is at odds with the mutual agreement and the related trust readers grant the author.

6. This causes readers to generate inferences concerning the author’s identity (e.g. who is this author?), intentions (e.g. why does he invite me to imagine this morally repugnant fictional world?) and moral position (e.g. is this author morally acceptable?).

These considerations lead to the following premises: Whenever a fictional narrative causes readers to feel unwilling to follow the author’s invitation in imagining a fictional world that – strongly – deviates from their moral or ethical judgment, readers will generate inferences regarding the author’s identity, intentions and moral position. The question is when the reader may feel invited to share such a view. I know of no – empirical – research that could answer this question, however, there are several examples of controversies around fictional works that boil down to clashes between, on the one hand, moral, ethical, or ideological opinions of readers and critics, and, on the other hand, those presumed to be embraced by the author. My guess is that texts that contain a narrator and/or a character that display unacceptable views, or act likewise, may trigger author inferences. An unreliable narrator in the sense of “…an ethically or morally deviant narrator who provides a sober and factual veracious account of the most egregious or horrible events, which, from his point of view are hardly noteworthy…” would be a good example (Nünning, 2005).

The hypothesis thus can be reformulated as: Readers of a text with an immoral narrator and an immoral character will generate author inferences regarding a) the author’s identity, b) the author’s intentions, c) the author’s moral position more frequently than readers of a text with a relatively neutral narrator and a neutral character. In order to examine empirically whether readers of fictional narratives have default assumptions concerning the author’s moral position, and whether immoral behaviour of fictional agents triggers author inferences, an experiment was conducted. In the experiment the text’s deviation from presumed default assumptions was manipulated by manifesting the author’s moral stance, and establishing effects on the reader’s readiness to report awareness of the author’s intentions and moral stance (see section 3). A pilot study was conducted in order to select stimulus materials for the experiment. The materials and results of this pilot study will be discussed in the next section.

2. The selection of materials: a pilot study

In order to violate the default assumption with regard to the (implied) author’s moral reliability, the selection of the experimental stimulus material was based on the criterion that the material should contain one or several morally questionable positions or actions. The novel Les Particules élémentaires by the French author Michel Houellebecq meets this criterion: it contains several fragments in which either the narrator or one of the main characters expresses morally or ideologically questionable views, or act likewise (Houellebecq, 1998). These – supposedly – ideologically questionable views appear to be

16 Houellebecq has by himself and his work stirred fierce debates about his personal moral views. On September 17th 2002, Michel Houellebecq went on trial on charges of inciting racial hatred after calling Islam “the stupidest
able to have readers question the (implied) author’s morals and intentions. At least, such can be gathered from the fierce debate that the novel stirred after its publication:

On its publication in France … it shot up the bestseller charts while provoking outrage for its strands of homophobia, racism and misogyny, not to mention explicit and frequently voyeuristic sex and violence. Houellebecq … found himself the subject of countless newspaper articles and the pariah of the literary journal Perpendiculaire, which he had helped to found. (Clark, 2000).

Interestingly, critics who criticized the novel on moral and ideological grounds took (the empirical author) Houellebecq instead of the text as target of their attacks, and some even demanded Houellebecq to explain his ideological position ("Perpendiculaire", 1998). Statements that were verbalized by the narrator and characters were easily attributed to the implied and – consequently – empirical author, not only in France. A book reviewer of The New York Times argued that “Mr. Houellebecq … conflates his character’s points of view with his own authorial voice” and then quoted from the book as if Houellebecq himself were the direct speaker: “Humanity, in his view, is a “vile, unhappy race, barely indifferent from apes…”” (Kakutani, 2000). This reaction is in line with what I mentioned earlier; readers seem to be unwilling to imagine a fictional world in which a view about their world is presented that they do not want to embrace.

Although Les Particules élémentaires seems to be able to cause a commotion and made critics put Houellebecq through his paces, it is not very clear which passages in the novel exactly had this effect (Cruickshank, 2003). Expert readers, e.g. critics, seem to be reluctant to point to specific segments in the text and rather prefer to be sketchy in outlining the larger picture. Did questionable views or opinions by one of the characters induce the outrage, or was it the narrator’s stance, or both? To check whether a specific fragment taken from the French novel actually invokes (Dutch) readers to generate inferences regarding the implied author’s intentions, identity, and moral position, a pilot study was conducted. My aim was to receive an answer to the following questions: Will a text fragment with a morally or ideologically questionable view cause readers to wonder who the implied author is and what moral or ideological position he or she has? Secondly, is it important who expresses this view: the narrator, a character, or both? The last question implies that readers have to be able to keep track of the different views that are represented in the text and attach them to the appropriate fictional agent (cf. the communication model in section 6 of Chapter 1). Graesser and others have conducted several experiments which showed that readers are capable of tracking and discriminating in reconstructing “who knows what” and “who said what” in the story world (Graesser et al., 1997a; Graesser et al., 1999; Graesser et al., 2001a). In addition to this body of research one could investigate whether readers can keep track of the different

---

17 For more details on the discussion that the novel caused in France, I refer to an interesting article by Liesbeth Korthals Altes in which she analyses the discussion, but also discusses in what way Houellebecq’s novel meets and deviates from a genre Susan Suleiman has called roman à these (Korthals Altes, 2000).

18 A small study among researchers in the field of Literature, Visual Arts, and New Media from the Faculty of Arts of the VU University Amsterdam supported this presumption.

19 More specifically, it could be the case that readers’ constructed image of an implied author, who holds in their opinion – a view on things that they do not want to embrace, may lead to wonder who the empirical author is, and what his opinion is on matters. It is also possible that readers merge the implied and empirical author into one mental representation of the concept author. However, in this pilot study participants did not receive any information about an empirical author, and therefore could only generate inferences about the implied author.
opinions of character and pragmatic agents, e.g. “who believes what”. In this pilot study, therefore, it was examined whether readers discriminate between different views and attach a specific opinion to the appropriate character or pragmatic agent. In other words, do readers construct separate mental representations of the participants – the characters, narrator, and implied author etcetera – of the communication model that I presented in Chapter 1? Text manipulations were made by varying both the narrator’s and the character’s hostile position towards the Islam. It was predicted that a text version that included both a narrator and a character with questionable views was expected to generate most inferences regarding the implied author’s moral or ideological position, since there is no representative of a positive attitude present in the text that the reader can interpret as the implied author’s stance, and given that the reader presumes the implied author to be basically a moral person. Furthermore, the study examined whether readers are able to keep track of which agent in the text – character or narrator – has what opinion.

Method

Materials

The following fragment – taken from a Dutch translation of Les Particules élémentaires – served as stimulus material (Houellebecq, 1999). This is the original text which includes the original names of the characters. A character named Desplechin expresses contempt for the Islam as he says to another character named Djerzinski:

Ik weet best dat de feiten me ongelijk lijken te geven, ik weet best dat de islam – van alle godsdiensten verreweg de domste, de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische – tegenwoordig terrein lijkt te winnen, maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur is de islam ten dode opgeschreven, meer nog dan het christendom. (ibid., 289) [I do know that the facts are proving me wrong, I do know that the Islam – of all religions by far the most stupid, mendacious and most obscurant – seems to win ground lately, but that is nothing but a superficial and momentary phenomenon: in the long run the Islam will be moribund, even more than Christianity.]

Based on this fragment four text manipulations were constructed. One includes a first-person narrator who visits a friend called Desplechin. This character argues that every religion – and the Islam in particular – is malicious by nature. On his way home the narrator concludes that he has to agree with Desplechin and then utters the words taken from Houellebecq’s novel.

Despelchin zette zijn kopje naast zich neer en rechtte zijn rug. Hij zei nu aan het einde van zijn betoog te komen en sprak de volgende woorden: “Ik ben overtuigd van het inherent kwaadaardige karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook, en in het bijzonder van de islam”. Hij leek de reactie van zijn bezoekers niet af te willen wachten en liep zonder iets te zeggen naar de keuken.

Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden en moest hem gelijk geven. De islam – van alle godsdiensten verreweg de domste, de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische – lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen, maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur is de islam ten dode opgeschreven, meer nog dan het christendom. [Desplechin put his cup aside and straightened up. He said to have reached the end of his plea and spoke the following words: “I am convinced that
whatever religion, and the Islam in particular, is malicious by nature”. It seemed that he did not want to wait for his visitor’s reaction and walked to the kitchen without saying a word. On my way home I thought about Desplechin’s words and had to agree with him. The Islam – of all religions by far the most stupid, mendacious and most obscurant – seems to win ground lately, but that is only a superficial and momentary phenomenon: in the long run the Islam will be moribund, even more than Christianity.]

In the second text manipulation both Desplechin and the narrator show a very positive stance towards the Islam. Only minor corrections were made to the first text version: words with a negative connotation were replaced by contrasting words. For instance, the word malicious was replaced by the word peaceful and deceitful was replaced by reliable. The third text manipulation consisted of a negative stance towards the Islam expressed by Desplechin, while the narrator concludes he has to disagree with Desplechin and thinks of the Islam as a very peaceful religion. In the fourth text manipulation it is now Desplechin who shows a positive stance towards the Islam, while the narrator has to disagree and is convinced that the Islam is a malicious religion (for all versions see the appendix). To sum up, the following versions were constructed; a “+” refers to a positive attitude towards the Islam and a “-” to a negative attitude.

Version 1: Desplechin +, First-person narrator +
Version 2: Desplechin -, First-person narrator -
Version 3: Desplechin -, First-person narrator +
Version 4: Desplechin, +, First-person narrator -

Finally, as you might have noticed, I changed the perspective of the original text fragment. I did this for a specific reason. The narratological perspective in Les Particules élémentaires is rather complex; towards the end of the novel it becomes clear that the perspective from which the story about the two main characters Bruno and Michel is told, lies with a post-human clone who lives – as Hollywood-films often introduce their science fiction stories ominously – “somewhere in a near future”. In this case the clone is situated somewhere towards the end of the 21st century. On the textual level this narrator easily moves in and out of the characters minds, showing their thoughts and meditations. This is a technique that is known in narratology as focalization. This complexity has implications for the reader; it is sometimes hard to tell who is speaking: the narrator or the character. Graesser et al. suggest that some pragmatic agents may be less salient if not invisible to most readers. Results of an empirical study showed that readers under normal reading conditions do not construct third-person narrators, whereas first-person narrators were more salient to readers than normal character agents (Graesser et al., 1997a). In order to give readers the ability to discriminate between the agents and their opinions and beliefs, the original text with a third-person narrator was rewritten in a first-person perspective. This is in particular important since readers are supposed to construct a mental model of both the story world (situation model) and the communicative context (context model). As I mentioned before, I would like to know whether readers discriminate between the different agents and construct separate mental representations of fictional and pragmatic characters such as the narrator or the implied author. I expect that if readers are able to discriminate between the narrator and the character, and both agents present a questionable stance towards the Islam, readers will experience this as a challenge of their default assumption of good behaviour. Readers expect that the implied author will not try to convince them of a questionable view or have them view their world in a way that they do not want to accept. In other words, I expect that in that case the text will
trigger readers to generate author inferences that relate to the implied author – as readers were not provided with biographical information – unless readers recognize the text and its empirical author.

PARTICIPANTS

Thirty-two academics from different fields – literature, psychology, linguistics, and communication – participated in the pilot study. All were approached by e-mail to participate in a pilot study that would last no more than 15 minutes. Participants that volunteered could complete a questionnaire whenever suited them best, as long as the questionnaire would be returned within three days.

MEASUREMENT

A short questionnaire was constructed that included items regarding reported author inferences and representation and recollection of who believes what in the text, i.e. the narrator, and/or the character. The first two items concerned the reader’s consideration of the author’s identity and his or her position towards the Islam (e.g. During reading, have you wondered what the author’s position towards the Islam is?). Readers were asked to elaborate on their answers. In addition, readers were presented with six positions that provided propositional information of some of the narrator’s and character’s utterances, such as The Islam is a mendacious religion. Readers were asked to mark whether the character Desplechin, the narrator, and the author respectively, agreed or disagreed with the presented statement. Six statements were included in order to measure readers’ recollection of who expressed what in the text, i.e. the narrator or character. These statements showed the exact utterances of the text, and readers were asked who expressed the utterance: the narrator, Desplechin, or neither. For instance in the following question: According to whom is the Islam the most mendacious and most obscurant religion? The questionnaire is included in the appendix.

PROCEDURE

Participants were presented with a twelve page booklet. The instruction was printed on the first page: “You are about to read a fragment from a literary text. Read the fragment at ease and in your own pace. After reading you will be asked several questions about the contents of the text”. The second page contained one of the four text versions, followed by four pages of questions. Participants were instructed to answer the questions without returning to the text and it was stressed that whether the question was answered correctly or incorrectly was of no importance. Instead, readers were encouraged to answer the questions based on what they had in mind about the fragment they had read only a moment ago. Next, one of the three remaining text versions was presented and followed by the same questions that the participant had already answered to after reading the first text version. Finally, participants were asked if they had any idea from what literary text both fragments were taken. Altogether there were four different booklets, including two different text versions in a different order: A1 (text version 1 then version 2), A2 (version 2 then version 1), B1 (version 3 then version 4), B2 (version 4 then version 3). Participants were given randomly one of the four booklets.
Results and implications

The implied author’s identity

Participants answered to the question whether they had wondered who the author of the text is during or after reading the text. Table 3.1 shows the frequencies of the answers that readers provided. Generally, most readers reported to have wondered about the author’s identity (25 out of 32 or 78%). Text versions containing a narrator with a hostile perspective on the Islam showed relatively high numbers (9 out of 10 and 5 out of 5 respectively). It was not possible to conduct a Pearson Chi-square test on all text versions, because the data matrix showed too many cells with low expected frequencies, i.e. < 5. Results of a Fisher’s exact test on the frequencies of text versions 1 and 2 – both narrator and character have either a positive or negative (hostile) stance towards the Islam – attained a marginal statistical significance ($p = .094$, one tailed). However, qualitative data that participants provided in elaborating on their answer show that the answers did not relate exclusively to the narrator’s or the character’s hostile position towards the Islam. For instance, some participants were curious about the author’s identity because of the character’s name Desplechin. One participant remarked “because I found the name of the protagonist remarkable, so I tried to determine the text’s – and consequently its author’s – cultural context”. Other remarks related to a general reading style, such as “When I’m reading, I consciously or unconsciously look for a context: Do I know this author? Have I read something by him or her before or have I read something in a paper or a magazine about him/her?” Nevertheless, most of the collected remarks (5 out of 9) on the text version with both a character and narrator showing a hostile stance towards the Islam (version 1) did relate to the text’s content rather than to stylistic features or the character’s name. One participant wondered about the author’s identity because of “the bold statements about the Islam: who puts these into the mouths of his or her characters?” Another participant explained: “because an opinion is enunciated that clearly refers to the present society and you wonder in what context the writer presents this opinion here and to what extent the writer enunciates a certain opinion in the media” (see the appendix for all data). This is in line with the presumption that if readers think that an (implied) author expresses a certain opinion and perspective on the readers’ – and the (implied) author’s – world, readers want to know why this opinion is expressed in the text, what is the purpose or intention of the (implied) author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>VERSION 1 Na-, Ch-</th>
<th>VERSION 2 Na+, Ch+</th>
<th>VERSION 3 Na+, Ch-</th>
<th>VERSION 4 Na-, Ch+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes,...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No,...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented include the data that were provided by participants after reading the text version that was presented first. Data regarding the text version that was presented second are excluded. It appeared that reactions after reading the second text were almost exclusively comparative comments about the differences between the two text versions instead of relevant comments about text. E.g. one participant answered the question about the author’s identity as follows: “who cares who the author is, this text is obviously a fake”.

20 The results presented include the data that were provided by participants after reading the text version that was presented first. Data regarding the text version that was presented second are excluded. It appeared that reactions after reading the second text were almost exclusively comparative comments about the differences between the two text versions instead of relevant comments about text. E.g. one participant answered the question about the author’s identity as follows: “who cares who the author is, this text is obviously a fake”.
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THE IMPLIED AUTHOR’S STANCE TOWARDS THE ISLAM

Next, participants had to answer to the question whether they wondered what opinion the author has towards the Islam. Table 3.2 shows the frequencies of the answers. Overall, half of the participants did and half did not wonder about the author’s position (16 out of 32 or 50%). However, most participants who read the text version in which both the narrator and the character display a hostile position towards the Islam did wonder about the author’s opinion (7 out of 10). Results of a Fisher’s Exact test on the frequencies showed no significant differences between the two text versions 1 and 2 ($p = .13$, one-tailed). Elaborations of the participants’ answers show that questioning the author’s position was mostly triggered by the text’s content, e.g. the expressed statements. This was most apparent for the text version with both a questionable narrator and character (version 1). Participants all referred to the text’s content as a reason to wonder about the author’s opinion. One participant reported that “you start to wonder why the author has his characters produce such statements; does he want his readers to reflect on the value of the Islam?” Another asked himself: “…does the author agree with these statements or does he want to expose them?” See the appendix for all the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>VERSION 1</th>
<th>VERSION 2</th>
<th>VERSION 3</th>
<th>VERSION 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Na-, Ch-</td>
<td>Na+, Ch+</td>
<td>Na+, Ch-</td>
<td>Na-, Ch+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes,...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No,...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, participants who did not wonder about the author’s stance towards the Islam explained that they were more occupied by the characters or they found that the author’s opinion was obvious. Other participants commented that they generally do not wonder what the author’s opinion could be. Two participants, for example, explained that “I have developed the tendency to disregard the author when reading fiction” and “I hardly equate characters of a book with the author…” This was especially true for participants from the field of literature.

KEEPING TRACK OF WHO BELIEVES WHAT

Results indicated furthermore that participants were perfectly able to keep track of who believes what in the text, especially since they were asked to answer these questions without returning to the text. Assuming they did not return to the text, participants attached between 81% and 90% of the statements to the correct fictional agent; Desplechin, the narrator, or neither one. However, when asked what they thought was the author’s opinion on the presented position taken from the text, most participants seemed reluctant as they answered “I do not know” (143 out of 192, or 74%). In fact, participants did not know the empirical author’s identity because the texts were presented without the name of the author attached. Therefore participants could only make assumptions about the implied author’s stance towards the Islam. In addition, most participants did not have a clue about a possible context,  

---

21 See the appendix for more details.
for instance, from what literary text the segments could have taken. When they were asked about their ideas in the questionnaire, only six participants wrote down a name of a French author (Camus, Céline, Sinoué and Houellebecq), and only two of them mentioned a title of a novel, but most participants were not sure at all ("it's just a feeling"). Only two participants recognized the texts as being written by Michel Houellebecq and one participant remembered an interview with Houellebecq "with statements [about the Islam] that almost perfectly match with those of the narrator, hence my supposed certainty about the author's opinion". Apparently, a pragmatic context helps readers to infer the implied author's position towards – in this case – the Islam. However, there were also participants that remarked that they were simply educated with the doctrine that you can never draw conclusions about the author's opinion based on characters' statements in the story, and therefore apparently felt reluctant to even presume what the implied author's position could be.

To conclude, the results show that, although a text with two contrasting points of view may trigger author inferences, i.e. which position is the author's?, a text with a morally questionable view expressed by both the narrator and character seems to evoke most frequently questions about the implied author's intentions and his or her moral or ideological position. Furthermore, readers seem to be able to keep track of the opinions of the different agents given that the perspective is unambiguous, e.g. a first-person perspective. Finally, the results indicate that academic readers may be less willing to report author awareness. This is possibly due to their knowledge of the so-called intentional fallacy or the text-as-only-means-to-interpretation – paradigm, as some of the remarks indicated. Therefore I decided to select participants for the experiment that have no obvious literary expertise. Furthermore, based on the results I decided to select a text fragment for the experiment that would exclusively present morally disputable views or acts, and manipulate this into a text version of morally indisputable, neutral if you like, views or acts. On second thought, a hostile stance towards the Islam is not really at odds with morality, at least not on the same level as for instance murder or – sexual – abuse. Readers can either agree or disagree with the perspective that is provided on the Islam or either religion for that matter, but I can imagine that readers may feel less reluctant to imagine a world in which murder or abuse is accepted or even promoted, to put it rather boldly (cf. the puzzle of imaginative resistance that I discussed in the previous section). Therefore, I decided to opt for different stimulus material in the experiment in order to challenge the reader more in joining an author in imagining a world that is morally or ethically deviant from the reader's world. Finally, the characters' names are rather specific and they can raise questions about the author's identity (as the results showed) or contribute to readers' recognition of the text. Therefore, original names were substituted with more neutral names in the materials that were used in the experiment.

3. Experiment 1

At the end of the first section of this chapter I mentioned that the basis for the predictions lies in the reader's presumed default assumption about the (implied) author (default assumption of good behaviour), namely that this author basically is a morally acceptable person (hypothesis 1). In other words: someone who does not invite a reader to share a view on the actual – reader's – world that challenges the reader's standards of morality. In line with the rationale that immorality is a deviation of the default assumption it was predicted that readers of a text with an immoral narrator and an immoral character will generate author inferences regarding a) the implied author's identity, b) the implied author's intentions and c) the implied author's moral position more frequently than readers of a text with a neutral narrator and a neutral character (hypothesis 2).
Method

DESIGN

In order to examine whether immorality can be considered as a deviation from the default assumption of good behaviour and consequently will trigger readers’ generation of author inferences, a combined within and between-subjects design was used with repeated measures: a pre-test and a post-test. Text condition (immoral vs. neutral) and Pre-test (pre-test/post-test vs. post-test only) are the independent variables whereas Author Inferences (the author’s identity, intentions and moral position) is the dependent variable. As the pre-test can affect the post-test, a Solomon four groups design was used to control for possible pre-test sensitization effects (see Table 3.3). The current design deviates from a classical Solomon four groups design in the sense that participants received a (neutral) treatment before the pre-test. The reason for this decision is that I wanted to create a situation that is somewhat similar to a “natural” reading situation in which the reader joins an implied author in the pretence, builds a relationship throughout the reading, and then stumbles upon a text passage (the target text) that violates the joint pretence and challenges the reader’s default assumption. The current design satisfies this condition. Participants were randomly allocated to one of four conditions: 1. Immoral target text with pre-test and post-test, 2. Neutral target text with pre-test and post-test, 3. Immoral target text with post-test only, and 4. Neutral target text with post-test only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Condition 3</th>
<th>Condition 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline text</td>
<td>Baseline text</td>
<td>Baseline text</td>
<td>Baseline text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target text</td>
<td>Target text</td>
<td>Target text</td>
<td>Target text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral- (immoral)</td>
<td>Moral + (neutral)</td>
<td>Moral - (immoral)</td>
<td>Moral + (neutral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>post-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

One hundred and seventy-one students of the VU University Amsterdam and Rotterdam College (‘Hogeschool Rotterdam’), 52 men and 118 woman, volunteered to participate ($M_{age}$ = 22.85, $SD = 2.24$ and a range of 18-33). All participants were undergraduate students in Social Sciences and Cultural & Social Education respectively. They received 3 Euro or course credits for their participation in the experiment that lasted about 20 minutes.

Materials

Based on the results of the pilot study, another fragment from the Dutch translation of Les Particules élémentaires was manipulated in order to violate the default assumption of moral reliability. As I mentioned earlier, the fragment about the Islam that was used in the pilot

---

22 One value is missing for gender.
23 The Rotterdam College students received course credits and the students from the VU University Amsterdam received 3 Euro.
study suited in a way. Nevertheless, I wanted to increase chances of finding an effect by pushing the possibility of violating the joint pretence or game of make-believe a little further, and in effect challenge the reader’s presumed trust in the implied author. For that reason, a passage from *Les Particules élémentaires* was selected that includes a universally condemned deed, namely neglecting a young child in order to fulfil personal needs; in this case visiting a prostitute. The original fragment has two episodes: one episode deals with two characters that are sitting in a room and are drinking wine.24 One of the two (a writer) tells the other about a meeting he had with a publisher. This fragment will be referred to as the *baseline text*. Ideally, this text will create a reading situation in which the reader is not invited to imagine a morally deviant world, and thus will not violate the agreement of joint pretence and challenge the reader’s default assumptions. The other episode deals with a father who is at home with his child, and gives the boy a sedative in order to quiet him. This fragment will be the *target text*.

Let me start with the *baseline text*. In order to realize a neutral text, small changes were made to the original text: potential offensive segments from the baseline text that could possibly challenge readers’ positive assumptions about the author were deleted, for example “the only women he managed to pull were cultivated old whores”. In addition, the name of the main protagonist, Bruno, was deleted because this could lead to readers’ recognition of the original text. The baseline text was furthermore rewritten in a first-person perspective for the same reason that I mentioned in the previous section (see the appendix for both the original text and the small changes that I made).

The *target* fragment deals with standards of responsibility. The protagonist, a young male father, is at home with his baby, waiting for his wife to return from a meeting. As time passes he decides to go out and have a drink, and he leaves the baby behind. In the original version the protagonist gets mad at his absent wife, expresses contempt for children, and loathes regular views of caring for them. He drugs the baby, goes to the café, and afterwards sees a prostitute. I changed the original version by adding a final passage in which the effects of the man’s immoral behaviour to his child are expressed. Two versions were then made, a *Moral-*(immoral) text version, with a supplement passage in which the protagonist returns home to find his child dead, and a *Moral+*(relatively neutral) text version in which the protagonist is merely irritated by his wife’s being late, expresses some observations about children’s developments, and gives the baby some innocent tranquilizer. He then visits a friend who lives in the neighbourhood and together with the friend’s girlfriend they drink a glass of wine. When he returns home his child is sleeping peacefully. Both versions were, again, rewritten in a first-person perspective (see for both versions the appendix).

The *Moral-* version is really at odds with what most people find morally acceptable. Results from a small pilot study supported this.25 However, two problems in manipulating perceived moral reliability of the author have to be mentioned. The first is of theoretical significance and has to do with the fact that authors do not address the reader directly, morally or otherwise, but through character agents and pragmatic agents, in particular *non-narrator character agents*, which are character agents who are not affiliated with a pragmatic agent (the terms are borrowed from Graesser & Klettke, 2001). All I could do was to try to render the impression the reader has about the character and first-person narrator as immoral as possible, in order to increase the probability of the reader’s doubt about the intentions and moral position of the implied author proper. The second problem has to do with the internal

---

24 The original passage can be found at page 196 through 198 of the Dutch translation (Houellebecq, 1999).

25 Twelve persons with various expertises (linguistics, contemporary literature and psychology) were informed about the goal of the experiment and asked to judge the text versions in detail on several aspects, such as the degree of immorality, coherence, interestingness, and whether it was credible that the text was derived from a literary novel. Based on their comments small corrections were made to the manipulated text versions, and these new versions were used in the experiment.
validity of the manipulation. If I had made the Moral + version diametrically opposed to the Moral - version, I would have had to make the protagonist into an angel of some sort. Apart from the credibility problem this option creates, it is also less fun to read. Here we stumble on the quality of literary texts that has already been mentioned: the default assumption may be that the (implied) author is morally OK, but some playing with moral standards, e.g. by creating personae that have their deficits is not only sustained but even desirable. This is why I have chosen to create a protagonist who is a relatively morally acceptable person compared to the immoral protagonist who visits a prostitute, shows relief when his child turns out to be dead etcetera. Strictly speaking, the Moral + text version, therefore, is not really moral and definitely not moralistic, but in relation to the immoral text version the text can be regarded as relatively moral. Whether the distinction suffices is a matter of empirical judgment.

MEASURES

The questionnaire contained items concerning author awareness, default assumptions about the moral stance of the author, and the degree to which the text deviates from these assumptions. This questionnaire was used in both the pre-test and the post-test (see the appendix). Table 3.4 shows the items related to the variables. Except for the first three items, one of which included an open question regarding reported thoughts that occurred during reading, all items were formulated as statements and participants could rate their level of agreement with these statements on 5-level Likert scales or semantic differential scales, e.g. 1 very shocking through 5 not shocking at all. Items 7 and 8 refer to text evaluation: participants were asked if the texts contain situations that are morally reprehensible, and if so to underscore related segments in the text. The post-test included the questionnaire that was used in the pre-test plus some added items related to text evaluation.

TABLE 3.4
Items of the questionnaire relating to the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author inferences and related items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author inferences- identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. During or after reading, have you wondered who the author of the text is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author inferences- intentions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. During or after reading, have you wondered what the author of the text wanted to accomplish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author inferences- moral position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. The text gives no reason to think other than that the author is a morally acceptable person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. To what degree do you think the text gives reason for questioning the author’s moral position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. I think that the author is morally acceptable/unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I believe that the writer of the second passage approves of the behaviour of the &quot;I&quot;. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. After taking note of the ideas that the writer has stated in an interview, I believe more strongly that the writer approves of the behaviour of the &quot;I&quot;, than before I had taken note of the ideas.**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text evaluation and related items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immorality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. I totally (dis) approve of the utterances of the character Van Dijk.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e. I find the utterances of the character Van Dijk very shocking/ not shocking at all.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5f. I find the actions and behaviour of the &quot;I&quot; very shocking/ not shocking at all.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5g. I totally (dis) approve of the actions and behaviour of the &quot;I&quot;.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. The first passage contains situations that are morally reprehensible.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. The second passage contains situations that are morally reprehensible.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interestingness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. I find the text, very interesting/ not interesting at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very boring/ not boring at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very fascinating/ not fascinating at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. I find the text...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
very complex/not complex at all
very easy to understand/very hard to understand

Credibility of presented genre

5b. How likely is it to find the passage that you have read in a literary novel? (very likely/not likely at all).

Other

Default assumption
4a. “Normally I assume that the author is a morally acceptable person”
11a. I know more morally acceptable than morally unacceptable authors of literature.**
11b. Can you give an example of a morally unacceptable author?**
12. When I ‘meet’ an immoral character in the text, I wonder whether the author agrees with this character.*

Appreciation of text and author
6a. I would be embarrassed to tell others that I appreciate the book from which this passage is taken.*
6b. I would be embarrassed to tell others that I appreciate the writer of the book from which this passage is taken.*

Image of the author
10. young/old; impulsive/cautious; man/woman; introvert/extravert; helpful/indifferent; naughty/well-behaved; progressive/conservative; dumb/smart.**

Reading preferences
13. I prefer to read novels that deviate from the reigning social norms.**
14. Novels that do not propagate a provoking vision are boring.**

* Items that were added to the questionnaire that was used in all post-test conditions (condition 1 through 4)
** Items that were added to the questionnaire that was used in the post-test only conditions (conditions 3 and 4)

PROCEDURE

Participants received a booklet that included the two texts as well as the questionnaire, and were instructed to read the texts silently, at ease, and at their own pace. They were told that after reading they would be asked about their reading experience. After reading the first text (the baseline text), participants in the pre-test conditions (1 and 2) completed a questionnaire. After reading the second text (the target text), participants in all four conditions completed a questionnaire with the same items as in the pre-test and additional items for control of text manipulation. To compensate the time that participants in the pre-test conditions (1 and 2) spent on completing the first questionnaire, participants in the post-test only conditions (3 and 4) were given extra questions that related to their image of the author as well as text preferences. All participants received a debriefing (which is included in the appendix).

4. Results

A 2 × 2 ANOVA was conducted with two fixed between-subjects factors: Text condition and Pre-test. The items with regard to default assumption of good behaviour, as well as the scales author awareness, text evaluation with concern to the moral content, and general text evaluation scales complexity and interestingness were the dependent variables that were entered into the analysis. Overall results show a significant effect of Text condition ($F(7,154) = 9.44, p <.001, \text{partial eta}^2 = .30$ and observed power = 1.00) and Pre-test ($F(7,154) = 19.18, p <.001, \text{partial eta}^2 = .47$ and observed power = 1.00), and no significant interaction ($F(7,154) = .49, p = .84$).26

The items that concern generated inferences about the author’s identity and intentions are both dichotomous variables; therefore, loglinear analyses were conducted. Results are reported on in the following subsections. I will first give a short impression of participants’ reported thoughts during and directly after reading the texts.

26 Although the observed power was relatively small: .21, therefore there is a chance that pre-test sensitization occurred.
A first impression: thoughts during and after reading

After having read the baseline text with the conversation between Van Dijk and the publisher, participants in the pre-test conditions first had to report what thoughts had come up during or after reading. Generally, participants either posed questions (mainly what is the text about), evaluated the text in terms of liking or disliking (strange text, nice use of language, boring) or complexity (vague, confusing, complex, chaotic, unclear) or they tried to formulate a theme or point (about writing in the ’50, Paris, good wine, Catholicism, publishers).

After having read the target text, participants in all conditions were asked to write down any thoughts that came up during or after reading. Participants who read the immoral text version frequently showed an affective reaction towards the protagonist, such as “what a dickhead”, “humour and disgust”, “bizarre”, “what a terrible guy, that he shows pleasure about his son’s death and gives him Valium”, “that it’s a very rude part, shocking”, “Yuk! That guy is out of his mind!”, “I think he is nuts!” Some participants wrote down a theme or point of the text, such as “moral responsibility” or “addicted to alcohol” and some referred to the implied author: “author with extreme thoughts and dares to write them down/share them”, “interesting turn of the story, especially shocking, the author seems to be a very intelligent/philosophical person”. In a few cases it is not clear though whether participants refer to the text’s implied author (in terms of “writer”) or the narrator, because occasionally they seemed to identify the narrator (the “I”) with the character Van Dijk from the first segment, who is a writer by profession. Questions mostly referred to the events and motivations of the main protagonist in the story, e.g. “why did he have children?”, “whether the child actually died”, “why you give your child Valium, why the man had an affair”.

In the relatively neutral text condition, participants wrote down affective responses as well, although these were somewhat more mild and less frequent than in the immoral text condition, e.g. “happy that this bloke has not been my dad”, “disgusting that such a man drinks that much if he has to watch children and why does he use Valerian, who does such a thing”, “that the I has a nasty personality, without any sense of responsibility”, “how can he leave his son home alone?”, “typical men”. Other readers, again, tried to define a theme or give an interpretation of the text, such as “more negative, eccentric person with as passion for some stimulants, sees children as not wholly human with a conscious <I>”, “the image of a alcoholic, not caring, not much emancipated father”, and one participant related the text content to the text’s style, conflating the narrator and implied author, and wrote down “This man has young children that make his life more chaotic, that is why his texts are incoherent”. Questions referred to the identity of the narrator or implied author, such as “Is the narrator a man or woman”, “who is the narrator”, “who is writing this story: confusing because there was a third person involved in the beginning” and again participants referred to the story’s point or theme, e.g. “has the text a meaning, where is it leading to”, “when is the story situated, why presenting that family in that way, time flies when you’re having fun”.

27 Some participants also referred to their reading experience or qualification of the text. Especially participants in the pre-test condition found the target text more interesting or less complex, than the baseline text, such as “I find this part more fun to read” (also see the next subsection).

---

**Manipulation check text stimulus**

**IMMORALITY**

First, let us check whether the text manipulation has been successful. In other words: have participants who read the immoral text version (the target text) evaluated the text as significantly more immoral than participants who received the relatively neutral text version? The scale Text evaluation-immorality includes the items with respect to evaluation of the character and narrator in terms of immoral behaviour as well as immoral text content (items 5d through 5g and 8a in Table 3.4) (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$ for post-test measurements). If we look at the means of immorality displayed in Table 3.5, we see that the mean for the Moral-text condition is smaller ($M = 1.96$) than the mean for the Moral+ condition ($M = 2.77$), which indicates that readers in the Moral-text condition rated the text overall as more morally unacceptable than readers in the Moral+ text condition. Results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) show that these results are significant; a main effect was found for Text Condition on Text evaluation-immorality ($F (1,160) = 53.69$, $p <.001$ partial eta$^2 =.25$ and observed power = 1.00). In addition, there was a significant main effect of Pre-test ($F (1,160) = 5.65$, $p <.05$ partial eta$^2 =.034$ and observed power =.66), the target texts were, on average, evaluated as more immoral ($M = 2.23$) in the pre-test/post-test condition than in the post-test only condition ($M = 2.50$). However, no significant interaction was found ($p = .57$).

In addition, results of within measurements for the pre-test/post-test conditions showed that participants in the Moral-text condition found that the target text gives reason to question the author’s position significantly more than the baseline text (see Table 3.6). However, this is also true for the relatively Moral+ text condition, although the difference in means is smaller than in the Moral-text conditions. Apparently, participants in the Moral+ text condition found the target text more at odds with standards of morality compared to the baseline text. Which text segments raised questions about the author’s moral position will be discussed in the subsection Marked text segments. In short, differences in evaluations between the relative neutral target text and the neutral conversation about a publisher (baseline text) seem relative, meaning that – besides personal standards of morality that were most likely taken into account – some participants found it morally unacceptable that a father gives his baby son a few drops of Valerian. Nevertheless, the results show that the Moral-text version clearly generated more frequently questions about the author’s moral position than the Moral+ text version.

**TABLE 3.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immoral text condition</th>
<th>Neutral text condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test/Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immorality</td>
<td>1.86, SD = .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>3.93, SD = .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interestingness</td>
<td>2.46, SD = .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre credibility</td>
<td>2.35, SD = 1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides aspects of immorality, control for text manipulation was also conducted for evaluated degree of complexity, interestingness, and genre credibility of the text versions (see Table 2.4 for related items). Reliability analyses for pre-test and post-test measurements showed satisfactory results for the scales that relate to interestingness (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .84$ and .69) and complexity (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$ and .83). The means, which are displayed in Table 3.5, show that the two text versions did not differ on evaluated complexity ($M_{\text{immoral}} = 3.40$ and $M_{\text{neutral}} = 3.58$ respectively). Results of the ANOVA showed no significant effect for Text condition with regard to complexity ($F(1,160) = 2.36, p = .13$). As for interestingness, however, the neutral text version was, on average, rated slightly less interesting ($M_{\text{neutral}} = 2.95$) than the immoral text version ($M_{\text{immoral}} = 2.62$). Results showed a significant main effect for Text condition on the texts’ interestingness ($F(1,160) = 8.13, p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .048$ and observed power = .81). This is not quite surprising as immorality is said to have an appealing, interest raising quality (cf. Schank, 1979). I will return to this issue in the discussion section. As for genre credibility, i.e. how credible is it that the text is derived from a literary novel, participants generally found it credible that the texts were derived from a literary novel; the means ranged from 2.06 through 2.35 (answers could range from 1 very credible through 5 very incredible on a 5-level Likert scale). No effects were found for Text condition ($F(1,60) = .17, p = .68$).

As for possible pre-test sensitization effects, Pre-test did have a significant effect on ratings for both the text’s complexity ($F(1,160) = 106.14, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .40$ and observed power = 1.00) and interestingness ($F(1,160) = 10.69, p < .005$, partial $\eta^2 = .063$ and observed power = .90), but no effect on ratings for genre credibility ($F = 1.12, p = .29$). However, there was no significant Text condition × Pre-test interaction ($F < 1$), meaning that the pre-test affected both text conditions. Means show that participants who received a pre-test evaluated, on average, the target text as somewhat more interesting ($M = 2.62$) and substantially less complex ($M = 4.03$), than participants who received only a post-test ($M = 3.00$ and $M = 2.76$ respectively).

Results of the paired $t$-tests that were conducted for the within-subject measurements of the pre-test/post-test conditions, furthermore, show that the target texts were evaluated as more interesting and more complex than the baseline-text, regardless of text condition (see the appendix for specifics). Significant results were found for the text variables interestingness
and complexity for both text conditions (all \( p < .005 \) and \( t \) ranged from 3.48 through 10.73).\(^{28}\) This is understandable because the baseline-text is merely a report of a conversation and “non-neutral” segments from the original text were deleted for reasons mentioned in the previous sections. For example, the last two sentences of the following segment were deleted, but these sentences make the text actually interesting: “Excellent, really excellent – you’re real reactionary, that’s good. All the great writers were reactionaries: Balzac, Baudelaire, Flaubert, Dostoyevsky. But you have to fuck too, you know? You have to fuck as much as possible, that’s important.” I will discuss the manipulation of texts further in the discussion section. All in all, we can conclude that text manipulation seems to have been successful.

*Do readers have default assumptions about the implied author? (Hypothesis 1)*

The basis for the hypothesis was that readers of fictional narratives should have default assumptions regarding the implied author’s moral stance, i.e. the implied author is basically a morally acceptable person. The results, which are displayed in Table 3.7, show support for this assumption: overall, regardless of text or pre-test condition, readers agreed partly or completely with the default assumption (95 out of 171 or 56%) and means ranged from 2.44 through 2.78 (see Table 3.8). Results of a Chi-square test show that participants agreed significantly more compared to the expected frequency, which is based on the assumption that the frequencies are randomly distributed across the scale (positive z-score of 8.17 and \( p < .001 \)). In addition, participants totally disagreed less frequent than expected (negative z-score of -5.16 and \( p < .001 \)). The results thus show support for the prediction that readers by default assume that the author is morally acceptable. This is regardless of text or pre-test condition: the results of the 2 × 2 ANOVA show no significant effects of Text condition or Pre-test on the item (4a) concerning default assumption (both \( F \)'s < 1), and no interaction effect (\( F(1,160) = 1.50, p = .23 \)). As for within-subjects measurements in the pre-test/post-test conditions, results of paired \( t \) tests show no significant results for both the Moral - and the Moral + condition (for both conditions \( p > .32 \)).

| TABLE 3.7 |
| Chi² statistics of degree to which participants agreed on the position “Normally I assume that the author is a morally acceptable person” |
|-----------
| Frequency | Expected Freq. | Z-score | p-value | Chi² |
|-----------
| Valid 1 “totally agree” | 13 | 34.2 | -3.63 ** | 13.14 |
| 2 | 82 | 34.2 | 8.17 ** | 66.81 |
| 3 | 45 | 34.2 | 1.85 n.s. | 3.41 |
| 4 | 27 | 34.2 | -1.23 n.s. | 1.52 |
| 5 “totally disagree” | 4 | 34.2 | -5.16 ** | 26.67 |
| Total | 171 | 171 | | 111.54 |

\(^{28}\) Absolute numbers for \( t \), specifics are included in the appendix.
Participants in the post-test only conditions answered to three additional items regarding default assumptions about the author, one of which is an open question. The first question related to what degree the participant agreed with the statement “I know more morally acceptable than unacceptable writers of literature”. Table 3.8 shows that participants generally tended to agree with the statement, although the standard deviation was relatively large ($M_{\text{total}} = 2.48, SD = .94$). There were no significant differences between the two conditions ($t(71) = 1.43, p = .67$).

Participants were also asked if they could give an example of a morally unacceptable writer, and if so why they considered this writer to be morally unacceptable. Most participants reported that they did not know any morally unacceptable author (49 out of 72 or 68%), some did know a morally unacceptable author (23 out of 72 or 32%), but only half of these participants actually wrote down a name. Almost all of these names concerned Dutch authors, such as Reve, Wolkers, Cremer, Grunberg and Giphart, and American author Bret Easton Ellis was mentioned for his novel *American Psycho*. In the literary field (most of) these writers are – highly – valued for their literary competence but at the same time all have caused a controversy either by their work, their comments in the public domain, or both. One participant, for example, mentioned Arnon Grunberg for writing “bad stories mainly about sick people and sleazy sex”, another participant wrote down “Jan Cremer: writes about morally unacceptable issues as if they were acceptable”, and yet another participant found Gerard Reve morally unacceptable for “fantasies about having sex with minors”. Finally, participants answered a third question, namely to what degree they agreed with the position “When I read a book with a morally unacceptable character, I wonder whether the author agrees with the character”. Table 3.8 shows that participants in both conditions incline to agree with the position, although the means tend to go in the direction of indifference and the standard deviation is relatively large ($M_{\text{total}} = 2.85$ and $SD = 1.3$). Results of a t-test analysis between the text conditions Moral – and Moral + of the post-test only conditions (condition 3 and 4) for additional items concerning “default assumptions” showed no significant results ($t(71) = -.44, p = .66$). All in all, the results show support for the prediction that participants assume by default that an author is basically a morally acceptable person.

---

29 No significant differences were found between the two post-test only conditions for “yes, I know an example of an immoral author/ no, I do not know…”, $\chi^2(1, N = 72) = 0.36, p = .55$, two-tailed.

---
**Effects of text manipulation on reported author inferences (Hypothesis 2)**

**The implied author’s moral position**

According to the hypothesis, results should indicate that readers in the Moral – (immoral) text conditions (condition 1 and 3) have generated inferences regarding the implied author’s identity, intentions, and moral position more frequently, than readers in the Moral+ (neutral) text conditions (conditions 2 and 4). First, we take a look at possible effects of immorality (Text condition) on generated inferences concerning the implied author’s moral position. Table 3.9 displays the means for the dependent variable Implied author’ moral position for the two text conditions as well as for the pre-test and post-test only conditions.\(^{30}\) We see that readers in the immoral text condition, on average, reported that the text leads to questioning the author’s moral position \((M = 3.39)\), more than in the neutral text condition \((M = 3.08)\). Furthermore, readers who received a pre-test treatment, questioned the author’s moral position, on average, more \((M = 3.47)\) than readers who received a post-test only treatment \((M = 3.00)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test/post-test ((N = 94))</th>
<th>Post-test only ((N = 70))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral text condition</td>
<td>3.69, SD = 1.0</td>
<td>3.08, SD = .86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral text condition</td>
<td>3.24, SD = .95</td>
<td>2.92, SD = .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the \(2 \times 2\) ANOVA show that these differences are significant. A main effect of Text Condition was found for the dependent variable Implied author’ moral position \((F (1,160) = 4.53, p < .05, partial \eta^2 = .028\) and observed power = .56). Readers in the immoral text condition considered the author significantly more immoral \((M = 3.39)\) than readers in the neutral text condition \((M = 3.08)\). There was also a main effect of Pre-test \((F (1,160) = 10.67, p < .005, partial \eta^2 = .062\) and observed power = .90); participants in the pre-test conditions found the author, on average, more immoral than participants in the post-test only conditions \((M = 3.47 and 3.00\) respectively). However, no interaction effect was found \((F (1,160) = .98, p = .32)\). This implies that there were pre-test sensitization effects, but the pre-test affected the post-tests in both text conditions. Nevertheless, because I found an effect of pre-test, I cannot reduce the data by merging the text conditions, e.g. conditions 1 and 3.

**The implied author’s identity and intentions**

The hypothesis also predicted that readers in the immoral text condition would generate inferences about the author’s identity and intentions more frequently, than readers in the neutral text condition. The idea was that immoral views displayed in the text function as deviation from the default assumption and consequently stimulate readers in inferencing...
about the author’s identity and motivations in writing such a text. Table 3.11 summarizes the data and Table 3.12 summarizes the results of the loglinear analysis.

### Table 3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Pre-test/post-test</th>
<th>Post-test only</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immoral condition</td>
<td>Immoral condition</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29 (58%)</td>
<td>19 (51%)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 (42%)</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intentions</th>
<th>Pre-test/post-test</th>
<th>Post-test only</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immoral condition</td>
<td>Immoral condition</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29 (58%)</td>
<td>16 (43%)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 (42%)</td>
<td>21 (57%)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identity: “During or after reading, have you wondered who the author of the text is?”

Intentions: “During or after reading, have you wondered what the author may have wanted to accomplish?”

### Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial $X^2$</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial $X^2$</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST<em>TEXTCOND</em>AUTINF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.3483</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.266</td>
<td>.0217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST*TEXTCOND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.5826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST*AUTINF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.8329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.8566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTCOND*AUTINF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.3474</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.304</td>
<td>.0213*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.304</td>
<td>.0213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTCOND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.8521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.8521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTINF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.9505</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.151</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With concern to inferences about the implied author’s identity, the results of the loglinear analysis show that the data are best described with a model containing a main effect of Pre-test ($\chi^2 = 5.30, p < .05$). Table 3.11 shows that differences in frequencies of generated vs. not generated author inferences are more pronounced in conditions with a pre-test than in post-test only conditions. As for inferences concerning the implied author’s intentions, results indicate that the data are best described with a model containing a three-way interaction ($\chi^2 = 5.27, p < .05$), and two main effects ($\chi^2 = 5.30, p < .05$ and $\chi^2 = 34.15, p < .0001$ respectively). The three-way interaction suggests that the combination of generated vs. not generated author inferences and text condition is different between the pre-test/post-test and post-test only conditions. In order to explain this three-way interaction, I conducted two separate Chi-square analyses for the two pre-test conditions. The results show a trend for the pre-test/post-test conditions (Text condition × Author Inference) ($\chi^2 (1, N = 98) = 3.32, p = .068$) but no significant results for the post-test only conditions (Text condition × Author Inference) ($\chi^2 (1, N = 73) = .67, p = .41$). If we look at the frequencies of the pre-test/post-test conditions in Table 3.11 we see that participants who read the immoral text version questioned the implied author’s intentions more frequently (29 out of 50 or 58%) than participants who read the relatively neutral text version (19 out of 48 or 40%).
Participants’ elaborations on their answers show that readers seem to have an interest in the implied author’s identity and intentions for several reasons, one of which is in line with the expectations. Immoral views displayed in the Moral- text version indeed triggered readers to wonder who had written this text and with what intentions. Participants wondered, for instance, “who would write such a text?!” “why would you make up a story in which a child is murdered?” or “I am curious who dares to express these thoughts”. Some inferred that the author intended to “provoke” or “shock”, others thought, for instance, that the writer wanted to “show that there are some sick puppies in this world”. It was not always clear whether readers wondered about the implied author’s identity in reaction to immorality in the text (e.g. “I am very curious, I assume it is a Frenchman”). However, other motivations for showing an interest in the implied author’s identity were mentioned as well, regardless of text condition. These range from general interest and curiosity (e.g. “just curious”; “wondered whether it is a male or female”) through identification of the implied author as the first-person narrator or character (e.g. “Victor’s father”; “a friend of Van Dijk”). Reasons not to have wondered about the implied author’s identity or intention in general were “not interested” or it never crossed their minds (“not of importance to know at this point”), being immersed into the story, genre conventions (e.g. “not of importance because it’s just a story”), or, ironically, because of a negative stance towards the implied author (“I do not want to get to know this writer”).

Marked text segments – “immoral”

As the results of the manipulation check of the text stimulus showed, participants in the Moral- text condition rated the target text overall as more morally unacceptable than readers in the Moral+ text condition. One of the items of the Text evaluation-immorality scale that measured participants’ text evaluation concerns immoral text content. On average, participants that read the immoral text version agreed more on the position that the text contains morally reprehensible situations (M = 1.53) than participants that read the relatively neutral text version (M = 2.30) (see the appendix for all means). Results of the 2 (Text Condition) × 2 (Pre-test) ANOVA for this particular item showed a significant effect for Text Condition (F (1,160) = 25.16, p < .001, partial etasq = .14, observed power = 1.00). No effects were found for Pre-test (F (1,160) = .011, p = .92) and there was no interaction effect (F (1,160) = .015, p = .90).

Participants who agreed partly or completely with the statement that the target text contains situations that are morally reprehensible were asked to mark these situations in the text. Segments in the immoral text conditions that were marked relatively frequently, that is by 50% or more of these participants, were segments that represent some of the narrator’s actions that are regarded as unacceptable. For instance, participants frequently referred to the fact that the narrator feeds his son Valium: the words “Valium-tabletten” were marked by 59%. Also, sentences that display the narrator’s report that the child’s swallows the mixture on the spoon easily and the thoughts of relief that the narrator expresses when he finds his son dead were marked by 58% and 76% of the participants respectively (details can be found in the appendix).

In the relatively neutral text version participants could not appreciate that the narrator feeds his son with drops of Valerian (73%), the fact that the narrator puts on his jacket and leaves for a visit to his friend while his son is home alone (76%). Finally, only occasionally were sentences in the baseline text marked by one or three participants at most.
5. Discussion

This chapter started with a scene from Paul Auster’s novel *Oracle Night* in which the narrator Sidney Orr tells that he had been sick for a long time. I explained that we seem to change to a different frame of reference once we learn that the text is fictional. Readers and authors of fiction make an implicit mutual agreement, called *joint pretence* or *game of make-believe*, which implies that they jointly pretend that the events in the fictional world are taking place. Similar to children who pretend that there was once a kingdom and ‘I was the king and you were the queen’, Paul Auster and we readers jointly pretend that Sidney Orr lives in New York. We (make) believe that Sidney has all the attributes that we ascribe to humans, and all the props that are available in the story, i.e. descriptions and impressions, can help us to construct a vivid image of the narrator. Authors and readers thus coordinate by signalling and calling upon common ground, meaning that authors can provide certain signals in the text that can help readers to keep track of the various characters’ knowledge, or shifts from one level of the story to another, or to mark certain episodes as significant for a coherent representation of the story. In addition, authors can provide signals in order to have readers experience suspense or other affective responses, for instance by ending a chapter or section with a cliff hanger and then move on to another scene. Readers may understand these signals as such and this contributes to the game of make-believe that authors and readers jointly play.

I argued that from the reader’s perspective this agreement means that the reader grants the author a certain trust. The reader assumes by default that the author has morals and values that are not questionable and that the author will not invite him to share a view on his world that he does not want to embrace. This is what I called the *default assumption of good behaviour*. Readers can easily imagine a world in which the rules of logic or nature are heavily challenged, and they seem largely unconstrained in what they take to be factual or possible. Despite this ability to imagine practically every fictional world authors come up with, readers seem unwilling to accept an invitation to imagine moral judgments that are sharply divergent from those that they ordinarily make. This is probably because moral claims are thought to be categorical in nature and they hold true in all possible worlds, both the actual world and fictional worlds.

In the experiment that I have reported on in this chapter I tried to examine whether morally disputable claims, represented by a narrator through his comments and actions, indeed violate the default assumption of good behaviour and cause readers to generate inferences about the implied author in terms of his identity, intentions, and moral position. Of course, this presumes that readers *do* have a default assumption that the implied author is sincere and embraces no questionable moral position (*hypothesis 1*). Results of the experiment provided support for the premise that readers assume by default that the author is a morally acceptable person. In addition, when asked whether participants can give an example of a morally unacceptable author, only a small portion wrote down a name of an author. Not surprisingly, all of the authors mentioned were – once – controversial, either through their work, their comments in the public domain, or both. Although the results provide support for the *default assumption of good behaviour* premise, more research concerning readers’ default assumptions about authors of literary fiction is necessary. This study gives some indication about reader’s default assumptions, but still much is unknown, such as exactly what assumptions readers make about an author, and how variables such as text type, readers’ knowledge about the empirical author, readers’ earlier constructions of one or several implied authors, knowledge about conventions, institutional knowledge, reading competence, and reading experience influence these assumptions. For now I would argue that this default assumption is similar to more general default assumptions, that in the absence of...
information on the contrary readers assume that the author is a morally acceptable person and the results of this experiment seem to support this presumption.

With regard to text manipulation the question was whether the distinction between the two text versions sufficed. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, two problems occur in manipulating presumed moral reliability of the author; one has to do with the fact that authors address the reader indirectly, through narrator agents and character agents, therefore I had to made the narrator as immoral as possible in order to increase the reader’s doubts towards the author’s intentions and moral position. The other involves the internal validity of the manipulation and has to do with the quality of literary texts that fictional characters with some deficits are desirable and make the texts appealing. Therefore I made an immoral and a relatively neutral, or somewhat less immoral, text version. Results show that the manipulation has been successful. Participants who read the immoral text version evaluated the text significantly as more immoral than participants who read the relatively neutral version, although the immoral text was also evaluated significantly more interesting than the neutral version, which does not come as a surprise, because of the appealing quality of immoral characters. Participants who read the relatively neutral text version, for that matter, found that the father shows irresponsible behaviour and they did not appreciate the fact that he gives his son drops of Valerian or leaves his son home alone. This is also not surprising, since this text version is relatively neutral, or less immoral if you will, compared to the immoral text version.

Moreover, I presumed that immorality, i.e. immoral behaviour and beliefs of fictional agents, is a deviation from the default assumption of good behaviour and as a result readers will generate inferences about the implied author’s intentions, identity and moral position (hypothesis 2a, b and c). Results showed that participants indeed questioned the implied author’s moral position if the text contained a morally reprehensible narrator. Participants’ responses on the implied author’s moral position differed significantly for the two text conditions, although the effect size was rather small. Readers apparently did not appreciate, to say the least, the author’s invitation to imagine a world in which a father drugs his baby son, leaves his son home alone to visit a prostitute and who shows no remorse whatsoever when he finds his son dead, instead he even smiles. Reported thoughts that occurred during or after reading the text show that participants appear to be indignant towards the narrator’s irresponsible and immoral behaviour, e.g. ‘… it’s a very rude part, shocking’, ‘Yuk! That guy is out of his mind’, ‘Man, you don’t leave your child home alone!’, ‘It seems that this man is either deranged or has a wild imagination, but probably both and some wondered ‘why this man would give his child Valium’. These reactions to fictional agents and the fictional world do not seem to differ much from non-fictional events. We attribute characteristics and knowledge about human beings to fictional characters and respond to their actions as if they were real human beings. Perhaps moral and ethical standards are indeed categorical in nature and are easily transported from and into the textual world.

As for inferences about the implied author’s identity and intentions (hypothesis 2a and b), results show no convincing support for the presumption that texts with a morally objectionable narrator trigger readers to wonder about who the author is and what are his intentions. Results show only a trend for generated inferences about the implied author’s presumed intentions and only in the pre-test/post-test conditions. Therefore the results should be interpreted with some caution. Elaborations on participants’ answers give an impression of what readers thought during and after reading. These elaborations indicate that readers wondered about the implied author’s identity and intentions because of the immoral views and actions that were displayed in the text, yet, not exclusively. Readers appear to require some context. For instance, readers were occasionally curious about the author’s identity in terms of gender or age and this curiosity seems to originate in an interest in the text; readers
find the text interesting or fascinating and want to know who the author is. In addition, readers seem to require a point or intention of the text, responses were frequently in terms of what is the point – in Dutch ‘bedoeling’ – of the text. This seems in line with what I mentioned in the first and previous chapter, namely that readers may read in a point-driven way and comprehension is based on the search after meaning principle (Graesser et al., 1994; Vipond & Hunt, 1984).

I also explained that readers construct a context model that represents the communication situation and which is based on both text-internal and text-external information, such as referential frames that may include culturally agreed upon moral and ethical standards but also literary frames of reference such as generic knowledge and the implicit mutual agreement of joint pretence. It seems that without information about the context, i.e. without information about the empirical author and genre of the text, readers are not sure about whether there is a common ground, signals are more difficult to interpret, and readers find it difficult to construct a coherent text representation, e.g. a point, meaning or intention of the text. Of course, because I did not provide the participants in the experiment with information about the genre, i.e. literary fiction, intentions were less clear. To put it differently, readers did not know for certain whether they were invited to jointly pretend that the events in the story actually happen, although when asked after reading the text, most participants found it credible that the text could be found in a literary novel. In the two experiments that I will discuss in the next chapters I provided participants with more information about the context, i.e. about the empirical author’s identity – name, age and gender – as well as the empirical author’s moral position either through his opinion or deeds. Nevertheless, the results indicate that readers, even if they have no information about an empirical author or other contextual information, construct a representation of an implied author which includes questions or presumptions about the author’s moral position.

Finally, and of importance is that the results of the experiment indicated which segments in the texts participants felt that these contain situations that participants feel that are morally reprehensible. This gives me possibilities to focus on when exactly during the reading of the texts readers may generate author inferences. In the experiments that I will discuss in the next two chapters I used this information and these specific sentences in order to conduct on-line experiments. These are experiments in which I used instruments that can measure reader responses during the act of reading up to the nearest millisecond.
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We have reached a point at which we can conclude that readers of fiction – at least under some conditions – seem to construct an image of the implied author, and consider the implied author’s identity, intentions and moral position during the act of reading. This is specifically the case when the implicit mutual agreement that is involved in the reading of fiction (joint pretence) is violated or put under pressure due to morally disputable text content. The results of the previous experiment indicated which text segments or sentences of the presented texts readers find morally reprehensible and caused them to question the implied author’s moral position, and occasionally the implied author’s identity and intentions. However, these results were based on readers’ reports of their own reading process after they had read the text samples. I now want to investigate whether readers generate author inferences during the reading of these specific sentences. In other words: the previous experiments examined participants’ reports of their comprehension processes during reading through post-reading tasks. The current experiment will focus on the immediate moment-by-moment process of creating meaning for utterances, i.e. the comprehension process (cf. section 6, chapter 1). In order to answer this question we have to find a method that can measure these so-called on-line author inferences

How do we measure cognitive activity during reading without having a reader stored in a lab with all kinds of wires connected to his head, making him feel he is a character in Terry Gilliam’s Brazil instead of reading a text? Although experimenting very often implies concessions on ecological validity, we can at least try to create a situation in which the reader feels he is reading a text in a natural fashion. An ideal situation would be, of course, one in which the experimenter is a fly on the wall of a reader’s mental interior. Although at this point developments of measurements and methods have not reached the level of “a fly on the wall”, there are several methods available that can measure cognitive as well as affective activation during the process of reading. For instance, (semantic) priming methods, rooted in the so-called priming paradigm, are frequently used in experiments as instruments for the measurement of inference generation during the act of reading.

Priming – in the context of linguistic processing – is the phenomenon that the speed with which a word is recognized increases if the word is preceded by a word that is (semantically) related.1 For instance, the word nurse is expected to be recognized faster when it is preceded by a related word such as doctor, than an unrelated word such as dog. The theoretical explanation is that the word doctor automatically activates semantically related concepts, and therefore activation of nurse needs little extra effort compared to activation of a

1 Stimuli in priming experiments, however, are not exclusively verbal. Visual stimuli such as pictures, photographs of human faces, and abstract objects, such as Chinese ideographs or polygons, have also been used to investigate an (affective) priming effect (see section 1).
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semantically unrelated concept such as *dog*. Furthermore, relations between words are considered to be determined by context; it is assumed that related words in a text or a sentence will also be related in the mental representation of that text or sentence. For example, if the sentence *Bobby pounded the boards together with nails* activates the word *hammer*, both *hammer* and *board* will be related in the mental representation of the sentence (Noordman, 1983: 341). Thus, the prediction would be that participants in an experiment will recognize the word *board* faster if it is preceded by a related word (*hammer*) than when it is preceded by an unrelated word (*fish*).

Several results have provided evidence for semantic priming; these results indicate that under some conditions concepts are activated or particular inferences are generated during the course of comprehension (e.g. McKoon & Ratcliff, 1992). However, a problem emerges when complex inferences are involved such as thematic inferences: “A single word is rarely an adequate theme for a narrative because a generic concept is not sufficiently complex, novel, or illuminating to be “comment worthy”” (Graesser et al., 2001b: 23). Similarly, author (intent and attitude) inferences cannot simply be captured by a single word, which excludes the possibility to measure these inferences through a classical priming experiment that uses single words as primes. What we need is a method that includes the sensitiveness of priming methods in measuring inference activation or generation, without the necessity of representing the inference in a single word. The affective priming paradigm meets these demands.

The present chapter is organized as follows. In the next section I will consider some of the assumptions underlying the affective priming paradigm and discuss empirical work that has used affective priming methods. I will also explain more why this paradigm serves our purpose of investigating readers’ generation of author inferences during the reading of literary fiction. The second section reports three pilot studies that were conducted in order to select stimulus materials for two online experiments. The first experiment is reported on and discussed in the third section; the second will be discussed in the next chapter. Using the affective priming paradigm, I examined whether biographical information about an author affects the generation of author inferences *during* the reading of text fragments that display morally reprehensible views or acts.

1. Affective priming paradigm

Several theories about affect, emotion, and attitude suppose that affective connotations of environment stimuli can be evaluated relatively fast; with minimal cognitive effort. The connotations thus activated can influence subsequent emotional and cognitive processes (e.g. Fazio et al., 1986; Murphy & Zajonc, 1993; e.g. Zajonc, 1980). One of the first and still most influential theories about affective response is the *affective primacy hypothesis* by Robert Zajonc (Murphy & Zajonc, 1993; Zajonc, 1980). In his famous 1980 article ‘Feeling and Thinking, Preferences Need No Inferences’, Zajonc wonders what happened to Wilhelm Wundt’s affective primacy idea, which holds that acts of cognition and recognition are always preceded by feelings (Wundt, 1896). Instead, till then, most (appraisal) theories presupposed that affect is the *result* of cognitive processes; in order to like something we must have some knowledge about it (e.g. Lazarus, 1982). The question is how fully and completely must objects be cognized before they can be evaluated, e.g. liked/disliked? According to Zajonc the answer is minimally, and he presents convincing empirical observations and experimental results that support the affective primacy hypothesis. Zajonc reasons for instance that there is a biological necessity to evaluate objects in a split second that points to survival value (like/dislike i.e. approach-avoid). Affective reactions are thought to be primary and inescapable. To

---

2 Also see Hermans, de Houwer and Eelen (2001) who state that there is support for the idea of automatic stimulus evaluation from neurophysiologic accounts and social psychology (Hermans et al., 2001: 144).
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give an example that relates to our current field of interest: we can instantly like the appearance of poems in a foreign language with a special typography such as *Apfel* by Reinhard Döhl or *Il Pleut* by Guillaume Apollinaire.

Zajonc tested the affective primacy hypothesis in an experiment in collaboration with Kunst-Wilson and found support for the hypothesis. Results showed that participants’ feelings in discriminating new from old stimuli are a better indicator than their knowledge of exposure (Kunst-Wilson & Zajonc, 1980). They presented participants with random polygons at an extremely short exposure duration (1 ms) and then asked them to rate a set of old and new polygons for liking. They also tested participants on recognition memory. Although participants seemed unaware of the fact that they had already seen a polygon – recognition being at chance level – they had a clear preference for the ‘old’ polygons, i.e. the ones presented before.

One way of showing that people evaluate stimuli automatically and without intending so, is by using a priming paradigm. If an affective reaction or attitude is activated by a presented stimulus, the activated attitude or reaction is thought to affect subsequently deliberate judgments. For instance, very short presentation of a happy face may activate a positive attitude which may in turn affect evaluation of (neutral) target stimuli (*affective priming effect*). Results from several experiments, in which the priming paradigm has been used, have provided support for the affective priming effect, while different priming stimuli (e.g. names of attitude objects, pictures and photographs), target stimuli (e.g. evaluative adjectives and nouns), and tasks (e.g. adjective connotation task, lexical decision, identification task, naming and pronunciation task) were employed. For an overview I refer to the appendix that Klauer and Musch have included in their 2003 article (Klauer & Musch, 2003), and further see (Fazio, 2001), and (Bargh et al., 1992; Klauer & Musch, 2001; Klauer et al., 1997; Murphy & Zajonc, 1993). In the context of (literary) narrative reading, (affective) priming has only obtained marginal interest: Krista Phillips & Gerald Cupchik (2004) examined priming effects of pleasant and unpleasant odours on the reading experience and recollection of hedonically congruent and incongruent literary text samples (Phillips & Cupchik, 2004), and Richard Gerrig and Gail McKoon (1998) used the priming paradigm to show that certain (within-story) information, that ‘readies’ readers for certain outcomes of the story, becomes more accessible during the reading of narrative texts (Gerrig & McKoon, 1998). I will discuss two studies to give an impression of how experiments that employ the affective priming paradigm are conducted. More important, these studies are specifically useful for our purpose to measure author inferences, as I will show in the last subsection.

Two examples of affective priming studies

The first study concerns a series of experiments that Robert Zajonc conducted with Sheila Murphy, in which they used a priming paradigm to show that positive and negative reactions can be evoked with minimal stimulus input, and can precede and influence an individual’s perceptions (Murphy & Zajonc, 1993). In one experiment they presented participants with photographs of male and female faces that expressed either happiness or anger. After they presented a happy or angry face, a Chinese ideograph was shown, and participants were asked to rate each ideograph for liking on a 5-level Likert scale. In addition, Zajonc and Murphy varied the exposure duration of the primes: to one group of participants primes were presented for a very short duration (4 ms), and to a second group primes were presented for 1000 ms.³

³ Zajonc and Murphy checked whether the degraded 4 ms exposure duration was at a sufficiently subliminal level by giving participants in both exposure duration conditions a forced-choice test of awareness. After the trials participants were presented with a prime (4 ms) and then asked which of two presented primes they had
Besides the affective prime trials, the experiment also included a number of trials without primes (no prime control), and trials with neutral primes, i.e. polygons (irrelevant prime control). Results showed a significant Prime × Exposure interaction ($p < .001$); primes presented under subliminal conditions (4 ms exposure duration) affected the likeability of the targets. Results of a paired $t$ test revealed that target stimuli were rated significantly higher in likeability when preceded by a positive prime (a happy face), than when preceded by a negative prime (an angry face) ($p < .001$). Control trials showed no significant effects, and the same was true for primes presented under optimal conditions (1000 ms exposure duration).

Zajonc and Murphy reasoned that stimuli at longer exposure durations are likely to generate an affective reaction based on cognitive appraisal that may involve multifaceted feature identification and evaluation. These assumptions were presented in a model, which predicts that early affective reactions (A) can be overruled or strengthened by cognitive appraisal (C), leading to a positive or negative priming effect ($A',C'$ or $A',C$), or to dilution of the early reaction ($A,C'$ or $A',C$). Five additional experiments were conducted to examine this assumption, using the same targets (Chinese ideographs), the same and different primes (e.g. large and small circles), different tasks for judgment of targets (e.g. small vs. large, male vs. female), and variance in exposure durations (subliminal and optimal). The findings were consistent with the afore-mentioned model and they provided support for the affective primacy hypothesis.

Motivated by their model of attitudes as object-evaluation associations in memory, Fazio, Sanbonmatsu, Powell and Kardes (1986), reasoned that presentation of attitude objects will automatically activate any associated evaluation from memory, and these evaluations will, in turn, facilitate a related judgment (Fazio et al., 1986).\(^4\) In order to test these presumptions Fazio et al. conducted a priming experiment in which they first presented participants with words that have a positive or negative valence (e.g. “cockroach”), and then asked them to judge each word (good vs. bad) as fast as possible by pressing the appropriate key. From the results Fazio et al. selected those words that were responded to fastest, and used these as primes in the next trial. Participants were now presented by a word from the previous trial, followed by an evaluative adjective with either a positive (e.g. “attractive”) or a negative valence (e.g. “disgusting”). They were asked to indicate as fast as possible whether the target word (the adjective) had a positive or negative connotation by pressing the appropriate key. To provide an example, participants would be shown the word “cockroach” followed by the target word “disgusting”. Fazio et al. reasoned that the presentation of the attitude object will automatically activate a strong association to that object. Such activation is assumed to spread along the paths of the memory network, which includes any evaluative association pertaining to the object (spreading activation mechanisms). Consequently, the activation levels of associated evaluations are temporarily increased. In the presented example, the object “cockroach” will likely activate a negative evaluation. If the presented target word (e.g. “disgusting”) corresponds in valence to one of these previously activated (negative) evaluations, it is assumed that less additional activation is required for the activation level of the target word to reach threshold and, consequently, less time is needed to make a judgment.

---

\(^4\) Fazio et al. (1986) view attitudes as simple associations between a given object and a given evaluation. Both object and evaluation are used in a broad sense: objects can refer to a variability of (potential) attitude objects, such as specific individuals, categories of people, or social issues. Evaluation “…may range …from a very “hot” affect (the attitude object being associated with a strong emotional response) to a “colder” more cognitively-based judgment of one’s affect (feelings of favorability or unfavorability) toward the object” (Fazio et al., 1986: 230). In the context of the present research, object can also refer to a variability of potential attitude objects, one could think of author as a person, or fictional characters, as well as social or moral issues either related to the empirical author or presented in the text through fictional characters.
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Therefore, after the presentation of the prime word “cockroach” shorter reaction times are expected for “disgusting” than for “attractive”. In statistical terms the prediction is a Valence Prime × Valence Target interaction, which is a hallmark of the automatic activation effect (Fazio, 2001: 116). In the experiments that followed, Fazio et al. manipulated the exposure duration of the prime word in order to examine whether facilitation occurs under both subliminal (short presentation duration) and optimal (long presentation duration) conditions.

In line with their predictions, Fazio et al. found that under certain conditions facilitation of judgment occurred in cases of congruence between the valence of the prime and target word, but not in cases of incongruence. However, facilitation occurred only in subliminal conditions and only for strong primes, i.e. primes that were valued relatively fast in the first trial. Presentation duration is usually expressed in the time interval between the presentation of the prime and that of the target – the **stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA)** – which can be varied by presenting the stimuli for a shorter or longer period of time. To illustrate: if a prime word is presented for 200 ms and is followed by a positive or negative target word after an interval of 100 ms, the SOA is 300 ms, i.e. the interval between the onset of the prime and the onset of the target. An SOA of 300 ms is such a short interval that participants cannot consciously perceive the stimulus (cf. Hermans et al., 2001: 144-45). Fazio et al. found the predicted interaction at an SOA of 300 ms, but not at an SOA of 1000 ms. If the observed effects were due to controlled processes one would expect similar or stronger effects when participants were provided with more time – 1000 ms – to process the prime-target relation. Therefore Fazio et al. reasoned that evaluation of attitude involve automatic instead of controlled processes.

**Underlying mechanisms of affective priming**

Before moving on to the possibilities of applying the affective priming paradigm to the study of author inference generation, one issue is worth mentioning. Although several studies have found support for affective priming, the underlying mechanism, if there is a primary one, remains unclear. As noted before, one possible explanation for the affective priming effect is provided by spreading activation models of memory (e.g. Fazio, 2001; Fazio et al., 1986). These models draw on semantic network models and postulate that concepts are stored in memory as nodes, which are connected through associative links. Activation is spread automatically along those links in such a way that association strength determines the rate of activation spread (Jordens & Van Overwalle, 2004: 4). In other words: affect associated with a presented prime such as “cockroach” becomes activated and spreads through the network of affectively associated objects, thereby facilitating subsequent processing of evaluative congruent information, e.g. “disgusting”. Also, it is assumed that the stronger the association, the faster the response.

However, some researchers have noted that instead of, or in addition to, spreading of activation, affective priming could also be due to other mechanisms that embody response competition (e.g. De Houwer et al., 2002; e.g. Fazio, 2001; Klauer & Musch, 2003). According to this approach, differences in response times are not primarily driven by facilitation due to congruence of valence between prime and target, but by inhibition due to incongruence. When prime and target are incongruent, the affective response to the prime conflicts with the response to the target; in order to allow an accurate response to the target (e.g. “negative”), the affective response to the prime (e.g. “positive”) needs to be suppressed. This takes time, whereas response to congruent targets needs no suppression, hence the

---

5 But see Bargh, Chaiken, Govender and Pratto (1992) on Fazio et al.’s conclusions regarding associative strength (Bargh et al., 1992: 894-95 ff.).
difference in response times (Fazio, 2001: 120). Notice that both accounts, spreading activation models and response competition mechanisms, assume that the evaluation of the primed object is activated automatically once the prime is presented. The difference lies in what is assumed to happen after automatic attitude activation. An important assumption of the spreading activation account is that affective priming is due to the impact of the primes on the semantic encoding of the targets. Response conflict accounts of affective priming, on the other hand, assume that primes do not influence targets’ semantic encoding, but “merely the selection of the correct response” (De Houwer et al., 2002: 645).

A third prominent account of affective priming suggests a mechanism that is specific to an affective matching principle (e.g. Klauer & Musch, 2003; Wentura, 2000). This principle assumes that evaluations of prime and target are activated automatically and spontaneously, regardless of a person’s goals or tasks, and that response hinges on a spontaneous feeling of plausibility (consistency of prime and target) or implausibility (inconsistency of prime and target). The principle predicts that a spontaneous feeling of plausibility will facilitate making affirmative responses and inhibit making negative responses, whereas a feeling of implausibility will facilitate making negative responses while inhibiting making affirmative responses.

In order to be able to account for a broader context of affective priming results, Klauer & Musch (2003) propose a model of the evaluative system that includes both the response conflict and affective matching mechanisms. These mechanisms are believed to be complementary and are supposed to operate simultaneously and in parallel (Klauer & Musch, 2003: 27). Which of the discussed models or mechanisms can best explain possible affective priming involved in author inference generation, and under what task specific conditions, remains – at this point – an empirical question, although one that falls outside the scope of the present study. I will take these mechanisms into account in the discussion section of the experiments. First, however, I will reflect on the possibilities and limitations of the affective priming paradigm in light of measuring generated author inferences.

Possibilities and limitations of the affective priming paradigm

The affective priming paradigm offers some interesting possibilities for the measurement of author inferences during the act of reading for a number of reasons. For one, the main assumption of the paradigm is that affective connotations of environment stimuli can be evaluated relatively fast, that is, with minimal cognitive effort. These activated connotations are presumably able to influence subsequent emotional and cognitive processes. If we extend this to the field of reading it seems reasonable to assume that readers of fiction can automatically activate affective responses in terms of preferences, i.e. decide relatively fast whether they like or dislike the text as well as the implied author at hand. It is also plausible that particular sentences or words in a text activate affective connotations that affect in result, for instance, evaluation of the text's (implied) author.6

The belief that novels and other fictional texts are affect-laden or emotion-laden, and therefore are able to evoke affective responses, needs no further explanation (cf. Miall & Kuiken, 1999). Most of us can probably recollect a work of fiction that moved us, struck us for its beautiful style, or for its interesting ideas, and we may have admired or appreciated its author for accomplishing this effect. By contrast, some of us may – also – recall a work of fiction and its author that annoyed us for different reasons, for instance, style, or reprehensible ideas or characters. Even before reading, a mere glance at an author’s picture on a book cover

---

6 Cf. Gibbs (1999) who assumes that readers automatically generate inferences about the author’s communicative intentions during the act of reading (Gibbs, 1999). Although Gibbs does not mention affect-laden author inferences, author intent inferences could very well be triggered by affective responses.
may automatically evoke feelings of preference or disliking (cf. Stapel et al., 2002). The controversies surrounding some authors and novels that I mentioned in the first chapter – e.g. ‘false identities’, Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses* – may also be brought to mind as examples of novels and authors that trigger affective responses. And, finally, the results of the experiment reported on in the previous chapter provide support for the idea that fictional texts that deal with controversial issues, i.e. include a morally reprehensible narrator, can evoke affective responses directed at the (implied) author – the presumed creator of the text. The majority of the readers in this experiment marked several text segments that they found morally reprehensible, and which made them question the author’s moral position (e.g. who would write such a thing and why?). As I explained in the previous chapter, readers may be indignant at the author because they feel that the author has betrayed their trust, as both author and reader seem to have agreed on an implicit joint agreement. In sum, it seems reasonable to say that – excerpts of controversial – fictional texts as well as biographical information on an – controversial – author can be expected to evoke affective responses, and therefore may function as primes in an experimental setting.

Secondly, the affective priming paradigm, sensu Fazio et al., predicts that congruence between the valence of a prime and a target facilitates – at least for connotation tasks and under subliminal conditions – evaluation of the target. Facilitation should be displayed by faster response times, while incongruence inhibits responding, leading to longer response times. This offers us a way to measure author inferences during the act of reading without having to represent the inference in a single word (see my comments in the introduction of this chapter). After all, of primary importance in the affective priming paradigm is congruence or incongruence of the prime’s and target’s *valence*, instead of the necessity to have *semantic* consistency or inconsistency between prime and target, such as in semantic priming experiments. I will explain how this can be accomplished in section 3.

To summarize, the affective priming paradigm offers some interesting possibilities to measure author inferences for the following reasons. For one, as I mentioned in the first chapter, author (intent and attitude) inferences are considered to be generated automatically during reading and are thought of to be transient in nature (e.g. Gibbs, 1999). The results of the empirical study reported on in Chapter 2 seem to imply the same. Therefore we need a method that is sensible enough to measure these responses. Affective priming meets this demand. Furthermore, the text samples that I intend to use in the experiment are affect-laden and have shown to generate affective responses directed at the texts’ implied author. Lastly, author inferences are rather complex and for that reason a single word that functions as a target word is rarely adequate to capture the complexity of the author (intent) concept. Affective priming offers a way to measure author inferences without having to capture these inferences in one single word.

There are nevertheless limitations to the application of the affective priming paradigm to the study of processes involved in the reading of (fictional) texts. A problem specifically arises when texts, instead of single words or pictures, are used as attitude stimuli (*primes*). As participants have to be able to read the text it is impossible to present texts under *subliminal* conditions, i.e. at a presentation duration (SOA) of, for instance, 300 ms or less. Furthermore, readers have variable reading times; there are relatively slow and fast readers. This implies that the SOA will vary with the reading time of the participant. Finally, there is of course a difference between the primes that have been used in the above-mentioned studies (a single word or picture), and the primes that will be used in the current experiment, namely a short text about a fictitious empirical author and text samples taken from a literary novel. My expectation is that the author information will generate an affective response and contribute to readers’ constructions of a context model that will function as a contextual frame during the reading of a text, and which will presumably affect response and reading times. In line with
the affective priming paradigm, my guess is that maximal congruence between the valence of
this affect laden information about the empirical author, the text, and the target will cause
relatively shortest response times. Whether the author information and text samples ‘behave’
as primes and cause a priming effect is an empirical matter. I will return to this subject in the
discussion section.

Predictions

In short, I assume that readers of affect-laden text samples can automatically activate
evaluative responses towards these texts in terms of liking or disliking. Furthermore, I assume
that this evaluative response is directed at the empirical and/or implied author, which means
that a reader will generate author inferences. I will discuss conceptual matters, i.e.
presumptions about readers’ constructions of empirical and implied author representations,
in the next section. In terms of affective priming, I predict that biographical information about
an author will affect response latencies when readers have to judge evaluative adjectives in an
adjective connotation task. In other words, I predict that there will be a priming effect of
author information. These and other (more specific) predictions were tested in two
experiments: one will be reported on in the current chapter, and the other in the next chapter.
In order to select stimulus materials (primes and targets) for the experiments, three pilot
studies were conducted. The next section reports and discusses the results of these pilot
studies.

2. Selection of material: three pilot studies

2.1 Selection of the text primes

The goal of this pilot study was to examine whether the selected texts samples are judged
according to the following predictions: 1. the immoral text versions are considered to be
significantly more immoral than relatively neutral text versions, and 2. both text versions do
not differ significantly in evaluation of the dimensions interestingness, complexity,
appreciation, and literariness.

Participants

Forty-six introductory English Language & Literature, German Language & Literature,
French Language & Literature, Dutch Language & Linguistics, Comparative Art Studies,
General & Comparative Literature, and Ancient History students of the VU University
Amsterdam participated for course credits.

Materials and Procedure

Text samples from Experiment 1 (Chapter 3), which were frequently marked as “immoral” –
see the previous chapter – together with additional samples with an immoral narrator taken
from the novel Platform, also by the French author Michel Houellebecq, were presented in
one of two versions: immoral or relatively neutral.\(^7\) Four different booklets were constructed

\(^7\) The added samples taken from – a Dutch translation of – the novel Platform were manipulated in the same way
as the samples taken from Les Particules élémentaires (see previous chapter, section 2). The narrative
perspective was changed from a third-person to a first-person perspective, and in order to construct relatively
neutral text versions some words with a negative connotation from the original – “immoral” – version were
with each booklet containing seven out of totally fourteen text samples. The first booklet contained sample 1, 2 and 3 in the neutral text version, and sample 4 through 7 in the immoral version, the second booklet included samples 8, 9 and 10 in the neutral condition and sample 11 through 14 in the immoral version, the third booklet sample 1, 2 and 3 in the immoral version, and so on. Each text sample was followed by ten items about the text’s evaluation.

Participants were randomly presented with one of the booklets. The introduction on the first page told them that the text samples were taken from two literary novels both written by a French author. Participants were asked to read each text sample and judge the sample with respect to appreciation of the text, presence of morally reprehensible elements, degree of agreement with own standards of morality, degree to which the text was considered to be shocking, and degree of interestingness, complexity, and literariness. Except for the question about the appreciation of the text – ratings could be 1 through 10 – all questions were assessed on a 6-level Likert scale, e.g. 0 no agreement with own standards of morality at all through 5 total agreement with own standards of morality. Finally, a question was included about the author’s identity (“do you have an idea who could be the author of the text samples that you have read?”). The questionnaire is included in the appendix.

Results and Conclusion

A one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni-corrected post hoc analyses was conducted for the items of the two text versions. As we can see in Table 4.1, the results indicate that five out of the fourteen text samples show significant differences between the text versions immoral vs. neutral on the items ‘morally reprehensible’, ‘agreement with own moral standards’ and ‘shocking’: Sample 3 ‘Ontwikkeling’ ($p < .05$), sample 5 ‘Madison’ ($p < .05$), sample 7 ‘Trekkergids’ ($p < .05$), sample 8 ‘Paradijs’ ($p < .001$), and sample 10 ‘Babysit’ ($p < .001$). These samples furthermore showed neither significant differences on appreciation nor on the items regarding the dimensions interestingness, complexity, and literariness (all $p > .20$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Morally reprehensible</th>
<th>Agreement with own standards of morality</th>
<th>Shocking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text condition</td>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Immoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortus</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.18 *</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luier</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.00 *</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontwikkeling</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.35 **</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valium</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.79 *</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4.31 **</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trekkergids</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.86 *</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradijs</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.25 ***</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the reliability analysis for the two text conditions showed satisfactory reliability of the morality scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .81$), the complexity scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .81$) and the interestingness scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .75$). No reliability analysis was conducted for literariness because there was only one item.

8 Results of the reliability analysis for the two text conditions showed satisfactory reliability of the morality scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .81$), the complexity scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .81$) and the interestingness scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .75$). No reliability analysis was conducted for literariness because there was only one item.

9 replaced by more neutral words. For instance, in the sentence *... all women should be aborted* the word *aborted* was replaced by *informed*. All text samples, including the original samples, are included in the appendix.
Finally, two text samples were excluded from the body of text samples: sample 13 ‘Monotheïsme’ and sample 14 ‘Bacterie’. Results of the post hoc tests with a Bonferroni correction showed no significant results for these texts on the morality items \( (p > .40) \), and results of the sample ‘Monotheïsme’ showed significant results for the interesting scale \( (p < .05) \). Furthermore, although these two text samples – on average – were valued no less than the other samples, on second consideration, these samples were not very successful manipulations and were therefore excluded from the final stimulus selection. The other twelve samples were selected as stimulus material for the experiment. In the results section (section 4) I will discuss whether the text samples that showed significant results in this pilot study produced better results in the affective priming experiment, than the remaining text samples.

2.2 Selection of the targets (probes)

Much of the research on the affective priming effect has employed evaluative adjectives as targets. For instance, Fazio et al. (1986) as well as Bargh et al. (1992) used adjectives that were – according to them – almost synonymous with good (e.g. appealing, delightful, pleasant, enjoyable, beautiful, magnificent) and bad (e.g. repulsive, disgusting, horrible, offensive, painful) (Bargh et al., 1992; Fazio et al., 1986). Because the text samples, which will be used in the current experiment as primes, display morally disputable issues, I looked for evaluative adjectives that belong to a dimension of morality and immorality and of which

---

**TABLE 4.2**

Means for text samples pilot study 1 - control items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Literariness</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortus</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luier</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontwikkeling</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valium</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trekkergids</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradijs</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysit</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinderen</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woestijn</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotheïsme</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterie</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* = \( p < .05 \), \*\* = \( p < .005 \), \*\*\* = \( p < .001 \)
the valence can be considered congruent or incongruent with the valence of the particular text sample.

Hoorn & Konijn (2001) had participants judge six fictional characters according to two scales: ethics – good and ethics – bad (‘ethiek goed’ and ‘ethiek slecht’) \((N = 312)\) (Hoorn & Konijn, 2001). The ‘ethics good’ scale (Cronbach’s \(\alpha = .95\)) consisted of the following items: benevolent, honest, sincere, reliable, just, conscientious (goedaardig, eerlijk, oprecht, betrouwbaar, rechtvaardig, gewetensvol). The ‘ethics – bad’ scale (Cronbach’s \(\alpha = .96\)) consisted of the items mean, liar, aggressive, vicious, unscrupulous and selfish (gemeen, leugenaar, agressief, vals, gewetenloos, egoïstisch). All original – Dutch – items were included in the present pilot study except for the noun ‘liar’ (‘leugenaar’), which was replaced by the adjective ‘mendacious’ (‘leugenachtig’). The goal of this pilot study was to select six extremely positive and six extremely negative adjectives that could function as target probes, and twelve moderately positive or negative adjectives that could function as so-called filler probes. Priming experiments usually include filler probes in order to mask the experiment’s purpose and discourage participants in developing a guessing strategy.

**PARTICIPANTS**

Fifty undergraduate Language & Communication and Dutch Language & Linguistics students of the VU University Amsterdam participated for course credits.

**MATERIALS AND PROCEDURE**

A list of 46 adjectives, 23 with a positive and 23 with a negative valence, was presented in a fixed random order (see the appendix). Participants were asked to rate each adjective on a 6-level semantic differential scale (very negative, negative, somewhat negative, somewhat positive, positive, very positive). The list of adjectives included the six positive and six negative adjectives taken from the Hoorn and Konijn questionnaire. The remaining adjectives were taken from a Dutch thesaurus called *Het juiste woord. Standaard betekeniswoordenboek der Nederlandse taal* (Brouwers, 1989). These adjectives were derived from the dimensions good behavior, bad behavior, (dis)honesty, benignancy and malicious. The adjectives ‘pretty’ (mooi), ‘ugly’ (lelijk), ‘attractive’ (aantrekkelijk), ‘nice’ (leuk) and ‘boring’ (saai) regard a different dimension than ethical, and these were included with the presumption that these adjectives could perhaps function as filler probes in the experiment.

**Results and Conclusion**

The data of two participants were excluded from the dataset because they contributed largely to the amount of missing values and outliers. One of these participants indicated that her mother tongue was German. From the data of the remaining 48 cases, the positive target adjectives were selected on the basis of the following criteria: the statistic mean evaluation of the specific adjective should exceed 5.00 (range 1 very negative to 6 very positive), the variation should be small (i.e. relatively many 5’s and 6’es) and, finally, a criterion of substance was that the adjectives should be part of the dimensions ethics good or ethics bad. The choice of negative target adjectives was based on this same criterion of substance, and the statistic mean should not exceed 1.80 and the variation should be small (i.e. relatively many 1’s and 2’s). The choice of potential filler probes was based on the criteria that the statistic mean should be somewhere between 2.00 and 4.50, and attribution of extreme values (i.e. 1 or 6) should be incidental. The descriptive statistics of the selected adjectives are included in Table 4.3.
### TABLE 4.3
Evaluation of the adjectives: Means, range and variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable (betrouwbaar)</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest (eerlijk)</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincere (oprecht)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful (behulpzaam)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive (attent)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good (goed)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive (agressief)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicious (vals)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious (kwaadaardig)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad/nasty (slecht)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unscrupulous (gewetenloos)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heartless (harteloos)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filler adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate (meedogend)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthy (eerzaam)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decent (deugdzaam)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well-disposed (welgezind)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral (moreel)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>righteous (rechtschappen)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientious (gewetensvol)</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merciful (barmhartig)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoying (vervelend)</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peppery (opvliegend)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indecent (ondeugdzaam)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questionable (twijfelachtig)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Selection of the author prime

This pilot study’s goal was to examine which of four versions with information about a fictitious author had the most potential to stimulate readers to generate author inferences. Taking this goal into account, the question was which version would be judged as most immoral or moral respectively, while at the same time not being regarded as incredible.

**Participants**

Nineteen undergraduate General & Comparative Literature, and Comparative Art Studies students of the VU University Amsterdam took part in the first session for course credits, and thirteen PhD students of the Faculty of Arts (VU) volunteered to participate in the second session.

**Materials and Procedure**

The students received a short questionnaire and were asked to judge information about a fictitious author on a moral dimension, based on the image that emerges through that information. In addition, they were asked to judge the credibility of the presented information.
Students had to assess four immoral and three moral versions. In addition, they were asked to select the most immoral version, the most moral version, and the most incredible version, and elaborate on their answers.

The immoral versions provided information about Jean Nicholai, a fictitious French writer of very controversial novels, who is convicted of molesting children, and – depending on the particular version – is also racist and discriminates women (versions 2 through 4). The moral Jean Nicholai is a French writer of several rewarded novels and he is the former ambassador of UNICEF. In other versions he is also pro equal rights for men and women and against racial discrimination. The PhD students received the same questionnaire, but their text versions were adjusted based on the commentary of the undergraduate students (see the appendix for all versions). All participants were informed in advance about the goal of the pilot study.

**Results and Conclusion**

The students were rather unanimous about which text version they thought to be most immoral (95% opted for the most extreme – third – version), but also judged this version to be the most incredible (42%). Elaborations of their choice indicated that incredibility was due to the statement “it is rumoured that” (het gerucht gaat), and a superabundance of negative qualities or actions. According to the students the third version could be made more immoral by including more specific information, e.g. “include age: an older man (say 60) is more repulsive as a paedophile than a younger man”. Students were less unanimous in their choice of the most moral text version; 11% opted for the first version, 47% for the second version and 42% for the third version, which was also thought to be the most incredible version (53%). In the second version the writer is said to have distributed pamphlets during a demonstration against apartheid in South Africa. Students did not appreciate this segment (“relevance is unclear”, “vague”), and they mentioned that adding more moral issues to this passage would increase its incredibility.

The comments that students provided were processed into six improved text versions, which were presented to the PhD students. Most of these students opted for the third version (version 7 in the appendix) to be the most immoral but also the most incredible version (both 62%). In this version Nicholai is said to be convicted of sexually molesting two young girls and having molested his wife some years ago, and he is also an active member of right-wing extremist party ‘Front National’. Most students (46%) selected version 6 as the most moral version, but this version was also regarded as the most incredible version (31%). In this version, Nicholai is said, among others, to have won several prestigious literary prizes, and he is praised for his part in realizing a home for poor Romanian children.

Based on the evaluations, I decided to use the version which reports that Jean Nicholai is the writer of controversial novels and has been convicted for raping a five year old girl (version 5 in the appendix) as the immoral author prime for the on-line experiment; 38% of the PhD students thought this version to be the most immoral, while only 15% judged this version to be the most incredible. The version which tells us that Jean Nicholai has received two prestigious prizes for his novels and is a strong advocate of equal rights regardless of gender and race (version 4 in the appendix) serves as the moral author prime; 23% of the PhD students thought this version to be the most moral, while only 8% regarded this version as most incredible version.

---

9 The immoral versions are numbered 5, 6 and 7, and the moral versions are numbered 4 through 6. See the appendix for all versions.
3. Experiment 2

In order to test the prediction that author inferences are generated during the reading of sentences that display morally disputable issues, an experiment was conducted in which the affective priming paradigm was used. Provided with biographical information about a fictitious author, participants’ primary task was to read twelve short texts, which were occasionally interrupted by an evaluative adjective. On such an occasion the participants’ task was to indicate as quickly as possible whether the presented adjective, such as ‘reliable’, has a positive or negative connotation. Response latencies and reading times served as the dependent variables.

My concern was to what extent the judgment of the adjective would be facilitated by the author information and the text context – which both served as primes. In line with the affective priming paradigm it was reasoned that the text context will activate a particular evaluation; positive or negative. If the valence of the text and the target word are congruent, less additional activation will be required to evaluate the valence of the presented word, e.g. ‘reliable’. As I explained in Chapter 1, I presume that readers construct a mental representation of both the story world (situation model) and the communication context in which they participate together with an author (context model). The author information in the current experiment is expected to function as text-external information that is likely to determine the construction of a reader’s context model, and that presumably will be an information source for generated author inferences related to the author’s identity, intentions and moral position. To put it differently, it was predicted that congruence of valence of the primes (author prime and text prime) and the targets (adjectives) will facilitate the judgment of the targets, which should be reflected by shorter reaction times. In addition, it was reasoned that cognitive or affective activation will also be reflected in the reading times, i.e. longer reading times. More specifically, longer reading times were expected for incongruence between the valence of the author information and text sample, because the conflict in information sources presumably causes readers to puzzle about the (empirical and/or implied) author’s intentions and moral stance. In sum, my predictions for response times were:

I. Congruence between the valence of the author prime, text prime, and the target (evaluative adjective) will lead to shorter reaction times in an adjective connotation task, than when congruence between the valence of the primes and target is minimal.

II. Congruence between the valence of text prime and target will lead to shorter reaction times in an adjective connotation task, than when the valence of text prime and target are incongruent (e.g. Fazio et al., 1986).

In statistical terms, I predict a three-way (author prime × text prime × target adjective) interaction (hypothesis I) and a two-way (text prime × target adjective) interaction (hypothesis II). It is expected that maximal congruence will produce the relatively shortest reaction times. Maximal congruence would be, for instance, if both the author prime and text prime are negative, and a negative target adjective such as ‘aggressive’ is presented. No predictions are made about what affects the reaction times more: congruence between author prime and target, or congruence between text prime and target.
Method

Materials & Measures

Twelve text samples taken from the first pilot study (subsection 2.1) functioned as text primes. Each text sample had two versions; a relative neutral version (positive valence) and an immoral version (negative valence). Evaluative adjectives functioned as so-called targets or probes; twelve target adjectives (six positive and six negative) and twelve filler adjectives (nine positive and three negative). Four different lists were constructed that contained the twelve text primes in one of the two versions in combination with a positive or negative target probe (see Table 4.4). Each participant would read all twelve text samples in one of the two versions, and respond to all of the target probes. Regardless of list, the text samples were presented in a fixed random order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>tnpn</th>
<th>tppp</th>
<th>tppn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List 1</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 2</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
<td>10,11,12</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 3</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>10,11,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 4</td>
<td>10,11,12</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tnpp= negative text, positive probe, tnpn = negative text, negative probe, tppp= positive text, positive probe, tpnp = positive text, negative probe. The numbers correspond with the text samples (see the appendix for all text samples).

Furthermore, a questionnaire was constructed that included items about the constructed image of the author, perceived immoral statements in the text, degree of agreement with the default assumption, and preferences of literature that include immoral characters. Also a question was included in order to verify whether readers had recognized the texts as being written by Michel Houellebecq.

Lastly, as mentioned in section 2.3, two versions of information about a fictitious author called Jean Nicholai were used as author prime; one version in which the author is said to have been convicted of raping a five year old girl (immoral version) and one in which the author is said to be a strong advocate of equal rights (moral version). Both versions are included in the appendix.

Participants and Design

Thirty-seven Social Sciences students of the VU University Amsterdam (11 men and 26 women) participated in the experiment (average age of 20.8, SD = 2.3 and range 17 – 27). Participants received 8 euros for participation and the session took between 30 and 40 minutes.

A 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) balanced Latin Square design was used in which the author prime (immoral vs. moral) is a between-

---

10 Within the priming paradigm both the terms primes and targets are frequently used. Words functioning as targets are frequently called probes, and a distinction is often made between so-called target probes and filler probes. The last category (filler probes) contains words that serve to mask the research goal and prevent participants from developing a guessing strategy. I am aware that these different concepts – bearing the same names – can be somewhat confusing.

11 The adjective righteous (rechtschapen) accidentally appeared twice in the definitive list of adjectives, and the adjective annoying (vervelend), which was chosen based on the results of the pilot study, unfortunately did not occur in this list. Both annoying and righteous were selected as filler probes.
subjects factor and valence of text prime (positive vs. negative) and target adjective (positive vs. negative adjective) are both within-subject factors (see Table 4.5). In other words, for half of the participants the texts were primed with a positive author prime, and for the other half with a negative author prime. All participants were then presented with both positive and negative text primes, and all participants were shown both positive and negative targets (evaluative adjectives). Text Groups include three text items each and were counterbalanced over groups of subjects (see Table 4.5 and cf. Table 4.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author condition +</th>
<th>tnpp</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>tnpn</th>
<th>tppp</th>
<th>tpnn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author condition –</th>
<th>tnpp</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>tnpn</th>
<th>tppp</th>
<th>tpnn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8 Subjects...</td>
<td>Text Group 4</td>
<td>Text Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tnpp = negative text, positive probe, tnpn = negative text, negative probe, tppp = positive text, positive probe, tpnn = positive text, negative probe. Text Group 1 included text items 1, 2 and 3, Text Group 2 included items 4, 5 and 6, Text Group 3 includes items 7, 8 and 9, and Text Group 4 includes text items 10, 11 and 12.

PROCEDURE

Participants were randomly allocated to one of four lists (see Table 4.4) in one of the two author prime conditions (immoral vs. moral) and they were all tested individually. Participants were asked to be seated in front of a computer screen and a box with five push buttons, a so-called Serial Response Box or SRBOX, and read the instruction that was laid down in front of them carefully. They were told that they would read 15 text samples sentence by sentence from a computer screen, and that these samples were taken from two literary novels that were both written by a French author. Information about this author would occur on the screen somewhere during the trial, followed by a question. The instruction furthermore mentioned that the reading of the text samples could be interrupted by a word that would appear on the screen. It was explained that participants were expected to respond as soon as possible by using specific – labelled – buttons on the response box. Finally, participants were instructed that, after they had read three text samples, they had to judge the correctness of two statements about one of the three texts. The purpose of including these statements is to encourage readers to adopt a deep reading strategy and discourage them to merely ‘scan’ the text (for the exact words of the instructions see the appendix).

The instruction was then gone through again with the experimenter, while the participant had the opportunity to express whatever was indistinctive. Next, the reading
experiment started, and after the participant had pressed the button <3> on the SRBOX, the first text sample would appear on the screen. The series of fifteen trials started with a block of three practice trials – involving different words and different (i.e. neutral) text samples than used in the experimental trials – so as to familiarize participants with the procedure. The experimenter would be present at the first and the second sample of the practice trial to answer possible questions and, if necessary, to correct the participant’s finger position on the SRBOX. If the participant indicated that the procedure was clear, he or she could complete the remaining trials independently.

Participants read the text samples in their own pace, and sentence by sentence. For example, a participant would be shown:

Toen ik naar buiten ging voor het avondeten was de duisternis volledig ingevallen; ________
______ ___________ ___________ ______ ______ __ _______. __ _____ ____ _________ __
______ __ __ ______ __ ____ __ ______ __ ______; __ ____ ___ _________ __ _________
____ ___ _____. ___ __ ________ ___ __ ____ __ ______ _ _____ ___ __ ______; __ __ ___
_____ __ ___ _____ _____ ___ ___ __________.

After having read the sentence, the participant would press button <3> on the response box, upon which the sentence would be replaced by underscores, and the next (part of the) sentence would appear, and so on. Each text sample was interrupted twice by the presentation of a – filler or target – adjective that would appear on a different screen, and which would be introduced by three asterisks (***). Because this was mentioned in the introduction and participants had practiced before starting the experimental trials, they knew that on the presentation of these stars they were expected to move their fingers to the buttons that correspond to ‘positive’ (<2>) and ‘negative’ (<4>). The interval between the warning (***)) and the presentation of the adjective was sufficient to move the fingers on the buttons (1000 ms). The word remained visible on the screen until the participant responded, and disappeared on the pressing of one of the two appropriate buttons on the response box. The participant’s response was recorded, along with the latency of the response (from word onset to response) to the nearest millisecond. Furthermore, the reading times per sentence, as well as responses to the statements and to the question about the author’s image, were recorded.

When the participant had completed the trials, a message would appear on screen to warn the experimenter. Next, the participant was requested to complete the questionnaire that was given to him or her (see appendix). After the experiment each participant received 8 euros and a debriefing, which explained the goal of the experiment and the importance of the participant’s contribution. Participants were asked not to tell anything about the experiment to their fellow students (see the appendix for the exact words).

APPARATUS

The stimuli were presented on an IIYama PLE430S/T monitor with a frame area of 800 × 600 pixels of the visual area in width and height of the screen, connected to a 433 MHz Laser USL computer. The viewing distance was approximately 50 cm, depending of the participant’s position in the chair. A 1.0 version of the software program E-prime was used to

---

12 The reason for allowing participants to move their fingers to the buttons that refer to ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ is to limit the loss of time in judging the adjectives and thus the risk of ‘loosing’ measurement of cognitive activity. Because participants had already practiced to use the buttons, they needed hardly any time thinking about what finger/button refers to what answer. In the evaluation after the experiment participants responded that they experienced no trouble with tracking which button referred to which answer, and that responses were given more or less automatically.
construct and display the experiment and to collect the relevant data such as reaction and reading times. A (PST) Serial Response Box was used to register reading times, correct and incorrect responses, and corresponding response times. This response box is said to have a 0 millisecond de-bounce period.13

4. Results

Participants committed few errors in judging the connotation of the evaluative adjectives; of a total of 888 adjectives (37 participants × 12 text samples × 2 adjectives) only 72 or 8% was judged incorrectly.14 These adjectives and the corresponding reaction times were excluded from the data file (cf. Bargh et al., 1992; De Houwer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 1986; Klauer et al., 1997).15 Extreme reaction times were also excluded, i.e. plus or minus two standard deviations of the mean reaction time per author condition and list. These values were replaced by a missing value. Furthermore, only the reaction times of the target probes (adjectives) were included in the statistical analyses, the reaction times of the filler probes were excluded.16

Reaction time data of the correct target adjectives were then analyzed using two ANOVA’s: one 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) × 8 (Subject Groups) × 37 (Subjects) ANOVA, and one ANOVA that included the 4-level factor Text Group. Item-based analyses have not been conducted, since variance due to text items is controlled for by counterbalancing the items across conditions (Raaijmakers, 2003; Raaijmakers et al., 1999). I will elaborate on this subject later on when I discuss the results of the response data analyses. However, let us first see whether the manipulation of author primes was successful.

Manipulation check author prime

During the experiment participants received information about either a fictitious French moral or immoral author named Jean Nicholai, depending on the condition they were appointed to. Participants were asked twice to share their image of the author on a 4- and 5-level semantic differential scale, ranging from very positive to very negative; once immediately after reading the information about the author, and once after having read the text samples. The question is whether the manipulation of the author prime was successful, i.e. is the immoral author evaluated negatively and the moral author positively?

Immediately after reading the information about the immoral author, most participants (89%) reported that their image of the author is negative ($M_{immoral} = 4.06, SD = .87, 63%$)

---


14 Differences in distribution of these incorrect probes between the conditions were not appreciable. Decisions, with regard to whether subjects had judged an adjective correctly or incorrectly, were based on the results of the pilot study, e.g. aggressive was judged as negative.

15 The decision to exclude these data from the data file is supported by the results of an independent $t$-test on response times of the correct and incorrect adjectives (both filler and target adjectives), regardless of text prime or author prime conditions. Results show that incorrect adjectives have a longer mean response time (2161.54 ms) than correct adjectives (1417.14 ms) ($t(74) = -3.76, p < .001$).

16 This decision is supported by the results of an independent $t$-test on the response times for target and filler adjectives, regardless of text prime or author prime conditions. Target adjectives, on average, had shorter reaction times (1279.16 ms) than filler adjectives (1675.83 ms) ($t(819) = 6.63, p < .001$).
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‘negative’, 26% ‘very negative’ and 11% ‘positive’). In the moral author condition all participants reported to have a positive image of the author ($M_{\text{moral}} = 2.00$, $SD = .00$). Results of an independent $t$-test showed that the difference in means between the two author prime conditions is significant ($t(17) = 9.99, p < .001$). Participants’ image of the empirical author is thus much in line with the valence of the relating author information.

Next, of interest was participants’ image of the author after reading the text samples. Is this image unaffected, or has the image changed due to the reading of the text samples? In order to answer this question we have to compare participants’ answers before and after reading the text samples. As the scales related to author judgment before and after reading differ – the second scale included an option ‘neutral’, whereas the first scale did not – the data was transformed into $z$-scores. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 4.6 and displayed graphically in Figure 4.1. As Figure 4.1 clearly shows, the mean $z$-scores relating to participants’ image of the author before reading the text samples, obviously differ for the two author prime conditions. However, after reading the text samples the $z$-scores seem to have converged; the author’s image has shifted compared to participants’ image before reading the texts (i.e. directly after having read the author information).

As the mean $z$-scores show, participants that received information about an immoral author have a less negative image of the author after they have read the texts; before reading .82 $SD$ from the reference mean, while after reading .038 $SD$ from the reference mean. Participants’ image of a moral author, on the other hand, seems to have diminished after they have read the texts supposedly written by this author; -.78 and -.036 respectively. To see whether these results are significant, I conducted a GLM-analysis on the $z$-scores with repeated measures for Author’s image (‘before’ and ‘after’) and Author Prime Condition as a between-subjects factor. Results show a significant effect of Author Prime Condition ($F(1,35) = 19.24$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .36$ and observed power = .99), however, as the lines in Figure 4.1 already suggest, I also found a significant Author’s image $\times$ Author Prime Condition interaction ($F(1,35) = 15.37$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .30$ and observed power = .97).

TABLE 4.6  Descriptive Statistics (z-scores) for author’s image by Author Prime Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Prime Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-score: image author before reading the text samples</td>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>.8229</td>
<td>.84934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral</td>
<td>-.7796</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-score: image author after having read the text samples</td>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>.03855</td>
<td>1.02857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral</td>
<td>-.03652</td>
<td>.99896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 During the experiment participants could press button <1> for ‘very positive’, <2> for ‘positive’, <4> for ‘negative’ and <5> for ‘very negative’. For purpose of statistical analyses, the values for ‘negative’ and ‘very negative’ are recoded in 3 and 4 respectively.
In addition, the questionnaire included other items that measured participants’ post-reading evaluation of the author. These items relate to the presumed author’s intentions and default assumptions regarding the author. Results of a $t$-test for independent samples between the two author prime conditions show only significant results for the above-mentioned item about the author’s image after reading ($t(35) = 3.70, p < .005$) and general reading preferences ($t(35) = -2.31, p < .05$). Means, degree of significance, and exact formulation of the item are presented below in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Immoral author Mean (N=18)</th>
<th>Immoral author Std.</th>
<th>Moral author Mean (N=19)</th>
<th>Moral author Std.</th>
<th>Statistics t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author’s image¹</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$t(35) = 3.70, p &lt; .005^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral position author²</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>$t(35) = .81, p = .42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default author³</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>$t(35) = .41, p = .69$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s intentions choice of narrator⁴</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>$t(35) = -1.43, p = .16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s intentions⁵</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>$t(35) = -.85, p = .40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocking⁶</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>$t(35) = 1.45, p = .16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default reading⁷</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>$t(35) = -2.31, p &lt; .05^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹What is your image of the author of the text samples you have read? (very positive/very negative on a 5-level scale); ²The author seems to me a very moral/immoral person (5-level scale); ³Normally I assume that the writer of a literary text (story, novel, short novel etcetera) is a morally acceptable person (totally disagree/agree on a 5-level scale); ⁴Some of the text samples made me question why the writer has chosen to have the ‘I’ pass such immoral judgments (idem as item 3); ⁵Some of the text samples that I read, in which the ‘I’ has immoral views, made me doubt the writer’s intentions (idem as item 3 and 4); ⁶In some of the text samples I found the passed judgments of the ‘I’ so shocking, that if I had not participated in an experiment I’d rather stopped reading (idem as item 3, 4 and 5); ⁷In general I enjoy reading literary texts (story, (short) novel etcetera) in which the writer presents morally unacceptable characters (idem as item 3 through 6). * = two-tailed.
The results show that readers’ image of the author, after having read the text samples, differs significantly between the two author conditions; the image of the immoral author is, on average, negative ($M_{\text{immoral}} = 3.94$), while the image of the moral author is relatively positive ($M_{\text{moral}} = 2.89$). In addition, appreciation for literature that includes morally reprehensible characters differed significantly between the two author conditions; readers in the moral author condition agreed more to the statement ($M_{\text{moral}} = 3.74$) than readers in the immoral condition ($M_{\text{immoral}} = 2.89$). Perhaps that the negative text content, in addition to the immoral author information, affected the participants' opinion on this matter. Furthermore, no significant results were found for the items regarding the author’s image in terms of morals (‘The writer seems to me a very moral/immoral person’), the author’s intentions (‘Some of the text samples, in which the ‘I’ passes immoral judgments, made me question the writer’s intentions’), and default assumptions concerning the author (‘Normally I assume that the author of a literary text (story, (short) novel etc.) is a morally acceptable person’) (all $p$’s exceeded .39, two-tailed). All in all, the results suggest that the author prime possibly has lost its priming effect somewhere during the reading experiment due to text content. I will elaborate on this in the discussion section.

Finally, manipulation checks of the text stimuli could only be limitedly conducted as participants read both positive and negative samples. The descriptive statistics of the response times for the individual text samples, however, may be indicative of the “behavior” as primes. After all, the results of the pilot study showed that some text items had significant results on text evaluation in terms of immorality. Possibly these “significant” text samples behave as better primes in the experiment. Results of descriptive statistics, however, show no obvious patterns in line with the first prediction (three-way interaction), except for some samples in the moral author condition: sample 4 Valium, 6 Islam, and 12 Woestijn, of which only sample 4 showed significant results in the pilot study. In addition, some samples showed patterns in line with the second prediction (text prime × target interaction) in one of the two author conditions, i.e. a: sample 5 Madison, 7 Trekkergids, and 9 SM, of which the samples 5 and 7 showed significant results in the pilot study.

Predictions: affective priming effects and reading times

In order to understand my choice of data analysis better, it may be helpful to explain something about the debate among researchers about what is the proper data analysis for experiments that use language materials such as priming experiments. In particular the use of the F1 (subject) and F2 (items) tests to generalize over subjects and items has been called into question. This debate or controversy is known as the language-as-fixed-effect-fallacy, named after Clark’s influential paper, in which he basically argues that the materials factor should be treated as a random instead of a fixed factor, since the items are sampled from a larger population of items (Clark, 1973). Clark’s solution is rather simple; researchers should treat language materials as a fixed factor, conduct an F2 analysis in addition to a F1 analysis, and calculate $minF'$. Raaijmakers et al. (1999), however, have shown that in counterbalanced designs the treatment effect can be tested directly, without the need to perform both a subjects and item analysis. An item analysis in some cases even leads to a needless loss of power (Raaijmakers et al., 1999). Because the text items in the current experiment are counterbalanced over conditions, only subject analyses were conducted. Two ANOVA’s were conducted for the response times: a 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) × 8 (Subject Groups) × 37 (Subjects) ANOVA, and one ANOVA that also
included the 4-level factor Text Group. Table 4.7 presents the ANOVA summary table of the data; all within-subject effects are tested against the error term.\textsuperscript{18}

AFFECTIVE PRIMING EFFECT OF AUTHOR PRIME (HYPOTHESIS 1)

According to the first prediction, maximal congruence of the valences of author prime, text prime, and target adjective should produce relatively fastest response times, while minimal congruence should result in the longest response times. This prediction should be statistically reflected in a significant three-way interaction. The results do not support this prediction.\textsuperscript{19} Table 4.8 shows the mean response times for the different conditions. Based on the hypothesis, we would expect relatively short response times for a positive (i.e. moral) author prime, positive text, and positive probe, as well as for negative (i.e. immoral) conditions: immoral author prime, negative text, and negative probe. The underscored means in Table 4.8 represent these two conditions; response latencies for a positive probe in a positive text context in the moral author prime condition are relatively short (1139.13 ms). However, response latencies for a negative probe in a negative text context in the immoral author prime condition are relatively long (1304.88 ms). Results of the ANOVA (Table 4.9) confirm that the factor Author Prime Condition did not seem to have affected response latencies; results show neither a significant three-way interaction nor a significant main effect of Author Prime Condition (both $F$’s <1).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Mean response times (ms) for Author Prime Condition x Valence Text Prime x Valence Probe interaction}
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
Valence Author Condition & Positive Text & & & \\
 & Positive Probe & Negative Probe & Positive Probe & Negative Probe \\
Immoral & 1112.31 & 1351.30 & 1103.36 & 1304.88 \\
Moral & 1139.13 & 1417.16 & 1365.72 & 1289.49 \\
Total & 1126.08 & 1385.12 & 1245.78 & 1297.18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18} The first analysis is conducted in order to determine the correct value of the Sum of Squares of the factor Text Group, the second analysis provides the Sum of Squares of the other relevant effects. Based on the results of both analyses, each treatment effect can be tested against the Treatment × Text Group (within) effect. If the Treatment × Text Group interactions are not significant a more powerful test may be obtained by pooling the SS of these interactions and the SS of the error term and test the treatment effect (in this case Valence Text Prime and Valence Probe and all interactions with these factors) against this pooled error (Raaijmakers, personal correspondence, dated 23 June 2008).

\textsuperscript{19} Results of a conventional subject (F1) and item (F2) analysis showed also no support for the predicted Author Prime × Text Prime × Target Probe interaction (all $F$’s <1). A significant main effect of Valence Probe was found ($F_1$ (1,35) = 6.96, $p < .05$, $F_2$ (1,11) = 7.18, $p < .05$, and $MinF'$ (1,33) = 3.53, $p = .069$). Participants responded, on average, faster to positive than to negative probes. In addition, a significant Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction in the subject analysis ($F_1$ (1,35) = 4.25, $p < .05$) but the $F_2$ and $MinF'$ values were < 1).
TABLE 4.9
ANOVA Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC (Author condition)</td>
<td>452600.484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>452600.484</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups (AC)</td>
<td>9931151.655</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1655191.942</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (AC x Groups)</td>
<td>64322788.701</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2218027.197</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Text (VT)</td>
<td>17350.123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17350.123</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Probe (VP)</td>
<td>3464090.964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3464090.964</td>
<td>12.426</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP</td>
<td>678808.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>678808.273</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x AC</td>
<td>67724.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67724.749</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP x AC</td>
<td>30707.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30707.524</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP x AC</td>
<td>125462.383</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125462.383</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG (Text Group)</td>
<td>209766.891</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69922.297</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP x AC x TG</td>
<td>133862.565</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>690821.447</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24199418.831</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>284699.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled error</td>
<td>26763509.595</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>278786.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on critical values of the F-distribution (Field, 2005: Appendix A.3)*

AFFECTIVE PRIMING EFFECT OF TEXT PRIMES (HYPOTHESIS 2)

The second hypothesis stated that an affective priming effect should occur for text primes, which should be reflected in a Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction. The means that are displayed in Table 4.10 show that positive probes indeed have a shorter response time when they are presented in a positive text context, compared to a negative text context ($M_{\text{positive context}} = 1083.01$ ms, and $M_{\text{negative context}} = 1204.37$ ms), negative probes have a shorter response time in a negative text context than in a positive text context ($M_{\text{negative context}} = 1241.00$ and $M_{\text{positive context}} = 1333.13$ ms). This pattern shows a Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction (also see Figure 4.2). Results of the ANOVA’s, which are presented in Table 4.9, however, show that the Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction is not significant ($F (1,96) = 2.44$, $p = .12$). In addition, results also showed a significant main effect of Valence Probe ($F (1,95) = 12.43$, $p < .0001$). Positive probes, on average, were judged faster than negative probes ($M_{\text{positive}} = 1143.69$ ms and $M_{\text{negative}} = 1287.07$ ms).

All in all, no support could be found for the first hypothesis and although the response times for text primes and targets are in the predicted direction (second hypothesis), the results show no significant Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction effect.

TABLE 4.10
Mean response times for Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valence Text Prime</th>
<th>Positive Probe</th>
<th>Negative probe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1083.01</td>
<td>1333.13</td>
<td>1208.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1204.37</td>
<td>1241.00</td>
<td>1222.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1143.69</td>
<td>1287.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 If the effect of Text Group is neglected and only the results of the (first) 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 8 (Subject Group) × 2 (Valence Tex Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) × 37 (Subject) ANOVA are taken into account, the VT×VP interaction is significant ($F(1,27) = 5.03$, $p = .033$).
READING TIMES

As for reading times, longer reading times were expected for incongruence between the valence of the author information and text sample, because the conflict in information sources presumably causes readers to puzzle about the (empirical) author’s intentions and moral stance. As sentences of the text samples obviously vary in length, and I want to compare the (overall) reading times of the different text versions, I determined the reading time per syllable by dividing the collected reading times of each sentence by its number of syllables (cf. Therriault et al., 2006).  

Although the text versions differ in content (immoral vs. relatively neutral), the sentence before the target word is identical, regardless of text version. For instance, text sample 1 is about abortion, and in the immoral version the I says [“I wrote that children ruin the relationship between man and woman] [and all pregnant women should be aborted’’][I told Desplechin]. In contrast, the ‘I’ in the relatively neutral version says [“I wrote that children affect the relationship between man and woman positively] [and that all pregnant women perhaps should be informed about that”’][I told Desplechin]. Notice that the sentence I told Desplechin is identical in both versions. The target adjective is presented immediately after this sentence has been read by the participant and the warning signal (***) has disappeared and thus cannot affect the reading time of the sentence which it precedes.

In order to determine whether the information about the author (the author prime), the context of the sentence (text prime version), or a combination of both affected reading times, reading times per syllable for the afore-mentioned identical sentences (dependent variable) were entered in two ANOVA’s (see previous subsection). Extreme reading times were determined per person per condition; reading times that fell two standard deviations above or below a person’s mean were replaced with reading times exactly two standard deviations above or below that mean (cf. Field, 2005; Klauer et al., 1997).

As the results in Table 4.11 show, text context seems to have affected reading times whereas the author prime did not. The sentence that precedes the target evaluative was, on average, read faster in a positive text context ($M_{positive} = 204.69$ ms), than a negative text context ($M_{negative} = 220.79$ ms). Results of the ANOVA’s, that are displayed in Table 4.12,

\[ \text{Figure 4.2. Mean RT for Valence Text Prime and Valence Probe} \]

22 Some have claimed that the ‘Kintsch method’ is based on a wrong assumption, namely that reading time starts at zero and that the reading process is linear (Cozijn, 2000). Another way to analyze reading times in the current context is to predict the reading time of the target sentence by the reading times of the preceding sentences, i.e. to conduct a linear regression residual analysis as suggested by Cozijn (2000). Aleth Bolt has conducted both Cozijn’s analysis and Kintsch’s analysis on one and the same dataset. The results of the analyses differed only marginally (Bolt, in press; Bolt & Spooren, 2003).
show support as a significant effect of Valence Text Prime was found on reading times \( (F(1, 102) = 5.32, p < .05) \). No significant effects were found for the Author Prime Condition \( (F(1.29) = 1.24, p = .28) \), nor were there significant interactions \( (p > .10) \).

### TABLE 4.11
Means for reading times per syllable for sentence preceding the target evaluative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Information</th>
<th>Mean (in ms)</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative text context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>238.02</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral</td>
<td>204.47</td>
<td>42.95</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>220.79</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive text context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td>209.20</td>
<td>42.96</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral</td>
<td>200.42</td>
<td>39.21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>204.69</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4.12
ANOVA Summary Table for reading times per syllable for the sentence preceding the target probe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>sign a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC (Author condition)</td>
<td>21886.591</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21886.591</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups (AC)</td>
<td>71542.367</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11923.728</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Groups)</td>
<td>511825.990</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17649.172</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Text (VT)</td>
<td>31337.325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31337.325</td>
<td>5.322</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Probe (VP)</td>
<td>3417.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3417.547</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP</td>
<td>750.215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750.215</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x AC</td>
<td>15533.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15533.647</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP x AC</td>
<td>3751.157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3751.157</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG (Text Group)</td>
<td>5952.259</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1984.085</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>558279.280</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6134.937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled error b</td>
<td>600647.301</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5888.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on critical values of the \( F \)-distribution (Field, 2005: Appendix A.3)

b Pooled error is the residual term (= SS error + SS (all treatment factors x TG interactions))

In addition, analyses for overall reading times per syllable were conducted. These were similar to the analyses for the reading times of the sentence that precedes the target evaluative, except that Valence Probe had three levels: a sentence could precede a positive probe, a negative probe, or no probe. Results are presented in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14. Overall, participants in the immoral author condition, on average, read somewhat slower \( (M_{immoral} = 216.87 \text{ ms}) \) than participants in the moral author condition \( (M_{moral} = 196.30 \text{ ms}) \).

---

23 Results of the conventional subject (F1) and item (F2) analysis showed an effect of Text Prime \( (F_1(1.35) = 6.18, p < .05, F_2(1,11) = 4.33, p = .06, \text{ and } \text{ MinF}'(1,28) = 2.55, p = .12) \). The target sentence, on average, was read faster in a positive text context than in a negative text context. In addition, an effect was found for Author Prime Condition \( (F_1(1.35) = 2.93, p = .096, F_2(1,11) = 8.53, p < .05, \text{ and } \text{ MinF}'(1,46) = 2.18, p = .15) \). Readers in the immoral author condition appeared to read the target sentence, on average, slower than readers in the moral author condition. The subject analysis also showed an Author Prime Condition \( \times \) Valence Text Prime interaction that attained a marginal level of significance \( (F_1(1.35) = 3.51, p = .069) \). However, both the item analysis and \( \text{ MinF}' \) showed no significant effects \( F_2(1,11) = 2.57, p = .14, \text{ and } \text{ MinF}'(1,28) = 1.48, p = .23) \).

24 Results of a conventional subject (F1) and item (F2) analyses showed a significant effect of Author Prime Condition on overall reading times in the item analysis and a trend in the subject analysis \( (F_2(1,11) = 36.93, p < .001, F_1(1,35) = 3.86, p = .058, \text{ and } \text{ MinF}'(1,42) = 3.49, p = .069) \). Readers in the immoral author condition, on average, read slower than readers in the moral author condition.
Information about the author seems to have affected the overall reading times, as I found an effect of Author Prime Condition that attained a marginal level of significance \( (F(1,29) = 3.12, p = .088) \). In addition, a significant effect of Valence Text Prime \( (F(1,166) = 5.56, p < .05) \), and a significant Valence Text Prime \( \times \) Valence Probe interaction was found \( (F(1,166) = 5.61, p < .005) \). Furthermore, I also found an effect of Text Group and an interaction of Text Group with Valence Probe (both \( p \)'s < .001). I cannot easily explain these results; the means do not show obvious patterns.

### Table 4.13
Means for overall reading times per syllable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Information</th>
<th>Text context</th>
<th>Mean (in ms)</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>216.31</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive/Neutral</td>
<td>217.27</td>
<td>118.34</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216.78</td>
<td>112.01</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>198.13</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive/Neutral</td>
<td>194.39</td>
<td>97.72</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196.30</td>
<td>97.83</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.14
ANOVA Summary Table for overall reading times per syllable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>sign*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC (Author condition)</td>
<td>174841.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174841.311</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups (AC)</td>
<td>112968.295</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18828.049</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Groups)</td>
<td>1623763.566</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55991.847</td>
<td>7.673</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Text (VT)</td>
<td>35274.811</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35274.811</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Probe (VP)</td>
<td>51925.804</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25962.902</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP</td>
<td>71182.547</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35591.274</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x AC</td>
<td>7932.246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7932.246</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP x AC</td>
<td>731.537</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>365.769</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP x AC</td>
<td>23660.572</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11830.286</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG (Text Group)</td>
<td>240611.930</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80203.977</td>
<td>9.440</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP x TG</td>
<td>231773.639</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38629.940</td>
<td>4.546</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>923864.089</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>6647.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled errorb</td>
<td>1053750.099</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6347.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Based on critical values of the \( F \)-distribution (Field, 2005: Appendix A.3)

*b Pooled error is the residual term (= SS error + SS (all treatment factors x TG interactions, except for the significant VP x TG interaction))

### Post-reading measurements

**Statements**

Statements about events in the text samples were included in the reading experiment in order to prevent readers from merely ‘scanning’ the text and to stimulate a deeper text understanding. Results indicate that participants have not disregarded the texts’ contents. Participants answered relatively many of the statements correctly (235 out of 296 or 72%). Distribution of correct and incorrect answers was more or less equal for the author prime conditions: 18 participants in the immoral condition answered 32 out of 144 (22%) incorrectly and 112 out of 144 correctly (78%), 19 participants in the moral condition answered 29 out of 152 (19%) incorrectly and 123 out of 152 (81%) correctly. Results of a Chi square test show...
neither significance of the frequency distribution for author prime conditions (Fisher’s Exact, 
\( p = .57, \text{ two-tailed} \)) nor for list, i.e. distribution of text samples to text conditions (\( \chi^2 \) (3, 296) 
\( = 4.61, p = .20, \text{ two-tailed} \)).

5. Discussion

Results indicate that the information about the fictitious author ‘Jean Nicholai’ that I provided 
readers with had an effect on their reading process; the information did – to some extent – 
affect reading times. Readers who received information about the immoral Nicholai, on 
average, read the text samples marginally significant slower, than readers who received 
information about a moral Nicholai. Secondly, the results did not show a priming effect of 
author information, and no support was found for the prediction that congruence of valence 
between author prime, text prime and target probe facilitates judgment of target words, i.e. 
evaluative adjectives (hypothesis 1). Thirdly, the results were in line with predictions of the 
affective priming paradigm (hypothesis 2) (e.g. Fazio, 2001; Fazio et al., 1986): congruence 
of valence between text prime and target seemed to facilitate judgement of target words, 
hence lead to shorter reaction times (an affective priming effect). However, results of a 
statistical analysis that is based on the assumption that text items are a random factor (see 
previous section) could not support this.

First, let us focus on explaining why I did not find support for the main prediction. 
Can the choice and manipulation of materials account for the findings? As for the 
manipulation of author information, results indicated that the manipulation was successful: 
after reading the information about the immoral author readers had a negative image of this 
author while readers of the moral author had a positive image, and the difference was 
significant. Besides, as mentioned before, information about the author seems to have affected 
reading times. However, although the author prime manipulation seems to have been 
successful, the manipulation possibly was not strong enough to create a priming effect of the 
author information. Results of the pilot study, after all, suggested that the manipulation was 
not optimal. The morality dimension of the information could be improved, however, that 
would be at the expense of the information’s credibility.

Another possible explanation for the fact that I did not find an effect of the 
biographical information on response times, and no convincing effect on reading times, could 
be that the effect of the author prime declined due to text content. Normally affective priming 
experiments present participants repeatedly with primes and targets, and the interval between 
the prime and target presentation is rather small. This is because it is assumed that the effect 
of the primes is short-lived. One could argue that the author information that I presented as 
prime lost its effect very short after the presentation and that, as a consequence, I could not 
find the predicted results. The difference between readers’ image of the author before and 
after reading also lead to the conclusion that the author prime may have lost its effect due to 
text content, i.e. the valence of the author prime changed in the perception of the readers. 
Besides a methodological explanation there may also be a theoretical explanation for the 
results. The biographical information, after all, will most likely contribute to readers’ 
constructions of a context model that includes an empirical author representation, i.e. the 
moral or immoral Jean Nicholai. In addition, the text samples with both a moral and immoral 
‘I’ will contribute to readers’ constructions of an implied author. Apparently the two 
constructions have been confounded or at least affected each other. Perhaps that the 
participants’ image of the immoral empirical author, the convicted child molester, becomes 
somewhat more positive once readers learn that this author writes texts about positive, 
morally acceptable persons, e.g. they may think that the author is not that bad. In other words, 
the construction of readers’ implied author may have affected or has been confounded with
their construction of the empirical author. As a result, reader’s image of the moral Nicholai, the celebrated advocate of equal rights, possibly becomes less positive once readers learn that this author writes about persons with morally objectionable ideas. Readers may have asked themselves what kind of person is able to create these credible morally reprehensible characters. Perhaps they thought that the author must have some dark corner in his mind from which these ideas have grown and taken shape?

With regard to text stimuli, the findings provide some support for the prediction that text context facilitated or inhibited judgment of target stimuli (affective priming effect). This could imply that the text samples – as was expected – were able to automatically activate an evaluative response. Contrary to earlier findings of affective priming experiments, some of which were discussed in the previous sections, my results were obtained under optimal conditions, which means under presentation durations exceeding 300 ms (e.g. Fazio et al., 1986). Some theorists have argued that “…affective priming effects are obtained most robustly for short SOAs well below 300 ms. Thus, the activation of prime evaluations seem to be quite short-lived” (Klauser & Musch, 2003: 16). Others have suggested that SOAs of 1000 ms and beyond will give participants enough time to disregard the prime (Fazio et al., 1986; Hermans et al., 2001; Pratto, 1994). As I mentioned before, it is impossible to present text stimuli at short presentation durations, and besides that, reading times vary per reader, therefore SOA’s will vary per reader.

Another explanation for the results could be that the text prime manipulation was not optimal, meaning that the positive text versions did not include an extremely moral narrator as opposed to the negative text versions that included an immoral narrator (see remarks in Chapter 3). Therefore, the congruence or incongruence between valences of author primes, text primes, and targets were relative and possibly not optimal for creating the predicted affective priming effects. As I explained in the previous chapter, increasing the contrast between the two text versions by making the moral version diametrically opposed to the immoral version creates a credibility problem. In addition, as results of the pilot study indicate, the factor interestingness will most likely vary between the versions, i.e. an extremely moral text version is less fun to read.

Obviously, more research is needed in order to explore in what way information about an empirical author affects the reading process, i.e. reading times and response times. At this point I can only speculate on what may have happened during reading, based on the findings and theoretical assumptions pertaining to the reading of fiction. Because I found that readers in the immoral author condition read slower than readers in the moral author condition it is possible that these readers were more on guard, speculating on the author’s intentions, perhaps inferring ironic intentions when reading the relatively positive text samples. In line with what I discussed in the previous chapter, readers were perhaps unwilling to share the author’s presentation of the fictional world, because it offers them a view on their world that they do not want to embrace (Gendler, 2000). Especially since this view is offered by an empirical author with reputable morals and behaviour. Different from the assumed default assumption of good behaviour, and the assumption that readers agree on a joint pretence with the author, these readers possibly were reluctant to join this immoral author in pretending a fictional world in which a father poisons his baby son, it is argued that pregnant women should be aborted, or a male adult sees no harm in having sex with a 15 year old girl. In addition, and I can merely guess at this point, readers in the immoral author condition may have questioned or doubted the author’s intentions when reading positive text samples. For instance, when one of these samples mentions a person who intends to follow a travel guide’s advice not to be seduced by underage Thai girls, readers may have been somewhat suspicious
of the author’s intentions or morals, given the information that the author is a convicted child molester.

Although the results cannot provide convincing support, it seems reasonable to posit that readers of the moral author condition, on the other hand, also have questioned the author’s intentions or perspective on matters when they were reading negative text samples. For example, one of the negative text samples includes a narrator who argues that all pregnant women should be aborted. Given the information that the empirical author is a fierce defender of equal rights of women, readers may have wondered whether to take the author seriously, or interpret the text content as a – bizarre kind of – ironic comment of the author. In a follow-up experiment, which will be reported on in the next chapter, this discrepancy between the empirical author’s personal values and the values displayed in the fictional text was therefore explored further.

In sum, we can conclude that the affective priming paradigm offers an interesting and still promising way to measure author inferences. Although I did not find an affective priming effect of the author prime, nor an affective priming effect for the text primes, response latencies for the text primes and targets were in the predicted direction, even under optimal priming conditions. At this point it is difficult to interpret the results in terms of what underlying mechanisms may have been involved in the affective priming (cf. section 1), therefore I would like to postpone this discussion until a later moment. More importantly, the biographical information about the author seems to have been active during the reading process, since I found an effect on reading times. However, we clearly need more information on when this information about the author is activated, and what are the contents of this activated information (e.g. presumed irony).

Therefore, in a follow-up experiment some improvements are called for to achieve a stronger effect, i.e. to achieve and increase the effect on response and reading times respectively. The following alternations were considered. For one, items were included in a questionnaire with the purpose of collecting additional information on readers’ thoughts and considerations concerning the author (e.g. his intentions). Secondly, in order to accomplish a stronger effect, an effort was made enhance the reliability and authenticity of the presented information about the author. Thirdly, the design was altered so that the factor Valence Text Prime becomes a between subject factor, i.e. participants read texts with either a positive or negative valence instead of both positive and negative texts. In that way, we could explore in more detail whether readers start puzzling about the author’s morals, intentions, and sincerity in asking the reader to join him in a game of make-believe, when there is a discrepancy between, on the one hand, biographical information about the fictitious author, and, on the one hand, information derived from the text contents. In other words, between readers’ mental representations of an empirical and an implied author. Finally, results of the current experiment showed that positive adjectives have significant shorter response times than negative adjectives. This is in line with findings from other affective priming experiments, in which this result is interpreted as indicating that negative stimuli are automatically attention grabbing, and are more unusual or unexpected than positive stimuli (e.g. Pratto, 1994). The number of positive adjectives in the current experiment outnumbered the number of negative adjectives. In order to limit the biased effect of positive adjectives on evaluation decision, the number of positive and negative adjectives was equalized in the follow-up experiment. The next chapter will discuss the method and results of this second on-line experiment.
This chapter reports and discusses a second on-line experiment (Experiment 3) which is similar to the on-line experiment that has been reported on in the previous chapter, yet, has a modified design and enriched, livelier biographical information about the author. The question that is addressed is, again, whether readers of literary fiction generate author inferences as part of their reading process. Findings of the previous experiment indicate that the affective priming paradigm offers methodologically reasonable possibilities to measure the generation of author inferences during reading. Information about the author seems to have been activated during the reading of text samples, as I found a – modest – effect of author information on reading times. In addition, although the statistical analyses could not provide support for an affective priming effect of text samples, results were in the predicted direction. It is noteworthy that text primes were presented under less than optimal priming conditions, i.e. relatively large presentation duration of the prime. What is more, off-line measurements indicated that readers have constructed a representation of the empirical author as part of their context model. This representation seems to have changed during the course of reading most likely due to the texts’ content. In other words, because of a discrepancy between readers’ mental representation of an empirical author based on the provided information before reading the text samples, and a mental representation of an implied author that may have been constructed based on the texts. In effect, the author prime probably lost its effect in the course of the experiment. This could be an explanation for the fact that no priming effect was found for author information, and the effect on reading times merely attained a marginal level of significance. In the current experiment the effects of this discrepancy between information sources on readers’ constructions of an author’s representation as part of their context model was further explored.

The aim of the present chapter is twofold. The first is of methodological concern in that it attempts to provide stronger support for the assumption that readers generate author inferences during reading. My object was to find an effect of biographical information about the empirical author on both reading times and response latencies. The second aim concerns a theoretical or conceptual level. In the previous experiment I provided readers with information about a fictitious empirical author in terms of gender, age, morals, and qualification of the author’s work, such as “controversial”. Readers can use this text-external information to construct their context model, which theoretically includes information about the context, i.e. setting, participants, genre etcetera. In the current experiment I decided to provide more extensive and more detailed information about the empirical author, his position in the literary field, and his morals and values expressed through acts, comments, or specific intentions. This way, the contrast between the immoral and moral author was increased, while at the same time enhancing the credibility and authenticity of the information (source). Given that readers presume that the author is sincere and morally acceptable (default assumption of
good behaviour), information about an immoral author should challenge this default assumption and trigger readers into generating author inferences. Readers may feel unwilling to accept the author’s invitation to jointly pretend that the events in the fictional world actually take place, given the author’s morally reprehensible acts or position. The detailed information about the moral author, on the other hand, should endorse the default assumption. Furthermore, because of a change in the design, which implies that readers either read texts with a morally reprehensible or acceptable narrator, it is expected that based on these texts readers will construct either a representation of a positive (more or less moral) or negative (immoral) implied author. In addition, the discrepancy that I mentioned earlier should thus be stronger, e.g. readers of texts with a morally objectionable narrator written by an author who is praised for his moral deeds will likely be puzzled. Possibly they maintain that this author has some artistic or other intention with the texts, for instance, to give readers a thorough shake-up and make them reflect on their – and the author’s – world.

In short, participants of the current experiment (Experiment 3) were presented with one of two versions of a fictitious article that was supposedly taken from an August issue of the French magazine *Lire*, which is, in fact, an actual magazine. One version of this article is entitled ‘French writer discredited because of sexual offence’, and reports of a fictitious author named Jean Nicholai who is said to have been arrested on suspicion of severe sexual molesting of two girls some years ago. It is furthermore mentioned that this writer’s controversial novels have put him in hot water before. The other version, entitled ‘French writer wins prestigious ‘Prix Goncourt’’, reports that Jean Nicholai, author of several successful and revealing novels, is awarded with a prestigious literary prize. His novels are also said to have caused a unique national debate about children’s rights.

The next section will present the predictions and the above-mentioned modifications to the design and materials. The results of the statistical analyses will be laid out in section 2. Finally, section 3 will discuss the results of the experiment, thus creating an ‘upbeat’ for the final chapter, in which the findings of all empirical studies that have been reported on in this book will be discussed.

1. Experiment 3

In line with the experiment that I discussed in the previous chapter, I assume that readers of affect-laden text samples can automatically activate evaluative responses towards these texts, for instance, in terms of liking or disliking. These positive or negative responses can be either congruent or in conflict with readers’ evaluative responses towards the empirical author, which are, in effect, triggered by the text-external information that readers receive before reading the texts and which will likely be used to construct a context model. The premise is that if, for instance, readers read information about an author who is on suspicion of severe sexual molesting of young girls, readers will most likely construct a mental representation of an empirical author that is morally reprehensible. The expectation is that if readers subsequently read texts samples with a (moderately) moral narrator, they will construct a representation of a (moderately) moral/positive implied author that is based on the text, which in this case will be heavily determined by readers’ constructions of the first-person narrator. The valences of these two primes and the related reader constructions (of an empirical and/or implied author) will conflict, and it is expected that this will result in longer response latencies to target words. In terms of the affective priming paradigm, I reasoned that less additional activation will be required to evaluate the valence of the presented word, if the valence of the author information, text, and the target word are congruent. To put it differently, I predict that – biographical – information about an author will affect response latencies in judging evaluative adjectives (see hypothesis I below). In addition, and in line
with the affective priming paradigm, I predict a priming effect of the text primes (hypothesis II).

Predictions

I. Congruence between the valence of the author prime, text prime, and target (evaluative adjective) will lead to a shorter reaction time in an adjective connotation task, than when congruence between the valence of the primes and target is minimal.

II. Congruence between the valence of the text prime and target will lead to a shorter reaction time in an adjective connotation task, than when the valence of the text prime and target are incongruent (e.g. Fazio et al., 1986).

In statistical terms I predict a three-way (Author Prime Condition × Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe) interaction (hypothesis I) and a two-way (Valence Text Prime × Valence Probe) interaction (hypothesis II). It is expected that maximal congruence will produce the relatively shortest reaction times. Maximal congruence would be, for instance, if both the author prime and text prime are negative, and a negative target adjective such as ‘aggressive’ is presented. No predictions are made about what affects the reaction times more: congruence between author prime and target or congruence between text prime and target.

In addition, it was reasoned that cognitive or affective activation will also be reflected in the reading times. More specifically, longer reading times were expected for incongruence between the valence of the author information and text sample, because the conflict in information sources presumably causes readers to puzzle about the (empirical and/or implied) author’s intentions and moral stance. Although the predictions are identical to the ones of the previous experiment, some alternations were made to the design and to the author prime of the current experiment in order to reach a larger effect of author information, i.e. an effect on both response latencies and reading times. These alternations are discussed in the following subsections.

Method

Materials

The same twelve text samples that were used in Experiment 2 functioned as text primes in the current experiment. In order to limit the effect that positive probes may have on reaction times, and based on the results of the previous experiment, the number of positive vs. negative filler probes was evened. In addition, the user frequency of each adjective was also taken into account, as several studies have reported that variables such as word length and word frequency significantly correlated with mean evaluation latencies (e.g. Bargh et al., 1992). Based on the Dutch data from the Dutch Centre for Lexical Information (CELEX) database, frequencies of the corresponding word forms and lemmas of the adjectives were compared and, if necessary, adjectives with a relatively low frequency were replaced with a similar adjective with a relatively higher lemma and word form frequency (see the appendix).  

---

1 CELEX is part of the Max Planck Institute of Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen (http://www.ru.nl/celex/). To give an example of the frequencies displayed in the Dutch database, the wordform ‘eerlijk’ (honest) has a frequency of 2339, the lemma ‘eerlijk’ which includes all corresponding wordforms (e.g. ‘eerlijke’ – fair, ‘eerlijkst’ – fairest, ‘eerlijkheid’ – fairness, ‘eerlijkheidshalve’ – in fairness) has a frequency of 26001. I compared both word form and lemma frequencies of the adjectives. See the appendix for details, such as word frequency, word form, and lemma of the adjectives that were used in the current experiment.
different lists were constructed with each list containing the twelve text primes in one of two versions, and twelve positive and negative target adjectives. Furthermore, each text sample contained a positive or negative filler adjective. Each participant would hence read all text samples in either the negative or relatively neutral version, and respond to all of the target probes (see Table 5.1).

### TABLE 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lists by valence of text prime and target adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tppp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

trpp= negative text, positive probe, tppn = negative text, negative probe, tppp= positive text, positive probe, tnpn = positive text, negative probe. The numbers correspond with the text samples (see the appendix of Chapter 4 for all text samples).

Most importantly, compared to the previous experiment, the information about the empirical author, i.e. the author prime, was edited and more detailed information was added. First of all, both versions were presented as if the information was derived from a genuine French magazine (*LiRE: le magazine littéraire*). A reference to the name and edition of the magazine was included at the bottom of the page and a title was added at the top of the text that said either ‘French writer discredited because of sexual offence’ or ‘French writer wins prestigious ‘Prix Goncourt’’, depending on the author condition. Furthermore, the style of the text resembled that of a newspaper article, i.e. factual and objective, and the objectivity was further implied by the inclusion of a quote from an interview with the author. The intention was to make the participants of the experiment believe that the provided information about the empirical author was authentic and objective. I expected that participants would construct a lively picture of the author and believe – at least – that this Jean Nicholai was either a popular writer of controversial novels and a morally questionable person, or a very respectable writer with noble intentions and high standards of morality. The immoral version told readers for instance:

> Jean Nicholai, writer of several controversial novels (e.g. ‘Obsession’), is subject of discussion after it turns out he has been arrested on suspicion of severe sexual molesting of a 5 year old girl and her 8 year old sister several years ago.

The moral version included the following phrase:

> Yesterday Jean Nicholai, author of several success novels (e.g. ‘Sur la table de nuit’) won the prestigious literary prize the ‘Prix Goncourt’ for his most recent novel ‘Petit air’ […] In 1996 he published ‘Univers d’ Enfants’, a novel that in an unmistakable way portrayed the vulnerability of children in disadvantaged neighborhoods…

Both versions were judged by a small number of literary experts on credibility and occasionally suggestions for stylistic improvements were made. Based on their commentary small corrections were made (see the appendix for the final versions).

Finally, a questionnaire was constructed that concluded some of the items from the questionnaire used in Experiment 2, such as items regarding the constructed image of the author, immoral positions in the text, the default assumption, preferences of literature that
include immoral characters, verification of recognition of the original text (Platform and Elementary Particles, both by Michel Houellebecq), and demographic items. Items were added concerning readers’ consideration of the author’s intentions during reading (e.g. “Some text samples made me wonder whether the writer wanted me to interpret his text as irony”), and with regard to recollection, impact, and qualification of the provided author information. The reason for including these additional items is to evaluate how well the provided author information is processed and what elements have emerged into the context model. Also, definitions of both moral and immoral were taken from the standard dictionary of Dutch language De Dikke Van Dale, and included in the beginning of the questionnaire. The reason is to prevent that readers generate different interpretations of the two concepts, and use these when answering the questions of the questionnaire. Items for text evaluation, e.g. readers’ image of the narrator, were also included, as well as the evaluative adjectives that were used in the reading experiment as target probes, both for the purpose to evaluate the degree to which the manipulations were successful. Participants were asked to judge each adjective on a 6-level semantic differential scale ranging from very positive to very negative. The complete questionnaire can be found in the appendix.

PARTICIPANTS AND DESIGN

Forty students of the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Arts of the VU University Amsterdam, 11 men and 29 women, participated in the experiment (average age of 21.7, SD = 2.4 and range 18 – 28). Participants received 5 euros for participation and the session took between 20 and 30 minutes.

A 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) balanced Latin Square design was used. Because the results of Experiment 2, as reported on in the previous chapter, indicated that the author prime may have been affected by the valence of the text primes – as participants read both positive and negative text samples – small changes were made to the design. In the design of the current experiment both Valence Text Prime (positive vs. negative) and Author Prime Condition (immoral vs. moral) are between-subjects factors, and Valence Probe (positive vs. negative adjective) is a within-subject factor. This way, there is either consistency or inconsistency between the valence of the author information and text samples, i.e. text-internal information. Furthermore, as Table 5.2 shows, each level of Text Groups consist of six text samples, and these text groups are counterbalanced over the text conditions (cf. Table 5.1).

TABLE 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>tnpp</th>
<th>tnpn</th>
<th>tppp</th>
<th>tppn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author condition +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Text Group 1</td>
<td>Text Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 It is important to mention that the participating students of the Faculty of Arts did not include students of literature. Only Communication and Information Studies, and Cultural Studies: Comparative Arts Studies students participated in the experiment, and these students were equally distributed between the conditions and lists. The same goes for gender: male and female participants were equally distributed over the conditions.
Subjects...
Group  4      Text Group 2 Text Group 1
Subjects...

Author condition –
Group  5      Text Group 1 Text Group 2
Subjects...
Group  6      Text Group 2 Text Group 1
Subjects...
Group  7      Text Group 1 Text Group 2
Subjects...
Group  8      Text Group 2 Text Group 1
Subjects...

tnpp= negative text, positive probe, tnpp = negative text, negative probe, tppp = positive text, positive probe, tppn = positive text, negative probe. Text Group 1 included text items 1 through 6, Text Group 2 included items 7 through 12.

PROCEDURE AND APPARATUS

The procedure and apparatus were identical to Experiment 2 except for the duration of the experiment, which was between 20 and 30 minutes, instead of 30 to 40 minutes in the previous experiment. Participants were randomly allocated to one of the eight subject groups (see Table 5.2). For details on the procedure and apparatus I refer to the relating sections of the previous chapter.

2. Results

Participants committed relatively few errors in judging the valence of the evaluative adjectives; of a total of 960 adjectives (40 participants × 12 text samples × 2 adjectives) only 59 or 5.6% was judged incorrectly. These incorrect adjectives and the corresponding reaction times were excluded from the data file (cf. Bargh et al., 1992; De Houwer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 1986; Klauer et al., 1997). This was also true for extreme reaction times (plus or minus two standard deviations of the mean reaction time per author condition and text group); these values were replaced by a missing value. Furthermore, only the reaction times of the target probes were included in the statistical analyses, the reaction times of the filler probes were excluded.

Reaction time data of the correct target adjectives were then analyzed using two ANOVA’s. Response latencies were entered in a 2 (Valence Author Prime) × 2 (Valence Text Student) factorial design.

---

3 Differences in distribution of these incorrect probes between the conditions were not appreciable. Decisions, with regard to whether subjects had judged an adjective correctly or incorrectly, were, again, based on the results of the pilot study (see previous chapter). In addition, the determined valence of the few adjectives that were added to the list (see the subsection materials) was based on the common sense idea that, for instance, aggressive is a negative trait and reliable a positive trait.

4 The decision to exclude these data from the data file is also supported by the results of an independent t-test on response times of the correct and incorrect adjectives (both filler and target adjectives), regardless of text prime or author prime conditions. Results show that incorrect adjectives have longer mean response times (1720.10 ms.) than correct adjectives (1158.30 ms.) (t (61) = 5.00, p < .001, two-tailed). As for participant characteristics, results of an independent t-test for study (Arts vs. Social Sciences) showed no significant results (t (429) = .61, p = .54, two-tailed). However, this was different for the variable Gender. Female participants, on average, responded somewhat slower (1211.56 ms.) than male participants (1128.34 ms.) and this difference attained a marginal level of statistical significance (t (958) = 1.81, p = .071, two-tailed). However, male and female participants were equally distributed over the conditions; therefore the factor would have affected all conditions.

5 This decision is supported by the results of an independent t-test on the response times for target and filler adjectives, regardless of text prime or author prime conditions. Target adjectives, on average, had shorter reaction times (1099.78 ms) than filler adjectives (1285.88 ms) (t (935) = 4.89, p < .001, two-tailed).
Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) × 8 (Subject Groups) × 40 (Subjects) ANOVA and an ANOVA that also included the 2-level Text Group factor. As in the previous chapter, item-based analyses were not conducted, since variance due to text items is controlled for by counterbalancing the items across conditions (Raaijmakers, 2003; Raaijmakers et al., 1999). Before I discuss the results in terms of the formulated predictions, I will first report on the findings that relate to manipulation checks of the author and text primes.

**Manipulation check author prime**

During the experiment participants received information about either a *moral* or *immoral* fictitious Jean Nicholai. Participants were asked twice to judge the author on a 5-level semantic differential scale that ranged from very positive through very negative: once immediately after reading the information and once after reading the text samples. Was the manipulation successful; that is to say, is the immoral author evaluated negatively and the moral author positively? The results indicate that this is the case. The means of author evaluation are displayed below in Table 5.3. The table shows that directly after having read the information about the author, and notice that this is before participants read the text samples, participants in the *moral* author condition evaluated Jean Nicholai positively ($M_{moral} = 1.50$) while participants in the *immoral* author condition evaluated Nicholai negatively ($M_{immoral} = 3.95$) and the result is significant ($t(38) = -12.79, p < .001, \text{two-tailed}$).

After having read the text samples participants were asked to indicate their image of the text’s author for the second time (on the same 5-level scale). The results, which are displayed in Table 5.3, Figure 5.1, and Figure 5.2, show that the moral Nicholai is, on average, evaluated positively ($M_{moral} = 2.85$) and the immoral Nicholai, on average, negatively ($M_{immoral} = 3.80$). The difference in means is significant; the results of a 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on author evaluation show a main effect of Author Prime Condition on the evaluated author’s image ($F(1,36) = 11.09, p < .005, \text{partial eta}^2 = .24$ and observed power $= .90$).

Notice, however, that the difference in means is smaller after reading compared to before reading the text samples (Figure 5.1). This could indicate that the text content, again, affected he reader’s image of the author. After all, participants read texts that were – in terms of valence – either consistent or inconsistent with the provided author information. Support for this effect of text content can be found in the means for author evaluation by Valence Text Prime that are displayed in Table 5.3. The results show that regardless of author prime condition, participants that read positive text samples, on average, clearly had a much more positive image of the author ($M_{positive} = 2.90$), than participants that read negative text samples ($M_{negative} = 3.75$). Results of the above-mentioned ANOVA show a significant main effect of Valence Text Prime on evaluated author’s image ($F(1,36) = 8.88, p < .01$) and no interaction between author prime condition and text valence was found ($p = .23$). (see also Figure 5.2).

| TABLE 5.3 |
|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Descriptive Statistics for author’s image – valence before and after reading by Author Prime Condition and Valence Text Prime |
| Author Prime | Text Prime | Mean$^1$ | Std. | N |
|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Image author before reading text samples | Immoral | 3.95 | .69 | 20 |
| Moral | 1.50 | .51 | 20 |
| Total | | | | 40 |
Besides reporting their image of the author in terms of *valence* (positive or negative), participants also reported their image of the author in terms of *morality*. They were asked to read the presented definitions of the words *moral* (moreel) and *immoral* (immoreel) before answering the question. Results show that, on average, participants in the moral author condition evaluated the author to be more moral ($M = 2.45$) than participants in the immoral
author condition \( (M = 3.95) \) (see Table 5.4). Furthermore, participants who read positive text samples judged the author to be more moral \( (M = 2.85) \) than readers of negative text samples \( (M = 3.55) \) (see Table 5.4). Results of the \( 2 \) (Author Prime Condition) \( \times 2 \) (Valence Text Prime) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on author evaluation (morality) support these results: I found a significant main effect of Author Prime Condition \( \left( F(1,36) = 23.14, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .39 \right. \) and \( \text{observed power} = .97) \) and a significant main effect of Valence Text Prime \( \left( F(1,36) = 5.04, p < .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .20 \right. \) and \( \text{observed power} = .83) \) and no significant interaction \( (p = 1.0) \).

**TABLE 5.4**

Descriptive Statistics for author’s image – immorality after reading by Author Prime Condition and Valence Text Prime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Prime</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral Author Condition</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Author Condition</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Answers could range from 1 very moral person through 5 very immoral person on a 5-level scale.

In addition, participants’ responses to an item in the questionnaire concerning the credibility of the author information showed that most participants, i.e. 24 out of 40 or 60\%, found the information – highly – credible, only 4 out of 40 participants or 10\% found the information (highly) incredible, and 12 out of 40 or 30\% had no opinion. Means of the text and author conditions ranged from 3.22 through 4.00, \( M_{\text{overall}} = 3.67, SD = .93 \). With regard to recognition of the text samples as being written by Michel Houellebecq, nearly all participants reported that they had no clue which French writer could have written the presented text samples. Only one participant wrote down the name of Voltaire “because he has a slightly similar ironic style”, but this participant indicated that she was not sure.

Furthermore, when asked what they remembered especially from the information about the author, participants frequently reported the most important aspects that most likely contributed to their representation of the empirical author, i.e. sexual abuse of children, the author’s opinion on paedophilia (immoral author condition), and helping underprivileged children and/or donating money to welfare (moral author condition). Finally, participants wrote down positively or negatively valued words to qualify the author. Results were in line with the expectations; on average more positively valued words were reported to qualify the moral author and vice versa for the immoral author. I will return to this issue at the end of this section when the data derived from other items in the questionnaire are discussed. For now it is important that the manipulation of author information seems to have been successful. The next subsection will discuss whether the same can be concluded for the manipulation of the text stimuli.
Manipulation check text stimuli

Text samples, taken from two novels by the French author Michel Houellebecq, were presented in one of two conditions: an immoral (negative) version and a relatively neutral version, i.e. a first-person narrator that displays morally reprehensible views or acts, or a relatively neutral first-person narrator. The question is whether participants evaluated the immoral text samples negatively and the relatively positive samples positively. Table 5.8 shows the means for the item in the questionnaire that corresponded to text evaluation, with answers ranging from very positive through very negative on a 5-point semantic differential scale. The relatively positive text versions were, on average, evaluated as being relatively neutral (\(M_{\text{positive}} = 3.05\)), and the immoral text versions were, on average, evaluated negatively (\(M_{\text{negative}} = 4.10\)).

Results of a 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) ANOVA on text evaluation show that this finding is significant. A main effect of Valence Text Prime was found (\(F(1,36) = 27.78, p <.001\), \(\text{partial } \eta^2 = .44\) and \(\text{observed power} = 1.00\)). However, I also found a significant Author Prime Condition × Valence Text Prime interaction (\(F(1,36) = 10.64, p <.005\), \(\text{partial } \eta^2 = .23\) and \(\text{observed power} = .89\)). As can be gathered from Table 5.5 and Figure 5.3 differences in text evaluation for relatively positive and negative texts were most obvious in the immoral author condition. In addition, readers in the moral author conditions evaluated positive text samples, on average, as being neutral, going towards negative (\(M = 3.30\)).

The results of the manipulation checks of both the author prime and text primes hence suggest that the texts’ contents have affected readers’ image of the (implied and/or empirical) author (see the previous subsection), while information about the empirical author has presumably influenced readers’ evaluation of the texts as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Prime</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immoral Author condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Author condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Primes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Answers could range from 1 very positive through 5 very negative on a 5-level scale.

\(\text{6 Text evaluation was measured by one item from the questionnaire: ‘How positive or negative do you judge the texts you have read?’ Answers could vary from 1 ‘very positive’ through 5 ‘very negative’}.\)
The valence of the text samples is mainly determined by the actions, ideas and comments of the ‘I’ (the narrator). Therefore it is important that the ‘I’ is evaluated in line with the appointed valence of the texts, i.e. positive vs. negative. Participants were asked in the questionnaire to characterize the ‘I’ by writing down up to five words, and indicate whether this qualification was thought to be positive, neutral, or negative. Results were in line of the expectations: the ‘I’ of the negative text samples generated more negative qualifications, while the ‘I’ of the positive text samples generated more positive qualifications. I will discuss these results in more detail in the questionnaire subsection. For now it is important that the manipulation of the text stimuli seems to have been successful.

Manipulation check target adjectives

The questionnaire that participants completed after reading the text samples included a list of evaluative adjectives that were used in the experiment as target probes. Participants were asked to rate each adjective on a 6-level semantic differential scale ranging from very positive to very negative. Results showed that the evaluations were in line with the expectations, as well as with the results of the pilot study (see Chapter 4, section 2.2). Positive adjectives were rated almost exclusively positive and negative adjectives almost exclusively negative. Details are included in the appendix.

Predictions: affective priming effects and reading times

In order to test the prediction that agreement in valence of author prime, text prime, and target adjective will result in the relatively shortest reaction times, I conducted two ANOVA’s: response latencies were entered in a 2 (Valence Author Prime) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 2 (Valence Probe) × 8 (Subject Groups) × 40 (Subjects) ANOVA and an ANOVA that included the 2-level Text Group factor. Because the text items in the current experiment are counterbalanced across conditions only subject analyses were conducted (Raaijmakers et al., 1999, cf. chapter 4). Results of a conventional subject (F1) and item (F2) analysis showed no support for the expected three-way interaction \((F_1 (1, 36) = .052, p = .82, F_2 (1, 11) = .43, p = .52, \text{MinF}^* (1,30) = 0.23, p = .63)\). Results showed an effect of Author Prime Condition in the item analysis \((F_2 (1, 11) = 10.29, p < .01, F_1 (1, 36) = 1.28, p = .27, \text{MinF}^* (1.43) = 1.14, p = .29)\) as well as an Author Prime Condition × Text Prime interaction \((F_2 (1, 11) = 12.29, p = .001)\)
AFFECTIVE PRIMING EFFECTS OF AUTHOR PRIME (HYPOTHESIS 1) AND TEXT PRIMES (HYPOTHESIS 2)

It was predicted that information about an empirical author (author prime) would affect response latencies if its valence was consistent with both the valence of the text sample (text prime) and the evaluative (target probe). This effect should be reflected in a significant three-way interaction. The mean response times in ms are displayed in Table 5.6 below. Participants in the moral author prime condition seem to have responded, on average, faster than participants who received an immoral author prime; response latencies are shorter, independent of text prime condition and valence of the probe. In addition, mean response latencies in the immoral author condition are longer for positive than for negative text contexts, while the reverse pattern can be found in the moral author condition. Results of the ANOVA’s, however, do not show a significant effect of Author Prime Condition \((F(1,31) = 1.43, p = .24)\) or an Author Prime Condition \(\times\) Valence Text Prime interaction \((F(1,32) = 1.08, p = .31)\) nor was there support for the predicted three-way interaction \((F < 1)\). As for the second hypothesis which predicted a Valence Text Prime \(\times\) Target Probe interaction, results could not support this prediction \((F < 1)\). The results of the ANOVA’s showed only a significant effect of Valence Probe \((F(1,35) = 10.50, p <.005)\). On average, positive probes showed shorter response times than negative probes (see Table 5.6 and Figure 5.4).

**TABLE 5.6**
| Mean response times (ms) for Author Prime Condition \(\times\) Valence Text Prime \(\times\) Valence Probe interaction |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Author Prime Condition          | Positive Text                   | Negative Text                   | Positive Text                   | Negative Text                   |
| Positive Probe                  | Negative Probe                  | Positive Probe                  | Negative Probe                  | Positive Probe                  | Negative Probe                  |
| Immoral                         | M 1134.88 SD 482.84              | M 1217.24 SD 386.63             | M 1037.99 SD 483.86             | M 1135.93 SD 448.74             |
| Moral                            | M 877.17 SD 242.43              | M 995.34 SD 239.36             | M 1017.49 SD 323.04             | M 1122.67 SD 269.77             |
| Total                            | 1006.02 SD 394.66               | 1106.29 SD 333.02              | 1027.74 SD 400.56              | 1129.30 SD 360.42              |

**TABLE 5.7**
| ANOVA Summary Table for response latencies (ms) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Source of variation             | SS 1792906.892                 | df 1                            | MS 1792906.892                 |
| AC(Author condition)            |                                |                                | F 1.429                        |
| Groups (VT \(\times\) AC)      | 5832979.624                    | 4                              | MS 1458242.656                 |
| Subject (VT \(\times\) AC \(\times\) Groups) | 41228875.544                  | 32                             | MS 1288402.361                 |
| Valence Text (VT)              | 54444.829                     | 1                              | MS 54444.829                  |

\(<.01, F_{1, 36} = .96, p =.33, and MinF'(1,41)= .89, p = .35)\). Participants in the immoral author prime condition, on average, responded faster, especially to adjectives that appeared in a positive text compared to participants in the moral author condition. These, on their part, reacted faster to adjectives in a negative text context. In addition, a main effect was found for Target Probe \((F_{1, 36} = 10.33, p <.005, F_{2, 11} = 3.33, p = .095, and MinF'(1,19) = 2.52, p =.13)\). Positive target adjectives showed, on average, shorter mean response times than negative target adjectives. However, all MinF' values were non-significant.

\(a^\) Because results of some affective priming experiments found effects of word length and/or word frequency of the target on response times, I conducted a regression analysis on the response times. Results showed that the variable word length was the better predictor \((\beta = 34.59, t (450) = 3.34, p <.005)\), although the proportion of variance explained by the model that includes both variables was rather small \((R^2 = .035, F(2, 452) = 8.18, p <.001)\). Results of two ANOVA’s on the corrected response times (RT/word length) showed no significant effects, the ANOVA Summary Table is included in the appendix.
Valence Probe (VP)  1108362.490  1  1108362.490  10.503  .003**
VT x VP  45.575  1  45.575  .000
VT x AC  1352229.687  1  1352229.687  1.078  .307
VP x AC  12614.334  1  12614.334  .120
VT x VP x AC  5557.222  1  5557.222  .053
TG (Text Group)  23346.756  1  23346.756  .228
Error  3244858.408  32  101401.825
Pooled errorb  3693399.406  35  105525.697

a Based on critical values of the F-distribution (Field, 2005: Appendix A.3)
b Pooled error is the residual term (= SS error + SS (all treatment factors x TG interactions))

Figure 5.4 Mean response latencies by text primes and target probe

**AFFECTIVE PRIMING II**

**READING TIMES**

Longer reading times were expected for incongruence between the valence of the author information and text sample, because the conflict in information sources presumably causes readers to puzzle about the (empirical) author’s intentions and his moral stance. Again, the reading time per syllable was determined by dividing the collected reading times of each sentence by its number of syllables (cf. section 3.2 of the previous chapter). Extreme reading times were determined per person per condition; reading times that fell two standard deviations above or below a person’s mean were replaced with reading times exactly two standard deviations above or below that mean (cf. Field, 2005; Klauer et al., 1997). Mean reading times per syllable were calculated for the identical sentences in the text versions over participants (dependent variable) and entered into an ANOVA. An example of a target sentence is the neutral segment *I told Desplechin* in [“I wrote that children ruin the relationship between man and woman [and all pregnant women should be aborted”,] [I told Desplechin]. The first two sentences differ in the two text versions whereas the last sentence is identical. The target adjective is presented immediately after this last sentence has been read by the participant and the warning signal (***) has disappeared, and thus cannot affect the reading time of the sentence that it precedes. Since the sentence before the target word is identical for both text versions, differences in reading time should be due to text context, author prime, or an interaction of both factors.9

9 Results of a conventional subject (F1) and item (F2) analysis on reading times per syllable for the target sentence showed main effects in the item analysis of Author Prime Condition ($F_2 (1,11) = 19.31, p <.005$, $F_1 (1,36) = 2.23, p = .058$, and $MinF' (1,43) = 2.00, p = .17$) and of Valence Text Prime ($F_2 (1,11) = 5.06, p <.05$, $F_1 (1,36) = .98, p = .33$, and $MinF' (1,46) = .82, p = .37$). No interaction effects were found (all $F$’s < 1.1). Mean reading times showed that the sentence was read faster when readers were given information about a moral...
A 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) × 8 (Subject Groups) univariate ANOVA was conducted on reading times per syllable for the target sentences. The mean reading times per syllable are presented in Table 5.8 below. Overall, readers in the immoral author condition read the sentence, on average, slower ($M_{immoral} = 198.45$ ms) than readers in the moral author condition ($M_{moral} = 181.62$ ms) and the sentence was, on average, read faster in a positive text context ($M = 193.70$ and $178.34$ ms respectively) than in a negative text context ($M = 203.20$ and $184.91$ ms respectively). Yet, the results of the ANOVA show neither significant effects of Author Prime Condition nor for Valence Text Prime (both $p$’s > .28) and there was no interaction effect found ($p = .94$).

### Table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text context</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral author condition</td>
<td>positive 193.70 51.51 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative 203.20 46.80 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total 198.45 48.15 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral author condition</td>
<td>positive 178.34 58.58 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative 184.91 48.66 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total 181.62 52.52 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, means of overall reading times by author and text prime condition are displayed in Table 5.9. Readers in the immoral author condition read, on average, slower ($M_{immoral} = 190.57$ ms) than readers in the moral author condition ($M_{moral} = 179.20$ ms) and positive texts, on average, were read slower ($M = 176.79$ and $172.30$ ms) than negative texts ($M = 204.36$ and $186.11$ ms). Analysis of overall reading times could neither provide support for an effect of Author Prime Condition, nor for an Author Prime Condition × Valence Text Prime interaction (both $F$’s<1). However, there was an effect of Valence Text Prime that attained a marginal level of significance ($F (1,28) = 2.98, p = .095$).

### Table 5.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text context</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral author condition</td>
<td>positive 176.79 37.59 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative 204.36 35.30 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 190.57 38.20 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral author condition</td>
<td>positive 172.30 38.54 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative 186.11 32.46 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 179.20 35.39 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of a conventional subject ($F_1$) and item ($F_2$) analysis on the overall reading times per syllable showed main effects in the item analysis of Author Prime Condition ($F_2 (1,11) = 38.49, p < .001, F_1 (1,36) = 1.27, p = .27$, and $MinF' (1,38) = 1.23, p = .27$) and of Valence Text Prime ($F_2 (1,11) = 70.55, p < .001, F_1 (1,36) = 3.92, p = .098$, and $MinF' (1,40) = 3.71, p = .06$). Positive text samples, on average, were read faster than negative text samples. There was also a significant Author Prime Condition × Valence Text Prime interaction in the item analysis ($F_2 (1,11) = 11.40, p < .01, F_1 (1,36) = .46, p = .50$, and $MinF' (1,39) = .044, p = .51$).
Post-reading measurements

STATEMENTS

During the reading experiment participants had to judge the correctness of statements that referred to one of the text samples that they had just read. These statements were included to stimulate participants to read the text samples carefully instead of merely scanning the texts (see the subsection Procedure). Participants could answer either <correct> or <incorrect> by pushing on the appropriate button of the response box. Results show that, overall, most statements were correctly judged (152 out of 320 or 79%), which indicates that readers have not merely scanned the text samples but likely have reached a deeper text understanding. Distributions of correct and incorrect answered statements were more or less equal for author and text prime conditions (see the related table in the appendix). Fisher’s exact tests show neither significance of the frequency distribution of the two text conditions for the immoral author condition ($p = .57$, two-tailed) nor for the moral author condition ($p = 1.00$, two-tailed). List (cf. Table 5.1) did not affect the distribution of correct and incorrect answers either ($\chi^2 (3, 320) = .65, p = .89$, two-tailed).

QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire included items with regard to participants’ image of the author in terms of the author’s moral position, intentions, and a general impression, i.e. positive or negative. Also items concerning text evaluation were included, some of which were discussed in the previous sections.

Characterisations of the author

Let me start with reporting on participants’ responses to the question – item 2 in the questionnaire – to write down a maximum of five words that would characterize the author and narrator respectively and indicate for each word whether they would qualify the word as positive, negative or neutral. Table 5.10 displays the mean number of words that participants wrote down to qualify the author and narrator.

On average, participants in the immoral author condition attributed more negative qualifications to the author ($M_{immoral} = 1.56$ and 2.90), than participants in the moral author condition ($M_{moral} = .60$ and 1.30). Negative qualifications for the immoral Jean Nicholai were words such as perverse, paedophile, egoistic, sexist, and controversial. The moral Jean Nicholai was qualified with negative words such as judgmental (oordelend), stringent (streng) and exorbitant (overdreven). In addition, participants in the moral author condition attributed, on average, more positive qualifications to the author ($M_{moral} = 3.00$ and 2.20) than participants in the immoral condition ($M_{immoral} = 1.56$ and 1.30). Examples of positive qualifications for the moral author are: moral, just (rechtvaardig), honest (eerlijk), and humane (menselijk). With regard to the immoral author condition, words were mentioned such as honest (eerlijk), intelligent and outspoken (uitgesproken). However, there is also a difference between the text conditions; overall, more positive qualifications were contributed to an author of positive texts ($M_{positive} = 2.32$) than to an author of negative texts ($M_{negative} = 1.75$) and the same was true for negative qualifications for an author of negative text samples ($M = 2.10$ and 1.05 respectively).

11 Participants responded to two statements after each block of three text samples.

12 A Chi Square analysis was conducted, but the cross tabs showed cells with an expected count less than the minimum expected count. Therefore, Fisher’s exact tests were conducted.
Results of a 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) ANOVA on the number of words mentioned support these findings. An overall main effect was found for Author Prime Condition ($F(6,30) = 2.49, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .33$ and observed power = .75) and Valence Text Prime ($F(6,30) = 3.51, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .41$ and observed power = .89), and there was no interaction ($p = .16$). On item level, meaning positive, negative and neutral qualifications respectively, effects of Author Prime Condition were found for both the number of positive author qualifications ($F(1,35) = 7.32, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$ and observed power = .75) and the number of negative qualifications ($F(1,35) = 9.32, p < .005$, partial $\eta^2 = .21$ and observed power = .84) that were attributed to the author. However, there was also an effect of Text Condition found for negative qualifications ($F(1,35) = 5.97, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .15$ and observed power = .66) and neutral qualifications of the author ($F(1,35) = 4.99, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .13$ and observed power = .58). No interaction effects were found (all $p > .22$).

Table 5.10
Means - Qualifications author and narrator in number of positive, negative, and neutral words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Text</th>
<th>Immoral author</th>
<th>Moral author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive text</td>
<td>Negative text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($N = 9$)</td>
<td>($N = 10$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author – pos.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author – neg.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author – neutr.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator – pos.</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator – neg.</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator – neutr.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum of five words, qualitative data is included in the appendix

Characterisations of the narrator

Table 5.10 also shows participants’ qualifications of the narrator (‘I’). Firstly, as was expected, the ‘I’ of the negative text samples (the negative narrator) was mainly characterized by negative words ($M_{negative} = 3.40$ and $2.90$ as opposed to positive text samples $M_{positive} = 1.11$ and $1.70$), such as selfish (egoïstisch), unscrupulous (gewetenloos), cruel (wreed), and irresponsible (onverantwoord). One person wrote down the words pedophile, selfish, criminal, murderer and wacko, and used these words to characterize the author as well. Positive qualifications were occasionally given, such as honest (eerlijk), funny (grappig) and intelligent. Secondly, participants in the positive text sample condition needed fewer words to characterize the ‘I’ (the positive narrator): $M_{positive} = 1.89$ and $1.10$ as opposed to negative text samples $M_{negative} = .80$ and $.40$. Most participants frequently used positive words such as intelligent, smart (slim), rational (rationeel) and pensive (nadenkend). Occasionally, also negative qualifications were mentioned, e.g. selfish and unreliable (onbetrouwbaar).

Results of the 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) ANOVA on item level, that is, positive, negative and neutral narrator qualifications respectively, show a main effect of Valence Text Prime for both positive ($F(1,35) = 7.21, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$ and observed power = .74) and negative qualifications of the narrator ($F(1,35) = 16.12, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .31$ and observed power = .97), and no interaction effects (all $p > .22$). In addition, an effect was found for Author Prime Condition on positive qualifications of the
narrator that attained a marginal level of significance \((F (1,35) = 3.44 \ p = .083, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .08 \text{ and observed power } = .41)\). However, apart from the lack of significance, the effect size is rather small. I will discuss theoretical implications of these results in the next section.

**Reading preference and ‘I had rather stopped reading’**

Next, participants answered to a number of items in the questionnaire that concerned frequency of thinking about the author during reading, default assumptions, violation of this assumption, and resulting inferences about the author’s intentions. Also items concerning text evaluation and preference of literature were included. Results of a 2 (Author Prime Condition) × 2 (Valence Text Prime) ANOVA on the items show only significant effects of Author Prime Condition for the item *reading preference* and *stopped reading* (both \(p’s < .05\)). There were no effect of Valence Text Prime (all \(p > .085\)), and there were no significant interaction effects (all \(p > .085\)). However, there were so effects of author prime condition that attained a marginal level of significance (see Table 5.11 below).

**TABLE 5.11**

Descriptives for ‘author’ items of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency about thinking about the author</th>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author Prime condition</td>
<td>Positive text samples</td>
<td>Negative text samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>(M = 3.70, SD = .68)</td>
<td>(M = 3.00, SD = 1.05)</td>
<td>(M = 3.35)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>(M = 3.90, SD = .74)</td>
<td>(M = 3.60, SD = .97)</td>
<td>(M = 3.75)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(M = 3.80)</td>
<td>(M = 3.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_{AC}(1,36) = 2.10, p = .16, F_{VT}(1,36) = 3.29, p = .08, F_{ACxVT}(1,36) = .53, p = .47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Default assumption</th>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author Prime condition</td>
<td>Positive text samples</td>
<td>Negative text samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>(M = 3.00, SD = 1.16)</td>
<td>(M = 2.70, SD = .48)</td>
<td>(M = 2.85)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>(M = 2.10, SD = .88)</td>
<td>(M = 2.80, SD = .92)</td>
<td>(M = 2.45)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(M = 2.55)</td>
<td>(M = 2.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_{AC}(1,36) = 2.01, p = .16, F_{VT}(1,36) = .50, p = .48, F_{ACxVT}(1,36) = 3.15, p = .09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author’s intentions</th>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author Prime condition</td>
<td>Positive text samples</td>
<td>Negative text samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>(M = 3.10, SD = .87)</td>
<td>(M = 3.90, SD = 1.10)</td>
<td>(M = 3.50)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>(M = 3.30, SD = 1.25)</td>
<td>(M = 3.20, SD = 1.03)</td>
<td>(M = 3.25)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(M = 3.20)</td>
<td>(M = 3.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_{AC}(1,36) = .54, p = .47, F_{VT}(1,36) = 1.06, p = .31, F_{ACxVT}(1,36) = 1.76, p = .19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author’s intentions – irony</th>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author Prime condition</td>
<td>Positive text samples</td>
<td>Negative text samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>(M = 3.50, SD = .85)</td>
<td>(M = 3.40, SD = 1.51)</td>
<td>(M = 3.45)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>(M = 3.40, SD = 1.27)</td>
<td>(M = 3.60, SD = .97)</td>
<td>(M = 3.50)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(M = 3.45)</td>
<td>(M = 3.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reading preference**

In general I enjoy reading literary texts (story, (short) novel etcetera) in which the writer presents morally unacceptable characters (totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 totally agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>$M = 3.70, SD = .82$</td>
<td>$M = 3.80, SD = 1.03$</td>
<td>$M = 3.75$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>$M = 2.50, SD = 1.27$</td>
<td>$M = 3.50, SD = .71$</td>
<td>$M = 3.00$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$M = 3.10$</td>
<td>$M = 3.65$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{AC}(1,36) = 5.84, p < 0.05^*, F_{VT}(1,36) = 3.14, p = .09, F_{AC \times VT}(1,36) = 2.10, p = .16$

**Stopped reading**

Had I not participated in an experiment some of the text samples would have made me stopped reading. (totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 totally agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Prime condition</th>
<th>Positive text samples</th>
<th>Negative text samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>$M = 1.80, SD = 1.03$</td>
<td>$M = 2.50, SD = 1.58$</td>
<td>$M = 2.15$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>$M = 3.50, SD = 1.43$</td>
<td>$M = 3.20, SD = 1.48$</td>
<td>$M = 3.35$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$M = 2.65$</td>
<td>$M = 2.85$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{AC}(1,36) = 7.39, p < 0.05^*, F_{VT}(1,36) = .21, p = .65, F_{AC \times VT}(1,36) = 1.28, p = .27$

The first item that showed a significant result for Author Prime Condition regards *Stopped reading*. Participants were asked to indicate to what degree they agreed with the statement that some of the text samples would have made them stopped reading had they not participated in an experiment. Results of the ANOVA show a significant main effect of Author Prime Condition ($F(1,36) = 7.39, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .17$ and observed power = .75), no effects were found for Valence Text Prime, nor were there interaction effects (both $p$’s > .26). On average, participants in the moral author condition agreed more to the statement than participants in the immoral author condition (see Table 5.11).

Elaborations on why participants had rather stopped reading showed that especially participants in the moral author condition did not appreciate some of the text samples, and this was true for both the positive and negative text samples. Positive text samples received more general comments, such as “the text often had a negative undertone” except for one participant who remarked that “I hear dumb statements about ‘the’ Islam often enough. Even if it were meant to be ironic”. The elaborations for the negative text samples were more specific, e.g. “some of the text samples were somewhat too extreme sexist to read for fun (in a novel)”, “I found them [text samples] too negative I rather do not read them for leisure time. They give me a negative feeling”, “Normally I would have skipped the part about the Islam and then start reading further”, “I got a negative impression regarding women, children and the Islam”. Four of the ten participants in the immoral author condition who read negative text samples indicated that they had rather stopped reading, because “I found it sometimes simply over the top, really offensive. I do not necessarily have to identify with an author, but I found him just like a “Dutraux”(sic!)”, “the patheticness was all over the shop: Thailand + Thai underage girls/children”, “it is all an opinion, and an opinion that I absolutely do not share”. In the immoral author condition with positive text samples only one participant had rather stopped reading, but that was because “the stories were not interesting to me”.

The second item that showed a significant result for Author Prime Condition regards *Reading preference*. Participants had to indicate to what degree they agreed with the statement that they generally enjoy reading literary texts in which the writer presents morally unacceptable characters. Participants in the Immoral Author condition agreed, on average,
significantly more to the statement ($M_{immoral} = 3.75$) than participants in the Moral Author Condition ($M_{moral} = 3.00$) ($F(1,36) = 5.84, p < .05$).

**Frequency thinking about the author**

The results also show effects of Valence Text Prime for the items regarding frequency of thinking about the author, default assumption, and reading preference that attain a marginal level of significance. As for the first item (**Frequency thinking about the author**) participants generally indicated that they had not thought about the author often during reading, as the means ranged from 3.00 (now and then) through 3.90 (hardly). This is remarkable since results of the other items with regard to the author's image or evaluation of the author seem to indicate that all participants have constructed a representation of the author, at least in affective terms. I will return to this in the discussion section. The results also show that text valence seems to have been of influence; compared to participants who read positive text samples ($M_{positive} = 3.80$) participants who read negative text samples, on average, occasionally thought about the author ($M_{negative} = 3.30$) ($F(1,36) = 3.29, p = .08$).

**Default assumption**

As for the default assumption, participants did not seem to agree, on average, with the statement that they usually assume that the writer of a literary text is a morally acceptable person: all means ranged between 2.10 and 3.00. Participants in the moral author condition who read positive text samples, on average, agreed least to the statement, while participants in the immoral author condition seemed, on average, indifferent. This result is reflected in the Author Prime Condition × Valence Text Prime interaction effect that attained a marginal level of significance ($F(1,36) = 3.15, p = .09$). Most likely, both the author information and the author’s image that may have emerged from the text samples have affected participants’ opinion on this matter. In addition, valence of the text samples seems to have affected participants’ opinion about their reading preference as well, as readers of negative text samples, on average, agreed more to the statement that they generally enjoy reading literature in which the writer presents morally unacceptable characters, than readers of the positive text samples (a trend was found for Valence Text Prime, $F(1,36) = 3.14, p = .09$).

**How serious should I take the ‘I’ and does the author share the ideas of the ‘I’?**

Finally, participants responded to two questions, that related to 1) whether they had asked themselves during the reading of the text samples how serious the opinions of the ‘I’ should be taken, and 2) whether the author shares the narrator’s opinions. If so, participants were asked to point to what text sample made them specifically think that way (items 7 and 8 in the questionnaire).

As for the first question (item 7), participants who had asked themselves how serious the opinions of the ‘I’ had to be taken frequently referred to the samples about the Islam and sex, e.g. SM, sex tourism in Thailand, sex with a 15-year old girl, and sex with young Thai girls. This was true for both author conditions. Differences between the text versions were most apparent in the immoral author condition: participants who read the positive text versions only occasionally questioned how serious the narrator should be taken (2 out of 10) and referred to the text sample about the Islam. More than half of the participants that read the negative text versions, on the other hand, questioned the narrator (6 out of 10) and referred to the sample in which the ‘I’ severely neglects his baby son (“killing children, the death of his son”), the sample about the Islam (“Islam, Muslims”), and the sample about sex with young
Thai girls. Two participants answered “all text samples”. Results of a Fisher’s exact test show a trend for the Immoral Author Condition (Fisher’s exact, $p = .085$, one-tailed, frequency distributions are included in the appendix). Consequently, some caution is required in interpreting the results.

With regard to the second question (item 8), results show that participants in the immoral author condition who read negative text samples wondered more often (8 out of 10) about whether the writer would share the ideas of the narrator in the text than participants who read positive text samples (4 out of 10). Results of a Fisher’s exact test show a trend for the Immoral Author Condition (Fisher’s exact, $p = .085$, one-tailed, frequency distributions are included in the appendix). Text samples that were frequently referred to by participants in the immoral author condition were the samples about sex (“blow-jobs etcetera, sex and children, sex with Thai girls, sex tourism in Thailand, that 15-year old girl”). Most participants in the moral author condition who wondered about whether the author shared the opinions of the ‘I’ referred to the text samples about the Islam (7 out of 8 participants).

3. Discussion

The aim of the present chapter was to provide stronger support for the assumption that readers generate author inferences during the process of reading. Therefore, a second on-line experiment that was, again, based on the affective priming paradigm was conducted. Based on the results of the on-line experiment that has been discussed in the previous chapter, some alternations were made to the materials and design of the present experiment. First of all, the contrast between the immoral and moral author was increased by including more details in the biographical information while at the same time enhancing the credibility and authenticity of the information (source) by presenting the information in the format of a journalistic article. Secondly, the design was altered so that readers read text samples with either a positive or negative valence instead of reading both positive and negative texts. As for methodological aspects, this way I could investigate whether the effect of the author prime possibly declines due to text context in case the valence of both primes differs. In theoretical terms, this gave me the opportunity to explore in more detail whether readers start puzzling about the author’s moral position, intentions, and sincerity in asking the reader to join him in a game of make-believe, when there is a discrepancy between on the one hand biographical information about the fictitious author, and on the other hand information derived from the text contents. In other words: a discrepancy between readers’ mental representations of an empirical and an implied author. Thirdly, frequencies of the word forms and lemmas of the probes were taken into account and the number of positive and negative probes was equalized. The expectation was to find an affective priming effect of the author prime on response latencies (hypothesis 1) as well as an effect on reading times. In addition, I hoped to find an affective priming effect of the text primes (hypothesis 2).

Despite of the above-mentioned alterations, i.e. intended improvements, results could not provide support for the predictions: the author primes appeared not to have affected response latencies and reading times. In addition, no support was found for the second hypothesis, which predicted an affective priming effect of the text primes. Results showed only an advantage of positive over negative probes: response latencies were significantly shorter for positive probes, which is in line with findings of previous research (cf. Pratto, 1994 and Chapter 4). Moreover, results of the reading times showed that positive text samples were, on average, read marginally significantly faster than negative text samples. This is not surprising as immorality is said to have an appealing, interest raising quality (cf. Schank, 1979), which could be reflected in longer reading times.
At the same time, off-line measurements show interesting results that suggest that readers have constructed a context model that includes a representation of an author. Readers who received information about the immoral Jean Nicholai had an obvious negative image of this author, and found him immoral, especially compared to readers who received information about the moral Jean Nicholai. This moral author was valued as positive and moral. Most readers found the information – highly – credible and, without being stimulated to do so, recollected those aspects of the provided author information that presumably contribute largely to their constructed image, such as sexual abuse of children and donating money to welfare respectively. Readers’ evaluation of the author in terms of positive or negative valued words was also in line with the expectations. The manipulation of the author prime thus seems successful. However, readers’ constructions of a mental representation of the empirical author that is based on the biographical information, i.e. before reading, differed significantly from the evaluation of the author after having read the text samples. Similar to results in the previous experiment, an effect was found on author evaluation from both the biographical information (author prime) and the information provided by the text (text prime).

This result can be interpreted in two ways. First of all, the evaluation of the author before reading is exclusively based on the biographical information; therefore readers’ evaluation must refer to their mental representation of the empirical author. Yet, readers’ responses to the question about their evaluation of the empirical author after reading are most likely affected by both the biographical and the textual information. One possible interpretation is that these post-reading responses reflect the influence of readers’ representation of an implied author and/or the narrator on their initial representation of the empirical author. Another possibility is that they reflect a mental representation of an author that consists of both an empirical author (based on the biographical information) and an implied author (based on the text information), cf. François Jost’s constructed author (Jost, 1995). As the readers that participated in the experiment can be considered as non-expert readers, that is that they are expected to have relatively little literary reading proficiency, representations of the implied author and that of the empirical author may have been merged into one representation of the author. At this point it is hard to tell which of these two options is most likely. I will elaborate on aspects of readers’ author constructions in the next chapter. In methodological terms, these findings suggest that the effect of the author prime, again, declined due to text context.

Moreover, the effect of the text primes, in turn, seems to have declined due to readers’ empirical author representation based on the biographical information. Text samples that contained a first-person narrator that, depending on the text version, displays morally reprehensible or acceptable views, opinions, and actions, were evaluated in accordance with their valence. The manipulation of the text primes thus seems successful. Results indicate, however, that the information about the empirical author seems to have affected readers’ evaluation of the texts as well, i.e. results showed a significant interaction between author and text prime. Differences between text evaluations were considerably larger in the immoral author than in the moral author condition. For instance, mean evaluations by readers who received information about a moral author and read relatively neutral text samples tended to go towards negative. This is not quite surprising because these text samples are not exactly neutral; much more they are mildly immoral. For instance, the sample in which the narrator promises himself not to be deduced by minor Thai girls, independent of how willing they are, is obvious different from the immoral version in which the narrator promises himself not to be deprived of the pleasure of having sex with willing minor Thai girls. Nevertheless, the first, neutral version is not actually neutral (cf. discussion of the previous chapter). In either way, the results seem to imply that the text primes may have lost their evaluative force during the course of reading, due to readers’ (empirical and/or implied) author representation. This could explain the fact that no support could be found for the hypotheses.
All in all, the results suggest that at some point during the process of reading readers have generated author inferences that contributed to their context model, but that these could not be measured using an affective priming paradigm. As I explained in the previous chapter, the experiments that I conducted differ on several aspects from other experiments that used the affective priming paradigm (e.g. Fazio et al., 1986; Stapel et al., 2002; Zajonc, 1980). The most important difference is that the interval between the presentation of the primes and the target is relatively long compared to other studies. Some have suggested that activations of prime evaluations are short-lived, which would imply that these evaluations will most likely disappear if the interval is rather long. Others assume that intervals over 1000 ms give – in my case – readers enough time to disregard the effect of the prime (see the discussion section of the previous chapter). Or more specifically, stimuli at larger exposure durations are likely to generate an affective reaction based on cognitive appraisal, meaning that early affective reactions may be overruled by cognitive appraisal (Murphy & Zajonc, 1993). This could imply that readers may have generated affective responses to both the texts and the author information, but these responses have disappeared, i.e. are short-lived, or have been overruled by cognitive reasoning, i.e. readers possibly have tried to interpret their feelings. It is very difficult to prevent these mechanisms to occur, because, as I explained earlier, it is impossible to present text stimuli, both text samples and author information, at short presentation durations. Besides that, reading times, and consequently SOA’s, vary per reader.

Consequently, my experiments possibly differ too much from the affective priming experiments and the paradigm. This could explain why I did not find the expected effect of both author and text primes on response latencies. At the same time I cannot prevent the author and text primes to interact. So even if I would make the author prime stronger, which I tried to accomplish in the present experiment, or maybe because of this, an interaction seems to occur between author and text primes. Readers apparently construct a representation of an implied author based on the text that affects their image of the empirical author, or readers adjust their constructed author image based on the text, which will consequently reduce the evaluative force of the author prime. At the same time, as the results of this and the previous experiment imply, readers’ image of the empirical author seems to have affected their evaluation of the texts, thereby the evaluative force of the text primes probably has been reduced. In effect, a debilitation of the evaluative force of the primes reduces the chance to find an affective priming effect.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that in these two on-line experiments I opted for two possible scenarios; one of an immoral person (author) who writes controversial novels and the other a respectable person who writes highly valued and praised novels. There are, of course, other conceivable scenarios and situations, such as a highly respected writer who is reviled as a person (e.g. Louis-Ferdinand Céline), or a presumably respectable person and writer of disturbing novels which are at the same time valued for their – literary – quality (e.g. Michel Houellebecq or Vladimir Nabokov). In addition, due to my choice of this specific author information, the author becomes a richly defined concept; the author is both the person who has specific morals and values and the writer who is part of the literary field in which he is judged on and valued for his writing skills as well as for his presumed intentions or vision. Theoretically readers can generate different types of author inferences that can contribute to the construction of their context model. These inferences can be based either exclusively on text-internal information (implied author), on text-external information (empirical author), or both. Ideally, the first category would concern bottom-up processing and the latter would imply top-down processing. In addition, the concept author could concern aspects of appreciation and profession (well written), the author as person who has certain moral standards, a cultural identity (French writer) etcetera. The results of both on-line experiments suggest that the processes involved in (literary) reading are far more complex; top-down and
bottom-up processes likely interact. I will continue this discussion in the next chapter where I will discuss the theoretical and methodological implications of the results of the empirical studies.
Chapter 6  Conclusion and Discussion
Looking back and forward

This book started with a short description of how the Dutch writer and self-made artist Jan Cremer entered the literary field boisterously on a Harley Davidson with a successful marketing strategy that got his book *Ik, Jan Cremer* high in the bestseller lists. The book also led to characterizations of Cremer, such as pervert and criminal, and one critic depicted both book and author as “partly fantasised biography of a son of a bitch”. I posed the question whether it would be possible to read Cremer’s book without having an image of Cremer in mind, by putting all information about his marketing activities, such as cruising the streets of Amsterdam in a Mercedes convertible shouting “Ik Jan Cremer”, aside. As I explained in the first section of Chapter 1, according to some literary theorists that is exactly what interpreters of literature should do. The author is considered to be irrelevant for the interpretation of a literary text. This view persisted in literary theory for a rather long time and some of the positions that I discussed are still highly influential today. At the same time the author concept remained implicitly or explicitly present in different areas of the literary field, such as edition philology, literary reviewing, and literary historiography. Furthermore, from a feminist and post-colonial perspective on literature the author’s identity, i.e. gender and ethnicity, is of importance to interpretation, and in controversies around literary works the author’s authenticity and sincerity seem to be taken into account (Chapter 1, § 2). The aim of the present study was to bridge this remarkable gap between literary theory and other areas of the literary field by taking the reading process of readers under investigation, and shed some light on what happens during the reading of literary fiction. Do readers follow the normative prescription that the author should be irrelevant to the interpretation of the text? Or is the author as present during the process of reading as he or she is in the different areas of the literary field?

The findings of the present study suggest that the author is indeed part of the reading process of readers of literature. More specifically, results from the empirical research indicate that even if readers do not have any information about the empirical author of a text, they create a mental representation of someone who has written the text with some purpose (Chapter 2 and 3). If readers, on the other hand, do have biographical information about a text’s author, they create a mental representation of an author that is based on both this contextual information and information derived from the text (Chapter 4 and 5). In the first situation, in which readers do not have any contextual information about the author, I have chosen to define this mental representation as an implied author construction. In the second situation, the results of the empirical research suggest that a complex process occurs in which readers’ mental image of an author that is based on biographical information (empirical author) interacts with their image of an author based on the text (implied author). In this chapter I will elaborate on these findings and their theoretical and methodological implications as well as on some ideas about future research.
In the next section I will discuss the theoretical and methodological implications of the results of the empirical studies that I presented in the previous chapters. The second section will discuss the implications of the results for both the field of literary studies and discourse processes, and in the last section I will briefly discuss some ideas about future research, including some potential reader and textual characteristics that may affect the generation of author inferences, some methodological difficulties and challenges, as well as some ideas about author constructions in other art forms.

1. Theoretical and methodological implications of the results

In an attempt to bridge the above-mentioned gap between normative assumptions in literary theory about the relevance of the author in interpreting literary texts, and the presence of the author concept in different areas of the literary field, I have chosen to conduct an empirical investigation of the role of readers’ assumptions about an author’s identity, communicative intentions and attitude in the reading of literary texts. In other words, I wanted to investigate whether the author is indeed irrelevant when readers read a literary text, or whether the author is as present during the process of reading as he or she is in the different areas of the literary field. As research findings in cognitive psychology, and especially discourse processing, have vastly contributed to our understanding of the cognitive processes involved in reading, I have chosen to combine the insights and methods of this field on this matter with knowledge about literary texts gained from literary theory. This has resulted in a preliminary framework that functioned as the foundation of the empirical studies that have been discussed in the previous chapters. The framework, which is based on the narratological communication model that I presented in Chapter 1, includes the different communication layers and participants that may be involved in the reading of narrative fiction. In order to make sense of the text, readers have to generate different types of inferences that are necessary to establish a coherent mental representation of the text. Discourse theorists agree that this mental representation has different levels: the surface code preserves the exact wording and syntax of the text, the text base contains the explicit propositions, and the situation model can be compared to a mental micro-world that contains the characters, spatial layout, and actions and so on. A fourth level, the communicative context model, represents the readers’ subjective interpretation of the communicative context, and is expected to include information and assumptions about mutual knowledge between the participants, i.e. authors and readers, and readers’ attributions of communicative intentions to – in this case – an implied or empirical author. The central question was whether readers construct separate representations of the empirical author, the implied author, and the narrator, and if so, under what conditions.
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Figure 1 Readers’ potential representations of communicative participants in the literary reading process

As Figure 1 shows, readers can theoretically construct 1) a representation of an implied author 2) a representation of an empirical author, or an interaction occurs between these two representations. In the first situation, this representation would be the result of exclusively bottom-up processing, i.e. based on the text alone. The second situation would imply that this
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construction is exclusively based on top-down processing, and the text ideally will not affect readers’ constructions of an empirical author. The third option includes interactions between readers’ constructions of an empirical and implied author. For example, readers’ constructions of an implied author, based on the text, can affect their representation of an empirical author, based on contextual information, especially if these two representations largely differ. Vice versa, information about an empirical author may affect readers’ implied author construction. My position is that readers will always construct an implied author representation, regardless of whether they have contextual (biographical) information about a text’s empirical author. With regard to readers’ narrator construction (Figure 1): although the focus of this study was on readers’ author constructions, and I have not investigated the effect of the narratological perspective on readers’ constructions of a narrator and an implied author, it seems plausible that the modus of narration, meaning the type of narrator, seems to attribute to readers’ constructions of an implied author representation. I will briefly discuss how the results of the empirical studies relate to the above-mentioned framework.

Generating author inferences while thinking aloud (Chapter 2)

Chapter 2 discussed a first exploratory study in which readers were asked to think out loud while reading a narrative literary text. Readers did not know anything about the text’s empirical author, context, or genre, and therefore could only construct a mental representation of an implied author. That is, unless they would have prior knowledge about the empirical author and would recognize the text and its empirical author. The main aim of this study was to examine how readers process narrative texts, both literary and non-literary, and to what extent communicative participants of the above-presented model, especially the implied author, will be cognitively represented by readers. Methodologically, the question was whether generated author inferences can be potentially revealed by the think-aloud method. Readers’ responses were categorized in, among others, inferences that could refer to different objects, such as the story world, text level, actual world, and the author. Results of the study showed that it was difficult to identify obvious author inferences because reader responses often concerned conflations of different levels and elements of the communication model, i.e. the text’s implied author, narrator, and/or the text point or theme. For example, one of the participants read a historic textbook text about how Hitler comes into power and verbalized the following thought: “…Hitler is spoken of in very grand words”. In this phrase it is difficult to determine by whom this reader thinks that Hitler is spoken of in grand words; by the implied author, the narrator, or the text as an intentional agent. Even somewhat more obvious author inferences that include a referent (such as someone in “perspective in retrospect of someone that thinks to know better”) were on second thought ambiguous, because these expressed readers’ conflations of the text’s narrator and implied author. In addition, the protocols included text inferences that in a way refer to an author’s selection or choice in constructing the text in a particular way. A participant that read a text sample from a novel by James Joyce referred to a detailed description of one of the protagonists “…are all things that in a discrete way somewhat provide an image of Gabriel”. Again, it is difficult to determine whether this reader refers to the implied author, or perhaps to the text as an intentional agent. What is more, the protocols in general imply that readers interpret textual elements as meaningful. These elements seem to function as signals that can point to the – presumed – meaning or intention of a text and that can contribute to the construction of a coherent text representation. These signals function the same way as so-called inference invitations or evaluation points (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003; Vipond & Hunt, 1984). To put it differently, readers seem to read in a point-driven way (Vipond & Hunt, 1984; Vipond & Hunt, 1989).
Although the verbal reports did not include many explicit author inferences and most of these concerned conflations such as the ones mentioned, results of post-reading tasks suggest that all participants created a mental representation of an implied author and his intentions. Without much effort, they all could formulate a presumed intention, point to text elements that contributed to this presumption. In addition, all participants felt, during the reading, the presence of someone who wants to tell a story or direct them in a certain direction, and all could provide an – often detailed – description of their image of the implied author. I concluded that readers may have generated author inferences during the process of reading that contributed to their construction of a context model, but that the think-aloud method cannot reveal these presumably short-lived and automatically generated inferences. Think-aloud protocols are, after all, supposed to reflect what is accessible to consciousness, codeable in language, and what is available in working memory (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Therefore I reasoned that if these inferences are short-lived, more sensitive measurements would be called for. In addition, I would have to look for conditions and methods that would enable me to discriminate between readers’ responses that refer to the empirical author, the implied author, narrator, and the text’s theme or point.

Reading fiction as joint pretence between an author and reader (Chapter 3)

Discussions around controversial novels provide a clue to possible conditions and methods to discriminate between readers’ constructions, because here readers seem to hold the (empirical or implied) author responsible for an unacceptable view on matters through opinions or acts of the fictional agents (narrator and/or protagonists). These debates also seem to point to certain expectations of the reader about the author that usually remain implicit. Because authors seem almost automatically subject to debate in the reception of novels that are qualified as controversial, I decided to take a closer look at what exactly is at stake here and why the author is explicitly involved in this debate. After all, these texts concern “merely” fictional events. In my opinion, this involves a unique characteristic of reading fiction that I discussed in Chapter 3, namely, an implicit mutual agreement between an author and reader of a fictional text. This so-called joint pretence basically holds that the author invites the reader to pretend that the events in the fictional world actually take place, and whenever the reader accepts this invitation, the implicit mutual agreement is in effect (Clark, 1996). This joint pretence agreement is similar to, for instance, the idea of a game of make-believe or fictional pact, which holds that an author invites a reader to play a game of make-believe, or invites him to adopt a relocation from the actual world to the textual world (Ryan, 1991; Walton, 1990). In my opinion, the implicit agreement on the reader’s part generates certain expectations about the (implied or empirical) author that are based on generic conventions and/or specific knowledge. The agreement implies that the reader grants the author a certain trust that his investment will reward him emotionally and cognitively, in reaching a sense of closure (cf. Tan, 1996; cf. Tan, 2008). Moreover, the reader has to trust the author that he is sincere in merely pretending, and has morals and values that are not questionable, i.e. morals and values that are shared by the reader. In addition, readers are expected to trust the author in that he or she will not invite them to imagine judgments or ideas that they find morally or ideologically repugnant and consequently make them accomplices. I have called this the default assumption of good behaviour. My premise was that if readers assume by default that the implied author is morally acceptable, then they should be able to discriminate between an immoral narrator and a presumably morally acceptable implied author. This immoral narrator will most likely put the joint pretence between author and reader under pressure. In effect, readers will be expected to generate inferences about the implied author’s moral position as well as his identity and intentions, such as: What are the intentions of this author? What is his
moral position? Is the author still pretending, or is he putting his own ideas into the mouths of his fictional characters/narrator?

These hypotheses were tested in a pilot study and an experiment (Chapter 3). I manipulated two text samples taken from Michel Houellebecq’s novel *Elementary Particles*, which raised a lot of discussion about Houellebecq’s intentions and moral position. Both text versions (immoral and relatively neutral) were, again, presented without any information about the empirical author. Similar to the findings of the first study, results of this experiment suggested that, although readers do not have any information about the empirical author, they need a certain context, meaning that they read the text with the assumption that it has been written by someone with some intention. Thoughts that occurred during reading, and which were reported directly after reading the texts, showed affective reactions towards the first-person narrator and the implied author, as well as presumptions and questions about the meaning or intention of the text. Furthermore, support was found for the default assumption of good behaviour. In addition, texts with morally questionable actions or views that are represented by the text’s narrator made the readers question the implied author’s moral or ideological position. However, no convincing support could be found for the generation of inferences regarding the implied author’s intentions or identity. Readers who did wonder about the author’s identity or intention, seemed to be curious for different reasons than the immoral text content alone. Apparently they needed some contextual frame to interpret the text and decide whether there is, for instance, mutual knowledge (common ground) between reader and implied author. What is important, though, is that even if readers do not have information about an empirical author, they seem to construct an implied author representation. In the case of texts with a morally reprehensible narrator, readers generate inferences that refer to questions about the implied author’s moral position.

**Effect of contextual information on the generation of author inferences (Chapter 4)**

In the two experiments that I discussed in Chapter 4 and 5, I wanted to investigate the effect of contextual, i.e. biographical information, on the reading process. In other words, if it is taken for granted that readers create a representation of an implied author, I wanted to know whether readers construct a mental representation of an empirical author if they receive biographical information about this author, and whether this representation affects the reading process and their construction of an implied author. More specifically, I wanted to know whether readers construct separate representations of an empirical and an implied author and/or narrator if they are provided with biographical information about the empirical author that either is consistent or inconsistent with the narrator’s and/or implied author’s moral stance. What happens, for instance, when readers receive information about an empirical author from which it appears that this author is a very moral person, after which they read a text with a narrator that displays morally reprehensible views and/or actions? Will the joint pretence and the related trust be violated and will readers generate inferences about the author’s intentions and attitude? Methodologically, I hoped to find support for the assumption that readers generate author inferences on-line, during the comprehension process, i.e. the moment – by – moment process as opposed to post-comprehension processes (also see the next subsection).

In the field of discourse processing, researchers often use a (semantic) priming paradigm to measure the generation of these on-line inferences (cf. Chapter 4, introduction and § 2). Priming – in the context of linguistic processing – is the phenomenon that the speed with which a word is recognized increases if the word is preceded by a word or sentence that is (semantically) related. This word that has to be recognized, which is used as a so-called target, usually expresses the concept that captures the inference. For example, after reading
the following sentence: “the director and cameraman were ready to shoot close-ups when suddenly the actress fell from the 14th story”, readers are expected to recognize a related word (dead) faster, than when the word is preceded by a control sentence that does not require readers to infer that the actress is dead: “Suddenly the director fell upon the cameraman, demanding that he get a close-up of the actress on the 14th story” (McKoon & Ratcliff, 1986). The problem, though, is that a single word usually cannot capture the complexity of an author intent and attitude inference. Therefore I used an affective priming paradigm, in which agreement of the prime’s and target’s valence (positive or negative) is of importance, instead of the necessity to have semantic consistency between prime and target. The main assumption of the paradigm is that affective connotations of environment stimuli can be evaluated relatively fast, with minimal cognitive effort. I translated this to the literary field: both novels and their authors can raise affective responses as the results of the previous discussed experiment, debates in literary reviewing, as well as some extreme controversies show (also see Miall & Kuiken, 1999).

The materials that were included in the first affective priming experiment (Chapter 4), and which functioned as text primes, were affect-laden text samples that were derived from Michel Houellebecq’s novels Platform and Elementary Particles. These original, “immoral” text samples were manipulated into relatively neutral text versions. Participants read both negative and relatively neutral text samples from a computer screen, but only one of two versions of each sample. Before they read these text samples, participants received information on their screen about either an immoral or moral fictitious author called Jean Nicholai, which functioned as author primes. In addition, the reading of each text sample was interrupted twice by the presentation of an evaluative adjective such as aggressive (on a different screen). Both the time (ms) that readers need to decide whether this adjective is positive or negative and the time that readers needed to read each sentence of the text samples were recorded (response latencies and reading times). Using the affective priming measurement, this experiment tested whether biographical information about the empirical author affects the reading process. If so, this should be reflected in an affective priming effect of the author and text information, as well as in reading times. For instance, a conflict between, on the one hand, information that readers derive from the text through the perspective of the first-person narrator (e.g. narrator abuses a young girl), and, on the other hand, biographical information about the empirical author (e.g. UNICEF ambassador), should result in readers’ puzzling about the author’s intentions and attitude. As a result, this puzzling should be reflected in longer reading times and response times. Results show that the information about the empirical author affected reading times, although the results merely attained a marginal level of significance. Furthermore, this information appears not to have affected response latencies. In addition, readers’ evaluations of the author were in line with the expectations. However, results of measurements of author evaluation before and after reading the texts showed significant differences. In methodological terms, the evaluative force of the author prime presumably declined due to text content, which would explain why I did not find the predicted affective priming effect. Possibly, because readers read both negative and relatively neutral text samples, their image of the implied author may have been moderate.

The effect of more detailed contextual information on the generation of author inferences (Chapter 5)

In a follow-up experiment (Chapter 5) I made some adjustments to the author primes, the design, and post-reading measurements of author and text evaluation with the aim of exploring in more detail readers’ mental representation of the empirical author, implied
author, and the text’s narrator. I also hoped to find more support for on-line generation of author inferences which should be reflected in an affective priming effect of author prime and in an effect on reading times. In contrast with the previous on-line experiment (Chapter 4), readers now read text samples with a narrator that was either consistent or inconsistent with the valence of the biographical information about the author, and this information was more detailed than in the previous experiment. Results, again, did not show an affective priming effect of the author primes, nor was an effect found on reading times. However, post-reading measurements of readers’ author evaluation showed interesting results that can shed some light on what happened during the process of reading. With concern to readers’ constructions of an empirical author, measurements of author evaluation directly after reading the biographical information (= before reading the text samples), reflect readers’ mental representation of the empirical author in terms of valence: a positive or negative image. Results were in line with the expectations: the immoral author generated a negative image and the moral author a positive image and differences were significant. Moreover, after reading the texts, readers – without being instructed before reading – recollected the most important aspects of the biographical information. This indicates that readers have constructed a representation of the empirical author. Measurements of author evaluation after reading, however, show effects of both the biographical information and text-internal information, as was reflected in significant main effects of the author and text prime conditions. This result could reflect readers’ constructions of an author concept that includes both an empirical author and an implied author representation. Another possibility is that evaluation of the author reflects readers’ representation of the empirical author (based on the biographical information) that has been affected by their image of the narrator and/or implied author (based on the text). In any case, the evaluation concerning the author seems to be the product of a complex process in which top-down and bottom-up processing – based on text-external (biographical) and text-internal information – take turns. Consequently, I cannot determine exactly what the reported author evaluation refers to.

Clearly, more research is needed to investigate under what specific conditions readers construct separate mental representations of an empirical author, an implied author, and a narrator. I will elaborate on some possibilities of future research in section 3. As for the affective priming paradigm, it seems that improvement of manipulation of text and author primes could increase the possibility of finding an affective priming effect. After all, an affective priming paradigm predicts that congruence in valence between prime and target will result in shorter response latencies. Yet, the text primes that I used in the experiment included negative vs. relatively neutral samples instead of clearly negative and positive text samples. Therefore, the congruence or incongruence is relative, in any case not as strong as when the text samples had been clearly positive or negative. However, as I discussed in Chapter 3, if I had made the relatively neutral text version diametrically opposed to the negative, immoral text version, I would have had to make the first-person narrator into an angel of some sort. Apart from the credibility problem that this option creates, it is also less interesting to read. This has to do with the intrinsic quality of literary texts that fictional characters with some deficits are desirable and make the texts appealing.

With concern to the author primes, I tried to improve the evaluative force of the primes that I used in the second on-line experiment (Chapter 5) by adding more detailed information from which an image arises of either an immoral or moral empirical author. In effect, I hoped to increase the contrast between the two versions. At the same time, I tried to enhance the credibility of the information by presenting it as a journalistic article. The effect, however, seems to be that even more interaction between author and text primes occurred, which was reflected in significant main effects of the two primes on author evaluation, and an interaction effect of the two primes on text evaluation. Possibly, this interaction between the
primes has resulted in a decline of evaluative force of both primes. Therefore, the affective priming paradigm in combination with a design that includes both an author and a text prime, seems not adequate to measure on-line author inferences, at least not if these should be reflected by an affective priming effect or in reading times. Obviously, other ways to measure (on-line) author inferences should be further explored.

In sum, the results imply that readers of literature read in a point-driven way, which means that they “implicitly realize that the text is an artefact, and therefore recognize the existence of an intentional being, who is responsible for it” (Vipond & Hunt, 1984: 7). In addition, these readers seem to construct a mental representation of the pragmatic context that includes an implied and/or empirical author representation, depending on whether or not they have any biographical or other contextual knowledge about the empirical author. This mental representation of an author concept can include features and characteristics of an author (identity), presumed communicative intentions, and in the case of literary texts with a morally reprehensible narrator, the representation can also include assumptions about an author’s moral position or attitude.

2. Implications for literary studies and discourse processes

The results of the empirical investigations have some theoretical and methodological implications for both literary studies and the study of discourse processes. Although some implications can contribute to theoretical or empirical discussions and findings of both fields, for reasons of clarity, I will discuss the implications for the two fields separately.

Literary studies

First of all, the results of the conducted empirical studies show that the poetical statement, that the author is irrelevant for the interpretation of literary texts, is untenable from a cognitive psychological view. Even if readers do not have any information about an empirical author they appear to read with the assumption that a creative figure with a set of plans and goals has written the text with some purpose or intention. Moreover, although the results of the empirical studies cannot tell us much about exactly how this is accomplished, the results do show that readers seem to construct a representation of an implied author. If readers do have biographical information about an empirical author, they do not exclude this information from their reading process. Instead, this information seems to affect readers’ reading process.

Secondly, the framework that I presented can be useful in gaining a better understanding of literary reading processes through empirical research. More specifically, I think that in order to study readers’ assumptions about an author as a concept empirically, we need at least a theoretical distinction between an empirical and an implied author. Moreover, the results of this study show that these concepts are useful and workable if we define them from a cognitive psychological perspective, namely, as readers’ inferences that contribute to their construction of a mental representation of the communicative context.

I am aware though that the concept implied author has been and still is highly debated in narratology and theories of interpretation for its theoretical inconsistency (e.g. Kindt & Müller, 1999b; Nünning, 2005).1 According to Wayne Booth, the implied author is considered to be an image that the empirical author intentionally creates of him- or herself through the text. This image is usually a second and better self, i.e. without negative character traits (cf. § 2, first chapter). The reader’s task is to reconstruct this image from the text. Booth assumes that the (which is in fact Booth’s) construction of an implied author is indeed the
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1 Also of interest may be Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller (2006), The Implied Author, Concept and Controversy. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
image that the empirical author intended to create through the text. In other words, he assumes that the implied author construction is a perfect copy of the intended implied author construction of the empirical author, which is theoretically problematic (cf. Chapter 1, § 2). Instead, I believe that readers construct a representation of an implied author and modify this image, based on information about an empirical author and their representation emerging from this information. In return, readers’ images of an implied author can also affect their representation of an empirical author. In both cases, however, these are modifications and by no means a perfect copy of each other.

In his article *Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother* (2005), Booth actually – probably unintentionally – shows that his construction of an implied author as opposed to his image of an empirical author is exactly what I have proposed in the preliminary framework: these are two separate representations that are constructed by a reader that can affect each other. Booth’s discussion of his reading of Sylvia Plath’s poems is a nice example of how a reader – in this case Wayne Booth – can construct a mental representation of an implied author based on the text. In addition, Booth uses his knowledge about the empirical author or poet Plath in order to signal a large difference between the empirical and implied author. On the one hand, there is Booth’s image of Plath that is based on biographical knowledge, i.e. she suffered from severe depressions and eventually committed suicide. On the other hand, there is the image of the implied author Plath that is based on her poems, i.e. Plath writes a beautiful poem about how contemplating suicide feels. Both images are nevertheless Booth’s subjective mental constructions. However, when Booth claims that Sylvia Plath has deliberately created a better second self through her poems, which Booth has successfully recognized, and which he greatly admires, his reasoning becomes problematic. How can he be certain that his construction of the implied author Plath is identical to Plath’s intention of creating a second self through her poems, presuming that she had that intention? Also problematic is his assumption that readers often misread literature if they fail to construct an implied author by interpreting the signals that the empirical author has included in the particular work, and thus indiscriminately assume that the empirical author is directly addressing the reader through the work. Again, how can a reader determine whether a so-called signal is deliberately and intentionally included by the empirical author? A reader can merely assume that an author has intentionally included a particular signal for some purpose. There is unmistakably a normative and moral element in Booth’s view: “great fiction educates ethically – unless we misread it” (p. 76) and his admiration for authors and poets who create better selves through their works (literary masking) is enormous: “…in wiping out the selves they do not like, the poets have created versions that elevate both their worlds and ours. Just think how impoverished our lives would be without such acting out of superior versions” (p.85). All in all, this example nicely shows that we need a theoretical distinction between an empirical and an implied author to describe the literary reading process.

I would like to make one remark though. My definition of the implied author in cognitive psychological terms, i.e. as a construct of an empirical reader, differs from a definition that some narratologists, such as Seymour Chatman, have proposed. The implied author is defined as the structure of the text’s norms and the concept is thus conflated with the text as a whole. At the same time it is positioned in the narratological communication model as a voiceless but inventing agent (“he is the principle that invented the narrator, along with anything else in the narrative”) that the reader has to reconstruct from the narrative (Chatman, 1978: 148). This position and definition have been criticized, because “an entity cannot be both a distinct agent in the sequence of narrative transmission and the text itself” (Nünning, 2005: 92). I have to add that there is not one position in narratology on the definition and position of the implied author concept, on the contrary, the concept is object of fierce debates (idem). At the same time, however, narratologists seem to need a concept in terms of a
constructive agent or authorial agency in order to account for, for instance, unreliable narrators. In this sense the agent is someone that designed the inconsistency in a text as a signal for unreliability (Phelan in Nünning, 2005).

The need for separate concepts in understanding debates in literary criticism and reviewing

What is more, I am convinced that we need both concepts not only to gain a better understanding of the literary reading process, but also to describe and understand the debates in literary criticism and reviewing. In addition, both concepts help us understand how literature functions and how we deal with literature and their authors. To give an example, a reviewer’s response to Michel Houellebecq’s novel *Elementary Particles* can be described according to the different elements of the framework: “This is a vision not only of someone who despairs of the human condition, but also, the reader of this repellent book is reminded, of someone who wants us to believe that the psychotic Bruno is a “pretty typical” human being” (Kakutani, 2000). This response nicely shows how the reviewer has apparently identified the narrator’s view as that of the implied and subsequently the empirical author. As I explained before, controversies around novels often show a lack of distinction between an implied and an empirical author; the empirical author is frequently held directly responsible for his character’s views. This seems to refer to an idea of ownership that the author has, the text becomes his property. On the appearance of his novel *Platform*, the empirical author Houellebecq was, again, questioned about the views of his fictional characters, in this case, the attack of his central character on the Islam. It did not help that when the empirical author Houellebecq was asked in an interview whether he shared his character’s views, he answered, “Yes”. Nevertheless, the distinction between, on the one hand, the image of an implied author that arises from the text and, on the other hand, the empirical author who takes part in a public debate, also protects the empirical author in juridical terms from being prosecuted and held responsible for what his fictional agents express in the fictional work. After all, both Houellebecq and the Dutch authors Gerard Reve and Willem Frederik Hermans, were acquitted by the French and Dutch court respectively. Although the empirical author and the image that arises from the text (implied author), in juridical terms, seem separate concepts, they are, of course, not completely independent of each other. An implied author construct cannot exist without an empirical author: after all, it is this empirical author who has written the text, from which a reader constructs an implied author representation.

Five possible author constructions: an example

What I want to point out is that the preliminary framework theoretically accounts for readers’ constructions of mental representations of an author construct in the following way; text-internal information contributes to readers’ representation of an implied author, while text-external information, such as biographical information, contributes to the construction of an image of an empirical author. However, like all frameworks and models, this is likely a simplified representation of both the literary reading process and what happens in debates in literary criticism and reviewing. I would now like to elaborate on readers’ constructed author representations, its possible aspects and concepts, as on the several information sources that can contribute to these constructions. Using my personal reading experience as an example, I will present five types of author constructions that include an implied and/or empirical author representation, depending on (a combination of) different information sources, e.g. the text, contextual information, and other reading experiences.

First of all, there is the text that provides me as a reader with all sorts of information and impressions that can contribute to my image of an implied author. For instance, in 1994 I
read *City of Glass* from *The New York Trilogies* by Paul Auster. It was the first story that I read by Auster and at that point I did not know anything about the empirical author Auster. Yet, based on that particular story, I created an image of this implied author Auster: a very intelligent and fascinating American male person with a fascination for the way language shapes and determines our idea of identity and reality. As I did not know anything about the empirical Auster at that time, my image of Auster, the implied author, was entirely based on the text. Interestingly, this text included a detailed description of one of the characters in the story which is referred to as Paul Auster: “a tall dark fellow in his mid-thirties, with rumpled clothes and a two-day beard. In his right hand, fixed between his thumb and first two fingers, he held an uncapped fountain pen, still poised in a writing position” (Auster, 1990: 111). Like me, the participants that took part in the first two empirical studies (Chapter 2 and 3) also did not know anything about the empirical author or the socio-historical context of the text that they read. Still, they were able to construct a – sometimes detailed – image of an implied author and his (or her) presumed intentions. Exactly what textual elements contribute to this image is a question that needs further empirical investigation. In my case, the description of “Paul Auster”, the character, largely contributed to my image, but there is obviously more to it. Besides, most texts do not include a description of a character that bears the same name as the empirical author and is a writer by profession. I will elaborate on possible textual factors that can affect reader’s constructions of author concepts in the next section, i.e. some ideas about future research.

Secondly, earlier reading experiences can also contribute to readers’ image of an implied author, and in a way these can form a collection of implied authors. After I read *City of Glass* and had created an image of let us say implied author Auster#1, I read the other two stories in *The New York Trilogy* and created implied author Auster#2 and Auster#3 with similar and different aspects compared to implied author Auster#1. Each time that I read another story written by Paul Auster, I create yet another implied author. Together, these different and sometimes – partly similar – implied authors form a rich image of a constructed author, and all are connected by the same name: Paul Auster. In a way, this seems similar to Foucault’s author function, namely as a means of identification; the name Auster groups together a number of texts and differentiates them from others. However, the author’s function claimed by Foucault becomes a property of the text or discourse and is culturally constructed. It is not a relation between a text and a (unknown) person attributed by a reader (Foucault, 2002 [1979]).

Thirdly, other persons’ experiences can contribute to an image of an implied and/or empirical author as well. In a way, all literary reviews are reports of the reviewer’s author construction, including presumed intentions. Usually, this constructed author consists of the reviewer’s image of the empirical author based on biographical or other contextual information, or maybe on personal encounters as well. In addition, the construction likely consists of the constructed image of the implied author based on the novel that is being reviewed. As reviewers often have read more works of a particular author, unless of course the work is an author’s début, other constructed implied authors are included in the review, or are at least part of the reviewer’s author construction, as well. A nice example is a reviewer from *The New York Times* who says: “Sometimes I think of Paul Auster as a D.J. […] I mean the late-night, freewheeling FM kind who are pretty rare now -- the ones who could talk all night between cuts, who never lacked for a story, an observation, a joke, a digression or a crackpot theory. That transmitted sound of the human voice in the middle of the night -- just talking, not haranguing or advising -- is the sound, to me, of the dirty world continuing to spin, raw proof that we’re never really that alone […].” She explains that her image is based on a theme that she often signals in Auster’s works; “vital persistence of story -- stories that twist and turn back on themselves in never-ending ambiguity” (D’Erasmo, 2003).
Intermedial experiences, meaning one-dimensional experiences such as reading an interview – as part of a book review – and/or watching an interview on television adds a forth dimension to readers’ constructions of an empirical author. For instance, in a review of Paul Auster’s *Brooklyn Follies*, reviewer James Campbell gives a detailed description of Auster’s apartment in Brooklyn and the typewriter on which Auster types all his books: “Above the piano, which hosts a mass of photographs, hangs a set of paintings of the famous typewriter. The object itself has been the subject of a small book. A model typewriter, no bigger than an inkwell, sits on the coffee table beside which Auster reclines, chainsmoking small Schimmelpenninck cigars” (Campbell, 2005). This image, as well as Auster’s remarks during the interview, has added another layer to my constructed author representation of Auster: it now consists of an empirical author and several implied authors.

Finally, personal meetings with authors can, of course, also contribute to readers’ image of an author, i.e. a mental representation of an empirical author. Suddenly, the possibility presents itself to communicate with the author face to face, even if that communication is minimal. In May 2008, Paul Auster visited Amsterdam to read from his latest novel *Man in the Dark*, that – at that time – is due to be published, but appears in a Dutch translation first. For the first time I was physically present in the same room as Paul Auster. I could hear him talk in his typical rasping, dark, but warm voice, and watched his gestures, noticed how his black hair is now peppered with grey. After the reading, visitors could get in line for a book signing. Although I had brought a copy of *City of Glass* with me, I hesitated till the very last minute whether I would want to get face to face with Auster or not. Somehow, I was afraid of ruining the magic, meaning my carefully built image of both the empirical author and my collection of implied authors. After waiting for half an hour (because of my hesitating I had ended up at the end of the line that nevertheless kept growing) I could finally climb the stairs to Auster who was seated across a small table. I remember apologizing for the “shabby” look of the copy, but this was the first book that I read and I was still a student then. Auster slowly looked up and said “That’s alright” before signing the book. With a strange mixture of arousal and disappointment I walked out of the building. What exactly was I thinking, I thought afterwards; that Auster would start an extensive conversation while having the people behind me wait? A couple of days later I read in an article that Auster is very shy when it comes to meeting his reader audience. This information contributed to a sense of gratitude that Auster had actually replied to my somewhat incoherent stuttering. I am certain that I am just one of many readers who admire a particular author, and the many book signings merely support the idea that readers for some reason desire to meet the flesh-and-blood authors. What I want to show with this personal anecdote is that these personal experiences or meetings add another layer to the author construct, in this case to the representation of the empirical author. In turn, this rich representation can affect the subsequent reading process and experience as well.

I am sure that when I am going to read *Man in the Dark*, all aspects of my constructed author image of Auster will be part of a complex process in which bottom-up and top-down processing will take turns. Some elements in the text will point to and trigger certain aspects of my biographical and contextual knowledge, which, in turn, can affect the way that I read and interpret the text. However, it is fairly possible that over the course of time I, and other readers, will no longer notice that we construct another implied Paul Auster representation. Instead, we adjust our constructed author image based on the text at hand, and we will probably only be aware of the fact that we construct an implied author representation when this image conflicts with our author construction. The results of the experiments that I discussed in Chapter 4 and 5 suggest that, even in relatively simple situations in which readers have the text and biographical information from an article as information sources, a complex
process occurs in which readers’ image of an empirical author affects their image of an implied author and evaluation of the text, as well as the other way around.

Of course, other kinds of interactions are possible between reader’s constructions of implied and empirical authors as well. For instance, sometimes empirical authors seem to try to manipulate readers’ image of the implied (and empirical) author by taking part in discussions about their work. The Dutch author Connie Palmen, for example, felt that she had to defend her novel *Lucifer* in front of an audience, after her novel caused huge turmoil in the Dutch press. She had been accused for character assassination of a Dutch composer by suggesting that he has murdered his wife. Her main character and fallen angel is explicitly based on this person, as she explains so herself in a postscript of the novel. In the public interview and lecture, Palmen explained the genesis of her novel, and she complained that many reviewers had not noticed her references to Joost van den Vondel’s *Lucifer* and accused some of them of moralistic criticism. In a way, she tried to shape her readers’ image of both the implied and empirical author by explaining how they had to interpret her work, and what her intentions had been. What is more, walking the fine line between fiction and reality is actually a central theme in her work as well as in her interviews.

*The fictional aspect of literary texts*

The examples that I have provided so far all concern fictional texts, and in all but one empirical study, I have included exclusively samples taken from novels that are generally qualified as literary fiction. But how important is the fact that these texts concern fiction? Could my findings as easily have been found for non-fictional texts? My answer would be no: there is a unique characteristic of fictional texts that directly connects its readers to an (implied) author, and that is a reader’s acceptance of an (implied) author’s invitation to jointly pretend that the events in the fictional world are taking place (cf. Clark, 1996). Remember the text sample that I used in the beginning of the third chapter, which started with: “I had been sick for a long time. When the day came for me to leave hospital, I barely knew how to walk anymore, could barely remember who I was supposed to be”. What makes this text fiction and not non-fiction is this conventional agreement between an author and his readership. When the reader accepts the author’s invitation to jointly pretend or play a game of make-believe, the author no longer is the same person as the one speaking. As readers, we automatically shift to another frame in which common rules of conversation (which are also applied to non-fictional texts) do not apply, such as the Gricean postulate “be brief” or “be truthful”. In a way, all communicative acts can be regarded as joint actions in which participants have to cooperate and coordinate. And they would not be able to cooperate if their activities were not grounded in a shared background based on socio-cultural information and personal backgrounds called common ground (Clark, 1996). For the reading of fiction this common ground that includes conventional knowledge (e.g. joint pretence) is crucial, because otherwise authors would constantly have to explain that they merely make-believingly assert that the described events take place. This constant reminding the reader of the context would consequently ruin the reader’s reading experience, i.e. getting immersed into the fictional world (cf. Chapter 3).

However, what is special about fictional texts – besides an indirect communication compared to face-to-face communication – is that the implicit agreement between an author and a reader immediately adds a layer to the basic communication level. The author no longer is the direct speaker of the text, and therefore, trying to understand his intentions becomes thwarted. In addition, fictional – and especially literary – texts usually include multiple layers, and actions can occur at different levels with different domains and participants. As authors and readers are not co-present at the time of reading, and readers have to keep track of all the
layers and movement between these layers, recognition of an (implied) author’s – presumed – signals and calling upon common ground seems of importance. Presumably more than when the reading involves non-fiction.\(^2\) What is more, I have claimed that the implicit mutual agreement, the joint pretence, generates certain expectations on the reader’s part towards the author. The reader has to trust that the author is merely pretending. Although there are some clear conventional fictional markers, such as “Once upon a time”, most texts do not have such clear markers and the reader thus has to trust on the conventional agreement that the author is merely pretending.\(^3\) In general, readers can imagine all sorts of fictional worlds, and authors call upon assumed common ground to help the reader to build a lively and detailed fictional world. In my opinion, the implicit mutual agreement from the reader’s part also has an ethical or moral dimension; it implies that readers generally trust the author in not inviting them to imagine a fictional world that deviates from their moral values and norms; offering them a view on their world that they do not want to embrace. In other words, they trust that the author will not call upon a – presumed – common ground that the reader does not want to share with the author. I have called this the \textit{default of good behaviour}. Controversies often show readers’ reluctance to share the (implied) author’s view on their world. The findings of the empirical studies that I conducted suggest that when this agreement and trust in the (implied) author is heavily challenged through morally reprehensible views or actions displayed by a first person narrator, that readers question the (implied) author’s moral position. If these texts had been non-fictional, the author and narrator would consequently have been the same person, and there would not have been a matter of trust that got violated or challenged, because there would not have been an implicit agreement or invitation to join a game of make-believe. I expect that readers would judge the author to be out of his mind or provocative, as some of the participants in the experiments did, e.g. a racist and a nutcase, a dirty old man that needs to be taken care of (Chapter 5).

\textit{Discourse processes}

The present study intended to contribute to the understanding of cognitive processing of narrative fiction, and in particular literary fiction (e.g. Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003; Zwaan, 1993). More specifically, my goal was to gain a better understanding of what role readers’ assumptions about an author, e.g. his or her identity, communicative intentions, and attitude, play during the process of reading. In cognitive psychological terms the question was whether readers generate author inferences as part of the literary reading process. In the field of discourse processes very little research has examined readers’ generation of so-called \textit{author intent and attitude} inferences (cf. Graesser et al., 1997b). The findings of the current study first of all suggest that this class of inferences is incomplete; readers’ generated author inferences are not limited to the author’s attitude or motive in writing, or to the point that the author is making, and the text that elicits these inferences is not necessarily the entire passage or text (Graesser et al., 1994). The results suggest that readers of literary texts can generate inferences concerning the author’s identity (features and characteristics, personality traits) and the author’s presumed communicative intentions, including a presumed moral or point. In the case of literary texts with a morally reprehensible

\(^2\) I do not suggest, however, that there is no implicit joint agreement between author and reader involved in non-fictional texts. Indeed, I think that the agreement from the reader’s perspective generates the expectation that the author is sincere in presenting facts instead of fiction.

\(^3\) People appear to be fairly able to discriminate between the genre of fiction and non-fiction. For instance, Hayward (1994) offers empirically attested support for the claim that people can determine very fast to which genre a text sample belongs: to fiction or non-fiction (history texts) (Hayward, 1994). Which surface or semantically related characteristics readers use to make this distinction is still a question that needs further empirical research.
narrator, the representation can also include assumptions about the moral position or attitude of an author. When exactly readers generate inferences about the text’s theme or point and how these inferences exactly relate to, or can be distinguished from, readers’ inferences about an author’s communicative intentions, is a question that needs further empirical investigation. As I discussed in Chapter 1, in my opinion, the point or moral reflects the author’s presumed stance or position towards a certain theme. I can imagine that the generation of thematic inferences can – eventually – point to an (implied) author, i.e. his position towards a theme. In addition, readers of literature may be more inclined to relate a particular inferred theme or point to an (implied) author if they have knowledge about other literary works by the same author. These readers share, from their point of view, a richer common ground with an (implied) author, and are possibly less hesitant to interpret certain text elements in terms of an author’s intentional signals that point to a certain theme or moral.

In addition to my remarks about the definition of author intent and attitude inferences, the definition of the concept inference itself, i.e. information that is activated during reading but that is not explicitly stated in the text, may be too narrow. At least, if it exclusively includes inferences that either explain, associate or predict and provide answers to why, what, how and what happens next questions (Trabasso & Magliano, 1996). Consequently, comments or positions that refer to the (implied) author, and which constitutes the question itself rather than providing an answer to a question, would not be considered as an inference. However, if a reader would say “I wonder why the author described Gabriel so extensively” the reader does use information that is not stated in the text and relate this to the context model, i.e. the author (cf. Chapter 2). The same is true for readers who, based on certain elements in the text, wonder about the author’s identity, intentions and moral position (cf. Chapter 3).

As for the status of this class of inferences, that is whether readers generate these inferences on-line, the findings of the present study cannot be decisive. What measures and tasks can uncover comprehension processes and representations that are constructed on-line has in discourse processes been subject to debate which is far from being settled (Graesser et al., 1997b). At this point I can say that results of off-line measurements, which show that readers have constructed a context model that includes an author representation, and results of on-line measurements, i.e. think-aloud protocols (although see the discussion in Chapter 2) and reading times, suggest that readers, at some point during the reading process, have generated inferences concerning the author’s identity, intentions and/or attitude. Hopefully, future research will contribute to answering the question whether and under what conditions readers generate on-line inferences about an (implied and/or empirical) author’s intentions, identity, and attitude.

From a constructionist theoretical point of view there are reasons to be pessimistic about the probability that author intent and attitude inferences are generated on-line during narrative text comprehension (Graesser et al., 1994 and Chapter 1). The constructionist theory predicts that only few inferences will be generated on-line during the comprehension of narrative text, and author inferences are not one of these classes. However, these predictions only hold under specific conditions. If the reader is convinced that the text is “inconsiderate” (lacks global coherence and a message), he is assumed to abandon attempts for search-after-meaning (Graesser et al., 1994). As literary texts are considered to be “inconsiderate”, in the sense that they require a much greater effort from readers than considerate texts, it is possible that readers of literary texts indeed generate author inferences. Moreover, these presumptions
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4 I would not say that literary texts lack global coherence and a message, though. Global coherence and a presumed message are likely more difficult to construct from literary texts than from texts with, for instance, explicit elements of text organization and explication of ideas. I therefore prefer to use a different definition of “inconsiderate” (see Chapter 1, § 4).
have not been tested empirically (cf. Chapter 1, section 4). What is more, readers of literature, i.e. readers who activate a developed literary control system (cf. Chapter 1, section 4), are expected to generate relatively many pragmatic inferences. The goal that is presumably generated once the literary control system is in effect, is to “construct a point for the text” and a sub-goal may be to “carefully inspect the surface structure for signals about the goals of the author and the point of the text and use these signals to form pragmatic inferences” (Zwaan, 1996: 156 ff.). Both goals are similar to Vipond and Hunt’s assumptions about a point-driven reading strategy (see Chapter 1), which include that these readers are expected to explain the narrative surface in terms of authorial intentions (Vipond & Hunt, 1984). Findings of the present study provide some support for the assumption that readers of literature read in a point-driven way (cf. Chapter 2 and Chapter 3). However, more empirical research is needed to provide additional support for the above-mentioned assumptions.

Finally, the field of discourse processing generally distinguishes several levels of representation that are constructed when individuals read a (narrative) text. One of these levels is the situation model that is the content or the micro-world that the text is about, including constructions of a narrative text’s characters. In addition, readers are assumed to build a model of the communicative context in which they are involved (a context model). Pragmatic agents, such as the narrator and writer as well as the narratee and reader, are assumed to be part of the communicative context in which the text is embedded and consequently can end up in a reader’s presentation of that context. On the other hand, there are narrator-types that amalgamate pragmatic and character agents. Therefore, it is possible that both models, to some extent, will overlap. Although researchers in the field of discourse processing generally assume that context crucially influences the structures and processing of spoken en written discourse, context models have long been neglected in the psychology of text processing and only recently gained theoretical attention (Van Dijk, 1999, 2004, 2006). There is still much that we do not know about context models, such as how readers construct these models, how context models are structured, and how they function, i.e. constrain and control discourse comprehension (and production) (Van Dijk, 2006). It is assumed, though, that readers’ presumptions about the goals and intentions of the communicative participants, as well as mutual or shared knowledge, are a prominent component of context models (idem: 171). Based on the findings as well as some theoretical considerations that I discussed in Chapter 1 and 3, I expect that in literary reading processes the implicit mutual agreement between author and reader will play an important role in the construction of readers’ context models, because it temporarily anchors the communication situation and is part of shared knowledge or common ground. Presumably, readers of literary texts use this and other – presumed – shared knowledge to call upon during the reading process in order to keep track of the several communication layers, but also to signal stylistic features, tone and diction (narrative surface) and explain these in terms of authorial intentions (cf. Vipond & Hunt, 1984).

Finally, the context model is expected to specify relevant information to derive from the text and hence what to include in the situation model (idem 1999: 134). In this sense, the model is assumed to function as a controlling mechanism which seems much like the above-mentioned literary control system. However, at the same time it refers to a discourse participant’s mental construction of the communicative context and in this sense it is comparable to other levels of representations. Future research will be needed to get a better understanding of how these models – in the context of literary communication – are constructed and in what way they affect other levels of representation.
3. Some ideas about future research

The present work is a first attempt to investigate reader’s assumptions about an author during the process of reading literature. Readers’ cognitive processes that are involved in the reading of literature will likely vary with the characteristics of the individual reader, the nature and characteristics of the text, and the context in which the reading takes place. In effect, these three factors will presumably also affect readers’ constructions of a context model, including their representation of an author concept. We still know little though about, for instance, what specific text, reader, and contextual characteristics affect these processes. In the empirical studies that I have conducted I have included some of these factors, e.g. reader expertise and a textual moral dimension, but obviously more empirical research is needed to gain a better understanding of what and how particular factors affect the literary reading process, as well as readers’ representations of a pragmatic context. I will briefly discuss some potential reader and textual characteristics.

Research into reader characteristics in constructing author representations

Findings of the empirical study that I discussed in Chapter 2 showed that expert readers generated most author inferences and seemed more aware of a textual level, i.e. the text as an artifact, as they generated relatively many text generations compared to non-expert readers. Some caution in interpreting the results should be exercised though, since the study included a small number of participants. Results from other empirical research show that expert readers are able to use multiple, specific reading strategies in order to create a context in which author, text, and reader are positioned and interact. Expert readers viewed the text as a result of deliberate choices made by the author and their perception of these choices affected their understanding of the text (e.g. Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; Haas & Flower, 1988; Shanahan, 1992; Vipond & Hunt, 1984). Also, reader expertise in terms of readers’ development of a literary control system and related reading strategies, will probably affect the extent to which they signal certain text elements, such as narrative perspective, stylistic devices, or certain aspects of the narrative surface, and use these elements to generate author inferences. These are premises that need further empirical investigation.

Narrator visibility and foregrounding as possible text factors in constructing author representations

Different textual characteristics can probably contribute to a reader’s representation of an (implied) author and his or her presumed intentions. In Chapter 1 I have briefly discussed two empirical studies concerning readers’ assumptions about an author’s intentions; one included reader’s recognition of (the object of) satire, and the other included reader’s understanding of metaphors (Gibbs et al., 1991; Pfaff & Gibbs, 1997). I would like to mention two kinds of textual characteristics that may contribute to readers’ generation of author inferences, and subsequently to their construction of a contextual model that includes a representation of an (implied) author. The findings of the empirical studies that I conducted firstly suggest that the modus of narration or the narrative perspective may be of importance, and secondly, so-called foregrounding, or evaluation points, also referred to as inference invitations or signals can be mentioned (cf. Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003; Clark, 1996; Miall & Kuiken, 1999; Mukaťovský, 1964; Peer, 1986; Shklovsky, 1965; Vipond & Hunt, 1989).
NARRATOR VISIBILITY

To start with the first text characteristic, I believe that the modus of narration, the perspective that we adopt as we move and act in the fictional world, largely contributes to our construction of an implied author, especially if we have no biographical information about the empirical author and the text is all there is. Exactly how narrative perspective can contribute to readers’ constructions of an implied author is a question that needs to be addressed in future research. The few available empirical studies that address this question suggest that readers tend to attribute certain characteristics of narrators, i.e. gender, to implied authors (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003).

In the experiments of the present study I transformed text samples from literary novels into first-person narration to help readers construct a representation of the narrator and his views in order to create a discrepancy with default assumptions about the implied and/or empirical author (Chapters 3 – 5). Not much empirical studies have investigated readers’ ability to perceive different types of narrators however. The few studies that are available suggest that under normal reading conditions readers do not construct third-person narrators, whereas first-person narrator are more salient to readers than normal character agents (Graesser et al., 1997a). Other studies have shown that readers are quite good at keeping track of who said what and who knows what in literary short stories, except in the case of third-person narrators (Graesser et al., 1999: 172).

It may be interesting though to explore empirically to what extent extradiegetic, impersonal narrators affect readers’ constructions of separate representations of a narrator and an (implied) author. As these types of narrators imply that “there is no identifiable person to whom one can ascribe the views and beliefs of the narrator”, I would expect that readers – with no well-developed literary control system – ascribe these presumed views to the (implied) author (Bortolussi & Dixon, 2003: 64). An empirical question could thus be: Can non-expert readers, who read a literary text that includes a story which is told from the perspective of an extradiegetic, impersonal narrator, distinguish between a narrator and an implied author? Will they construct separate representations of the narrator and the implied author? Or will the narrator and implied author representation be blurred in one representation? In addition, this group of non-expert readers could be compared to expert readers with regard to constructed text and context representations. Will expert readers be able to signal this type of narrator, and distinguish the narrator from an implied author? Based on the above-mentioned findings, I expect that only expert readers will be able to signal this type of narrator and separate him or her from the implied author.

Moreover, the narratological discussion, about how we can determine whether a narrator is unreliable and whether we need an implied author concept, suggests another interesting line of investigation. Unreliable narrators come in different sorts, as Ansgar Nünning has pointed out: “Most would agree that it does make a difference whether we have an ethically or morally deviant narrator who provides a sober and factual veracious account of the most egregious or horrible events, which, from his point of view are hardly noteworthy, or a “normal” narrator who is just a bit slow on the uptake and whose flawed interpretations of what is going on reveal that he or she is a benighted fool” (Nünning, 2005: 93). It would be interesting to investigate to what extent readers will construct separate representations of a narrator and an (implied) author, if the narrator turns out to be unreliable. For instance, one could think of a narrator that inaccurately presents (well-known) historical, traumatic events. Will readers assume that the narrator is mistaken, or the (implied) author, or both? Will readers assume that the (implied) author has deliberately created this narrator for some purpose? Perhaps literary readers, i.e. with a developed literary control system, in particular
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will attribute (artistic) communicative intentions to an (implied) author. These are all empirical questions that need to be addressed in future research.

foregrounding

As for the second textual characteristic, in particular the findings of the first empirical study (Chapter 2), suggest that certain elements in a text that are foregrounded can contribute to readers’ ideas of an (implied) author’s communicative intentions. By foregrounded I mean that particular elements attract readers’ attention, because they deviate from the text’s norm or form a kind of parallelism because of repetition. In a way, these textual elements can be understood as discrepancies with regard to readers’ expectations that are based on conventional knowledge and/or their constructed text representation. Participants of this study (Chapter 2) seemed to interpret these elements as meaningful signals that can point to the text’s meaning. They also referred to these segments when asked to point to those text elements that contributed, in their opinion, to their idea of an implied author’s intention. An example of such a segment is an extensive description of the character Gabriel in the sample taken from James Joyce’s The Dead, the moral at the end of Borges’s text Everything and I, or the repetition of colours in the text by Stephen King and Peter Straub. Other elements that attracted readers’ attention and made them curious about the author’s identity were elements that refer to the text’s – presumed – context, e.g. the name Desplechin (Chapter 3). Future studies could explore what textual elements trigger readers to generate author inferences and which elements contribute to readers’ constructions of a context model. My guess is that these textual elements will mostly be semantic in nature, meaning that it may be difficult to identify syntactic markers that can contribute to readers’ generation of author inferences and constructions of a context model.

Methodological difficulties and challenges

There is one important issue that I have not fully addressed yet and that is: how well can we investigate readers’ generation of author inferences in the context of literary reading empirically? As I have mentioned above, it turned out to be difficult to measure generated author inferences on-line. Only a modest effect of biographical information on reading times seems to indicate that this information in some way has been activated during the reading process. However, off-line measurements show that readers have constructed a mental representation of the communicative context (context model) that includes an author representation. This implies that readers have generated author inferences at some point during the process of reading that have contributed to their construction of a context model. At what point during the reading process, i.e. the moment-by-moment process as opposed to post-comprehension processes, these inferences are being generated, the content of these inferences as well as on what textual or extra-textual information they are based, remain questions that need to be addressed in future research.

The affective priming paradigm appears not to be fit to measure the generation of on-line author inferences in the context of reading (literary) texts. Apparently, my choice of designs of the two experiments (Chapter 4 and 5) and the materials that functioned as primes differed too much from the classic paradigm. Possibly, the expected effect of author information could not be measured because the interval between the presentation of the author prime (biographical information about the empirical author) and the target was too long. What is more, readers’ information about the (implied and/or empirical) author is not a factor that is constantly activated during reading and it may be very short-lived. Therefore it is important to present the target word immediately after a presumed evaluation is being activated. Because I
presented the target word not immediately after the sentence in which I expected readers to activate certain author information, it is possible that the effect disappeared at the time that I presented the target word. In that sense the primes that I used differ from classical primes, such as single words or pictures. These types of primes are presented only for a short duration that is assumingly enough for participants to activate the related evaluation. More theoretical research is needed on the basis of which more specific predictions can be formulated about the location of the points in the text at which readers are expected to activate information about an author concept. In addition, other on-line measurements should be looked for to measure these methodologically complex inferences.

Moreover, what constellation of concepts constitutes this author representation is another question that needs some theoretical and empirical consideration. My experience is that the theoretical distinction between reader’s mental construction of an implied author and an empirical author appears to be difficult to operationalize and that the complexity of the literary reading process in which top-down and bottom-up processing take turns is hard to capture. Results of the first empirical study showed that when readers try to verbalize the thoughts that occur during reading, their protocols show conflations of several levels and concepts of communication, such as the implied author, the narrator, or they formulate assumptions about the text’s theme or point in terms of the text as an intentional agent. Presumably short-lived and automatically generated author inferences cannot be measured by the think-aloud method.

In addition, findings of the last two experiments (Chapter 4 and 5) have shown that if you provide readers with information about an empirical author (in these designs), it becomes too complex to measure readers’ constructions of an implied author construction, because readers’ mental representation of an empirical author seems to be interfering with their image of an implied author based on the text. In effect, responses to questions about readers’ evaluation of an author become ambiguous: they can refer to both readers’ constructions of an empirical author representation that is based on both biographical and textual information, or a constructed author representation that includes both an empirical and implied author representation. Perhaps there remains a grey area in which readers blur several author representations, much as my own multifaceted construction of Paul Auster includes theoretically different author concepts, but during reading these may be experienced as one fuzzy image.

Another theoretical distinction that appears to be difficult to operationalize is between readers’ constructions of a text’s point or theme and representations of an author concept in terms of identity and moral position. How exactly presumed intentions and representations of author concepts relate to each other is another question that needs to be addressed. On the one hand it seems that the literary reading process is intention-driven; readers read with the expectation that someone has written the text with some purpose or intention. However, this relation between the author as an intentional being, as a person with certain personality traits and representations of presumed intentions appears difficult to operationalize. The results of the verbal protocols (Chapter 2) as well as reported thoughts after reading as text sample (Chapter 3), for instance, showed that readers formulate questions that refer to the text’s point or theme in terms of “what is the story/it/this about?” or “I think it's about...”, without referring to an author. Maybe these expressions are very much conventionalized and readers are not aware of how their presumptions about an author’s communicative intentions shape their reading process. Furthermore, especially readers without a particular literary reading competence may not be accustomed to verbalize their ideas about possible intentions in terms of “I think that the author wants to...”. In addition, results of the experiment that have been discussed in Chapter 3 show that readers questioned the implied author’s moral stance if the text included a morally reprehensible narrator, however, no significant differences between
the text conditions were found for thoughts that referred to the implied author's intentions or identity. Here is another methodological challenge, because by asking for readers’ considerations about an author’s identity, intentions, or moral position, the impression may be given that these are separate and independent concepts. Readers’ responses to these questions can only reflect what arises to their consciousness. Therefore, it is possible that they indeed generated inferences concerning an author’s communicative intentions or his identity and moral position, but did so unconsciously. After all, some have argued that understanding and attributing intentions is crucial for engaging in everyday communicative activities (e.g. Dennett, 1987; Gibbs, 1999; Searle, 1975). It is also possible that the above-mentioned theoretical distinction needs to be reconsidered; readers’ inferences about an author’s moral position may include assumptions about the identity and intentions as well. Perhaps that readers (of literature) automatically, and by default, attribute intentions to a person, i.e. an author, and subsequently try to find signals in the text that can help them to make presumptions about what those communicative intentions might be. Immoral text content has shown to point to the author’s moral position, and possibly in terms of an author’s intentions with a moral dimension.

Obviously, from a methodological perspective, the measurement of author inferences is rather complex, and much work lies ahead of us, including some methodological challenges in finding ways to measure on-line author inferences, and to make the interactions between top-down and bottom-up processing during the literary reading process more visible.

Author constructions in other art forms

The framework that I presented in this book was first of all intended to gain a better understanding of the processes involved in literary communication. Nevertheless, I think that the framework can be useful to the reception of other media or art forms as well. It would be interesting to explore to what extent recipients of other art forms differ from readers of (literary) fiction in constructing the different levels and participants in the communication model. For example, like prose, poetry has a communicational structure similar to the narratological communication model with a text-internal agency who acts as the subject, originator, or voice of the text. Theoretically, this speaker has to be distinguished from the empirical speaker, the poet. It would be interesting to investigate whether readers of poetry interpret the poem as an expression of an intentional subject, and to what extent they differentiate this speaker from the poet.

The framework could also be helpful to learn more about how recipients of art create an image of the artist and his or her intentions based on the artwork in addition to an image of the artist based on biographical information. An interesting example is the famous street artist known by the name Banksy, whose often satirical pieces of graffiti art, such as the girl with balloons on Israel’s highly debated West Bank barrier (Balloon Debate), have popped up unannounced on and in buildings across the world. These pieces of graffiti art are highly valued in the art world. This is reflected in the financial value as well; Banksy’s work attracts 6-figure price tags. However, nobody, except for his agent, knows the identity of this “guerilla artist”, and his fiercely-guarded identity only seems to add to his subversive appeal. Last year, the English newspaper Main on Sunday claimed to have discovered the true identity of Banksy, who presumably is a 34 year old man from Bristol who visited an expensive private school when he was a schoolboy. Interestingly, it was speculated that the discovery would not only have judicial implications (claims for damages), but possibly would also dissolve the mystery surrounding his being an artist, and may even have an effect on the value of his work: “Banksy was duister, spannend, mysterieus, en vooral: van de straat. Nu is hij een mid-dertiger met een keurig kostschoolverleden. Het effect daarvan op de verkoopwaarde van zijn
werk kan groot zijn” [Banksy used to be obscure, exciting, mysterious, and most of all: street-wise. And now he turns out to be someone in his mid-thirties with a decent boarding-school history] (Zeil, 2008). Apparently, (some) people prefer to hold on to their created image of the implied artist, the street artist, and do not like the image of an empirical artist that is hard to unite with their mental representation of the implied artist. Banksy himself said once in a telephone interview: “…it’s a pretty safe bet that the reality of me would be a crushing disappointment to a couple of 15-year-old kids out there” (Verkaik, 2008).

The framework can also be applied to viewers of film, although this is of course somewhat more complex in the sense that there usually are multiple participants that realize a joint pretence. The director, the scriptwriter, the editor, the cameraman, and the person in charge of the cinematography, to name a few, together with a large collection of cinematic devices that they can use, all contribute to the way a particular story is communicated to its viewers. There is not a single “author” (see the debate on cinematic authorship in (Chatman, 1978)). In addition, we actually see the characters and the actors who play them. Together with all kinds of cinematic devices, such as unobtrusive camera work, this adds to our immersion into the fictional world and temporal illusion. Consequently, from the viewer’s perspective the director moves towards the background. At least, as long as there are no discrepancies between what we see and our expectations with concern to, e.g., style and generic knowledge or coherence breaks in the story. Results of a pilot study suggest that viewers tend to solve such a discrepancy by attributing a meaning in terms of an author’s intention, that is if they cannot solve the discrepancy by relating the information to the story context (cf. Claassen, 1999). There are of course so-called auteur-directors who have a clear signature and a poetical view about the function of film, such as David Lynch, Michael Haneke and David Cronenberg, to name a few contemporary directors. I think that from a viewer’s perspective we are involved in a joint pretence as well at the moment we accept an “author’s” invitation to watch a movie and jointly pretend that the events on screen actually take place. The very motivation to watch a movie supposedly is stimulated by affective and cognitive needs, and viewers are said to aim at a preferred final situation in which all falls into place and they leave the cinema feeling good, i.e. closure (Tan, 1996). Just as readers of literature grant the author some trust, film viewers also grant the “author” (director) some trust that he will not confront them with a world that deviates from our moral standards and judgements. Maybe we lean even more heavily on this sense of trust, because we do not have to picture a situation from the words on a piece of paper, but actually see what is happening on screen, and there is no escape (except covering your eyes, leaving the cinema, or pressing the stop-button on the DVD-player). In addition, the theoretical distinction in the framework between readers’ representations of an implied and empirical author as well as a narrator can also be applied to the context of viewing films. It would be interesting to investigate under what conditions film viewers construct separate mental representations of an empirical author, an implied author and a narrator. My guess is that viewers usually will not identify the narrator’s voice over as the director’s voice, also because usually the source of the voice-over – at some point – will be visualized on screen, and viewers are therefore expected to create separate mental representations of an (implied) author and narrator. As for the distinction between on the one hand an image of the director (to keep it simple) based on a movie, and on the other an image of the flesh-and-blood director, nowadays it is not uncommon to include extras to a DVD’s that often include the director’s commentary on the film or an interview. Viewers can thus create an image of the empirical author so to say, in addition to their constructed image of the director based on the film. Maybe most conventional films do not stimulate their viewers to create an image of the implied director; that would be a question that needs an empirical investigation. Also of interest would be to explore further what factors, e.g. themes and cinematic devices, can challenge the joint pretence between viewers
and “authors” and how they contribute to viewers’ construction of an image of an “author”; his attitude as well as his identity and presumed intentions.

Obviously, there is still much work to do, but I hope that the present study has to some extent contributed to a better understanding of the literary reading process, and more specifically, to a better understanding of how readers’ constructions of author concepts are involved in this process. My intention was to show that the theoretical statement that authors are to be dismissed from the interpretation of literary texts, from a cognitive psychological perspective is not tenable. Even if readers do not know anything about an empirical author, they construct a representation of an implied author. My impression is that these readers sense a – maybe faint – trail of the author’s footsteps once they join him on a journey into a fictional world.
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**Materials Chapter 2**


APPENDIX
CHAPTER 2 SHARING A CAB WITH THE AUTHOR, AUTHOR INFERENCE IN THINKING OUT LOUD

Appendix A – Materials

MATERIALS, TEXT A - A FRAGMENT TAKEN FROM ‘THE DEAD’ BY JAMES JOYCE (IN DUTCH TRANSLATION)

Natuurlijk hadden ze op een avond als deze alle reden om zenuwachtig te zijn. Bovendien was het al ver over tien en nog was er geen spoor van Gabriel en zijn vrouw. Ook waren ze verschrikkelijk bang dat Freddy Malins dronken zou komen aanzetten. Voor geen goud wilden ze dat een van Mary Jane’s leerlingen hem onder invloed zou zien; en als hij dat was, dan viel er niets meer met hem te beginnen. Freddy Malins kwam altijd te laat, maar ze vroegen zich af waar Gabriel zo lang bleef; en daarom liepen ze om de minuut naar de trap om Lily te vragen of Gabriel of Freddy er al was. ●

‘O, Mr. Conroy’, zei Lily tegen Gabriel toen ze hem opendeed, ‘Miss Kate en Miss Julia dachten dat u nooit meer zou komen. Goedendag, mevrouw Conroy.’

‘Ja, dat dacht ik al’, zei Gabriel, ‘maar ze vergeten dat mijn vrouw er drie eeuwigdurende uren over doet om zich te kleden.’

Hij stond op de mat en schraapte de sneeuw van zijn overschoenen, terwijl Lily zijn vrouw naar de trap bracht en naar boven riep:

‘Miss Kate, hier is mevrouw Conroy.’

Kate en Julia kwamen onmiddellijk de donkere trap afstruikelen. Beide kusten ze Gabriels vrouw, zeiden dat ze wel bevroren moest zijn en ze vroegen of Gabriel bij haar was.

‘Hier ben ik, zoals besteld, tante Kate. Ga maar naar boven. Ik kom zo,’ riep Gabriel vanuit het donker.

Hij veegde nog steeds krachtig zijn voeten, toen de drie vrouwen onder veel gelach naar boven liepen, naar de garderobe voor de dames. Een lichte franje van sneeuw lag als een cape over de schouders van zijn jas en als teenstukken op zijn overschoenen. En toen de knopen van zijn jas met een krakend geluid uit de knoopsgaten schoten, die stijf stonden van de sneeuw, ontsnapte er een koude buitenslucht uit de vouwen en plooien. ●

‘Sneeuwt het weer, Mr. Conroy?’ vroeg Lilly.

Ze was hem voorgegaan naar de keuken om hem te helpen met zijn jas. Gabriel lachte om de drie lettergrepen waarmee ze zijn naam had uitgesproken en keek haar aan. Ze was een tenger, jong meisje met een bleek gezicht en strokleurig haar. Het gaslicht in de keuken maakte haar nog bleker. Gabriel kende haar al van toen ze nog een kleuter was en haar lappenpoppen zat te wiegen op de onderste tree van de trap.

‘Ja Lily’, antwoordde hij, ‘en ik denk dat we er de hele nacht aan vastzitten’.

Hij keek omhoog naar het plafond van de keuken, dat schudde door het gestamp en geschuifel van de voeten op de vloer erboven, luisterde even naar de piano en keek toen naar het meisje, dat z’n jas zorgvuldig opvouwde op het eind van een boekenplank. ●

‘Zeg Lily’, zei hij vriendelijk, ‘zit je nog steeds op school?’

‘O nee meneer’, antwoordde ze. ‘Daar ben ik al meer dan een jaar van af.’

‘Zo’, zei Gabriel vrolijk, ‘dan denk ik dat we een dezer dagen wel naar de bruiloft toe moeten, van jou en je vriend.’

Het meisje keek hem over haar schouder aan en zei verbitterd:

‘De mannen van tegenwoordig hebben alleen maar smoesjes en willen altijd wat van je.’

Gabriel bloosde, alsof hij voelde dat hij een fout had begaan, en zonder haar aan te kijken, schopte hij zijn overschoenen uit en wreef ijverig met zijn handen over zijn lakschoenen.

Hij was een grote, zwaargebouwde man. De hoogrote kleur van zijn wangen zette zich voort tot aan z’n voorhoofd, en verdeelde zich daar over een paar vormloze vlekken van lichtrood; en op z’n baardloze gezicht schitterden
onophoudelijk zijn geslepen brilleglazen en het blinkende, vergulde montuur dat zijn zachte en rustige ogen afschermd. Zijn glanzende, zwarte haar had een scheiding in het midden en was in een lange golf tot achter zijn oren gekamd, waar het enigszins krulde onder de streep die de rand van zijn hoed had achtergelaten. Toen hij z’n schoenen glanzend had gewreven, stond hij op en trok zijn vest strakker rond zijn gezette gestalte. Toen haalde hij snel een munstuk uit z’n zak. ●

‘Hier Lily’, zei hij en stopte haar iets in de hand, ‘hier heb je nog iets voor Kerstmis…een kleinigheid.’

Hij liep snel naar de deur.

‘O nee, meneer’, riep het meisje en ze liet hem achterna:

‘Echt meneer, dat kan ik niet aannemen.’

‘Kerstmis, Kerstmis’, zei Gabriel, hij dansde bijna naar de trap en wuifde afwerend naar haar.

‘Het meisje zag dat hij al bij de trap was en riep hem na: ‘Nou dank u wel meneer.’ ●

**MATERIALS, TEXT B – ‘EVERYTHING AND NOTHING’ BY JORGE LUIS BORGES (IN DUTCH TRANSLATION)**

Niemand was in hem; zijn gelaat (dat zelfs op de sl echte schilderijen van die tijd aan geen enkel ander doet denken) en achter zijn woorden, die welderig, fantastisch en opgewonden waren, zat niet meer dan een beetje kou, een droom die niet door iemand werd gedroomd. Aanvankelijk dacht hij dat alle mensen waren zoals hij, maar de verwondering van een vriend die hij over de leegte aansprak, maakte hem zijn verlossing duidelijk en door drong hem er voor goed van, dat een individu niet mag verschillen van zijn soort. ● Hij had wel eens gedacht dat hij in de boeken een middel zou vinden tegen zijn kwaal, dus leerde hij het weinige Latijn en het doordrong hem er voorgoed van, dat een individu nooit mag verschillen van zijn soort. ● Hij had wel een scheiding in het midden en was in een lange golf tot achter z’n oren gekamd, waar het enigszins krulde onder de streep die de rand van zijn hoed had achtergelaten. Toen hij z’n schoenen glanzend had gewreven, stond hij op en trok zijn vest strakker rond zijn gezette gestalte. Toen haalde hij snel een munstuk uit z’n zak. ●

‘Hier Lily’, zei hij en stopte haar iets in de hand, ‘hier heb je nog iets voor Kerstmis…een kleinigheid.’

Hij liep snel naar de deur.

‘O nee, meneer’, riep het meisje en ze liet hem achterna:

‘Echt meneer, dat kan ik niet aannemen.’

‘Kerstmis, Kerstmis’, zei Gabriel, hij dansde bijna naar de trap en wuifde afwerend naar haar.

‘Het meisje zag dat hij al bij de trap was en riep hem na: ‘Nou dank u wel meneer.’ ●

**MATERIALS, TEXT C – A FRAGMENT TAKEN FROM ‘VOORSPEL’ BY LOU DE JONG**

Met Hitler had von Papen inmiddels contact gezocht; de fatale maand januari ’33 werd gevuld met pogingen om enerzijds een voor de president aanvaardbare coalitie van NSDAP’ers en Deutsch-Nationalen, aangevuld met
preussischer Minister des Innern

Führer, befiehl! Wir folgen!

die karakter onthulde. Wie hem aanbad ('Heil Hitler!') zag hem als de verkondiger van een heilboodschap, als een messias, als een verlosser. 'Eén ding zult U moeten toegeven,' hoorde een Nederlander in Berlijn zich eens door een buurman toevoegen, 'als God ooit een zoon heeft gehad, dan is het Adolf Hitler.'

Maar dat werd in een schuilkelder gesproken tijden s een zwaar bombardement, niet lang voor de ineenstorting van het rijk dat zich duizendjarig waande en dat na twaalf jaar en drie maanden voor eeuwig in de woestenij wegzonk, Hitler, zelfmoordenaar, achterlatend in een naamloos graf.

Met fakkeloptochten en uitbundig gejuich van vele ('Rechtdoor?') vroeg de chauffeur, nog steeds glimlachend. Hij wees de straat uit. Het hotel stond daar levensgroot, niet zo ver van zijn huis.

Jack knikte. Toen zei hij: 'Jongen, kun je me zeggen hoe ik naar het Beverly Hills Hotel kom?'

Hij was dus toch een vreemde. Even was dat een teleurstelling voor Jack. Toen zei hij: 'Jongen, kun je me zeggen hoe ik naar het Beverly Hills Hotel kom?'

'Het was dus toch een vreemde. Even was dat een teleurstelling voor Jack. Hij wees de straat uit. Het hotel stond daar levensgroot, niet zo ver van zijn huis. 'Rechtdoor?' vroeg de chauffeur, nog steeds glimlachend. Jack knikte. Jij bent een knappe jongen,' zei de man en zijn passagier grinnikte.
‘Weet jij hoe ver het precies is?’ Jack zei: ‘Een paar zijstraten verder, geloof ik.’ Hij begon zich onbehaaglijk te voelen. De chauffeur glimlachte nog wel, maar het leek nu zo’n harde, lege lach. En het gegrinnik van de man naast hem had hijgerig en vochtig geklonken, alsof hij op iets zoog.
‘Nou, je wordt bedankt, jongetje,’ zei de chauffeur. ‘Wil je wat lekkers hebben?’ Hij stak zijn hand uit het portierraam met een rolletje snoep erin. ‘Voor jou. Pak maar aan.’


De chauffeur greep zijn hand beet en de man in het witte pak begon te schateren. Verbijsterd staarde Jack in de ogen van de man, die zijn hand omknelde – blauwe ogen, die in geel begonnen over te gaan, meende hij.

Van de overkant kwam een luide stem: ‘Hé, laat die jongen los! Jij daar! Wil je die jongen met rust laten!’


‘Weg, weg.’ zei de chauffeur en trapte het gaspedaal in. De man in het witte pak sprong naast hem en de wagen scheurde weg.

APPENDIX A – MATERIALS, INSTRUCTIONS

Instruction 1- Neutral


Na het lezen zal ik je vragen een samenvatting van de tekst te geven.

Instruction 2- Intentional

Je krijgt zo dadelijk een korte tekst te lezen. Deze tekst is een fragment uit een langere tekst. Gedurende het onderzoek zal mijn taak zijn dat ik luister. Ik kan geen vragen over de inhoud
beantwoorden. Het gaat er namelijk om wat *jij* denkt. Er zijn geen foute of goede antwoorden en je wordt ook niet getest op kennis. Het gaat er puur om wat *jij* persoonlijk denkt en vindt.
Lees de tekst voor het overige zoals je hem normaal ook zou lezen. Maar *neem je tijd, je kunt gerust teruglezen*.


Na het lezen zal ik je vragen een samenvatting van de tekst te geven en zal ik vragen wat *jij* denkt wat de schrijver met de tekst heeft bedoeld.

**APPENDIX A – MATERIALS, STATEMENTS**

1. Ik ervaar geen schrijver, ik ervaar alleen de tekst
2. Ik merk tijdens het lezen dat er iets is dat mij in de tekst stuurt, maar ik kan dat iets niet benoemen.
3. Ik merk dat er een schrijver achter de tekst zit die ik lees, maar ik heb in mijn hoofd geen duidelijk beeld van de schrijver
4. Ik merk dat er een schrijver achter de tekst zit die ik lees, en heb in mijn hoofd een duidelijk beeld van de schrijver
5. Anders, namelijk...

**APPENDIX A – MATERIALS, QUESTIONNAIRE**

Ik wil je tot slot een paar vragen stellen.

1) Mijn leeftijd:
2) Geslacht:
3) Mijn vooropleiding (middelbare school/ MBO/HBO):
4) Mijn huidige opleiding:

Een aantal vragen over boeken die je leest...

1) Stel, je hebt overdag een paar uur vrij te besteden. Wat zou je het eerste gaan doen? Omcirkel het cijfer achter het antwoord dat op jou van toepassing is.

Televisie kijken 1
In of rond het huis werken 2
Krant, boek lezen 3
De stad in gaan 4
Anders, namelijk…….. 5

Hier volgen enkele vragen over het lezen van verhalende boeken. Omcirkel het antwoord dat op jou van toepassing is.

2) Lees je wel eens verhalende boeken? Omcirkel het antwoord dat op jou van toepassing is.
Ja  (⇒ ga naar vraag 3)
Nee  (⇒ ga naar vraag 4)

3) Zo ja, waarom? Wil je hieronder aangeven hoe belangrijk onderstaande argumenten voor jou zijn?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heel belangrijk</th>
<th>Heel onbelangrijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Omdat ik me wil ontspannen 1 2 3 4
Omdat ik iets wil leren 1 2 3 4
Omdat ik me wil inleven in het boek 1 2 3 4
Omdat ik geniet van de stijl 1 2 3 4
Het hoort bij je algemene ontwikkeling 1 2 3 4
Om er met anderen over te praten 1 2 3 4
Omdat het thema me boeit 1 2 3 4

(→ Ga naar vraag 6)

4) Zo nee, waarom niet? Zijn de volgende argumenten van toepassing?

   Ik vind lezen vervelend ja nee
   Ik heb geen tijd om te lezen ja nee
   Ik doe liever wat anders ja nee
   Andere reden, namelijk........
   ........................................................................
   ........................................................................

5) Wat zou voor jou een reden kunnen zijn om te gaan lezen?
   ........................................................................
   ........................................................................

→ Dit was de laatste vraag. Je kunt nu naar de stellingen die na vraag 10 staan.

6) Hoeveel tijd besteed je bij benadering wekelijks aan het lezen van verhalende boeken? (kleur het rondje achter het antwoord dat op jou van toepassing is zwart).

   1-5 uur per week 0
   1-5 uur per week 0
   5-10 uur per week 0
   10-15 uur per week 0
   meer dan 15 uur per week 0

Vraag 7 staat op de volgende pagina →

7) Heb je de afgelopen drie maanden een van de onderstaande genres gelezen? Zo ja, hoeveel? Zet een kruisje in de kolom met het antwoord dat op jou het meest van toepassing is.

   Boeken per kwartaal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>Meer dan 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detectives, Thrillers, horror</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liefdesromans, bouquetreeks</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Fiction</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poëzie</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toneel</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fictie</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders nl.............</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Waar let je op bij de keuze van een boek?

   a. voorkant/ omslag ja nee
b. actualiteit [pas verschenen]  ja  nee  
c. thema  ja  nee  
d. [beroemde] auteur  ja  nee  
e. verfilming/ opvoering  ja  nee  
f. flaptekst/ tekst op achterzijde  ja  nee  

9) Door wie word je bij de keuze van een boek aangespoord?

Familie  ja  nee 
Vrienden  ja  nee 
Recensenten  ja  nee 
Boekhandelaar  ja  nee 
Docenten  ja  nee 
Schrijvers  ja  nee 
Anderen, namelijk....

10) Waarom zijn juist deze personen voor jouw keuze belangrijk?

Deskundigheid  ja  nee 
Voorkeur voor dezelfde boeken  ja  nee 
Zij praten er enthousiast over  ja  nee 
Er wordt veel over geschreven  ja  nee 
Andere reden....

Een aantal stellingen.

1) Ik vind de tekst die ik gelezen heb complex.

Helemaal mee eens   Helemaal niet mee eens
1  2  3  4

2) Ik vind de tekst die ik gelezen heb literair.

Helemaal mee eens   Helemaal niet mee eens
1  2  3  4

3) Ik vind dat in de tekst die ik gelezen heb de bedoeling van de auteur zichtbaar was.

Helemaal mee eens   Helemaal niet mee eens
1  2  3  4

4) Ik vind dat in de tekst die ik gelezen heb je een duidelijk beeld krijgt van de auteur.

Helemaal mee eens   Helemaal niet mee eens
1  2  3  4

5) Heb je nog andere opmerkingen over de tekst?

[...]

Heb je nog opmerkingen over het verloop van het onderzoek?

[...]

Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking!
APPENDIX B – ANALYSIS OF THE VERBAL PROTOCOLS

Key to the symbols

E = Explanatory
P = Predictive
A = Associative
SW = Story World
AW = Actual World
TE = Text
AUT = Author
AUT+ = Author (strong)
AUT- = Author (weak)
META = Metacomment
PARA = Paraphrase
N.C. = No Code
QWHY = Question: why (//E)
OP = Open prediction (//P)
QWH = Question: what, who etc. (//A)
RE = Reader Emotion
REFL = Reflection on reading or comprehension process
EXP = Experimental setting
A sample from the verbal protocols

**TEXT A (JOYCE), SUBJECT 1, INSTRUCTION 1 - NEUTRAL (ALSO CODED BY TWO EXTERNAL ENCODERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKER</th>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SPECIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Huh (..) ja da’s wel echt uh midden in ’t verhaal (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ja ’t is vooral uh de stijl die me zo zo (..) uh ja a naar voren komt eigenlijk dat ’t ’t een beetje uh beetje uh ja babbelig</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hoe moet ik ’t zeggen</td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ja dacht al bij de eerste regel van zou ’t Engels zijn dat ’t ’t uh ja (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ben benieuwd eigenlijk ja (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. tot nu toe is er eigenlijk nog helemaal niets gebeurd (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. ja wat uh wat ze gaan doen</td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. ja (..) genoeg ug (..) ja eigenlijk onduidelijk wat er nou uh precies voor situatie is</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. je hebt alleen maar mensen die ja ergens naar toe gaan maar de dus uh</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ja de doel is nog helemaal niet duidelijk (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. wel wel intrigerend (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. maar het zou net zo goed ook iets heel onbenulligs zijn kunnen zijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. Hm (..) ja ik heb ’t idee dat ’t een feestje is (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. pianomuziek ennuh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ja er staat een meisje dat dat de jassen opvouwt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. dus dat zal wel ingehuurd zijn en zo (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. ook die sneeuw dat uh (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. dat ’t uh ja (..) zal dan wel een factor zijn die die terug komt in ’t verhaal</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. dat uh zegt uh dat ze de hele nacht in de sneeuw vastzitten dus</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. hm ben benieuwd wat die Gabriel voor een rol in het hele verhaal speelt</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. die uh wordt zo beschreven en gedaan ennuh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AUT –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ja toch vanaf het begin af aan eigenlijk uh (..) ja (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. een punt van belang zeg maar dat ‘ie moet komen en dat ie nu ja (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. wordt ie in tien regels helemaal uitvoerig beschreven (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUT –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. dus uh ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. hm een echte weldoener zeg maar ennuh ja (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. hij zal vast zichzelf ook wel heel belangrijk vinden want dat ‘ie uh ja dat soort cadeautjes uh geeft</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. en niet ja duidelijk is wat maar goed dat meisje vindt het wel belangrijk dat ie dat ie wel (..) ja dat je er wel blij mee moet zijn? (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Is dit het einde?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXT A (JOYCE), SUBJECT 11, INSTRUCTION 1 – NEUTRAL (EXPERT READER WHO RECOGNIZES THE TEXT AND ITS AUTHOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKER</th>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SPECIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. ja want als ik de eerste zin uh zie dan denk ik van ja uh dat zou ’k uh ’t begin van een een typische short story of zo kunnen zijn</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. maar ik heb begrepen dat dat een stuk is ergens uit uit een ja (..)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Je ziet al die verwijzingen staan he die natuurlijk slaat ergens op terug en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

4. Ja dat deze ja dat is ook een uh [tekstisch?] element.

5. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is.

6. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is.

7. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

8. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

9. Dan zou dat nou een verhaal zijn dat [met nadruk] verhaal verder speelt en uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

10. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

11. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus ook wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

12. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

13. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

14. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

15. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

16. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

17. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

18. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

19. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

20. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

21. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

22. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

23. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

24. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

25. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

26. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

27. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.

28. Gabriël dan denk ik aan een verhaal The Dead van (...) uh (...) James Joyce (...).

29. En uh nou ja zo beginnen short stories dus also wel eens maar hier verwijst 't kennelijk naar iets wat een lezer van de hele tekst is al bekend is en dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is en waarom uh de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was.
10. dus als die man dan komt en uh (..)  & PARA  
11. *een lichte franje van sneeuw lag als een cape over de schouders van zijn jas en als teenstukken op zijn overschoenen*  & PARA  
12. daar vormt ie eigenlijk een mooi een mooi beeld (.)  & AUT+  
13. dat is eigenlijk een verdubbeling van de kleding  & TE  
14. dus als je nou zou willen want dat heb ik natuurlijk nooit in detail gezien (.)  & SW  
15. ‘t is natuurlijk een heel naturalistisch beeld alleen dan poetisch uitgedrukt  & AUTO –  
16. maar als je nou zou willen dan zou je ‘t eventueel kunnen interpreteren als uh gelaagdheid van de mens of zoiets (..)  & TE  
17. hij opent zich en er komt dan koude lucht uit  & PARA  
18. dat zegt dat weer over de kilte  & TE  
19. ondertussen was ‘t natuurlijk gewoon koud buiten (..)  & SW  
20. ik ga uh verder  & EXP

| 3 | 1. Ja dat is toch even een heel kleine ondersjje tussen stijve gesloten Gabriel en (...) meisje Lilly (.....)  & SW  
2. en zie je hoe gedetailleerd het eigenlijk geschreven is  & AUT+  
3. dus allerlei waarnemingen en bewegingen  & TE  
4. *hij keek omhoog naar ‘t plafond en (..)*  & PARA  
5. ja heel beeldend je ziet ‘t eigenlijk voor je je hoort ‘t ook (.)  & REFL  
6. *het meisje dat uh zorgvuldig z’n jas opvouwde (...)*  & PARA  
7. goed ik ik lees weer verder  & EXP

| 4 | 1. *ja d’r wordt in hele kleine scenes [??] iets te (.) van z’n persoonlijkheid uh iets bloot gegeven*  & AUT+  
2. *zo die stijve Gabriel die dan een beetje joviaal wil zijn tegen dat meisje (.) ‘t meisje wat dan wat zuur antwoordt en dan (..)*  & SW  
3. *ja dan bloost ook*  & PARA  
4. *en dan is ie toch heel gevoelig wat z’n eigen persoon uh betreft beetje onhandig in de communicatie*  & SW  
5. *wou die een keer vlot zijn en dan (...) pakt ‘t toch nog uh verkeerd uit (..)*  & SW  
6. *maar goed dat wijdt ie zich verder maar weer uh aan z’n kleding z’n overschoenen z’n lakschoenen [z’n identiteit??]*  & TE  
7. *ja op grond van zoiets kun je een beetje ah je je verhaal nog helemaal niet zou kennen zou je misschien toch een beetje tijd kunnen dateren*  & REFL  
8. *ik weet niet of tegenwoordig mensen nog overschoenen over hun lakschoenen dragen*  & EXP  
9. *dus dan zou ik een beetje gaan zoeken van uh ja misschien begin twintigste eeuw of (...) eerder (..)*  & TE  
10. *de manier waarop ‘t geschreven is is zo gedetailleerd en ook uh (..)*  & AUTO –  
11. *de introductie van de mens komt eigenlijk op op een wat later moment*  & TE  
12. *dan zou je ‘t verhaal toch uh laat negentienn begin twi twintigste eeuw kunnen dateren (...)*  & SW  
13. *je krijgt dan beetje een beeld uh (..)*  & REFL  
14. *ja man van middelbare leeftijd beetje gezet beetje flonkerende brilleglazen (..)*  & SW

| 5 | 1. *ja toch een beetje verlegen met zichzelf en uh*  & SW  
2. *stopt dan Lilly gauw iets in in de hand ‘t zijn toch uh (..)*  & PARA  
3. *meisje wil ‘t niet (..)*  & SW  
4. *en neemt ‘t dan toch maar aan (..)*  & SW  
5. *ja ‘t zijn ‘t zijn allemaal dingen die uh (..) die op een heel onopvallende manier toch een beetje een beeld van van Gabriel geven*  & TE
6. de manier waarop ie uh
7. ik ben er doorheen he ja (..)
8. beetje (.) beetje een onhandige man he
9. heeft wel meer uh [??] kan je niet zeggen maar beetje wel
10. de scene met dat meisje (..)
11. maar ja omdat ik de rest van 't verhaal ken en ja ook vrij uitvoerig d'r mee bezig heb gehouden ook in 't kader van die uh verfilmingen ook die eindscenes af en toe dan kan een verhaal met een film te vergelijken
12. heb ik natuurlijk toch een beeld van van de man en uh
13. ja voor dat je 't weet ga je dan uit zo'n stukje tekst ook al dingen halen uh waar ik wat uh al meer van weet (...) 
14. maar je 't is toch wel duidelijk denk ik dat ie communicatief een beetje onhandig is
15. en een beetje onhandig binnenkomt en dan vlot wil doen en dat pakt verkeerd uit en dan schaamt ie zich ennuh
16. nou daar doet ie dan misschien 't twee wat eigenlijk verkeerd is haar iets geven wat ze eigenlijk niet wil
17. en dan denkt zij natuurlijk van uh ik kan dat toch ook niet uh niet naar hem terug gooien
18. dus dan neem ik 't toch maar aan
19. dus uh beetje kondigt zich uh toch al aan het gedrag van uh van de persoonlijkheid die in 't verhaal besloten ligt
20. en die dan natuurlijk dan escaleert in die laatste scene waar dan z'n vrouw van streek raakt ennuh nare dingen gaat ophalen en daar is hij dan helemaal van uh van streek
21. en dan krijg je die monologue interieur (..)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKERS</th>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SPECIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. of nou dat blijkt ook inderdaad uh ne niks te zijn</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. want ’t begint al met nie niemand was in hem</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Huh nou ik ben hm ja ik uh wat ik denk is uh of uh wat ik denk dat dat we hier naar een uh naar een uh clou uh leiden</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>van uh nou hij gaat terug naar z’n uh geboortedorp en naar z’n kindertijd en dat</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>daar zal ie daar vindt ie de wortels en dan al dat andere dat is (...) spel en dat is masker</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>maar daar ben ik ’t daar ben ik ’t niet mee eens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>dat denk ik dat is de gedachte die ik heb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Nou toch wel heel mooi (...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>nou ik vind ja ok ik draai m’n uh conclusie uh bij</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>want ’t is toch uh toch zoals ik er ook uh over denk over uh identiteit en over persoonlijkheid</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>want ’t lijkt nu net alsof die iets gevonden heeft en dan komt ook nog God daar om de hoek en zomaar God die zegt eigenlijk ’t uh eigenlijk ’t uh zelfde ook van uh van ’t uh (...)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>ja ’t veel ’t vele zijn ennuh ennuh niemand zijn na ja (...)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>evenals ik velen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>ja ok ook ben ook weer niet [leest flusterend weer laatste fragment]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>ja ’t uh aannemen van vele rollen en dan uh ’t is niet zo noo noodzakelijk dat daar nou eentje van is die uh die het is of dat je je jezelf gevonden hebt</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>dat vind ie dus wie God in uh wat God tot hem zegt</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>dat is wat ik denk (lacht)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEXT C (De Jong), Subject 7, Instruction 2 – Intentional (also coded by two external encoders)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKERS</th>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SPECIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>uhm (...) ja volgens mij is ’t een beetje ’t allereerste begin van de tweede wereldoorlog een beetje maar ’t uh (...) dat idee heb ik</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>maar ja ’t is wel 1933 da weer wel ver van 1940 af maar f ja (...)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Hitler is dus blijkbaar al in de picture dus uh ja volgens mij uh ja (...)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>is er dus daar dan uh (...) bedacht dat die Hitler dus Rei Reichskanselier zou worden en de heer van Papen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>dat staat er dan vertrouwde als [vice kanselier] nagenoeg evenveel reele macht te zullen krijgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>maar in die zin spreekt er al een beetje uit dat het dus waarschijnlijk niet zo gaat verlopen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>dus uh (...) ja dat uh denk ik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>hmmm even kijken hoor (lange pauze)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>nou ja wat ik net zei klopt wel een beetje dat die uhm (...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>dat die Von Papen dus eerst er op vertrouwt dat die wel heel veel macht zal krijgen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>maar dat ’t dus uh niet ’t geval blijkt te zijn</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>maar hij uhm putte er dan nog hoo hoop uit dat ie uh dat ie Hitler dan effetjes door een korte periode van machtsuitoefening moet zeg maar</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>en dat ie dan z’n wilde haren wel verliest</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>en dat ie dan misschien wel wat meer (...) aan hem over zou laten of zo</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>uuhmm maar ja daar staat in dat</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>in die laatste regels voor die (...) stip staan dan die verschillende mensen die</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
belangrijke functies hebben
10. maar die daar staat die Von Papen dan niet bij dat begrijp ik dan niet helemaal (…)
11. omdat hij zegt uhm (.)
12. ja ‘t lijkt alsof hij zich een beetje troost met de gedachte van ach uh dat uh moet effetjes z’n wilde haren verliezen en dan komt ‘t allemaal wel
13. ja misschien zit ik wel onzin te vertellen hoor (lacht) maar uhm (.)
14. uh en dan troost ie zich een beetje met de gedachte van ach d’r zijn dan drie belangrijke fu uhm
15. ja alsof dat niet belangrijke functies zijn
dus gewoon een beetje van nuh nou dat ‘t ja ‘t klinkt een beetje van nou ja dat uh valt allemaal wel mee
17. maar hij zit er alleen niet bij maar ja
18. oh hier s hij is vicekanselier
19. dus dan ie natuurlijk uh als er iets met Hitler gebeurt dat hij ‘t dan over neemt
20. dus dan is ‘t dan o ja nee dan snap ik ‘t wel (.)
21. Hitler is dus (.) uh Reichskanselier (.)
22. dus als er iets met die Hitler gebeurt dan wordt hij dan volgens mij uh neemt ‘t dan over
23. dus dan is ‘t wel logisch dat ie {daarom?? daar dan??} weer niet (.)
24. nou ja zoietjes (lacht)
3 1. hm hier staat gewoon uhm ja beetje stukje geschiedenis over Hitler (..)
2. uhm wat niet waarin ie niet erg uh positief uh naar voren komt ennuh
3. op ‘t eind staat dus dat hij dan du dan aan ‘t hoofd komt van een nieuwe regering
dus dat is dus niet echt uh gunstig (.)
5. maar volgens mij is dit stukje voornamelijk een beetje (.) verduidelijking over uh Hitler
4 1. nou ja dit is dus het moment dat ie aa aan de macht is gekomen (..)
2. en uhm volgens mij is dat wel een beetje met gemengde gevoelens
3. even kijken hoor (.) waar stond dat ook al weer (.)
4. het uitbundig gejuich van velen en sombere voorgevoelens bij anderen
dus uh ja ‘t was niet ‘t was niet alleen maar hoopvol
6. er waren ook wel mensen die dus blijkbaar sombere voorgevoelens daar bij hadden
7. maar in ‘t algemeen uhm (.) uh wordt ‘r nog positief gedacht volgens mij (.)
8. want ja hij wordt begroet en hij staat op ‘t balkon
9. ik bedoel dat doe je niet als iemand uh als je niet echt enthousiast bent natuurlijk
10. dus uh ja dat is ‘t volgens mij
5 1. nou ‘t laatste stuk is een beetje de (.) anticlimax (.)
2. d’r wordt uh nou ja d’r wordt heel groots over ‘m gesproken
3. als God ooit een zoon heeft gehad dan is ‘t Hitler
4. nou ja dat is wel uh beetje erg uh
5. en dan uh komt de laatste alinea toch de anticlimax
dat dat ‘t uiteindelijk allemaal in mekaar stort ennuh (.)
7. dat ie eh in een naamloos graf uh eindigt (…)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAR KERS</th>
<th>SEGMENTS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SPECIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>’t heeft iets hm iets lugubers vind ik hier</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ik zie ’t voor me dat uh die Jack dat dat een (.) een jongen is die daar in die straat loopt (.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hier bijvoorbeeld uh (.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ik denk dat z’n vader overleden is</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>en dat ’t bijvoorbeeld (.) die chauffeur dat dat een uh ja een vriend was nou ja die zijn vader had gekend zoals hijzelf uh denkt uhm (.)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>nou ja die komt wel sympathiek over op mij de uh die chauffeur maar die andere man helemaal niet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>het krijgt iets (.) lugubers misschien door die zonnebril en en het spierwitte kostuum (.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>uh (pauze) nou ja dat is ’t even voor nu</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ja gadver ze zijn iets engs met ’m van plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hier zeggen ze vannuh (…)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nou ja gewoon inderdaad dat lachje v die lach van die chauffeur was puur om hem uh (.) uh te lokken of zo</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>en dan dan vragen ze dus wat (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>en wanneer ze hier zeggen hij bent een knappe jongen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dan denk je al wow wat zijn ze van plan [lacht] (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>en zeker als hier s op ’t eind nog staat en het gegrinnik van de man naast hen had hijgerig en vochtig geklonken (.) alsof hij op iets zoog nou ja (…) uh...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>nee je voelt je al onbehaaglijk voordat dan direct letterlijk staat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>hij begon zich onbehaaglijk te voelen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>je zit zeg maar in zijn uh positie (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>en je je denkt eigenlijk ook voor hem van gadverdarrie wat gaat gebeuren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>wat zijn ze met me van plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>en of het homo’s zijn</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>of wat er dan verder gaat gebeuren dat is nog niet uh (.) duidelijk (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>nou ja ik lees even door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>EXP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nou hier lijkt ie dus toch weer jonger dan ik dacht (…)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ik weet niet waarom ik dacht dat ie ouder was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nou je denkt met ’m mee op de een of andere manier (…)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>schat ’m ouder of zoiets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>maar hier staat je wordt bedankt jongetje een rolletje snoep (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td>REFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>maar goed zal ie dus wel onder de tien zijn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>maar als je ’m hier weer hoort denken over en dit dit moet ik eigenlijk niet doen dan lijkt ie weer ouder (.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>dit is ook wel herkenbaar ’t idee van ja je weet eigenlijk wel dat er iets niet goed is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>maar zoals hier staat het is ook weer zo onbeleefd om te weigeren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>of je wil eigenlijk ’t in ’t goede van de mens geloven of zoiets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>hoewel die dus eigenlijk zich helemaal niet op z’n gemak voelt(.) daar (…) uh...</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>nou hij weet ook wel dat ’t niet goed zit (…)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>zoals hier staat die ogen van die man die zo hard zijn als zijn lach (.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>en dat z’n instinct hem vertelt dat ie ’t niet moet doen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. nou doet ie t wel en dan (lange pauze) E SW
16. ja dan weet je dus al dat t niet goed zit E SW
17. je weet nog niet wat er gaat gebeuren maar (…) E SW
18. ’t gaat in elk geval iets goed mis (…) E SW
19. dat met die ogen vind ik wel (.) een apart stukje (…) META OP
20. Jack die kijkt in de ogen van die man en (lange pauze) PARA RE
21. nou ja goed dat ik weet ik niet wat ik daar mee moet META REFL
22. blauwe ogen die in geel begonnen over te gaan meende hij (.) PARA
23. nou ja misschien ziet ie dingen die er niet zijn of uh (.) angstvisioenen ik weet ’t niet (.) E SW
24. maar het maakt wel dat je denkt ‘hoelll’ ik wil weten wat er gebeurt META RE

4 1. ja ’t (.) ’t zijn geen mensen of zoiets E AW
2. ja van die ogen die worden geel dat dus gewoon in werkelijkheid niet kan (…) E AW
3. en dan heeft ie ook zo’n rare (.) klauw (…) PARA PARA
4. en bovendien staat er hier dat ie nou ja dat kan ook normaal maar dat ie absoluut geen moeite had om die Jack in bedwang te houden (…) E SW
5. lijkt wel een soort robot of of iets (.) A SW
6. hoewel met dit die witte jas deed me ook heel even denken aan uh (.) een uh (.) huh zo’n ja een soort psychiater of zo of een uh geestesdokter A SW
7. dat ie naar een of andere enge kliniek wordt uh gebracht en daar helemaal wordt volgespoten en in een dwangbuis wordt gestopt [lacht] P SW
8. maar dat komt puur door dat is eigenlijk mijn eigen associatie met die witte jas A SW
9. omdat je niet weet waar ’t naar toe gaat en een soort uh verklaring zoekt (…) uhm (.) META REFL
10. nou ja ik hou ’t even op dat ’t een soort robot is of zo en achter dus die ene oh nee die andere ook (…) E SW
11. ja allebei en dat ze zijn ingezet door uh een of andere enge creep die een soort experimenten wilde doen of zo E SW
12. misschien wel iemand die toch iets met die vader te maken had E SW
13. maar dat uh nou dat weet ik niet META REFL

5 1. ja valt een beetje tegen eigenlijk [lacht] dit eind (.) META RE?
2. want ik ik zat echt te verwachten waar gaat ’t nou naar toe META REFL
3. ze laten het verder in ’t in ’t vage wat ’t nou (…) wat ’t nou was AUT AUT +
4. misschien was ’t dus wel achteraf Jack z’n visie dat die ogen geel werden of dat ie zelf allemaal rare dingen ging zien (…) uhm (.) E SW
5. nee dit is een beetje een anti-climax moet ik zeggen (.) META RE
6. ik dacht wel hier even bij die uh META REFL
7. ’t is een beetje vrij rijke buurt kreeg ik ’t idee uhm (.) uh (…) A SW
8. rijke auto (…) A SW
9. ik kreeg een beetje ’t idee dat dit dan zo’n soort eindje is van kijk uh daar wonen natuurlijk allemaal blanken in die rijke buurt enzo E TE
10. en dat dan uiteindelijk uhm uh een zwarte man uh hem komt redden of zoiets E SW
11. dat dat dan weer allemaal zo (.) pedagogisch verantwoord uh afloop (langere pauze) E TE
12. ja (langere pauze) ja verder kan ik er weinig mee moet ik zeggen META REFL
**APPENDIX B – CODING SCHEME AND INSTRUCTIONS TO THE CODERS**

**Codeschema**

**Inleiding**

**STAP 1:**
Je gaat nu eerst bekijken hoe het commentaar van de proefpersoon getypeerd kan worden. Kan de zin worden gecodeerd met code E, A, P? Zo ja, zet een van deze codes in KOLOM 1. Zo niet, kan de zin worden gecodeerd met code META? Zo ja zet dan deze code in KOLOM 3. Is onduidelijk met welke code een zin kan worden gecodeerd omdat niet duidelijk is wat met de zin bedoeld wordt, of weet je gewoon niet welke code je moet toekennen, zet dan code N.C. in KOLOM 1. N.B. Er is maar één van deze codes per zin mogelijk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Omschrijving code</th>
<th>Definitie code</th>
<th>Voorbeeld van zin uit protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E    | Explanatory       | Verklarende zinnen geven *antwoord* op *waarom* vragen die de lezer gesteld kan hebben, maar die de lezer niet heeft verwoord: de zinnen geven redenen voor waarom een gebeurtenis of handeling in het verhaal plaatsvindt of een element in de tekst voorkomt. | 1. ja toch een beetje verlegen met zichzelf en uh. *verklaring van gedrag personage. Antwoord op vraag waarom gedraagt personage zich zo?*  
2. je ziet al die verwijzingen staan he die natuurlijk staat ergens op terug. *[antwoord op de vraag waarom staan er verwijzingen in de tekst]*  
3. het krijgt iets lugubers misschien door die zonnebril en het spierwitte kostuum *[Associatie die betrekking heeft op een beschrijvend detail, namelijk bepaalde kleding van een personage]* |
| A    | Associative       | Associaties geven *antwoorden* op *wat, hoe, waar, wannen* en wie —vragen die de lezer gesteld kan hebben, maar die de lezer niet heeft verwoord. Associaties kunnen soms ook betrekking hebben op een *beschrijvend detail* zoals de leeftijd van een personage, de grootte of kleur van een voorwerp of een middel om een handeling te verrichten. | 1. ja want als ik de eerste zin uh zie dan denk ik van ja uh dat zou 'k uh 't begin van een een typische short story of zo kunnen zijn *Antwoord op: wat voor een soort verhaal is dit?*  
2. beetje (*) beetje een onhandige man he *Antwoord op de vraag: wat voor een soort man is dat? Of geven van beschrijvend detail van de man.*  
7. het krijgt iets (*) lugubers misschien door die zonnebril en het spierwitte kostuum (...) *[Associatie die betrekking heeft op een beschrijvend detail, namelijk bepaalde kleding van een personage]* |
<p>| P    | Predictive        | Voorspellingen geven <em>antwoord</em> op vragen als ‘wat gaat er straks verder’ | 19. dus uh beetje kondigt zich uh toch al aan het gedrag van uh |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>META</th>
<th>Metacomment</th>
<th>Metacommentaar heeft betrekking op opmerkingen die eigenlijk vragen zijn die de lezer zichzelf stelt. Dat kunnen vragen zijn over de tekst of over de gebeurtenissen in de verhaalwereld of over zijn eigen gedachten. Deze opmerkingen zijn niet altijd in de vorm van een duidelijke vraag, maar bijvoorbeeld in de vorm van een vraag die niet af is of iets dat de lezer zich afvraagt. In tegenstelling tot de code E, A, of P geven opmerkingen die als metacommentaar kunnen worden gekwalificeerd geen antwoord op vragen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>om omdat je weet dat 't een stuk ergens uit is uh ja blijft dat maar een beetje door je hoofd malen Geeft reflectie weer van eigen denkproces. 8. de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was Geeft geen antwoord op een waarom-vaag, maar is een waarom-vaag. 14. uh wie zijn ze eigenlijk er worden wel allemaal genoemd maar uh wie ze zijn (.) Geeft geen antwoord op wie-vraag, maar is een wie-vraag. 17. je weet nog niet wat er gaat gebeuren maar (…) Geeft geen antwoord op de vraag ‘wat gaat er straks verder gebeuren’, maar is min of meer een vraag naar wat er gaat gebeuren. 12. daar vormt ie eigenlijk een mooi een mooi beeld Geeft een waardeoordeel of emotionele reactie op de tekst. 4. ja ik ben bij de volgende stip aangeland maar (.) Opmerking over de tekst als onderzoeksmateriaal, namelijk met stippen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>No code ( geen code )</td>
<td>Wanneer geen enkele code kan worden toegekend aan een zin omdat bijvoorbeeld niet duidelijk is wat er door een proefpersoon wordt bedoeld, wordt de code ‘no code’ aan een zin toegekend. 9. heeft wel meer uh [??] kan je niet zeggen maar beetje wel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAP 2:**
Je gaat nu de codes die je in kolom 1 hebt gezet, nader specificeren. Als code E, A, of P is toegekend: waar hebben deze codes dan betrekking op? Kan de zin gecodeerd worden met code SW, TE, AW of AUT? Zo ja, zet dan een van deze codes in KOLOM 2. N.B. Er is in principe maar één code per zin mogelijk. Is onduidelijk met welke code een zin kan worden gecodeerd, omdat niet duidelijk is wat met de zin bedoeld wordt? Of weet je gewoon niet welke code je moet toekennen? Zet dan code N.C. in KOLOM 2. Voorbeeld: 8. beetje (.) beetje een onhandige man he. Deze zin heeft betrekking op een personage van de verhaalwereld. De code die wordt toegekend is dan code SW (Story World). Deze zin had in KOLOM 1 al code A en krijgt in KOLOM 2 dus code SW.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Omschrijving code</th>
<th>Definitie code</th>
<th>Voorbeeld van zin uit protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Story World (Verhaalwereld)</td>
<td>De wereld die in het verhaal wordt weergegeven en elementen daarvan, zoals de plaats en tijd waar het verhaal zich afspeelt, de personages, de gebeurtenissen die zich in deze wereld afspeLEN.</td>
<td>14. maar je ’t is toch toch wel duidelijk denk ik dat ie communicatief een beetje onhandig is. Deze opmerking geeft een verklaring (code E) over een personage uit de verhaalwereld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Kenmerken van de tekst, zoals een tekstfragment, een zin, of een woord, maar ook thema en beeldspraak (zoals metafoor).</td>
<td>7. ’t is in ieder geval heel erg of dat nu ook echt de eerste alinea uit ’t verhaal is of dat ’t dat weet ik niet heel exact nu maar ’t is in ieder geval aan ’t begin van ’t verhaal (.). Deze zin geeft associatie weer (code A) van een gedeelte van de gelezen tekst (alinea) met de rest van de tekst 11. dat dan weer allemaal zo(.) pedagogisch verantwoord uh afloopt Deze zin geeft een verklaring (code E) voor de manier waarop de tekst eindigt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Actual World (Echte wereld)</td>
<td>De wereld waarin de lezer en de onderzoeker etc. zich bevinden. De wereld waarin zij en wij leven.</td>
<td>2. ja van die ogen die worden geel dat dus gewoon in werkelijkheid niet kan (…) 10. of je wil eigenlijk ’t in ’t goede van de mens geloven of zoiets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>Author (Auteur, Schrijver)</td>
<td>De auteur/schrijver van de tekst die door de proefpersoon tijdens het onderzoek is gelezen. Het woord ‘auteur’ of ‘schrijver’ hoeft niet letterlijk genoemd te worden.</td>
<td>10. de manier waarop het geschreven is is zo gedetailleerd en ook uh (…) 1. ja d’r wordt in hele kleine scènes [???] iets te (.) van z’n persoonlijkheid uh iets bloot gegeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>No Code (geen code)</td>
<td>Wanneer geen enkele code kan worden toegekend aan een zin omdat bijvoorbeeld niet duidelijk is wat er door een proefpersoon wordt bedoeld, wordt de code ’no code’ aan een zin toegekend.</td>
<td>9. heeft wel meer uh [??] kan je niet zeggen maar beetje wel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAP 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Omschrijving code</th>
<th>Definitie code</th>
<th>Voorbeeld van zin uit protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>Reflection (Reflectie)</td>
<td>Opmerkingen in de zin van reflectie op het eigen lees- of denkproces van de lezer. De lezer geeft niet alleen zijn of haar gedachten weer maar reflecteert ook over de manier van</td>
<td>12. ja om omdat je weet dat ’t een stuk ergens uit is uh ja blijft dat maar een beetje door je hoofd malen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Omschrijving code</td>
<td>Definitie code</td>
<td>Voorbeeld van zin uit protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWHY</td>
<td>Question why (Waarom-vragen)</td>
<td>Opmerkingen in de vorm van een waarom - vraag.</td>
<td>1. ik zie ook direct de filmbeelden d’r bij he hier natuurlijk ook herhaaldelijk gebruikt de verfilming (.) 2. want ik ik zat echt te verwachten waar gaat ’t nou naar toe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWH</td>
<td>Question who, what, when... (Wie, wat,...vragen)</td>
<td>Opmerkingen in de vorm van een wat, hoe, waar, wanneer of wie -vraag. N.B. Vraagtekens ontbreken in de protocollen!!</td>
<td>8. de rede was om zenuwachtig te zijn en waarom dat uh natuurlijk was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Open Prediction (Open voorspelling)</td>
<td>Opmerkingen in de vorm van een open voorspelling: er wordt niet duidelijk gemaakt wat de lezer voorspelt, maar wel dat deze voorspelt dat er iets gaat gebeuren of nieuwsgerig is naar wat er gaat gebeuren.</td>
<td>7. dan ga je je natuurlijk wel afvragen wat dat is wat een avond als deze wat dat is 13. van nou ja wat hebben we wat zijn dat allemaal voor een mensen en wat is er aan vooraf gegaan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Reader Emotion (Emotie van de lezer)</td>
<td>Emotionele reacties van de lezer op de tekst of het verhaal of waardeoordelen.</td>
<td>12. daar vormt ie eigenlijk een mooi een mooi beeld 13. of wat iemand eigenlijk [lacht] dit eind (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Opmerkingen met betrekking tot de situatie waarin wordt gelezen, namelijk het deelnemen aan een onderzoek. Hiertoe behoren bijv. opmerkingen of vragen gericht aan de onderzoeker.</td>
<td>4. ja ik ben bij de volgende stip aangeland maar (.) 2. maar ik heb begrepen dat dat een stuk ergens uit uit een ja (.) 29. heeft ’t zin verder te lezen 21. ik uh ga verder 7. goed ik ik lees weer verder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>No Code (geen code)</td>
<td>Wanneer geen enkele code kan worden toegekend aan een zin omdat bijvoorbeeld niet duidelijk is wat er door een proefpersoon wordt bedoeld, wordt de code ‘ no code’ aan een zin toegekend.</td>
<td>9. heeft wel meer uh [??] kan je niet zeggen maar beetje wel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAP 4:**
Als code AUT is toegekend heeft de opmerking van de proefpersoon betrekking op de auteur. Is de code AUT nader te specificeren door het toekennen van code AUT+ of AUT-. Weet je gewoon niet welke code je moet toekennen, zet dan code N.C. in KOLOM 4. Op de zelfde hoogte staat dan code AUT in kolom 2.
Frequently Asked Questions: Is the code X of code Y?

1. Is the code A of E?

Voorbeeld

7. maar hier staat je wordt bedankt jongetje een rolletje snoep (..)
8. maar goed zal ie dus wel onder de tien zijn
9. maar als je ‘m hier weer hoort denken over en dit moet ik eigenlijk niet doen dan lijkt ie weer ouder (.)

Zin 7 is een paraphrase van een zin uit de gelezen tekst. Zin 8 geeft een verklaring weer van de zin (moet dus onder de tien zijn), terwijl in zin 9 een ander stukje tekst de associatie oproept van de leeftijd (een detail of kenmerk van het personage) van het personage, namelijk dat deze ouder lijkt dan dat de lezer aanvankelijk dacht.

2. Is the code SW or TE?

Voorbeeld

18. hij opent zich en er komt dan koude lucht uit
19. dat zegt dat weer over de kilte

In zin 18 wordt een stukje van de tekst geparafraseerd en vervolgens wordt er in zin 19 een verklaring gegeven van het betreffende fragment in de tekst. Zin 19 zegt niets over wat zich in het verhaal afspeelt, dus een verklaring waarom een personage bijv. zijn jas opent. De verklaring heeft betrekking op de tekst: wat zegt dat fragmentje nu precies? De proefpersoon probeert dat te verklaren door het fragment als een beeldspraak uit te leggen.

3. Is the code TE or AUT?

Voorbeeld

14. de verteller geeft hier duidelijk zijn mening weer
Hoewel je bij een verteller een tekst denkt aan een persoon, is de verteller strikt genomen deel van de tekst en niet gelijk aan de persoon van de schrijver of auteur van de tekst. In zin 14 is er dus sprake van code TE van tekst en niet AUT van auteur.

4. Is the code A or QWH?

Ga na of er een antwoord wordt gegeven op een wat, hoe, wanneer etc. vraag of dat er eerder een wat, hoe, wanneer etc. vraag wordt gesteld. Is het een antwoord, dan is het code A, is het een vraag, dan is het code QWH.

5. Is the code E or QWHY?

Ga na of er een antwoord wordt gegeven op een waarom-vraag of dat er eerder een waarom-vraag wordt gesteld. Is het een antwoord, dan is het code E, is het een vraag, dan is het code QWHY.

6. Is the code P or OP?

Ga na of er een antwoord wordt gegeven op een vraag als ‘wat gaat er straks verder gebeuren?’ of dat er eerder een dergelijke vraag wordt gesteld. Is het een antwoord, dan is het code P, is het een vraag, dan is het code OP.

APPENDIX C – RESULTS: INTERCODER RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT (KAPPA)

STEP 1: Determine the combinations of attributed codes to the columns by the two encoders.

For instance protocol, participant 1, text A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>SEGM</th>
<th>COL. 1A</th>
<th>COL. 1B</th>
<th>COL. 2A</th>
<th>COL. 2B</th>
<th>COL. 3A</th>
<th>COL. 3B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>ITYPE</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 2:** Count the number of combinations of attributed codes:

**Column 1 and 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>META META</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITYPE ITYPE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITYPE META</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. META</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEEN CODE</th>
<th>TE SW</th>
<th>SW SW</th>
<th>GEEN CODE SW</th>
<th>SW GEEN CODE</th>
<th>AUT SW</th>
<th>TE SW</th>
<th>AW SW</th>
<th>SW TE</th>
<th>TE TE</th>
<th>AW AW</th>
<th>GEEN CODE TE</th>
<th>N.C.SW</th>
<th>SW AUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 3:** Calculate Kappa (not displayed: a table with the frequencies)

\[
K = \frac{\text{(proportion corresponding} - \text{expected proportion corresponding)}}{\text{(1-expected proportion corresponding)}} = \frac{(0.793 - 0.268)}{\text{(1-0.268)}} = 0.72
\]
Appendix C – Results, Figure 2.a – Distribution of Types of Inferences

Figure 2.a Frequencies of types of inferences. E (73%) = explanatory, A (22%) = associative, and P (5%) = predictive.

Appendix C – Results, Figure 2.b – Distribution of Specifications Metacomment

Figure 2.b Frequencies of specifications Metacomment (absolute numbers). QWHY (13%) = why-questions, OP (10%) = open prediction, QWH (10%) = what, how and where questions, RE (13%) = reader emotions, REFL (40%) = reflection upon reader’s thinking and reading process, EXP (15%) = remarks referring to the setting viz. participating in an empirical study.

Appendix C – Results, Figure 2.c – Protocol segments that cause disagreement OBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>COD.</th>
<th>COD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>“hm ben benieuwd wat die Gabriel voor een rol in het hele verhaal speelt”</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>“die uh wordt zo beschreven en gedaan ennuh”</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>“ja toch vanaf het begin af aan eigenlijk uh (...) ja (...).”</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>“een punt van belang zeg maar dat ie moet komen en dat ie nu ja (...)”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>“wordt ie in tien regels helemaal uitvoerig beschreven (...).”</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>“dus uh ja”</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borges</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>“‘t gaat over een uh toneelspeler en dat is sowieso iemand die ‘t natuurlijk moeilijk heeft met uh identiteit ennuh (...).”</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>“die dan ook nog eens gedwongen wordt om uh rollen van anderen te spelen ennuh maskers op te zetten ennuh dan bang is dat daar dat daar achter uh niks uh schuilt”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>“of nou dat blijkt ook inderdaad uh ne niks te zijn”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>“want ‘t begint al met nie niemand was in hem”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jong</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>“uhm (...) ja volgens mij is ‘t een beetje allererste begin van de tweede wereldoorlog een beetje maar ‘t ug (...) dat idee heb ik”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>“maar ja ‘t is wel 1933 da weer wel ver van 1940 af maar f ja (...).”</td>
<td>META</td>
<td>META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>“Hitler is dus blijkbaar al in de picture dus uh ja volgens mij uh ja (...).”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>“is er dus daar dan uh (...) bedacht dat die Hitler dus Rei Reichskanselier zou worden en de heer van Papen”</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>“mat staat er dan vertrouwde als {vice kanselier} nagenoeg evenveel reëlle”</td>
<td>PARA</td>
<td>PARA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maakt te zullen krijgen
maar in die zin spreekt er al een beetje uit dat het dus waarschijnlijk niet zo gaat
verlopen
1.7 dus ug (.) ja dat uh denk ik

3.1 hm hier staat gewoon uhm ja beetje stukje geschiedenis over Hitler (..)
3.2 uhm wat niet waarin ie niet erg uh positief uh naar voren komt ennuh
3.3 op ‘t eind staat dus dat hij dan du dan aan ‘t hoofd komt van een nieuwe
regering
3.4 dus dat is dus niet echt uh gunstig (.)
3.5 maar volgens mij is dit stukje voornamelijk een beetje (. ) verduidelijking
over uh Hitler
5.1 nou ‘t laatste stukje is toch een beetje de (. ) anti-climax (.)
5.2 d’r wordt uh nou ja d’r wordt heel groots over ’m gesproken
5.3 als God ooit een zoon heeft gehad dan is ‘t Hitler
5.4 nou ja dat is wel uh beetje erg uh
5.5 en dan uh komt de laatste alinea toch de anti-climax
5.6 dat dat ‘t uiteindelijk allemaal in mekaar stort ennuh (.)
5.7 dat ie uh in een naamloos graf uh eindigt (…)
5.8 nou dat denk ik erbij (lacht)

Figure 2.c. Protocol segments that cause disagreement OBJECT

Appendix C – Results questionnaire: items with regard to text evaluation

Table 2.a Frequencies of text evaluation items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Literary</th>
<th>Narrator visibility</th>
<th>Image author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>intention*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>neutral*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>intention*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = expert reader. Scales: 1 totally agree through 4 totally disagree. Statements were formulated as “I find the narrator in the text that I just read visible” (see items 1-4 in the questionnaire)


A (-,-): both narrator and character have a negative stance towards the Islam

Despelchin zette zijn kopje naast zich neer en rechthe zijn rug. Hij zei nu aan het einde van zijn betoog te komen en sprak de volgende woorden: “Ik ben overtuigd van het inherent kwaadaardige karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook, en in het bijzonder van de islam”. Hij leek de reactie van zijn bezoekers niet af te willen wachten en liep zonder iets te zeggen naar de keuken.

Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden en moest hem gelijk geven. De islam - van alle godsdiensten verreweg de domste, de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische – lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen, maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur is de islam ten dode opgeschreven, meer nog dan het christendom.

B (+,+): both narrator and character have a positive negative stance towards the Islam

Despelchin zette zijn kopje naast zich neer en rechthe zijn rug. Hij zei nu aan het einde van zijn betoog te komen en sprak de volgende woorden: “Ik ben overtuigd van het inherent vreedzame karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook, en in het bijzonder van de islam”. Hij leek de reactie van zijn bezoekers niet af te willen wachten en liep zonder iets te zeggen naar de keuken.

Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden en moest hem ongelijk geven. De islam - van alle godsdiensten verreweg de slimste, de meest geloofwaardige en de meest visionaire – lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen, en dat is geen oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur heeft de islam net als het christendom het eeuwige leven.

C (-,+): the character has a negative and the narrator has a positive negative stance towards the Islam

Despelchin zette zijn kopje naast zich neer en rechthe zijn rug. Hij zei nu aan het einde van zijn betoog te komen en sprak de volgende woorden: “Ik ben overtuigd van het inherent kwaadaardige karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook, en in het bijzonder van de islam”. Hij leek de reactie van zijn bezoekers niet af te willen wachten en liep zonder iets te zeggen naar de keuken.

Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden en moest hem ongelijk geven. De islam - van alle godsdiensten verreweg de slimste, de meest geloofwaardige en de meest visionaire – lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen, en dat is geen oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur heeft de islam net als het christendom het eeuwige leven.

D (+,-): the character has a positive and the narrator has a negative negative stance towards the Islam

Despelchin zette zijn kopje naast zich neer en rechthe zijn rug. Hij zei nu aan het einde van zijn betoog te komen en sprak de volgende woorden: “Ik ben overtuigd van het inherent vreedzame karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook, en in het bijzonder van de islam”. Hij leek de reactie van zijn bezoekers niet af te willen wachten en liep zonder iets te zeggen naar de keuken.

Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden en moest hem ongelijk geven. De islam - van alle godsdiensten verreweg de domste, de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische – lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen, maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard: op de lange duur is de islam ten dode opgeschreven, meer nog dan het christendom.


Beste deelnemer,

Je krijgt zo dadelijk een passage te lezen uit een literaire tekst. Lees de passage op je gemak en in je eigen tempo. Na het lezen volgen enkele inhoudelijke vragen over de tekst.

Je krijgt nu enkele vragen over de passage die je zojuist gelezen hebt. Ik wil je vragen de betreffende vragen te beantwoorden zonder terug te bladeren naar de tekst. Het is niet belangrijk of je een vraag juist of onjuist beantwoordt, belangrijk is dat je de vragen beantwoordt op grond van wat je in je hoofd hebt over de gelezen passage.

(Omcirkel je antwoord)

1. Heb je tijdens of na het lezen je afgevraagd wie de auteur van de tekst is?
a. Ja, dat komt doordat........................

b. Nee, dat komt doordat..................

2. Heb je tijdens of na het lezen je afgevraagd welke mening de auteur van de tekst zou hebben ten aanzien van de islam?

a. Ja, dat komt doordat...................

b. Nee, dat komt doordat..................

Hieronder zijn verschillende stellingen weergegeven. Kun je aangeven in hoeverre de genoemde (fictieve) personen het volgens jou eens zijn met de betreffende stelling?

*Omcirkel je antwoord.*

Indien je aangeeft dat een persoon het eens of oneens is met de opvatting, kun je dan aangeven of je hier zeker van bent of onzeker over bent?

### Stelling 1:
De islam zal niet lang meer bestaan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persoon</th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auteur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stelling 2:
Elke godsdienst is in wezen slecht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persoon</th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auteur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stelling 3:
De islam is een leugenachtige godsdienst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persoon</th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auteur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stelling 4:
Alle christenen moeten zich bekeren tot de islam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persoon</th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auteur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stelling 5:
De islam is inherent slecht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persoon</th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stelling 6:
De islam de slimste en meest geloofwaardige godsdienst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Is het eens</th>
<th>Is het oneens</th>
<th>Weet ik niet</th>
<th>Zeker</th>
<th>Onzeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Desplechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Auteur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De volgende vragen betreffen opvattingen die in de passage kunnen zijn weergegeven. Kun je aangeven wie volgens jou de weergegeven opvatting heeft? Omcirkel je antwoord.

Vraag 1:
Volgens wie is de islam ten dode opgeschreven?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Vraag 2:
Wie is overtuigd van het inherent vreedzame karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Vraag 3:
Volgens wie is de islam de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische godsdienst?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Vraag 4:
Volgens wie moeten alle christenen zich bekeren tot de islam?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Vraag 5:
Wie is overtuigd van het inherent kwaadaardige karakter van welke godsdienst dan ook?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Vraag 6:
Volgens wie is de islam de slimste en meest geloofwaardige godsdienst?

a. Desplechin
b. De verteller [de ik-persoon]
c. Geen van beide
d. Weet ik niet [meer]

Je krijgt nu een tweede passage te lezen uit een literaire tekst. Lees de passage wederom op je gemak en in je eigen tempo. Na het lezen volgen enkele inhoudelijke vragen over de tekst.

1. Heb je een idee uit welke literaire tekst de fragmenten afkomstig zouden kunnen zijn?
   a. Nee
   b. Ja, namelijk……………….. 

2. Heb je nog opmerkingen over het onderzoekje zelf (formulering van vragen, opzet, etc.)?

Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking aan dit onderzoekje!

APPENDIX B – PILOT STUDY – RESULTS: RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Text A (-, -)</th>
<th>Text B (+, +)</th>
<th>Text C (-, +)</th>
<th>Text D (+, -)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
<td>(Dis) Don't agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 55 11 54</td>
<td>9 21 5 13</td>
<td>8.3% 91.7% 16.7% 81.8% 25% 58.3% 16.7% 43.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages missing</td>
<td>0% 1.5% 15.6% 16.7% 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B – PILOT STUDY – RESULTS: QUALITATIVE

Question: Heb je je tijdens het lezen afgevraagd wie de auteur van de tekst is?

Ja, dat komt doordat…

Tekst A (-, -), N = 10: De naam van dat personage me deed afvragen of ik de tekst en dus ook de auteur kon plaatsen/ De stijl van de tekst met sterk aan twee van mijn favorieten doet denken: ofwel Celine ofwel Houellebecq, geen idee of t klopt/ er een mening wordt verkondigd die duidelijk betrekking heeft op de huidige maatschappij en je vraagt je af in welke context de schrijver deze mening hier presenteert en in hoeverre de schrijver ook in bijvoorbeeld de media een bepaalde mening verkondigt/ De boude uitspraken over de islam: wie legt zijn/ haar personages die in de mond?/[door] de naam Despelchin –ik vroeg me af of het een Russische roman was dementia over de islam als domste, meest leugenachtige godsdienst/ dat in zeker zin een beroepsdefinitie is (m.a.w.: ik kan het niet helpen)/ opm: ik weet wie de auteur is dus heb e dat niet afgevraagd, maar je zou het je in principe wel gaan afvragen door de nogal extreme uitspraken van de personages.
Tekst B (+,+), N = 11: Ik wil weten wat het perspectief is van de passage/ ik de naam van de protagonist vreemd vond. Dus heb ik even geprobeerd de tekst en daarmee de auteur ervan in een culturele context thuis te brengen/ door de vreemde naam van de persoon in het fragment en door het onderwerp (godsdienst)/ ik dacht dat het Houellebecq was, maar die heb ik nog niet gelezen, dus ik weet het niet zeker / ik ben als ik lees bewust of onbewust aan het zoeken naar een referentiekader. Ken ik deze auteur, heb ik eerder iets van hem of haar gelezen of heb ik in een krant of tijdschrift iets over hem/haar gelezen?/ de gebeurtenissen van/na 11 september

Tekst C (x, +), N = 6: er zo’n duidelijke overgang was van een beschrijving van hoe een situatie was geweest en daarna wat die voor de Ik-persoon betekend heeft/ Ik weet dat je met auteursintenties bezig bent voor je onderzoek (sorry: da’s denk ik niet het antwoord wat je wil hebben)/ de inhoud nu door de actualiteit nogal wat vragen oproept/ ja, aan het begin van de tekst, vanwege die naam: Desplechin./ Dat komt doordat ik de naam van de hoofdpersoon opvallend vind en me doet denken aan een ander boek waar ik nu natuurlijk niet op kan komen. Ben dus benieuwd of dat ergens op slaat en als dat zo is, dan zou de naam van de auteur me verder moeten kunnen helpen/ het een zeer uitgesproken mening geeft/ Ik de meen te herkennen uit ‘Elementaire Deeltjes’ van Houellebecq (?)

Nee, dat komt doordat

Tekst A (-,-), N = 10: ik meer met de personages bezig was.

Tekst B (+,+), N = 11: de aandacht vooral uitgaat naar Desplesin/ het op een fictief literair fragment lijkt/de tekst daartoe geen aanleiding geeft /ik in beslag genomen werd door de inhoud.

Tekst C (-,+), N = 6: het een kort fragment betrof en ik eerder aan de inhoud dan aan de mogelijke schrijver dacht.

Tekst D (+, -), N = 5: -

Question: Heb je je tijdens of na het lezen afgevraagd welke mening de auteur van de tekst zou hebben ten aanzien van de Islam?

Ja, dat komt doordat…

Tekst A (-,-), N = 10: Zulke radicale uitspraken worden gedaan, zo duidelijk niet politiek correct, dat de mening (de tegenovergesteld zou je kunnen zeggen) zich aan je opdringt/ Er een mening wordt verkondigd die duidelijk betrekking heeft op de huidige maatschappij en je vraagt je af in welke context de schrijver deze mening hier presenteert en in hoeverre de schrijver ook in bijvoorbeeld de media een bepaalde mening verkondigt / Als je dat doet dan moet je er zelf ook een uitgesproken mening over hebben ofwel zoals Dechelpin en verteller, of juist tegenovergesteld./ het daarover gaat! Zo expliciet/ de personages er zo negatief over zijn ik vraag me af of zij verder als sympathiek of onsympathiek worden uitgebeeld (dus: staat de auteur achter deze standpunten of wil hij ze aan de kaak stellen?)/de felle bewoordingen van de ik-persoon over de islam als domste, meest leugenachtige godsdienst.

Tekst B (+,+), N = 11: Eveneens ik benieuwd ben naar het kader/ De laatste zin daar aanleiding toe geeft/ er bijna apodictisch wordt beweerd dat de islam werkelijk superieur is. Die stelling klinkt zo normatief dat ze vrij intrigerend werkt. Ik bedoel dat je je gaat afvragen: hoe kan de narrateur zoiets zo zelfverzekerd beweren? En de vraag die dan opkomt, is: wat betoocht de auteur daarmee/? de gebeurtenissen van/na 11 september

Tekst C (-,+), N = 6: hij duidelijk een eigen mening had over religie in het algemeen en daarbij over de Islam; deze mening stelde hij tegenover die van degene die hij in de eerste regels beschrijft./ je niet weet of de auteur ‘sprekend’ of een fictief personage/ ja, in het fragment worden tenslotte twee (ongelijksoortige) visies op religie gegeven. Ik vraag me af welke visie van de auteur is.

Tekst D (+, -), N = 5: -

Nee, dat komt doordat

Tekst A (-,-), N = 10: Nee, dat komt doordat ik bij het lezen van een stuk fictie niet direct geïnteresseerd ben in de auteur zijn mening, maar in de [evt coherentie en kracht van de] mening van de personages. T zal mij een zorg zijn wat de auteur vindt als zijn personages maar sterke figuren zijn/ Of nee: want die mening staat er al expliciet in, dus dat vraag ik me niet meer af/ ik vooral op de tekst lette (de inhoud) en niet keek naar de bovenliggende laag v.d. auteur/ zie 1b + ik heb bij het lezen van fictie eigenlijk de neiging ontwikkeld om de auteur buiten mijn beschouwing te laten. Hiervan word ik me eigenlijk pas door jouw vraag bewust…
Tekst B (+, +), N = 11: de mening van het personage al duidelijk genoeg is/de tekst niet opmerkelijk retorisch is /geen idee/ niet zozeer de mening van de auteur intrigeert, maar de manier waarop hij/zij de meningen uit het fragment staat (of niet)/ ik weet niet waarmoe niet/i vraag me tijdens het lezen van fictie eigenlijk zelden af wat de auteur zelf denkt. In een boek worden meestal meerdere visies geuit, ik vraag me eerder af met welke ik het zelf eens ben dan wat de auteur denkt.

Tekst C (+, +), N = 6: Dit in de tweede alinea duidelijk wordt (na de eerste alinea vroeg ik me dat wel af)/ het voor mijn gevoel duidelijk ging om personages in een tekstfragment, die niet hoeven te stroken met de persoon van de auteur/ Nee daar heb ik niet aan gedacht. Ik weet niet waarom.

Tekst D (+, -), N = 5: Dat wel duidelijk is/I meer aandacht besteedde aan Desplechin en de ik-persoon/ Personages in een boek bijna nooit gelijk stel aan de auteur (tenzij ik daar een goede aanleiding voor heb). En dan vind ik de mening van een personage belangrijker dan die van de auteur, eerlijk gezegd.

APPENDIX C – EXPERIMENT – MATERIALS: TEXTS

Original text excerpts from:

BASELINE TEXT
Changes that were made to the original text (p. 197-198) are crossed out and additions are put between brackets

[Van Dijk vertelde me dat] Z[ze] hadden afgesproken in een café in de rue de l'Université. De uitgever kwam tien minuten te laat, zwaaiend met het sigarettenp pijpje waar hij later beroemd om zou worden. 'Zit u in de provincie? Dat is fout. U moet meteen naar Parijs komen. U hebt talent.' Hij kondigde Bruno [Van Dijk] aan dat hij de tekst over Johannes Paulus II in het volgende nummer van L’Infini zou publiceren. Bruno [Van Dijk] was sprakeloos; hij wist niet dat Sollers midden in zijn periode van ‘katholieke contrareformatie’ zat en grossierde in enthousiaste adhesiebetrugingen aan het adres van de paus. 'Péguy, daar ga ik van uit mijn bol,' zei de uitgever vol vuur. 'En Sade! Sade! Lees vooral Sade!…'

‘Mijn tekst over het gezin…’


‘Toen het uitkwam,’ vervolgde Bruno [Van Dijk], ‘heb ik toch vijf exemplaren van L’Infini gekocht. Gelukkig hadden ze niet de tekst over Johannes Paulus II gepubliceerd.’ Hij zuchtte. ‘Dat was echt een slechte tekst… Heb je nog wijn?’ [, vroeg hij mij.]

‘Mijn tekst over het gezin is nooit gepubliceerd, hetgeen jammer is. Ik schreef erin dat kinderen de relatie tussen man en vrouw verpesten en dat alle zwangere vrouwen moesten worden geaborteerd’, zei Van Dijk.

Nadat Van Dijk was weggegaan, was ik blijkbaar in een soort van alcoholroes terechtgekomen. Ik werd twee uur later uit gewekt door het gekrijs van mijn zoon. Tussen het tweede en vierde levensjaar worden menselijke kinderen zich in toenemende mate bewust van hun ik, wat soms tot buien leidt waarin ze graag hun zin willen krijgen. Ik pakte de bezoedelde luier en gooide hem op het parket; de stank was doordringend. Ik schoot mijn jack aan en ging naar Madison, een vriend die in de buurt woonde. Met mijn pinpas betaalde ik vijftien franc in een avondwinkel voor een fles Bordeaux, die ik deelde met mijn vriend en zijn vriendin, een heel knappe blondine. Ze glimlachte naar me en aaide me vriendelijk plagend over mijn hoofd. Ze heette Hélène, kwam uit de streek en volgde een toeristische opleiding; ze was negentien.

Een uur later besloot ik weer naar huis te gaan. Anne stond versteend naast het bedje van onze zoon. Victor bleek niet meer te ademen. Ik dacht bij mezelf ‘het lot is me gunstig gestemd’ en glimlachte.
APPENDIX C – EXPERIMENT – MATERIALS: QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE PRETEST/POSTTEST CONDITIONS

PAGE 1

Een paar woorden ter inleiding
Je gaat meedoen aan een onderzoek waarin je twee korte tekstfragmenten te lezen krijgt. Daarnaast worden er enkele vragen gesteld, waarin je mening wordt gevraagd over de tekst. Het onderzoek duurt in totaal ongeveer 20 minuten.

Introductie bij het eerste tekstfragment
BESTE LEZER,
Lees de onderstaande tekst op je gemak, in het tempo waarin je normaal leest. Na de tekst volgen enkele vragen, waarin je mening wordt gevraagd.

Zie volgende pagina

PAGE 2

Tekstfragment 1

[BASELINE TEXT]

Zie voor de vragen de volgende pagina

PAGE 3 AND 4

Je mag bij het beantwoorden van de vragen, als je wilt, terughalen naar het tekstfragment dat je zojuist hebt gelezen.

DE VRAGEN

1. Welke gedachten kwamen er tijdens en na het lezen van de tekst in je op?

..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

2a. Heb je je tijdens of na het lezen van de tekst afgevraagd wie de schrijver is van de tekst? (maak het rondje van je keuze zwart):

Ja 0
Nee 0

2b. Kun je je antwoord toelichten?

..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

3a. Heb je je tijdens of na het lezen afgevraagd wat de schrijver met de tekst zou willen bereiken? (maak het rondje van je keuze zwart):

Ja 0
Nee 0

3b. Kun je je antwoord toelichten?

..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

4. Geef je mening op de volgende stellingen (omcirkel het getal van je keuze):

a. Normaal gesproken ga ik er vanuit dat de schrijver een moreel acceptabel persoon is.
De vragen

1. Welke gedachten kwamen er tijdens en na het lezen van de tekst (fragment 2) in je op?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2a. Heb je je tijdens of na het lezen van de tekst afgevraagd wie de schrijver is van de tekst? (maak het rondje van je keuze zwart):

Ja 0
2b. Kun je je antwoord toelichten?

……………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………….

3a. Heb je je tijdens of na het lezen afgevraagd wat de schrijver met de tekst zou willen bereiken? (maak het rondje van je keuze zwart):

Ja 0
Nee 0

3b. Kun je je antwoord toelichten?

……………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………….

4. Geef je mening op de volgende stellingen (omcirkel het getal van je keuze):

a. Normaal gesproken ga ik er vanuit dat de schrijver een moreel acceptabel persoon is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>helemaal mee eens</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>helemaal mee oneens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. In de tekst die ik gelezen heb, zie ik geen aanleiding om iets anders te denken dan dat de schrijver een moreel acceptabel persoon is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>helemaal mee eens</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>helemaal mee oneens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. In hoeverre geeft de tekst aanleiding om de morele positie van de schrijver ter discussie te stellen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alle aanleiding</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>geen enkele aanleiding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Wat vind je van de tekst?

a. Ik vind de tekst…(omcirkel het getal van je keuze):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heel interessant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>helemaal niet interessant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heel complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>helemaal niet complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel saai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>helemaal niet saai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel boeiend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>helemaal niet boeiend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel moeilijk te</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>helemaal niet moeilijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begrijpen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>te begrijpen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helemaal in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>helemaal niet in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overeenstemming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>overeenstemming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met mijn moraal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>met mijn moraal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Hoe aannemelijk is het dat je het gelezen fragment tegenkomt in een literaire roman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heel aannemelijk</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>helemaal niet aannemelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. Ik vind de schrijver van de tekst…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>moreel geheel acceptabel</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>moreel ge heel verwerpelijk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. Ik keur de uitspraken van het personage Van Dijk…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>volledig af</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>in het geheel niet af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

e. Ik vind de uitspraken van het personage Van Dijk…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heel schokkend</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>helemaal niet schokkend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
f. Ik keur de handelingen en het gedrag van de ik-persoon…

volledig af 1 2 3 4 5 in het geheel niet af

g. Ik vind handelingen en het gedrag van de ik-persoon…

heel schokkend 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal niet schokkend

6a. Ik zou me enigszins generen om anderen te vertellen dat ik het boek waar dit fragment uit komt goed vind.

helemaal mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal mee oneens

6b. Ik zou me enigszins generen om anderen te vertellen dat ik de schrijver van het boek waar dit fragment uit komt goed vind.

helemaal mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal mee oneens

7a. Er komen in tekstfragment 2 situaties voor, die moreel verwerpelijk zijn.

helemaal mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal mee oneens

7b. Indien je het helemaal of gedeeltelijk eens bent met de stelling, onderstreep dan in tekstfragment 2 wat jij moreel verwerpelijk vindt.

8a. Er komen in tekstfragment 1 situaties voor, die moreel verwerpelijk zijn.

helemaal mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal mee oneens

8b. Indien je het helemaal of gedeeltelijk eens bent met de stelling, onderstreep dan in tekstfragment 1 wat jij moreel verwerpelijk vindt.

9. Heb je nog overige opmerkingen?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Tot slot nog drie korte vragen:

a. Mijn leeftijd is …..jaar
b. Ik ben 0 man
   0 vrouw
   c. Ik ben …e jaars student…………………

Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking!

EXTRA QUESTIONS FOR THE POST ONLY CONDITIONS

9. Wat vind je, na het lezen van beide tekstfragmenten, van de schrijver?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Geef aan wat jouw beeld is van de schrijver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bedachtzaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vrouw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introvert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extravert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behulpzaam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>onverschillig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ondeugend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>braaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>behoudend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>slim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In hoeverre ben je het eens met onderstaande stellingen?

11a. Ik ken meer schrijvers van literatuur die moreel acceptabel zijn, dan schrijvers van literatuur die moreel verwerpelijk zijn.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

11b. Kun je een voorbeeld geven van een schrijver van literatuur die je moreel verwerpelijk vindt?

0  Ja, namelijk……..  0  Nee

11c. Indien je ‘ja’ hebt geantwoord, kun je dan toelichten waarom je de betreffende schrijver moreel verwerpelijk vindt?

………………………………………………
………………………………………………

12. Als ik een boek lees waarin een moreel verwerpelijk personage voorkomt, dan vraag ik me af of de schrijver het eens is met dat personage.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

13. Ik lees het liefst romans die afwijken van de heersende normen en waarden.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

14. Romans die geen prikkelende visie uitdragen vind ik saai.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

15. Ik denk dat de schrijver van tekstfragment 2 het gedrag van de ik-persoon goed keurt.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

16. De schrijver van de tekst die je hebt gelezen, heeft in een interview het volgende gezegd:

   “Vrouwen vertonen vanaf een bepaalde leeftijd de behoefte een kind te krijgen. Ze zijn op zoek naar een affectieve band, ze willen van iemand houden. Dat geldt niet voor mannen: het grootste gedeelte van de tijd doen zij maar alsof. De vaderfiguur wordt in onze tijd steeds meer overbodig”.

a. Wat is jouw mening over de volgende stelling?

Nu ik kennis heb genomen van de uitspraken van de schrijver, denk ik sterker dat de schrijver het gedrag van de ik-persoon goedkeurt, dan voordat ik had kennis genomen van de uitspraken.

helemaal mee eens  1  2  3  4  5  helemaal mee oneens

b. Kun je je antwoord toelichten?

………………………………………………
………………………………………………
Je hebt zojuist meegedaan aan een onderzoek. Hieronder volgt enige uitleg over het doel van het onderzoek, en het belang van je bijdrage.

**Het doel van het onderzoek**

Heb je tijdens het lezen van een literaire roman wel eens afgevraagd wat de schrijver van de tekst beoogt met zijn of haar werk? Of hij of zij het eens is met wat een personage zegt? Zo ja, wat precies in de tekst stuit eigenlijk dergelijke overpeinzingen?

Het doel van mijn promotieproject is een antwoord te vinden op deze en andere vragen. Centraal staat de vraag ‘Genereren lezers van literaire teksten met een ethische lading tijdens het leesproces auteursinferenties?’ Anders geformuleerd: leggen lezers tijdens het lezen van dergelijke teksten (in cognitieve zin) verbanden met de schrijver?

Het onderzoek waaraan jij hebt deelgenomen, heeft tot doel na te gaan of immoraliteit het leggen van dergelijke verbanden beïnvloedt. Indien de verteller van een tekst een immoreel standpunt inneemt, vraag je je dan als lezer af of de schrijver achter de opvatting van de verteller staat? Denk je over het algemeen dat de schrijver in morele zin ‘o.k.’ is? Deze vragen hoop ik aan de hand dit onderzoek te beantwoorden.

**Belang van het onderzoek en bijdrage van proefpersonen**

Literatuurwetenschappers hebben veel gediscussieerd over de vraag of de schrijver bij het interpreteren van een tekst wel mag worden betrokken. Of de schrijver in het leesproces van de ‘gewone’ lezer wordt betrokken is echter nauwelijks onderzocht. Theorievorming hierover is dan ook van belang, net als toetsing van voorspellingen die op grond van een theorie kunnen worden gedaan. Empirisch onderzoek is noodzakelijk, omdat op die manier kan worden onderzocht of lezers ook daadwerkelijk de voorspelde processen genereren. Jij bent zo’n lezer, en derhalve is jouw bijdrage van groot belang voor dit onderzoek.

**De opzet**

In dit onderzoek zijn de proefpersonen verdeeld in twee groepen. De ene groep heeft een versie gelezen van een tekstfragment met een immorele verteller en personage, de andere groep heeft een versie gelezen van een tekstfragment met een relatief neutrale verteller en personage. Als het goed is verschillen de antwoorden op de vragen m.b.t. de schrijver tussen de twee groepen (significant). Simpel gezegd hoop ik te concluderen dat groep 1 meer aan de auteur heeft gedacht dan groep 2.

Wie meer informatie wil ontvangen, reacties kwijt wil, of -indien de resultaten bekend zijn - een kort verslag wil ontvangen, kan contact opnemen.

Vriendelijke groet,

Drs. E.H.P.M. (Eefje) Claassen
De Boelelaan 1105 (kamer 8A31)
1081 HV Amsterdam
tel. 020-4446567
e-mail: e.claassen@let.vu.nl

---

**Appendix D – Experiment – Results: Reliability Tests – Cronbach’s Alpha (SPSS Output)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Analysis - Scale (Alpha)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AFNDEF1</td>
<td>2,4845</td>
<td>8306</td>
<td>97,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AFDEF2</td>
<td>2,6392</td>
<td>9594</td>
<td>97,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AUTMOR</td>
<td>2,6289</td>
<td>6819</td>
<td>97,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statistics for Inter-item Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3031</td>
<td>0.2231</td>
<td>0.3655</td>
<td>0.1424</td>
<td>1.6384</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item-total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8235</td>
<td>7.9213</td>
<td>2.8145</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-item Correlations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Max/Min</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.439</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>6.475</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1.4525</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reliability Coefficients

- **3 items**
  - Alpha = 0.5604
  - Standardized item alpha = 0.5661

### I. POSTTEST MEASUREMENTS - ITEMS 4B, 4C AND 5C OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE (AUTHOR’S MORAL POSITION)

#### Reliability Analysis - Scale (Alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5765</td>
<td>4.4468</td>
<td>170,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.i

Significant results of paired t tests for within subjects measurements for the pretest/posttest conditions

- **Condition Immoral**
- **Condition Moral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Condition Immoral</th>
<th>Condition Moral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from default</td>
<td>M1= 2.44, M2 = 3.76</td>
<td>M1= 2.56, M2 = 3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text gives no reason to think...</td>
<td>t = -8.51, p &lt; .001</td>
<td>t = -3.26, p &lt; .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author's moral position</td>
<td>M1= 2.64, M2 = 3.58</td>
<td>M1= 2.62, M2 = 3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.ii
Means for “The second text segment contains situations that are morally reprehensible”
Scale ranging from 1 “totally agree” to 5 “totally disagree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest/posttest (N=94)</th>
<th>Posttest only (N=70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral text condition</td>
<td>(N=85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.53, SD = .91</td>
<td>1.53, SD = .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral text condition</td>
<td>(N=79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.29, SD = 1.41</td>
<td>2.32, SD = 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N = 164</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### APPENDIX D – EXPERIMENT – RESULTS: MARKED TEXT SEGMENTS

Immoral Text version (conditie I and III)*

*N = 49 + 36 = 85, N = 75 responded “totally agree”, minus N=4 missing = 71

‘Mijn tekst over het gezin is nooit gepubliceerd, hetgeen jammer is [1]. Ik schreef erin dat kinderen de relatie tussen man en vrouw verpesten [17 + 4 = 21 = 30%] en dat alle zwangere vrouwen maar [25 + 9 = 34 = 48%] moesten worden geaborteerd [26 + 9 = 34 = 48%]’. zei Van Dijk.


Neutral Text version
(conditie II and IV)*
*N = 45 + 34 = 79, N = 55 responded (totally) agree, no minus values

‘Mijn tekst over het gezin is nooit gepubliceerd, hetgeen jammer is. Ik schreef erin dat kinderen de relatie tussen man en vrouw sterk beïnvloeden [+1] en dat alle zwangere vrouwen daarover maar moesten worden voorgesproken [+1].


Een uur later besloot ik weer naar huis te gaan [1 + 1]. Anne stond naast het bedje van onze zoon [+1]. Victor bleek nog te slapen [1 + 3]. [Ik dacht bij mezelf] ‘het lot is me gunstig gestemd’ [13 + 8 = 21 = 38%] en glimlachte [6 + 6].
CHAPTER 4 ON-LINE MEASUREMENTS OF AUTHOR INFERENCESTHROUGH AFFECTIVE PRIMING I

APPENDIX A – PILOT STUDIES: TEXT PRIMES – TEXT FRAGMENTS

Gesegmenteerde Teksten

OefentekstGrisham01.txt
[Ik smeet de gids door de kamer,] [bijna tegen de Sony televisie,] [en pakte gelaten Advocaat van de duivel van John Grisham op,] [Het was een Amerikaanse bestseller,] [een van de beste - ] [dat wil zeggen een van de bestverkochte.] Probe [De held was een jonge, veelbelovende advocaat,] [een briljante, mooie jongen die negentig uur per week werkte;] [niet alleen was dat prul schaamteloos geschreven om te worden verfilmd,] [je voelde ook dat de auteur al over de casting had nagedacht,] [dat het duidelijk als een rol voor Tom Cruise was bedoeld.] Probe

OefentekstBoeddhisme02.txt
[In het oranje licht leken de kalkrotsen bijna zwart.] [De laatste zwemmers kwamen terug met een badhanddoek in de hand.] [Omspringend in het warme water,] [op een paar meter van de oever,] [lag een stelletje te vieren.] [De stralen van de ondergaande zon weerkaatsten halverwege het vergulde dak van een pagode.] [In de vredige avondlucht sloeg een klok een paar keer achtereen.] Probe [Het is een boeddhistisch gebruik om als je een goede daad of een verdienstelijke handeling hebt verricht,] [die te herdenken door een klok van een tempel te laten luiden,] [vrolijk is de religie die de lucht doet weergalm van de menselijke getuigenis van goede daden.] Probe

OefentekstMarriott03.txt
[Ik werd tegen twaalven wakker,] [de airco bracht een laag gebrom voort;] [mijn hoofdpijn was minder geworden.] [Ik lag dwars op het kingsize bed] [en liet mijn gedachten gaan over het verloop van de rondreis en wat daarbij op het spel stond.] Probe [Ik liep naar het raam en trok de gordijnen wagenwijd open.] [Vanaf de zevenentwintigste verdieping was het uitzicht spectaculair.] Probe [Links verhief de indrukwekkende massa van hotel Marriott zich als een krijtrots,] [van zwarte horizontale strepen voorzien door rijen ramen] [die voor de helft schuilgingen achter de balkons.]

EXPAbortie01.txt
[‘Mijn tekst over het gezin is nooit gepubliceerd,] [hetgeen jammer is.] Probe (filler) [Ik schreef erin dat kinderen de relatie tussen man en vrouw verpesten] [en dat alle zwangere vrouwen maar moesten worden geaborteerd,] [zei ik tegen Desplechin] Probe [Hoewel dat er eigenlijk niets mee te maken heeft,] [speelde misschien het conflict,] [dat ik ooit had met de hoofdredacteur van het tijdschrift,] [wel een doorslaggevende rol bij de beslissing om het artikel niet te publiceren.]

‘ContAbortie01.txt
[‘Mijn tekst over het gezin is nooit gepubliceerd,] [hetgeen jammer is.] Probe (filler) [Ik schreef erin dat kinderen de relatie tussen man en vrouw positief beïnvloeden] [en dat alle zwangere vrouwen daarover wellicht moesten worden beloond,] [zei ik tegen Desplechin.] Probe [Hoewel dat er eigenlijk niets mee te maken heeft,] [speelde het conflict,] [dat ik ooit had met de hoofdredacteur van het tijdschrift,] [wel een doorslaggevende rol bij de beslissing om het artikel niet te publiceren.]

ExpLuier02.txt
[Ik stond op van het tapijt in de woonkamer. ] [Het gekrijs verhevigde,] [het verried een razende woede.] Probe (filler) [Ik plette twee Valium-tabletten in wat jam] [en ging naar Victors kamer.] [Het kind had gepoept.] [Ik pakte de bezoedelde luier] [en gooide hem op het parket;] [de stank was niet te harden.] [Het kind slikte probleemloos het mengsel door] [en verstijfte,] [alsof het door een klap was geveld.] [Ik liep tevreden zijn kamer uit,] Probe [en ging weer in de woonkamer zitten lezen. ] [Gedurende twee uur hoorde ik het kind geen enkel geluid meer maken.]

ContLuier02.txt
[Ik stond op van het tapijt in de woonkamer. ] [Het gekrijs verhevigde,] [het verried een razende woede.] Probe (filler) [Ik deed twee druppeltjes Sinaspril in wat jam] [en ging naar Victors kamer.] [Victor had gepoept.] [Ik pakte de bezoedelde luier] [en legde hem op het parket;] [de stank was doordringend.] [Victor slikte probleemloos het mengsel door] [en ontspande zich vrijwel onmiddellijk.] [Ik liep tevreden zijn kamer uit,] Probe [en ging weer in de woonkamer zitten lezen. ] [Gedurende twee uur hoorde ik Victor geen geluid meer maken.]

252
[Tussen het tweede en vierde levensjaar] worden menselijke kinderen zich in toenemende mate bewust van hun ik, [Het lijkt dan net of ze de mensen die hun sociale omgeving vormen [(over het algemeen hun ouders)] naar hun hand willen zetten,] en bij hen uitproberen wat ze wel en niet mogen. [Hun egocentrisme immers kent nog maar weinig beperkingen] [- dat is waar de ontwikkeling toe leidt].

ExpValium04.txt
[Zodra ik het kind niet meer hoorde,] pakte ik mijn jas en ging ik de deur uit. [Met een beetje mazzel zou ik iets eerder dan Anne thuiskomen.] Probe (filler) Een uur nadat ik een bezoek had gebracht aan het bordeel, besloot ik weer naar huis te gaan. [Anne stond versteend naast het bedje van onze zoon.] Victor bleek niet meer te ademen. [Blijkbaar had de Valium,] [die ik hem had gegeven,] iets te goed gewerkt. [Ik dacht bij mezelf 'het lot is me gunstig gestemd'] en glimlachte.

ContValium04.txt
[Zodra ik het kind niet meer hoorde,] pakte ik mijn jas en ging ik de deur uit. [Met een beetje mazzel, zei ik tegen Anne, zou ik iets voor elven thuiskomen.] Probe (filler) Een uur nadat ik een bezoek had gebracht aan de buren, besloot ik weer naar huis te gaan. [Anne stond naast het bedje van onze zoon.] Victor bleek niet meer te slapen. [Blijkbaar had de Sinaspril, die ik hem had gegeven, goed gewerkt.] [Ik dacht bij mezelf 'het lot is ons gunstig gestemd'] en glimlachte.

ExpMadison05.txt
[Ik schoot mijn jack aan en ging naar Madison,] een nachtbar in de buurt. [Met mijn creditcard betaalde ik drieduizend franc voor een fles Dom Pérignon,] die ik deelde met een heel knappe blondine. Probe (filler) In een van de bovenkamertjes trok het meisje me langdurig af, [waarbij ze nu en dan de opwellende begeerte tegenhield.] Ze heette Hélène, kwam uit de streek en volgde een toeristische opleiding; ze was negentien. [Ik bleef nog een poosje met haar praten,] nam vervolgens afscheid, en besloot nog even een rondje te gaan lopen door de stad. [Het was een prachtige avond.]

ContMadison05.txt
[Ik schoot mijn jack aan en ging op weg naar Madison,] een vriend die in de buurt woonde. [Met mijn pinpas betaaldie ik in een nachtwinkel vijftien franc voor een fles Bordeaux,] die ik deelde met mijn vriend en zijn vriendin, [een heel knappe blondine.] Probe (filler) Ze glimlachte naar me en aaide me vriendelijk plagend over mijn hoofd. [Ze heette Hélène, kwam uit de streek] en volgde een toeristische opleiding. [Ik bleef nog een poosje met ze praten,] nam vervolgens afscheid, en besloot nog even een rondje te gaan lopen door de stad. [Het was een prachtige avond.]

ExpIslam06.txt
[Het was een gezellige avond geweest.] [Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin's woorden] en moest hem gelijk geven. [De islam] [- van alle godsdiensten verreweg de domste, de meest leugenachtige en de meest obscurantistische -] lijkt tegenwoordig terrein te winnen. Probe (filler) [maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard:] [op de lange duur heeft de islam net als het christendom het eeuwige leven.]
Hoewel hij zich in principe ten doel stelde de reiziger voor te bereiden op zijn reis naar Thailand, [bleek de Trekker een in de praktijk de grootste mogelijke bedenkingen te hebben,] en zich meteen al in het voorwoord geroepen te voelen zijn banvloek uit te spreken over het sekstoerisme, [die afschuwelijke slavernij.] 

Die trekkers waren werkelijk begaan met het land en ontzagen zich niet de bedenkelijke plezierjjes van gewetenloze toeristen aan de kaak te stellen. [Er waren veel dingen in de trant van acupunctuur,] massage met welriekende etherische oliën, [vegetarisch eten of tai-ji;] maar body massage of gogobars, ho maar.

Ik had gehoord dat Koh Samui niet alleen een tropisch paradijs was maar ook zeer trendy. [Alles wat ik op dat moment wilde was een ordentelijke massage,] gevolgd door een lange wandeling en een heerlijk diner in een aangename sfeer. [Niet zo moeilijk, zou je denken.] 

Er waren veel dingen in de trant van acupunctuur, massage met welriekende etherische oliën, vegetarisch eten of tai-ji; maar body massage of gogobars, ho maar.

Als ik een meerderjarige ben die uit vrije wil handelt, en als ik eraan verlang om pijn te lijden, [zie ik niet in op grond waarvan iemand me dat zou kunnen verbieden.] [We leven in een democratie…']

Als ik iemand zie die vrijwillig zijn nagels laat uitrukken met een nijptang en zich vervolgens laat onderschijten om daarna de stront van zijn beul op te eten, dan vind ik dat weliswaar walgelijk. Het is een mensonterende vorm van seks en dit deel van de mens vind ik afschuwelijk.', zei ik met luide stem.}

De nieuwe babysit, Eucharistie, was me door de buurvrouw aangeraden. [Het was een serieus meisje van vijftien.] Later wilde ze dokter worden, [misschien wel kinderarts,] in ieder geval kon ze heel goed met kinderen overweg. 

Ik was niet de eerste man van Eucharistie, [het jaar daarvoor had ze al een jongen gehad,] [een figuur uit de eindexamenklas,] [die ze vervolgens uit het oog had verloren,] [maar er waren dingen die ze niet kende,] [pijpen bijvoorbeeld.]

Het was toch wel een geluk dat ik geen dochter in de vijfde klas had; [in sommige omstandigheden zag ik niet hoe en vooral waarom incest moest worden vermeden.] Zo bedacht ik met een vreemd gevoel van betrekkelijkheid.
[De nieuwe babysit, Eucharistie, was me door de buurvrouw aangeraden.] [Het was een serieus meisje van vijftien.] [Later wilde ze dokter worden,] [misschien wel kinderarts.] [in ieder geval kon ze heel goed met kinderen overweg.] [De nieuwe babysit, Eucharistie, was me door de buurvrouw aangeraden.] [Het was een serieus meisje van vijftien.] [Later wilde ze dokter worden,] [misschien wel kinderarts;] [in ieder geval kon ze heel goed met kinderen overweg.] Probe (filler) [Ik was niet het eerste oppasadres van Eucharistie.] [Het jaar daarvoor had ze al een adres gehad,] [een gezin uit de buitenwijk] [dat ze vervolgens uit het oog was verloren;] [maar er waren dingen zie ze niet kende,] [koken bijvoorbeeld.] [Deze verstandhouding was een beetje een evenwichtige.] [Het was maar goed dat ik geen dochter in de vijfde klas had,] [in sommige omstandigheden zag ik niet hoe je het beste met een tiener kon communiceren.] [Zo bedacht ik met een vreemd gevoel van betrekkelijkheid.] Probe

[Om heel eerlijk te zijn] [had ik altijd een enorme afkeer van kleine kinderen gevoeld:] [voorzover ik wist waren het lelijke monstertjes] [die er in het wilde weg op los scheten] [en een ondraaglijk gekrijs uitstootten:] [de gedachte dat ik er zelf een zou kunnen hebben,] Probe [was nog nooit bij me opgekomen.] [Maar ik wist dat de meeste echtparen het deden;] [ik wist niet of ze er blij mee waren,] [in ieder geval durfden ze er niet over te klagen.] Probe (filler) [Ik was niet het eerste oppasadres van Eucharistie.] [Het jaar daarvoor had ze al een adres gehad,] [een gezin uit de buitenwijk] [dat ze vervolgens uit het oog was verloren;] [maar er waren dingen zie ze niet kende,] [koken bijvoorbeeld.] [Deze verstandhouding was een beetje een evenwichtige.] [Het was maar goed dat ik geen dochter in de vijfde klas had,] [in sommige omstandigheden zag ik niet hoe je het beste met een tiener kon communiceren.] [Zo bedacht ik met een vreemd gevoel van betrekkelijkheid.] Probe

[Het valt me niet moeilijk te zeggen] [dat ik altijd een zekere bewondering voor kleine kinderen heb gevoeld;] [voorzover ik wist waren het mooie creaturen] [die er soms in het wilde weg op los fantaseerden] [en geweldige bedenksels voortbrachten;] [de gedachte dat ik er zelf een zou kunnen hebben,] Probe [was vreemd genoeg nog nooit bij me opgekomen.] [En dit ofschoon ik wist dat de meeste echtparen het deden;] [ik wist dat ze er blij mee waren,] [in ieder geval straalden ze dat wel uit.] Probe (filler)

[Mag ik er u op wijzen dat de islam is ontstaan midden in de woestijn,] [midden tussen de schorpioenen, kamelen] [en alle mogelijke soorten wilde beesten?] [Weet u hoe ik moslims noem?] [De schooiers van de Sahara.] [Dat is de enige naam die ze verdienen.] Probe (filler) [Denkt u dat de islam had kunnen ontstaan in zo'n prachtige omgeving als de Nijldelta?] [De islam kon alleen maar ontstaan in een stompzinnige woestijn,] [te midden van arme bedoeïenen die niets anders te doen hadden dan hun kamelen en hun tenten.] [Dat kunt u toch niet ontkennen.] Probe

[Mag ik er u op wijzen dat de islam is ontstaan midden in de woestijn,] [midden tussen de schorpioenen, kamelen] [en alle mogelijke soorten wilde beesten?] [Weet u hoe ik moslims noem?] [De bedwingers, ja hoeders van de Sahara.] [Dat is de naam die ze verdienen.] Probe (filler) [Denkt u dat de islam had kunnen ontstaan in zo'n prachtige omgeving als de Nijldelta?] [De islam kon alleen maar ontstaan in een dorre woestijn,] [te midden van arme bedoeïenen die niets anders hadden dan hun kamelen en hun tenten.] [Dat kunt u toch niet ontkennen.] Probe

APPENDIX A – PILOT STUDIES: TEXT PRIMES – QUESTIONNAIRE

ONDERZOEKJE NAAR LEESERVARING

Voor een onderzoek dat ik (Eefje Claassen) in het kader van mijn promotieproject doe, ben ik benieuwd naar de mening van lezers over bepaalde literaire teksten. Je krijgt zo enkele korte tekstfragmenten te lezen. Deze fragmenten komen uit twee literaire romans die zijn geschreven door een (en dezelfde) Franse schrijver. Ik wil aan jou vragen de tekstfragmenten op je gemak te lezen, in het tempo waarin je normaal leest. Na elk tekstfragment volgen enkele vragen, waarin je mening wordt gevraagd.

[PAGE 1] - Blader voor tekst 1 naar de volgende pagina -

[TEKST01]

VRAGEN

Wat vind je van de tekst?

001. Ik geef de tekst het cijfer (omcirkel:)
Geef je mening op de volgende stelling (omcirkel het getal van je keuze):

002. Er komen in de tekst elementen (handelingen, denkbeelden en/of opvattingen) voor, die ik moreel verwerpelijk vind.

helemaal mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 helemaal mee oneens

Ik vind de tekst…….(omcirkel het getal van je keuze):

003 helemaal niet in overeenstemming met mijn moraal
004 heel schokkend
005 heel interessant
006 heel complex
007 heel saai
008 heel boeiend
009 heel moeilijk te begrijpen
010 heel literair

APPENDIX B – PILOT STUDIES: TARGETS - QUESTIONNAIRE

Vragenlijst beoordeling adjectieven

Voor een onderzoek dat ik (Eefje Claassen) in het kader van mijn promotieproject doe, wil ik graag weten hoe positief of negatief onderstaande adjectieven worden beoordeeld. Ik wil aan jou vragen of je bij elk van de onderstaande adjectieven op een schaaltje wilt aankruisen hoe positief of negatief jij het betreffende adjectief beoordeelt. Je kunt het snel doen; het gaat om je eerste indruk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectief</th>
<th>Heel negatief</th>
<th>Negatief</th>
<th>Beetje negatief</th>
<th>Beetje positief</th>
<th>Positief</th>
<th>Heel positief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>goedaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gemeen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leuk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking! Voor vragen kun je mailen naar e.claassen@let.vu.nl

APPENDIX C – PILOT STUDIES: AUTHOR PRIMES – QUESTIONNAIRE PhD STUDENTS

INLEIDING

Binnenkort ga ik een experiment uitvoeren waarin ik proefpersonen een aantal fragmenten uit een roman voorleg. Voordat proefpersonen de fragmenten gaan lezen wil ik aan alle proefpersonen informatie geven over de schrijver van de tekstfragmenten. Ik wil de ene groep proefpersonen ‘wijsmaken’ dat de schrijver een immorele man is. De andere groep proefpersonen wil ik ‘wijsmaken’ dat de schrijver een morele man is. Onlangs heb ik vier versies van de ‘immorele’ en drie versies van de ‘morele’ schrijver ter beoordeling voorgelegd aan 19 studenten ACW en LW (deze versies staan ter informatie aan het einde van deze vragenlijst).
Op grond van hun commentaar heb ik enkele veranderingen aangebracht in de tekstjes, hetgeen heeft geresulteerd in een aantal nieuwe versies.

Ik wil aan jou vragen deze nieuwe versies te beoordelen door de vragen te beantwoorden die onder elke versie staan. Wat ik van jou wil weten is in welke versie jij vindt dat de schrijver het meest immoreel respectievelijk moreel is. Daarnaast wil ik graag van je weten of je de versie van je keuze ook geloofwaardig vindt.

Alvast hartelijk dank voor je medewerking!

[PAGE] - BLADER VERDER NAAR DE VOLGENDE PAGINA -

DEEL I: De immorele schrijver

Hieronder volgen verschillende versies waarin informatie wordt gegeven over een immorele schrijver. Lees de informatie en beantwoord daarna de vragen.

VERSIE 5

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversele werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans is gebleken dat hij enkele jaren geleden is veroordeeld voor verkrachting van een 5-jarig meisje.

Vragen
(Omcirkel het antwoord van je keuze)

1. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zeer positief 1 2 3 4 5 zeer negatief

2. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zeer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

3. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zeer geloofwaardig 1 2 3 4 5 zeer ongelooofwaardig

VERSIE 6

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversele werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans is gebleken dat hij enkele jaren geleden is veroordeeld voor seksueel misbruik van twee kinderen en voor het mishandelen van zijn vrouw.

Vragen

4. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zeer positief 1 2 3 4 5 zeer negatief

- Blader verder naar de volgende pagina -

5. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zeer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

6. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zeer geloofwaardig 1 2 3 4 5 zeer ongelooofwaardig
VERSIE 7

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans is gebleken dat hij enkele jaren geleden is veroordeeld voor seksueel misbruik van twee kinderen en voor het mishandelen van zijn vrouw. Nicholai is actief lid van de rechts-extremistische partij ‘Front National’.

Vragen

7. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zeer positief   1  2  3  4  5  zeer negatief

8. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zeer moreel persoon   1  2  3  4  5  zeer immoreel persoon

9. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zeer geloofwaardig   1  2  3  4  5  zeer ongelooofwaardig

10. In welke versie vind je de schrijver het meest immoreel overkomen?

(kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)

0  Versie 5
0  Versie 6
0  Versie 7

11. Wat zou jij veranderen en/of toevoegen aan de gekozen versie om de schrijver nog moreler te maken?

- Blader verder naar de volgende pagina –

12. In welke versie vind je de informatie over de schrijver het meest ongelooofwaardig?

(kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)

0  Versie 5
0  Versie 6
0  Versie 7

13. Wat vind je precies ongelooofwaardig aan de informatie in de versie die jij hebt gekozen?

- DEEL II: De morele schrijver

Hieronder volgen verschillende versies waarin informatie wordt gegeven over een morele schrijver. Lees de informatie en beantwoord daarna de vragen die volgen door het antwoord van je keuze te omcirkelen.

VERSIE 4

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Zijn romans zijn bekroond met de prestigieuze literaire prijzen ‘Prix Goncourt’ en de ‘Prix Médicis’. Nicholai heeft in interviews aangegeven een groot voorvechter te zijn voor gelijke rechten voor mannen en vrouwen, en een fel tegenstander van elke vorm van discriminatie.

Vragen

1. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zeer positief   1  2  3  4  5  zeer negatief
2. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zieer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

3. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zieer geloofwaardig 1 2 3 4 5 zeer ongelooftwaardig

4. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zieer positief 1 2 3 4 5 zeer negatief

5. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zieer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

6. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zieer geloofwaardig 1 2 3 4 5 zeer ongelooftwaardig

7. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver?

zieer positief 1 2 3 4 5 zeer negatief

8. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zieer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

9. In hoeverre vind je de gegeven informatie over de schrijver geloofwaardig?

zieer geloofwaardig 1 2 3 4 5 zeer ongelooftwaardig

10. In welke versie vind je de schrijver het meest moreel overkomen?

(kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)

0 Versie 4
0 Versie 5
0 Versie 6

11. Wat zou jij veranderen en/of toevoegen aan de gekozen versie om de schrijver nog moreel te maken?
12. In welke versie vind je de informatie over de schrijver het meest ongeloofwrdig? (kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)

0 Versie 4
0 Versie 5
0 Versie 6

13. Wat vind je precies ongeloofwrdig aan de informatie in de versie die jij hebt gekozen?

Ik dank je hartelijk voor je medewerking. Ingevulde vragenlijsten kun je aan mij mailen (e.claassen@let.vu.nl) of in mijn postvakje leggen. Indien je nog vragen of opmerkingen hebt, dan kun je mij mailen of je kunt altijd langskomen (8a-31). Ter informatie staan hieronder de versies die ik onlangs ter beoordeling heb voorgelegd aan studenten ACW en LW.

Eefje Claassen, Aio ACW: Woord en Beeld

VERSIES DIE IK TER BOORDELING HEB VOORLEGD AAN STUDENTEN ACW EN LW

VERSIE 1. IMMOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans bleek dat hij ooit is veroordeeld voor een zedendelict met kinderen.

VERSIE 2. IMMOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans bleek dat hij is ooit veroordeeld voor een zedendelict met kinderen. Bovendien heeft hij in interviews zeer racistische en vrouwonvriendelijke uitspraken gedaan.

VERSIE 3. IMMOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan, en na het verschijnen van zijn romans is gebleken dat hij ooit is veroordeeld voor een zedendelict met kinderen en voor het mishandelen van vrouwen. Bovendien blijkt hij ooit pamfletten met racistische leuzen te hebben uitgedeeld tijdens een demonstratie van een verboden extreemrechtse organisatie.

VERSIE 4. IMMOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan, en het gerucht gaat dat hij ooit is verdacht van een zedendelict met kinderen. In interviews heeft hij bovendien zeer vrouwonvriendelijke en racistische uitspraken gedaan.

VERSIE 1. MOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse bekroonde werken op zijn naam staan en hij is ambassadeur geweest van Unicef.

VERSIE 2. MOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse bekroonde werken op zijn naam staan, en hij heeft zich actief ingezet voor Unicef. Daarnaast heeft hij in interviews aangegeven een groot voorvechter te zijn voor gelijke rechten voor mannen en vrouwen, en een fel tegenstander van elke vorm van discriminatie.

VERSIE 3. MOREEL
De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft al diverse bekroonde werken op zijn naam staan, en hij is ooit onderscheiden voor zijn inzet voor het welzijn van vrouwen en kinderen over de hele wereld. Bovendien heeft hij eind jaren tachtig pamfletten uitgedeeld tijdens een demonstratie in Parijs tegen de apartheid in Zuid-Afrika.
Stimulusmateriaal Experiment II
Tekstfragmenten

Lijst II

Oefentekst (OefentekstGrisham01.txt)
[Ik smeet de gids door de kamer,] [bijna tegen de Sony televisie,] [en pakte gelaten Advocaat van de duivel van John Grisham op.] [Het was een Amerikaanse bestseller,] [een van de beste -] [dat wil zeggen een van de bestverkochte.] Probe {SAAI} [De held was een jonge, veelbelovende advocaat,] [een briljante, mooie jongen die negentig uur per week werkte;] [niet alleen was dat prul schaamteloos geschreven om te worden verfilmd,] [je voelde ook dat de auteur al over de casting had nagedacht,] [dat het duidelijk als een rol voor Tom Cruise was bedoeld.] Probe {RECHTVAARDIG}

Oefentekst (OefentekstBoeddhisme02.txt)
[In het oranje licht leken de kalkrotsen bijna zwart.] [De laatste zwemmers kwamen terug met een badhanddoek in de hand.] [Omstrangeled in het warme water,] [op een paar meter van de oever,] [lag een stelletje te vrijen.] [De stralen van de ondergaande zon weerkaatsten halverwege het vergulde dak van een pagode.] [In de vredige avondlucht sloeg een klok een paar keer achtereen.] Probe {AANTREKKELIJK} [Het is een boeddhistisch gebruik om als je een goede daad of een verdienstelijke handeling hebt verricht,] [dat je voelde dat de auteur al over de casting had nagedacht,] [dat het duidelijk als een rol voor Tom Cruise was bedoeld.] Probe {RECHTVAARDIG}

Oefentekst (OefentekstMarriott03.txt)
[Ik werd tegen twaalven wakker,] [de airco bracht een laag gebrom voort;] [mijn hoofdpijn was minder geworden.] [Ik lag dwars op het kingsize bed,] [en liet mijn gedachten gaan over het verloop van de rondevis en wat daarbij op het spel stond.] Probe {RUIMHARTIG} [Ik liep naar het raam en trok de gordijnen wagenwijs open.] [Vanaf de zevenentwintigste verdieping was het uitzicht spectaculair.] Probe {VERVELEND} [Links verhief de indrukwekkende massa van hotel Marriott zich als een krijtrots,] [van zwarte horizontale strepen voorzien.] [De stralen van de ondergaande zon weerkaatsten halverwege het vergulde dak van een pagode.] [In de vredige avondlucht sloeg een klok een paar keer achtereen.] Probe {AANTREKKELIJK} [Het is een boeddhistisch gebruik om als je een goede daad of een verdienstelijke handeling hebt verricht,] [dat je voelde dat de auteur al over de casting had nagedacht,] [dat het duidelijk als een rol voor Tom Cruise was bedoeld.] Probe {RECHTVAARDIG}

III (ContOntwikkeling03.txt)
[Tussen het tweede en vierde levensjaar] [worden menselijke kinderen zich in toenemende mate bewust van hun ik,] [Probe (filler) ONDEUGDZAAM] [wat soms tot buien leidt waarin ze graag hun zin willen krijgen.] [Het lijkt dan net of ze de mensen die hun sociale omgeving voorhouden,] [over het algemeen hun ouders,] [naar hun hand willen zetten,] [en bij hen uitproberen wat ze wel en niet mogen.] [Hun egocentrisme immers kent nog maar weinig beperkingen,] [- dat is waar de ontwikkeling toe leidt.] Probe {EERLIJK}

XII (ExpWoestijn12.txt)
['Mag ik er u op wijzen dat de islam is ontstaan midden in de woestijn,] [midden tussen de schorpioenen,] [kamelen] [en alle mogelijke soorten wilde beesten?] [Weet u hoe ik moslims noem?] [De schooiers van de Sahara.] [Dat is de enige naam die ze verdienen.] Probe (filler) RECHTSCHAPEN [Denkt u dat de islam had kunnen ontstaan in zo'n prachtige omgeving als de Nijl delta?] [De islam kon alleen maar ontstaan in een stompzinnige woestijn,] [te midden van smerige bedoeïenen die niets anders te doen hadden dan hun kamelen te sodeflikkeren.] [Dat kunt u toch niet ontkennen.] Probe {AGRESSIEF}

XI (ExpKinderen11.txt)
[Om heel eerlijk te zijn] [had ik altijd een enorme afkeer van kleine kinderen gevoeld;] [vooroordeel hoe ik wist waren] [de lelijke monsterjagers] [die er in het wilde weg op los schieten;] [en een ondraaglijk gekrijs uitstooten;] [de gedachte dat ik er zelf een zou kunnen hebben.] Probe SLECHT [was nog nooit bij me opgekomen.] [Maar ik wist dat de meeste echtparen het deden:] [ik wist niet of ze er blij mee waren,] [in ieder geval durfden ze er niet over te klagen.] Probe (filler) DEUGDZAAM

II (ContLuier02.txt)
[Ik stond op van het tapijt in de woonkamer.] [Het gehuil verhevigde,] [het verried een zere boosheid.] Probe (filler) OPVLIEGEND [Ik deed twee druppeltjes Sinaspril in wat jam;] [en ging naar Victors kamer;] [Victor had gepoept.] [Ik pakte de bezoedelde luiers] [en legde hem op het parket;] [de stank was doordringend.] [Victor
slikt probleemloos het mengsel door [en ontspande zich vrijwel onmiddellijk.] [Ik liep tevreden zijn kamer uit.] Probe ATTENT [en ging weer in de woonkamer zitten lezen]. [Gedurende twee uur hoorde ik Victor geen geluid meer maken.]

VIII (ContTropischparadijs08.txt)
[Ik had gehoord dat Koh Samui niet alleen een tropisch paradijs was] [maar ook zeer trendy.] Probe (filler) BARMHARTIG [Voor mij hoefde het allemaal niet zo nodig. [Alles wat ik op dat moment wilde was een ordentelijke massage,] [gevolgd door een lange wandeling] [en een heerlijk diner in een aangename sfeer.] [Niet zo moeilijk, zou je denken;] Probe HARTELOOS [toch constateerde ik bij het doorbladeren van de folders met groeiende treurnis] [dat het allerminst de plaatselijke specialiteit scheen te zijn.] [Er waren veel dingen in de trant van acupunctuur,] [yoga met moeilijke houdingen en tai-ji;][maar een normale massage en een goed restaurant ho maar.]

X (ExpBabysit10.txt)
[De nieuwe babysit, Eucharistie, was me door de buurvrouw aangeraden.] [Het was een serieus meisje van vijftien.] [Later wilde ze dokter worden,] [misschien wel kinderarts;] [in ieder geval kon ze heel goed met kinderen overweg.] Probe (filler) WELGEZIND [Ik had gehoord dat Koh Samui niet alleen een tropisch paradijs was] [maar ook zeer trendy.] Probe (filler) RECHTSCHAPEN [Als ik iemand zie die vrijwillig zijn nagels laat uitrukken met een nijptang] [en zich vervolgens laat onderschijten om daarna de stront van zijn beul op te eten,] [dan vind ik dat walgelijk.] [Het is een mensonterende vorm van seks] [en dit deel van de mens vind ik afschuwelijk’,] [zie ik met luide stem.] Probe VALS

IX (ContSM09.txt)
[‘Als ik een meerderjarige ben die uit vrije wil handelt,’] [en als ik ernaar verlang om pijn te lijden,] [om de masochistische dimensie van mijn seksualiteit te verkennen,] [zie ik niet in op grond waarvan iemand me dat zou kunnen verbieden.] [We leven in een democratie…’] [‘U ziet de zaken verkeerd:’] [SM is absoluut walgelijk.] Probe (filler) BETROUWBAAR [ik bleef nog even een rondje te gaan lopen door de stad.] [Het was een prachtige avond.]

VII (ContTrekkergids07.txt)
[Aangezien hij zich in principe ten doel stelde de reiziger voor te bereiden op zijn reis naar Thailand,] [bleek de Trekkergids in de praktijk de grootst mogelijke bedenkingen te hebben,] [en zich meteen al in het voorwoord geroepen te spreken over het sekstoerisme,] [die afschuwelijke slavernij.] Probe (filler) MOREEL [Die trekkers waren werkelijk begaan met het land] [en ontzagen zich niet de bedenkelijke plezierjjes van gewetenloze toeristen aan de kaak te stellen.] [Ik nam mezelf voor hun advies te volgen] [en mee niet te laten verleiden door minderjarige meisjes,] [hoe strak en gewillig ook.] [Ik ging tenslotte naar Thailand voor mijn ontspanning.] Probe GEWETENLOOS

VI (ExpIslam06.txt)
[Het was een gezellige avond geweest.] [Op weg naar huis dacht ik na over Desplechin’s woorden] [en moest hem gelijk geven.] Probe (filler) EERZAAM [Ik had gehoord dat Koh Samui niet alleen een tropisch paradijs was] [maar ook zeer trendy.] Probe (filler) GEWETENLOOS [maar dat is slechts een oppervlakkig verschijnsel van voorbijgaande aard:] [op de lange duur is de islam ten dode opgeschreven,] [meer nog dan het christendom.]
Appendix D – Experiment: Materials: Author Prime

Version Immoreel

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Hij heeft diverse zeer controversiële werken op zijn naam staan. Nicholai is enkele jaren na het verschijnen van zijn romans veroordeeld voor verkrachting van een 5-jarige meisjje.

Version Moreel

De tekstfragmenten die je gaat lezen zijn geschreven door Jean Nicholai, een 60-jarige schrijver afkomstig uit Frankrijk. Zijn romans zijn bekroond met de prestigieuze literaire prijzen ‘Prix Goncourt’ en de ‘Prix Médicis’. Nicholai staat bekend als een groot voorvechter van de rechten van het kind, en een fel tegenstander van discriminatie.

APPENDIX D – EXPERIMENT: MATERIALS OF THE EXPERIMENT: INSTRUCTION (IN DUTCH)

Instructies leesexperiment

Beste deelnemer,

In dit experiment zul je 15 korte tekstfragmenten lezen. Deze tekstfragmenten zijn afkomstig uit twee literaire romans, beide geschreven door een en dezelfde Franse schrijver. Deze tekstjes zullen zin voor zin op een computerscherm worden gepresenteerd.

Elk tekstfragment wordt vooraf gegaan door de woorden “Nieuwe Tekst”. Zodra je klaar bent om te beginnen met het lezen van een nieuwe tekst, druk je op knop <3> van het toetsenkastje dat je voor je hebt staan.


Als je begint een tekst te lezen (en dus voor de eerste keer op <3> hebt gedrukt), zul je het volgende te zien krijgen:

Toen ik naar buiten ging voor het avondeten was de duisternis volledig ingevallen; _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______.

Opdracht:

Probeer de teksten zo natuurlijk mogelijk te lezen, d.w.z. zoals je normaal gesproken een verhaal (roman, novelle, kort verhaal etc.) leest.
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Woorden:

Tijdens het lezen zullen af en toe woorden op het scherm verschijnen. Zonder fouten te maken moet je zo snel mogelijk beslissen of het woord een positieve of negatieve betekenis heeft.

Druk op <2> als je vindt dat het woord een positieve betekenis heeft, druk op <4> als je vindt dat het woord een negatieve betekenis heeft.


Beweringen:

Nadat je drie tekstfragmenten hebt gelezen, volgen er enkele beweringen over één van de drie gelezen tekstjes. Zonder fouten te maken moet je zo snel mogelijk beslissen of die beweringen “waar” of “niet waar” zijn.

Druk op <1> als het antwoord “Waar” is en op <5> als het antwoord “Niet Waar” is.

De beweringen worden vooraf gegaan door de aankondiging “Nu volgen er beweringen over een van de tekst die je zojuist hebt gelezen”. Deze aankondiging verdwijnt vanzelf weer. Op dat moment leg je je linkerijsvinger op knopje <1> en je rechterwijsvinger op knopje <5>.

Informatie auteur


De vraag heeft vier antwoordmogelijkheden (<1>, <2>, <4> en <5>); op het computerscherm staat met welke antwoorden de cijfers corresponderen. Beantwoord de vraag door de knop op het knoppenkastje in te drukken die correspondeert met het door jou gekozen antwoord.

Na het experiment

Als je het einde van het experiment hebt bereikt, moet je dit meteen aan de onderzoeker laten weten. In het experiment zul je hier op worden gewezen. Na het experiment krijg je een vragenlijst voorgelegd die los staat van het experiment.

Tenslotte

Tijdens het lezen van de teksten moet je je niets aantrekken van mijn aanwezigheid, en ook niet spreken, omdat dat de metingen verstoort. Ik zou je willen vragen om je hand bij het toetsenkastje te houden.

Alvast hartelijk dank voor je deelname aan dit experiment!

Eefje Claassen

APPENDIX D: MATERIALS OF THE EXPERIMENT: QUESTIONNAIRE (IN DUTCH)

Vragen over het leesonderzoek


1. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver van de tekstfragmenten die je hebt gelezen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>zeer negatief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sehr positiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zeer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

3. Normaal gesproken ga ik ervan uit dat de schrijver van een literaire tekst (verhaal, roman, novelle etc) een moreel acceptabel persoon is.

helemaal niet mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 volkomen mee eens

4. Bij sommige tekstfragmenten die ik heb gelezen, vroeg ik me af waarom de schrijver ervoor heeft gekozen de ik-persoon zulke immorele opvattingen te laten hebben.

helemaal niet mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 volkomen mee eens

5. Bij sommige tekstfragmenten die ik heb gelezen, waarin de ik-persoon immorele opvattingen erop na hield, ging ik twijfelen aan de intenties van de schrijver.

helemaal niet mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 volkomen mee eens

6. Bij sommige fragmenten vond ik de uitspraken van de ik-persoon zo schokkend, dat ik het liefst was gestopt met lezen.

helemaal niet mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 volkomen mee eens

7. Over het algemeen vind ik het leuk om literaire teksten te lezen (verhaal, roman, novelle etc), waarin de schrijver moreel onacceptabele personen ten tonele voert.

helemaal niet mee eens 1 2 3 4 5 volkomen mee eens

8. De tekstjes die je hebt gelezen zijn van een bestaande Franse schrijver, maar niet van Jean Nicholai. De informatie die je over deze fictieve schrijver hebt gelezen is door mij verzonnen. Heb je een idee van welke Franse schrijver de teksten zouden kunnen zijn? (kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)

0 Ik weet het niet zeker, maar denk aan…………………………(vul een naam in)
Ik denk aan deze schrijver, omdat…………………………………………
0 Ik weet het zeker; het is………………………………………………(vul een naam in)
Ik denk dat, omdat………………………………………………………………
0 Ik heb geen idee.

9. Tot slot nog vier korte vragen:
a. Mijn leeftijd is…..jaar
0 Ja
0 Nee
b. Mijn moedertaal is Nederlands
  0 Ja
  0 Nee
c. Ik ben
  0 Man
  0 Vrouw
d. Ik ben …e jaars student
  0 SCW - BESTUUR EN ORGANISATIE
  0 SCW - Cultuur, Organisatie en Management
  0 SCW - Communicatiewetenschap
  0 SCW - Politicologie
  0 SCW – Sociale en Culturele Antropologie
  0 SCW – Sociaal Culturele Wetenschappen
  0 Anders, namelijk…

Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking!
APPENDIX D: MATERIALS OF THE EXPERIMENT: DEBRIEFING

UITLEG BIJ HET LEESONDERZOEK NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2003.

Je hebt meegedaan aan een leesonderzoek. Hieronder volgt enige uitleg over het doel van het onderzoek en het belang van je bijdrage.

Het doel van het onderzoek

Heb je je tijdens het lezen van een literaire roman wel eens afgevraagd wat de schrijver van de tekst beoogt met zijn of haar werk? Of heb je jezelf de vraag gesteld ‘Zou de schrijver het eens zijn met wat dit personage zegt?’ Zo ja, wat precies in de tekst stuurt eigenlijk dergelijke overpeinzingen?

Het doel van mijn promotieproject is een antwoord te vinden op deze en andere vragen. Centraal staat de vraag ‘Genereren lezers van literaire teksten met een ethische lading tijdens het leesproces auteursinferenties?’ Anders geformuleerd: leggen lezers tijdens het lezen van dergelijke teksten verbanden met de schrijver?

Het onderzoek waaraan jij hebt deelgenomen, heeft tot doel na te gaan of immoraliteit het leggen van dergelijke verbanden beïnvloedt. Indien een ik-persoon in een tekst een immoreel standpunt inneemt, vraag je je dan als lezer af of de schrijver achter de opvatting van die ‘ik’ staat? Ga je ervan uit dat een schrijver in principe een moreel acceptabel persoon is, en verwacht je van die schrijver geen teksten met uitgesproken immorele opvattingen? Deze vragen hoop ik aan de hand dit onderzoek te beantwoorden.

Belang van het onderzoek en bijdrage van proefpersonen

Literatuurwetenschappers hebben veel gediscussieerd over de vraag of de schrijver bij het interpreteren van een tekst wel mag worden betrokken. Of de schrijver in het leesproces van de ‘gewone’ lezer wordt betrokken is echter nauwelijks onderzocht. Theorievorming hierover is dan ook van belang, net als toetsing van voorspellingen die op grond van een theorie kunnen worden gedaan. Empirisch onderzoek is noodzakelijk, omdat op die manier kan worden onderzocht of ‘echte’ lezers de voorspelde processen genereren. Jij bent zo’n ‘echte’ lezer, en derhalve is jouw bijdrage van groot belang voor dit onderzoek.

De opzet

In het onderzoek waar jij aan hebt meegedaan zijn de proefpersonen verdeeld in twee groepen. Proefpersonen uit groep 1 hebben informatie gekregen over een immorele schrijver (veroordeeld voor verkrachting van een 5-jarig meisje), proefpersonen uit groep 2 hebben informatie gekregen over een morele schrijver (voorvechter van de rechten van het kind).

Als proefpersoon heb je verschillende tekstfragmenten gelezen; in sommige fragmenten was sprake van een moreel discutabele ik-persoon, in andere fragmenten was er sprake van een relatief neutrale ik-persoon. De teksten werden soms onderbroken door bijvoeglijke naamwoorden die een positieve (bijv. betrouwbaar) of negatieve (bijv. agressief) betekenis hebben; deze woorden moest je beoordelen door op knopje 2 ‘POSITIEF’ of knopje 4 ‘NEGATIEF’ te drukken.

Het idee is nu dat als de tekst en het woord congruent zijn (immorele ‘ik’ en het woord ‘agressief’: allebei negatief) de reactietijd niet om berekenen is dan wanneer de tekst en het woord incongruent zijn (immorele ‘ik’ en het woord ‘betrouwbaar: negatief en positief). Dat komt omdat de tekst een meer discutabele ik-persoon ontsluit en daarin past een woord wel of niet goed. Je verwacht zeg maar bij een tekst waarin de ik zich zeer negatief uitlaat over kinderen eerder een negatief woord, zoals agressief, dan een positief woord, zoals betrouwbaar.

Hoe zit het dan met de informatie over de schrijver? Hetzelfde verhaal gaat ook hier op: indien er congruentie is tussen informatie over de schrijver en tekst + woord, dan wordt er een snellere reactietijd verwacht bij het beoordelen van het woord (positief/ negatief), dan wanneer de informatie niet congruent is met de tekst + woord. Stel, je hebt gelezen dat de schrijver is veroordeeld voor verkrachting van een 5-jarig meisje, en je leest een tekst waarin de ik-persoon naar Thailand gaat om daar seks te hebben met een piepjong meisje. Je
krijgt vervolgens het woord *agressief* ter beoordeling voorgelegd. Dan is de verwachting dat je sneller reageert (en het woord als negatief beoordeeld), dan wanneer je het woord *betrouwbaar* krijgt.

Groep 1 en 2 hebben dezelfde tekstfragmenten en woorden voorgelegd gekregen en verschillen alleen op de informatie over de schrijver die ze hebben gekregen. Ik hoop dat ik significante verschillen vind tussen de groepen proefpersonen, want dan zou ik de conclusie kunnen trekken dat lezers - wanneer de tekst daartoe aanleiding geeft (immorele opvattingen of handelingen van ik-persoon) - *tijdens* het lezen een verband leggen met de schrijver van de tekst.

Tot slot heb je in een van de vragen van de vragenlijst kunnen lezen dat de schrijver Jean Nicholai en de informatie die over hem werd gegeven, door mij is verzonden. De immorele tekstfragmenten die je hebt gelezen zijn origineel en komen uit de romans *Elementaire Deeltjes* en *Platform*; beide zijn van de Franse schrijver Michel Houellebecq. De meer neutrale tekstfragmenten zijn door mij geconstrueerde ‘tegenhangers’ van de immorele tekstfragmenten.

Wie meer informatie wil ontvangen, reacties kwijt wil, of -indien de resultaten bekend zijn - een kort verslag wil ontvangen, kan contact opnemen.

Vriendelijke groet,
Drs. E.H.P.M. (Eefje) Claassen
De Boelelaan 1105 (kamer 8A31)
1081 HV Amsterdam
tel. 020-4446567
e-mail: e.claassen@let.vu.nl
CHAPTER 5 ON-LINE MEASUREMENTS OF AUTHOR INFERENCES THROUGH AFFECTIVE PRIMING II

APPENDIX A – MATERIALS – CELEX – INFORMATION ABOUT PROBES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nr</th>
<th>adjective Dutch (English)</th>
<th>Frequency word form</th>
<th>Frequency lemma (freq)</th>
<th>Log10 (freq)</th>
<th>Word length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>betrouwbaar (reliable)</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>eerlijk (honest)</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>oprech (sincere)</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>behulpzaam (helpful)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>attent (thoughtful)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>goed (good)</td>
<td>45406</td>
<td>79308</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target Adjective - Negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nr</th>
<th>adjective Dutch (English)</th>
<th>Frequency word form</th>
<th>Frequency lemma (freq)</th>
<th>Log10 (freq)</th>
<th>Word length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>agressief (aggressive/hostile)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>vals (vicious)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>kwaadaardig (malicious)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>slecht (bad)</td>
<td>4810</td>
<td>7977</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>gemeen (mean)</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>meedogenloos (ruthless)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filler Adjective - Positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nr</th>
<th>adjective Dutch (English)</th>
<th>Frequency word form</th>
<th>Frequency lemma (freq)</th>
<th>Log10 (freq)</th>
<th>Word length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>gewetensvol (conscientious)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>deugdzaam (virtuous)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>rechtshapen (upright)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>leuk (nice)</td>
<td>3026</td>
<td>4026</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>barmhartig</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>moreel (moral)</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filler Adjective - Negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nr</th>
<th>adjective Dutch (English)</th>
<th>Frequency word form</th>
<th>Frequency lemma (freq)</th>
<th>Log10 (freq)</th>
<th>Word length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>twijfelachtig (questionable)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>opvliegend (peppery)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>leugenachtig (mendacious)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>akelig nasty</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>egoïstisch (selfish)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>vervelend (anoying)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Word frequency lemma : 489
Median Log10(freq) : 2.69

** = no data available in CELEX at the time of the experiment (April 2004).

APPENDIX A – MATERIALS – AUTHOR PRIME VERSIONS (IN DUTCH)

Immoreel


Franse schrijver in opspraak vanwege zedendelict

Jean Nicholai, schrijver van diverse controversiële werken (o.a. ‘Obsession’), is de afgelopen dagen in opspraak geraakt, nadat is gebleken dat hij enkele jaren geleden door de politie van Lille is opgepakt op grond van verdenking van ernstig seksueel misbruik van een 5-jarig meisje en haar 8-jarige zusje. De zaak kwam aan het licht, doordat een journalist van Le Monde – die onderzoek doet naar een vermeende dooppotcultuur bij
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De 60-jarige schrijver is de laatste jaren vanwege zijn controversiële romans al vaker onderwerp van discussie geweest. Enkele jaren geleden was hij nog een obscure dichter en een herstellende psychiatrische patiënt die slechts één roman had geschreven en die zijn brood verdiende met het repareren van computers bij het Franse parlement. Toen publiceerde hij in 1999 ‘Univers d’Enfants’, een roman die vol stond met expliciete beschrijvingen van seks met kinderen. Er werden 300.000 exemplaren verkocht en de roman ontstond in Frankrijk een ongekend nationaal debat over wat nog valt onder vrijheid van meningsuiting, en wat onder het aanzetten tot pedofilie. In een interview zei Nicholai: “Ach, waar maken de mensen zich druk om. Pedofilie is een onderwerp waarop mensen veel te spastisch reageren. Seks met volwassenen zou kinderen beschadigen; nou, ik denk dat ‘t heus wel meevalt.”

Nicholai heeft zich teruggetrokken in zijn vakantiehuisje in Bretagne en weigert vooralsnog commentaar te geven. Zijn uitgever heeft aangegeven de betrekking en met de schrijver onmiddellijk te zullen verbreken indien de verdenkingen van verkrachting gegrond blijken.

(Uit: Lire, le magazine littéraire, augustus 2003)

Moreel


Franse schrijver wint prestigieuze ‘Prix Goncourt’

Jean Nicholai, schrijver van diverse succesvolle werken (o.a. ‘Sur la table de nuit’) heeft gisteren de prestigieuze literaire prijs, de ‘Prix Goncourt’, gewonnen voor zijn laatste roman ‘Petit air’. Zijn debuutroman werd in 1996 al bekroond met de ‘Prix Médicis’. De 60-jarige schrijver ontvangt hiermee een geldbedrag van 100.000 euro.

Nicholai is de laatste jaren al vaker in het nieuws geweest, vanwege zijn succesvolle en grensverleggende romans, maar ook vanwege zijn openhartige interviews. Enkele jaren geleden was hij nog een onbekende dichter uit een armlastig gezin die zijn brood verdiende met het repareren van computers bij het Franse parlement. Toen publiceerde hij in 1996 ‘Univers d’Enfants’, een roman die de kwetsbaarheid van kinderen in achterstandswijken op een onmiskenbare wijze in beeld bracht en een breed publiek deed kennismaken met Nicholai’s literaire kwaliteiten. Er werden 300.000 exemplaren verkocht en Frankrijk kende een ongekend nationaal debat over de rechten van het kind, wat uiteindelijk resulteerde in een mede door de Franse regering gefinancierd project SOS Enfants. In een interview zei Nicholai: “Kinderen moeten kind kunnen zijn, en in alle vrijheid en veiligheid kunnen spelen. Het is hartverscheurend om te zien dat kinderen in achterstandswijken die kans niet wordt geboden, en ze vaak al vroeg te maken krijgen met geweld en criminaliteit. Ik kan u niet zeggen hoe dankbaar ik ben de mogelijkheid te hebben via mijn romans mensen wakker te schudden, mensen die doorgaans niet in achterstandswijken komen, of daar geen oog voor hebben.”

Nicholai verblijft momenteel in zijn vakantiehuisje in Bretagne en heeft via zijn uitgever verklaard enorm vereerd te zijn met de prijs. Het geldbedrag wil hij ter beschikking stellen aan SOS Enfants.

(Uit: Lire, le magazine littéraire, augustus 2003)

APPENDIX A – MATERIALS – QUESTIONNAIRE (in Dutch)

Vragen over het leesonderzoek

Onderstaande vragen hebben betrekking op het leesonderzoek waaraan je zojuist hebt meegedaan. Omcirkel het antwoord van je keuze.

1. Wat is je beeld van de schrijver van de tekstfragmenten die je hebt gelezen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zeer positief</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>zeer negatief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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2. De tekstfragmenten die je hebt gelezen zijn geschreven door de Franse schrijver Jean Nicholai. Noem (maximaal) vijf woorden waarmee je de schrijver zou typeren, en geef per woord aan of je de kwalificatie positief, negatief of neutraal vindt (kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>woord</th>
<th>positief</th>
<th>negatief</th>
<th>neutraal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In de tekstfragmenten is een ikj persoon aan het woord. Noem (maximaal) vijf woorden waarmee je de ikj persoon zou typeren, en geef per woord aan of je de kwalificatie positief, negatief of neutraal vindt (kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>woord</th>
<th>positief</th>
<th>negatief</th>
<th>neutraal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hieronder staan definities van moreel en immoreel. Lees ze door en beantwoord daarna de rest van de vragen.

**moreel**
- dat wat in overeenstemming is met jouw normen en waarden.

**immoreel**
- dat wat in strijd is met jouw normen en waarden.

4. De schrijver lijkt me een…

zeer moreel persoon 1 2 3 4 5 zeer immoreel persoon

5. Hoe vaak heb je tijdens het lezen van de tekstfragmenten gedacht aan wat je over de schrijver (Jean Nicholai) hebt gelezen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>regelmatig</th>
<th>vaak</th>
<th>zo nu en dan</th>
<th>vrijwel niet</th>
<th>geen enkele keer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Wat is je het meest bijgebleven van de informatie over de schrijver die je tijdens het onderzoek kreeg te lezen?

7. Heb je tijdens het lezen van de tekstfragmenten je afgevraagd, hoe serieus je de opvattingen van de ikj persoon zou moeten nemen?

| 0 | ja, vooral bij het tekstfragment dat ging over……. |
| 0 | nee |

8. Heb je je afgevraagd of de schrijver de ideeën van de ikj persoon deelt?

| 0 | ja, vooral bij het tekstfragment dat ging over……. |
| 0 | nee |

9. Hoe positief of negatief vond je over het algemeen de tekstfragmenten die je hebt gelezen?

heel positief 1 2 3 4 5 heel negatief

10. Normaal gesproken ga ik ervan uit dat de schrijver van een literaire tekst (verhaal, roman, novelle etc) een moreel acceptabele persoon is.

helemaal niet mee eens  1  2  3  4  5 volkomen mee eens

11. Bij sommige tekstfragmenten die ik heb gelezen, ging ik twijfelen aan de goede bedoelingen van de schrijver.

helemaal niet mee eens  1  2  3  4  5 volkomen mee eens

12. Bij sommige tekstfragmenten die ik heb gelezen, vroeg ik me af of de schrijver wil dat ik zijn tekst als ironisch interpreteer.

helemaal niet mee eens  1  2  3  4  5 volkomen mee eens

- blader door naar de volgende pagina-

13a. Bij sommige fragmenten was ik - als ik niet had meegedaan aan een onderzoek - het liefst gestopt met lezen.

helemaal niet mee eens  1  2  3  4  5 volkomen mee eens

Indien je bovenstaande vraag hebt beantwoord met 4 of 5, beantwoord dan de volgende vraag. Indien je 1,2 of 3 hebt geantwoord, ga dan verder met vraag 14.

13b. Ik was het liefst gestopt met lezen, omdat

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. Over het algemeen vind ik het leuk om literaire teksten te lezen (verhaal, roman, novelle etc), waarin de schrijver moreel onacceptabele personen opvoert.

helemaal niet mee eens  1  2  3  4  5 volkomen mee eens

15. Zou je bij elk van de onderstaande bijvoeglijke naamwoorden op een schaaltje willen aankruisen hoe positief of negatief jij het betreffende bijvoeglijke naamwoord beoordeelt? Je kunt het snel doen; het gaat om je eerste indruk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bijvoeglijke naamwoord</th>
<th>Heel negatief</th>
<th>Negatief</th>
<th>Beetje negatief</th>
<th>Beetje positief</th>
<th>Positief</th>
<th>Heel positief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 betrouwbaar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 agressief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 gewetensvol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004 twijfelachtig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005 eerlijk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006 vals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 deugdzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 opvliegend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009 oprecht</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010 kwaadaardig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011 rechtschappen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 leugenachtig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013 behulpzaam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014 slecht</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015 leuk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016 akelig</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017 attent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Ik vond de informatie over de schrijver……
heel ongelovig 1 2 3 4 5 heel gelovig
- blader door naar de volgende pagina-

17. De tekstjes die je hebt gelezen zijn van een bestaande Franse schrijver, maar niet van Jean Nicholai. De informatie die je over deze fictieve schrijver hebt gelezen is door mij verzonnen. Heb je een idee van welke Franse schrijver de teksten zouden kunnen zijn? (kruis het antwoord van je keuze aan)
0 Ik weet het niet zeker, maar denk aan…………………………(vul een naam in)
0 Ik denk aan deze schrijver, omdat……………………………………………………
0 Ik weet het zeker; het is………………………………………..(vul een naam in)
0 Ik heb geen idee.

18. Tot slot nog vier korte vragen:

d. Mijn leeftijd is…..jaar
0 Ja
0 Nee
e. Mijn moedertaal is Nederlands
0 Ja
0 Nee
f. Ik ben
0 Man
0 Vrouw
g. Ik ben …e jaarsstudent (vul jaar in en kruis aan welke studie je volgt)
0 SCW – Bestuur en Organisatie
0 SCW – Cultuur, Organisatie en Management
0 SCW – Communicatiewetenschap
0 SCW – Politologie
0 SCW – Sociale en Culturele Antropologie
0 SCW – Sociaal Culturele Wetenschappen
0 Anders, namelijk…

Hartelijk dank voor je medewerking!

APPENDIX B – RESULTS: TABLES 5.i – 5.vii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable (betrouwbaar)</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest (eerlijk)</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincere (oprecht)</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good (goed)</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful (behulpzaam)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive (attent)</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicious (vals)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious (kwaadaardig)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mean (gemeen)  1.48  1-2  .506
bad/nasty (slecht)   1.50  1-3  .641
aggressive (agressief)  1.70  1-3  .687
ruthless (meedogenloos)  1.73  1-4  .784

Filler adjectives

mendacious (leugenachtig)  1.68  1-3  .616
horrible (akelig)   1.85  1-3  .700
selfish (egoistisch)  1.95  1-4  .815
peppery (opvliegend)  2.33  1-3  .656
annoying (vervelend)  2.35  1-3  .622
questionable (twijfelachtig)  2.80  1-4  .648
merciful (barmhartig)  4.73  2-6**  1.037
decent (deugdzaam)  4.93  3-6  .616
moral (moreel)   4.95  4-6  .552
righteous (rechtshapen)  4.98  4-6  .577
conscientious (gewetensvol)  5.00  3-6  .712
nice (leuk)   5.23  4-6  .530

*N = 40, ** only one participant evaluated the adjective negatively (2).

TABLE 5.ii
ANOVA Summary Table for corrected response latencies for word length a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>sign. cb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC(Author condition)</td>
<td>617258.707</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>617258.707</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups (AC)</td>
<td>2391346.286</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>597836.572</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Groups)</td>
<td>13208496.093</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>412765.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Text (VT)</td>
<td>148508.825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148508.825</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence Probe (VP)</td>
<td>238538.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238538.667</td>
<td>4.638</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP</td>
<td>2482.438</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2482.428</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x AC</td>
<td>110564.398</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110564.398</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP x AC</td>
<td>25550.526</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25550.526</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT x VP x AC</td>
<td>1635.155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1635.155</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG (Text Group)</td>
<td>12305.264</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12305.264</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>154292.354</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51430.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These results are based on 40 subjects.
b Based on critical values of the F-distribution (Field, 2005: Appendix A.3)

TABLE 5.iii
Correctness of the responses to statements by author condition and text valence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Valence</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral Author condition</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Author condition</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.iv

Qualifications of the author in positive, negative and neutral words (item 2 of the questionnaire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition: Immoral</th>
<th>Text Condition: Negative (congruent)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>eerbied/ruimdenkend/controversieel/ openhartig, expliciet/ direct, provocerend/ zelfverzekerd, levensgenieter</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>pervers, extreem, uitlokend, afwijkend, openlijk/direct, sarcastisch, kritisch, openhartig, ironisch/ controversieel, geobsedeerd, hard, pedofil/ pedofil, vunzig/ zielig, egoïstisch, immoreel/ grof, cynisch, sex-gericht, eigenzinnig/ egoencentrisch, masochistisch, gewetenloos/ pedo, racist, egoïstisch, crimineel, makkees/ eng, gestoord, controversieel/ eenzaam, miskend/ seksistisch, egoïstisch, cynisch/ egoïstisch, arrogant, kindonvriendelijk</td>
<td>42 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>shockerend/ziek/ afwezig/ rebels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition: Immoral</th>
<th>Text Condition: Positive (incongruent)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>intelligent, hoge neiging tot nadenken, avontuurlijk/ fantasierijk, interessant, levendig/bondig, kort/intelligent/ religieuze, open blik, dwars/ andersdenkend/ kunstig schrijvend/ reizen liefhebber, optimistisch</td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>vreemd/ vaag, chaotisch/ obscene, pervers, verwend, elitair/ vies, gek in zin v. gestoord, egoïstisch, arrogant/ normaal/ (tegen huilende) baby’s</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>apart/ serieus, moreel/ poëtisch/ tegen grenzen aanschoppen/ pro Islam, sexistisch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition: Moral</th>
<th>Text Condition: Positive (congruent)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>kindvriendelijk, rechtvaardig, menselijk, moreel, gewetensvol/ humaan, inspirerend, talentvol, gul/ alert, verrassend/kritisch, creatief/ ambitieus, idealistisch, niet op zichzelf gericht, moralistisch, betrouwbaar/ moreel, actueel/ kennisrijk, onderlegd, beschermd, brutaal/ kritisch, origineel/ eerlijk, oprecht/ genieidend, inspirerend</td>
<td>30 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>somber/onnadenkend, recalcitrant/streng/ grensverleggend, oordelend</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>ervaring/goed/ bedachtzaam, vooruitstrevend/ moreel/ excentrieik/resoluut</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition: Moral</th>
<th>Text Condition: Negative (incongruent)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>vrijgevig, interessant, veelzijdig/ meelevend, vriendelijk, slim/ direct, duidelijk, sociaal, moedig/grof, duidelijk/ direct, humoristisch, fantasierijk/ vrijgevig, steunend, humoristisch/controversieel/ maatschappelijk betrokken, emotioneel, gedreven</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>overdreven/ agressief, narcistisch, discriminerend, gefrustreerd/ zakelijk/ uitgesproken, obscene, overdreven, langdradig/ grof, hatelijk/ hard/</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>extreem/vreemd/direct/radicaal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5.v

Qualifications of the narrator in positive, negative and neutral words (item 2 of the questionnaire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition: Immoral</th>
<th>Text Condition: Negative (congruent)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>saai, sympathiek, begrijpelijk/grappig, eerlijk/ kind-gericht’, sympathiek/ controversieel/ seksistisch, kritisch/ eerlijk/ avontuurlijk, intelligent</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>pessimistisch, seksistisch/ gemeen, wreed, dom, gestoord, narcistisch/hard, egoïstisch/ egoïstisch/ zielig, [im] a-moreel, egoïstisch, vervelend/ koelibloedig, grof, pedofil, sexueel/ moordenaar, obsessief, egoïstisch/ pedo, racist, egoïstisch, crimineel, makkees (OPM: zelfde als bij schrijver)/</td>
<td>41 (73%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
masochistisch, pedofiel, gestoord, egoïstisch/ boos, gewetenloos, machtbelust, 
gefrustreerd, trots/ seksistisch, egoïstisch, cynisch/ onmenselijk, agressief, egoïstisch 
Neutral geobsedeerd door seks/ziek 2 56

Author Condition: Immoral Text Condition: Positive (incongruent) N

| Positive            | gezellig / interessant, op zichzelf/ nadenkend, intelligent, zachttaardig/ vriendelijk, open blik, verkenner/ open, normatief/ oplossing zoekend, optimistisch 13 (46.5%) |
| Negative            | onverantwoordelijk, eenzaam/ moeilijk/gemeen, ongeloofwaardig/ elitair/ naïef/ gewetenloos/ chagrijnig 9 (32%) |
| Neutral             | zelfverzekerd, apart/dromerig/ serieus, moreel/ ironisch 6 (21.5%) |
| One participant answered: “kan ik niet beantwoorden” 28 |

Author Condition: Moral Text Condition: Positive (congruent) N

| Positive            | slim, rationeel, interessant/nieuwsgierig/ kritisch/ zorgzaam/ sympathiek/ intelligent/ moralistisch, vredelievend, oprecht 11 |
| Negative            | egoïstisch, bekrompen, onbetrouwbaar, onvriendelijk/vreemd/ negatief ingesteld, stellig, niet ruimdenkend/ anti-moslim/ narrow minded, kwadaardig, moreel/ wereldvreemd, cynisch, lomp, onbetrouwbaar/oordelend/ 17 |
| Neutral             | levensgenieter/neutraal/oplettend/ oververweldig?, twijfelachtig/hebberig/ religieuzezoekende 8 |

Author Condition: Moral Text Condition: Negative (incongruent) N

| Positive            | eerlijk/ anders, eerlijk, onnadenkend 4 (10%) |
| Negative            | onverantwoordelijk, onaardig, achterbaks, racistisch/ haatdragend, verbitterd, gefrustreerd, afstandelijk/ egoïstisch, hard, seksbelust, kil, bekrompen/ onverantwoord, ongeinteresseerd/ saai, meedogenloos, discriminerend, gevoelloos/ ongeluiddig, gemeen, ontrouw, leugenaardig, immoreel/ ongevoelig, seksbelust, agressief/ gewetenloos, egoïstisch 30 (75%) |
| Neutral             | seksistisch, levensgenieter, extreme/seksistisch, lusteloos/ hard 6 (15%) |

**TABLE 5.vi**
Frequency distribution for response to statement ‘Wondered how serious the opinions of the ‘I’ should be taken’ by author condition and text valence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immoral Author Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive texts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative texts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Author Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive texts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative texts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum expected count is 4.00
**TABLE 5.vii**  
Frequency distribution for response to statement ‘Wondered whether the writer shares the ideas of the ‘I’ by author condition and text valence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Condition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immoral Author Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive texts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative texts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Author Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive texts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative texts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum expected count is 4.00
Samenvatting
(Summary in Dutch)

Maakt het voor het lezen van een roman of gedicht uit dat de lezer weet dat de schrijver antisemite pamfletten heeft geschreven (Louis-Ferdinand Céline), zijn hospita heeft vermoord (Gerrit Achterberg) of heeft verzonnen dat hij een zoontje had dat op 5-jarige leeftijd aan een hersentumor is overleden (Boudewijn Büch)? Of speelt die informatie bij lezers tijdens het lezen van een literaire tekst geen enkele rol? Maakt de lezer tijdens het lezen op basis van de tekst een voorstelling van de schrijver, ook als hij of zij niets van deze schrijver weet? Of speelt die schrijver als persoon en zijn of haar intenties tijdens het lezen geen rol?

Sommige literatuurwetenschappers zijn van mening dat de auteur irrelevant is voor de interpretatie van een literaire tekst en dus buiten het leesproces zou moeten worden gehouden. Deze opvatting heeft lange tijd een prominente positie binnen de literatuurtheorie behouden en is vandaag de dag nog steeds invloedrijk. Tegelijkertijd is de auteur wel degelijk relevant voor de interpretatie vanuit een feministisch of postkoloniaal perspectief op literatuur, waarin het geslacht en de etniciteit van de auteur van belang zijn. Bovendien is de auteur in de literatuurkritiek nooit afwezig geweest, en ook in de media en in de boekmarketing is de persoon van de schrijver, sinds de jaren zestig, niet meer weg te denken.

Het doel van dit proefschrift is om die opmerkelijke kloof te overbruggen tussen enerzijds de normatieve opvatting in de literatuurtheorie (de auteur is irrelevant) en anderzijds de prominente positie die de auteur inneemt in sommige interpretatie-opvattingen en in andere gebieden van het literaire landschap door het leesproces onder de loep te nemen en licht te laten schijnen op wat er gebeurt tijdens het lezen van literaire fictie. Volgen lezers het voorschrift dat de auteur irrelevant behoort te zijn voor de interpretatie van de tekst?

Om die vragen te kunnen beantwoorden is een theoretisch raamwerk opgezet waarin enerzijds inzichten vanuit de literatuurtheorie met betrekking tot literaire communicatie en anderzijds inzichten en methoden van onderzoek uit de cognitieve psychologie met betrekking tot het leesproces, meer precies discourse processing, zijn betrokken. Deze combinatie biedt mogelijkheden om tot een beter begrip te komen van het leesproces van lezers van literaire teksten. In literaire communicatie kunnen vanuit het perspectief van de lezer gezien verschillende deelnemers betrokken zijn, onder wie de lezer zelf en de auteur van een tekst, maar ook de verteller van het verhaal en de personages waarover hij of zij vertelt. Deze deelnemers opereren op verschillende niveaus van communicatie: de communicatieve context waarin de lezer en auteur zijn gepositioneerd, het tekstevenue en het niveau van de verhaalwereld. Hoe verwerkt de lezer die verschillende niveaus? Maakt hij bijvoorbeeld een

---

1 Nederlandstalige titel: Voetafdrukken van de schrijver in de tuin der fictie, door lezers gegenereerde auteursinferenties tijdens het lezen van literatuur.
mentale voorstelling van de auteur als onderdeel van of deelnemer aan de communicatieve context?

Bij de mentale representatie van de auteur is een onderscheid gemaakt tussen enerzijds een mentale voorstelling die een lezer van een auteur maakt op basis van contextuele, waaronder biografische, informatie (empirische auteur) en anderzijds een mentale voorstelling van een auteur op basis van de tekst alleen (geïmpliceerde auteur). De vraag die in het onderzoek centraal staat is hoe lezers binnen dat theoretische raamwerk de communicatieve niveaus in cognitieve zin verwerken, bijvoorbeeld of ze aparte voorstellingen creëren van een empirische auteur, een geïmpliceerde auteur en een verteller of dat ze die misschien samennemen in één mentale voorstelling. De veronderstelling is hierbij dat lezers tijdens het lezen in cognitief psychologische zin verbanden leggen met de auteur (auteursinferenties genereren) die bijdragen aan die mentale voorstelling van een empirische en/of impliciete auteur. Getracht is deze vraag te beantwoorden aan de hand van een aantal experimenten waarbij proefpersonen telkens een (al dan niet gemanipuleerd) fragment uit een literaire roman lezen.

In het kort tonen de resultaten van de empirische studies die in dit proefschrift zijn gepresenteerd aan dat de auteur wel degelijk deel is van het leesproces van lezers van literatuur. Dat betekent dus dat de normatieve literatuuropvatting dat de auteur irrelevant is voor het interpreteren van een tekst, althans waar het het leesproces van niet-professionele lezers betreft, op basis van de resultaten niet houdbaar is. Meer specifiek wijzen de resultaten erop dat zelfs lezers die geen informatie hebben over de empirische auteur van de tekst, een mentale voorstelling construeren van iemand die de tekst heeft geschreven met een bepaald doel (Hoofdstuk 2 en 3). Als lezers wél over biografische informatie beschikken over een auteur van de tekst, dan construeren zij een mentale voorstelling van de auteur die gebaseerd is op zowel die contextuele informatie als informatie die lezers uit de tekst halen (Hoofdstuk 4 en 5).

In het eerste geval, waarin lezers over geen enkele contextuele informatie beschikken over de auteur en alleen de tekst als informatiebron hebben, construeren ze theoretisch gezien een voorstelling van een impliciete auteur. In het tweede geval suggereren de resultaten van het onderzoek dat er een complex proces optreedt waarin het beeld dat lezers hebben geconstrueerd op basis van biografische informatie (empirische auteur) een interactie aangaat met hun beeld van de auteur dat is gebaseerd op de tekst (impliciete auteur).
eindigt met bovengenoemd theoretisch raamwerk en de doelstellingen en vraagstellingen van het onderzoek.

Hoofdstuk 2 gaat in op een explorerende studie waarin lezers – op aangegeven punten in de tekst – hardop moesten denken terwijl ze een fragment uit een verhalende tekst lazen. Hierbij kregen ze vooraf geen informatie over de schrijver, context of genre van de tekst. Het doel van deze studie was om te onderzoeken hoe lezers verhalende teksten in cognitief psychologische zin verwerken, en in hoeverre ze een mentale voorstelling maken van de communicatieve deelnemers uit het in hoofdstuk 1 gepresenteerde raamwerk.

De resultaten laten zien dat het moeilijk blijkt om duidelijke auteursinferenties te identificeren, omdat lezers vaak de geïmpliceerde auteur, verteller en het thema of de pointe van de tekst combineren in één opmerking. Reacties van lezers op vragen die na het lezen werden gesteld laten echter zien dat alle lezers een representatie van een geïmpliceerde auteur en zijn intenties hadden geconstrueerd. De conclusie is daarom dat lezers mogelijk wel auteursinferenties hebben gegenereerd die tot de constructie van hun auteursbeeld hebben bijgedragen, maar dat de hardop-denken methode deze waarschijnlijk vluchtige en automatisch gegenereerde inferenties niet kan aantonen. Als het waar is dat deze auteursinferenties een vluchtige respons betreffen, dan zou dus naar meer gevoelige meetmethoden moeten worden gezocht. Daarnaast zouden condities en methoden moeten worden ingezet die het mogelijk maken om een onderscheid te maken tussen een lezersrespons die betrekking heeft op hetzij de empirische auteur, de geïmpliceerde auteur, de verteller, of het thema of de pointe van een tekst.

Een aanknopingspunt is gevonden in controversiële romans, omdat lezers de empirische en/of geïmpliceerde auteur van deze romans verantwoordelijk lijken te houden voor een onacceptabel perspectief op bepaalde zaken via de mening of daden van verteller en/of personages. Die discussies lijken ook te wijzen op bepaalde verwachtingen die lezers hebben ten aanzien van de auteur die normaal gesproken impliciet blijven. Nagegaan is wat er precies op het spel staat en waarom die auteurs expliciet in het debat worden betrokken.

In hoofdstuk 3 is getoond dat hier een uniek kenmerk van het lezen van fictie aan de orde is, namelijk een impliciete, gezamenlijke afspraak tussen auteur en lezer van een fictionele tekst. Die afspraak, joint pretence, houdt in dat de auteur de lezer uitnodigt om te doen alsof de gebeurtenissen in de fictionele wereld echt plaatsvinden. Vanuit de lezer gezien genereert deze afspraak bepaalde verwachtingen over de auteur die gebaseerd zijn op conventionele (met betrekking tot genres) of specifieke kennis. De afspraak impliceert dat de lezer de auteur een zeker vertrouwen geeft dat de auteur zich ook houdt aan die afspraak, en dat hij waarden en normen heeft die gedeeld worden door de lezer. De veronderstelling is dat als lezers bij wijze van uitgangspunt (default) ervan uitgaan dat de geïmpliceerde auteur moreel acceptabel is, ze dan een onderscheid zouden moeten kunnen maken tussen een immorele verteller en een veronderstelde, moreel acceptabele geïmpliceerde auteur. Die immorele verteller zal naar verwachting de afspraak tussen auteur en lezer onder druk zetten en als gevolg daarvan zullen lezers inferenties genereren over de morele positie, identiteit en intenties van de auteur.

Deze verwachtingen zijn in hoofdstuk 3 getest in een pilot studie en in een experiment. Daarvoor zijn twee tekstfragmenten gemanipuleerd uit de Nederlandse vertaling van de roman Les Particules élémentaires van de Franse schrijver Michel Houellebecq. Deze roman heeft veel discussie teweeggebracht waarin vragen werden gesteld over Houellebecqs intenties en morele positie. Beide tekstversies – een oorspronkelijke, immorele en een gemanipuleerde, moreel relatief neutrale – zijn wederom zonder informatie over de schrijver aan de proefpersonen voorgelegd. De resultaten bieden ondersteuning voor de veronderstelling dat lezers als default aannemen dat de auteur moreel acceptabel is. Daarnaast suggereren de resultaten, net als de resultaten van de vorige studie, dat ook als lezers niet over informatie
beschikken over een empirische auteur, ze een voorstelling van een geïmprimeerde auteur construeren. Teksten met moreel discutabele acties of opvattingen die worden gepresenteerd door de (ik-)verteller van een tekst hebben blijkbaar tot effect dat lezers de morele en ideologische positie van de geïmprimeerde auteur in twijfel trekken.

Overigens is er geen overtuigende ondersteuning gevonden voor de hypotheses dat lezers van teksten met een immorele verteller meer inferenties genereren met betrekking tot de identiteit en intenties van die auteur dan lezers van teksten met een meer neutrale verteller. Lezers lijken over het algemeen een contextueel kader nodig te hebben om de tekst te interpreteren en vragen zich om andere redenen dan het immorele karakter van de tekst alléén af wie de auteur is en wat zijn intenties zijn.

Trot slot geven de resultaten aan welke specifieke tekstsegmenten voor lezers aanleiding gaven vraagtekens te zetten bij de morele positie van de geïmprimeerde auteur. Deze segmenten dienden als voorlopige basis voor het uitvoeren van zogenaamde on-line experimenten die in hoofdstuk 4 en 5 worden besproken.

Met het experiment in hoofdstuk 4 is onderzocht wat het effect is van biografische informatie over een empirische auteur op het leesproces. Dit experiment verschilt in twee opzichten van de vorige twee empirische studies. Ten eerste krijgen lezers dit keer doelbewust wel informatie over de empirische auteur. Ten tweede gaat het, in tegenstelling tot het vorige experiment waarin door lezers gegenereerde auteursinferenties gemeten zijn na het lezen van een tekst aan de hand van een vragenlijst, in dit experiment om een meetmethode waarvan verwacht kan worden dat ze inferenties tijdens het leesproces kunnen meten. Deze methode wordt vaak gebruikt in de cognitieve psychologie en psycholinguïstiek.

In dit hoofdstuk wordt eerst de theoretische achtergrond van deze zogenaamde affective priming methode besproken. Vervolgens worden de resultaten van drie pilot studies gepresenteerd op basis waarvan een keuze voor het stimulusmateriaal is gemaakt dat in het experiment is gebruikt. Dit materiaal bestaat allereerst uit tekstfragmenten uit twee romans van Michel Houellebecq: Platform en Elementaire Deeltjes. De originele, “immorele” tekstversies zijn wederom gemanipuleerd tot moreel relatief neutrale versies. De procedure van het experiment is als volgt: proefpersonen lezen zowel immorele als neutrale tekstfragmenten regel voor regel van een computerscherm, maar ze lezen slechts van elk fragment één versie. De leestijd van elke zin wordt geregistreerd. Voordat ze deze teksten lezen, ontvangen de proefpersonen informatie op hun scherm over een Franse, fictieve schrijver: de ene helft van de groep krijgt informatie over een heel moreel persoon (de auteur is bijvoorbeeld de voormalige ambassadeur van UNICEF) en de andere helft krijgt informatie over een immoreel persoon (veroordeeld voor het verkrachten van een 5-jarig meisje). Tijdens het verschijnen van de fragmenten wordt het leesproces tweemaal onderbroken door de presentatie van een positief (bijvoorbeeld betrouwbaar) of negatief woord (bijvoorbeeld agressief). De tijd die proefpersonen nodig hebben om te beslissen of dat woord positief of negatief is (reactietijd) wordt geregistreerd.

Aan de hand van het affective priming paradigma is getest of biografische informatie over de empirische auteur invloed heeft op het leesproces. Als dat zo zou zijn, zou dit tot uiting moeten komen in de leestijden en reactietijden. De resultaten laten zien dat de informatie over de empirische auteur in zekere mate invloed heeft op de leestijden: lezers die informatie hebben gekregen over een immorele auteur lezen iets langzamer dan lezers die informatie hebben gekregen over een morele auteur. Dit kan erop wijzen dat eerstgenoemde groep lezers op hun hoede zijn. De resultaten zijn echter niet significant. Daarnaast heeft de auteursinformatie geen effect op de reactietijden. De resultaten laten echter wel zien dat het beeld dat lezers vlak na het lezen van de informatie over de empirische auteur hebben na het lezen van de tekstfragmenten is verschoven: hun beeld van de auteur is minder positief of negatief.
Hoofdstuk 5 behandelt de resultaten van een vervolgexperiment dat qua opzet identiek is aan het experiment uit het vorige hoofdstuk. Op basis van de resultaten van het vorige experiment zijn in dit tweede experiment een paar aspecten aangepast om enerzijds de lezersconstructies met betrekking tot de empirische auteur, de geïmpliceerde auteur en de verteller beter te kunnen onderzoeken en anderzijds om meer ondersteuning te vinden voor de veronderstelling dat lezers tijdens het lezen auteursinferenties genereren. Dat zou tot uiting moeten komen in de reactie- en leestijden.

In tegenstelling tot het vorige experiment lezen lezers nu tekstfragmenten met een verteller die of in overeenstemming of in contrast is met de biografische informatie over de empirische auteur (beide positief of beide negatief). Deze biografische informatie is bovendien gedetailleerder dan in het vorige experiment en de informatie is gepresenteerd in de vorm van een origineel artikel afkomstig uit een bestaand literair tijdschrift.

De resultaten laten geen effecten zien van de auteursinformatie of tekstversies tijdens het leesproces, dus geen effect op reactie- en leestijden. Resultaten van metingen na het lezen van de tekstfragmenten geven echter aan dat lezers – zonder overigens daartoe vooraf te zijn geïnstrueerd – een mentale representatie van de empirische auteur hebben geconstrueerd die bestaat uit de belangrijkste aspecten van de vooraf gelezen biografische informatie. Daarnaast suggereren de resultaten dat de door lezers geconstrueerde representaties van een auteursconcept het resultaat zijn van een complex proces tussen zogenaamde top-down (geïnitieerd door biografische informatie) en bottom-up processen (op basis van informatie uit de tekst). Daarnaast is geconcludeerd dat het affective priming paradigm mogelijkt niet geschikt is om door lezers gegenereerde auteursinferenties on-line te meten.

In hoofdstuk 6 worden de resultaten van de empirische studies kritisch samengevat en geëvalueerd tegen de achtergrond van het theoretische kader zoals dat in het eerste hoofdstuk is weergegeven. De belangrijkste conclusie is dat lezers, ook als ze niets weten over de schrijver van een tekst, een mentale voorstelling construeren van een auteur (geïmpliceerde auteur). Als lezers over biografische informatie beschikken over een empirische auteur, dan sluiten ze die informatie niet uit van hun leesproces, integendeel, die informatie lijkt het leesproces te beïnvloeden.

De resultaten van deze studie hebben implicaties voor de literatuurwetenschap in die zin dat ze bijdragen aan een beter begrip van het literaire leesproces door middel van empirisch onderzoek. Om veronderstellingen van lezers over een auteur empirisch te onderzoeken, is het noodzakelijk een theoretisch onderscheid te maken tussen een geïmpliceerde en een empirische auteur. Als lezers over biografische informatie beschikken over een empirische auteur, dan sluiten ze die informatie niet uit van hun leesproces, integrandeel, die informatie lijkt het leesproces te beïnvloeden.

Daarnaast hebben de resultaten ook implicaties voor de cognitieve psychologie en meer specifiek voor de discipline van discourse processing, waarbij de vraag aan de orde is of lezers tijdens het leesproces zogenaamde auteursinferenties genereren. Hiernaar is nauwelijks onderzoek gedaan. Op basis van de resultaten van dit proefschrift kan worden gesteld dat de definitie van auteursinferenties, zoals die tot nu toe is gehanteerd, te beperkt is om de verschillende typen auteursinferenties die lezers van literatuur kunnen genereren te classificeren en te onderzoeken. Daarnaast wijzen de resultaten erop dat lezers van literaire teksten een mentale representatie construeren van de communicatieve context, waarvan de
auteur deel uitmaakt. In de cognitieve psychologie worden deze lezersconstructies *context models* genoemd. Verondersteld wordt dat – een door lezers geconstrueerde voorstelling van – context van cruciaal belang is in het leesproces.

De resultaten van deze studie suggereren weliswaar dat lezers tijdens het leesproces auteursinferenties hebben gegenereerd en dat deze hebben bijgedragen aan een mentale voorstelling van de auteur. Waar de resultaten echter minder eenduidig over zijn, en waarnaar meer onderzoek nodig is, is *hoe* lezers die auteursrepresentaties construeren en onder welke specifieke omstandigheden, bijvoorbeeld aan de hand van welke specifieke tekstkenmerken. Het is gebleken dat het lastig is om methoden en instrumenten te vinden waarmee de waarschijnlijk vluchtige en automatisch gegenereerde auteursinferenties *on-line* kunnen worden gemeten. In hoofdstuk 6 worden enkele ideeën voor toekomstig onderzoek gepresenteerd. Tot slot wordt besproken hoe het theoretische raamwerk dat was bedoeld om een beter begrip te krijgen van het literaire leesproces tevens zou kunnen bijdragen bij onderzoek naar de receptie van andere genres en media (poëzie, beeldende kunst en film).
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