Literature invites humans to escape from reality and venture into the fantastic. Ancient and modern thinkers have repeatedly commented on the spiritually cathartic role of storytelling (Aristotle, 330 BCE/1970; Nussbaum, 1995; Oatley, 1999), and a body of empirical literature has emerged to underline emotions as a cardinal component of exposure to fiction (Mar et al., 2011; Miall & Kuiken, 2002). From a scientific viewpoint, the longstanding tradition of reading books has been linked with a wide array of advantages in social skills (Kaiser & Quandt, 2016; Mar et al., 2006) and scholastic outcomes (Clark & Rumbold, 2006; Mol & Bus, 2011). For the present work, we sought to further scientific understanding of the mechanisms that draw readers into a text, building on studies that link reading fiction to increased empathy (e.g., Kidd & Castano, 2013). We embraced Kidd and Castano’s (2013) definition of literary fiction texts as pieces of literature that
have earned literary prizes and possibly attained classic status.

In an influential series of experiments, Kidd and Castano (2013) provided evidence that reading a piece of literary fiction yields higher theory of mind performance than reading a piece of nonfiction or popular fiction. These researchers measured theory of mind primarily through recognition tasks that mapped facial expression to affect (feelings), including the “Reading the Mind in the Eyes” Test (RMET; Baron-Cohen et al., 2001). Additional studies have corroborated this finding, showing that multiple forms of literary fiction increase performance on the RMET and related tests (Black & Barnes, 2015a, 2015b; van Kuijk et al., 2018) and boost self-reported empathy (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013; Djikic et al., 2013; Pino & Mazza, 2016). Several other studies, however, have failed to replicate these findings (Panero et al., 2016; Samur et al., 2017), whereas a meta-analysis recently suggested that literary fiction exposure results in statistically significant, albeit small, increases in social cognition (Doddell-Feder & Tamir, 2018).

Insofar as the meta-analysis (Doddell-Feder & Tamir, 2018) proposed that exposure to any piece of literary fiction confers at least some social-cognitive benefits, what mechanisms may underlie a reader’s absorption into a literary work? Narrative transportation refers to readers’ subjective experience of feeling “lost” or immersed in a story and, therefore, offers an important index of involvement with a narrative world (Green & Brock, 2000). Narrative transportation has been highlighted for its persuasive potential, but research has yet to indicate the extent to which it is related to genre. Thus far, there has been some evidence that literary fiction results in higher narrative transportation than popular fiction (Kidd & Castano, 2013; van Kuijk et al., 2018). Narrative transportation has also been found to have a moderating role in reading by increasing empathic concern in people assigned to read fiction rather than nonfiction (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013). Importantly, Black and Barnes (2015a) found that exposure to literary fiction produced greater narrative transportation than exposure to nonfiction did. Critically, however, multiple studies examining fiction (e.g., Panero et al., 2016; Pino & Mazza, 2016) have not included narrative transportation scales in their experimental designs, raising the question of whether narrative transportation consistently depends upon genre.

A second open question regards how empathy should be measured. Prior research on the psychology of fiction (e.g., Black & Barnes, 2015a; Kidd & Castano, 2013; Panero et al., 2016) has focused predominantly on participants’ state empathy (i.e., how empathy might be affected momentarily by different text conditions) when trait empathy (i.e., empathy as an enduring predisposition) may be at least as important. Extensive work has centered upon the moderating role of enduring personality traits on the impact of fiction exposure—traits such as need for affect (Appel & Richter, 2010), need for cognition (Zwarun & Hall, 2012), and openness to experience (Djikic et al., 2013). Relatively few studies focusing on narrative transportation, however, have operationalized empathy as a stable multidimensional trait that encompasses cognitive and emotional components (Davis, 1983). Examples of studies that have approached empathy as a trait construct include correlational work showing a positive relationship between trait empathy and narrative transportation into films (Hall & Bracken, 2011; Taylor, 2015). Some existing work studying empathy as a function of narrative transportation into written pieces (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013; Johnson, 2012) has not considered key dimensions of empathy (e.g., perspective-taking), whereas other studies utilizing trait empathy scales (Djikic et al., 2013; Pino & Mazza, 2016) have not also approached narrative transportation.

Finally, one of the major criticisms mounted against Kidd and Castano’s (2013) seminal work is that those authors did not match text length or difficulty level across conditions (Panero et al., 2016). By comparing fiction pieces of varying levels of difficulty with consistently hard nonfiction texts, prior studies have created a confound of story genre and reading difficulty (Panero et al., 2016), thereby obscuring whether postreading measures indicate an effect of genre or simply the challenge of a given piece. Understanding the different ways in which genre and reading difficulty impact narrative transportation is important given the potential for those variables to generate different levels of enjoyment, a principal correlate of narrative transportation (Green et al., 2004). Following prior work that has highlighted the emotional aspect of fiction (Mar et al., 2011; Mar & Oatley, 2008; Oatley, 1999) and identified need for affect as a moderator in a narrative’s capacity to persuade readers through narrative transportation (Appel & Richter, 2010), we posited emotionality during reading to be highly related to the characteristics of a piece (i.e., genre, difficulty) and, thus, a key process in eliciting different levels of narrative transportation.
The Present Study
We aimed to replicate and extend Black and Barnes’ (2015a) finding on narrative transportation, while approaching empathy as a trait construct. We placed major emphasis on how the confound of genre and story difficulty identified by Panero et al. (2016) may influence the impact of different fiction and nonfiction pieces on narrative transportation. In addition, we measured readers’ affective reactions after reading and investigated how these reactions influenced their narrative transportation into narrative worlds with different levels of reading challenges. In short, the present study addressed limitations of prior work by (a) operationalizing empathy as a multifaceted trait variable rather than a transient state (Davis, 1983), (b) removing a confound of genre and story difficulty present in prior work (Kidd & Castano, 2013), and (c) assessing the mediating role of affect (i.e., participants’ overall mood state; Watson et al., 1988) in narrative transportation.

The first hypothesis was that trait empathy would be positively correlated with narrative transportation (Hall & Bracken, 2011; Taylor, 2015). Second, we predicted that narrative transportation would be higher for participants assigned to read a literary fiction piece than for participants assigned to read a nonfiction piece (Black & Barnes, 2015a); we expected this to be the case regardless of the reading difficulty associated with each text. Third, we anticipated affect to mediate the effects of story genre on narrative transportation, building on literature that has discussed the affective component of narrative transportation (Appel & Richter, 2010; Green et al., 2004; Mar et al., 2011) and the reading experience more broadly (Mar et al., 1988) in narrative transportation.

Method
Participants
A power analysis conducted using G*Power (Cohen’s $d = .22$, significance level $= .05$, power $= .80$, between-subjects design, one-way ANOVA) indicated a required sample size of 267 participants per cell for the proposed study $(N_{\text{proposed}} = 801)$ across the three conditions (challenging fiction, easy fiction, nonfiction control). We collected a sample of 1,005 participants through the MTurk Toolkit platform offered by CloudResearch, each of whom were compensated $2.00 (USD) for participating. The average time to complete the survey was 12.5 minutes. Participants $(n = 111)$ were excluded if they did not give at least 60% correct responses to the attention check questions, resulting in a final sample greater than our proposed power analysis suggested $(N_{\text{final}} = 894)$. Two hundred eighteen respondents reported prior exposure to their assigned stories, but these responses did not change significance decisions for any tests, so these responses were included in the analyses.

Participants were evenly distributed across the challenging fiction, easy fiction, and nonfiction conditions $(N_{\text{CF}} = 296, N_{\text{EF}} = 300, N_{\text{NEF}} = 298)$ and did not vary substantially across demographic variables. Ages ranged from 19 to 74 years $(M = 37.4, SD = 11.5; 57% \text{ men, } 42\% \text{ women, } <1\% \text{ nonbinary/preferred not to say})$. Participants were asked to check all racial categories that applied to them, resulting in a sample that was 75.7% White or European American, 11.0% Black or African American, 0.3% American Indian or Alaska Natives, 4.5% Asian, 0.0% Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islanders, 2.6% Latino/a/x, and 0.3% reported a different race. The remaining 5.6% of the participants reported multiple races or did not report any race. Lastly, participants reported the religious category that applied to them, resulting in a sample that was 17.3% Protestant, 12.9% Roman Catholic, 1.5% Christian Scientist, 0.8% Jewish, 0.8% Muslim, 0.6% An Orthodox Church such as the Greek or Russian Orthodox Church, 0.4% Seventh-Day Adventist, 0.2% Mormon, and 3.6% reported a different religion or preferred not to report their religion. The remaining 61.9% of participants reported that they did not identify with a religious tradition.

Measures
Interpersonal Reactivity Index
The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) was developed by Davis (1983) to measure participants’ levels of trait empathy. The scale contains 28 items that fall into one of four subscales. The cognitive subscales include Perspective-Taking and Fantasy, while the emotional subscales include Empathic Concern and Personal Distress. One example item from this scale is, “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.” Participants rated these items on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 (does not describe me well) to 4 (describes me very well). Davis (1983) reported internal consistency coefficients that ranged from .71 to .77. The Cronbach’s alpha for the present study’s entire scale was .88.

Spot-the-Differences Filler Task
The Spot-the-Differences filler task from All-Star Puzzles (www.allstarpuzzles.com) presented participants with two seemingly identical pictures of kitchen scenes and required them to identify as many differences between the two as possible in 1 min. In the context of this study, this exercise
was intended to mask the exact purpose of the manipulation by introducing a distracting study-irrelevant task and, therefore, lessening the degree to which the completion of the IRI would influence participants’ reactions to their assigned narratives.

**Narratives**
All stories were drawn from Kidd and Castano’s (2013) series of studies and were roughly 1,000 words in length. To remove the confound of story genre (fiction, nonfiction) and readability in that work (Panero et al., 2016), we attempted to assess readability. Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scores were calculated using Microsoft Word on the basis of word length and sentence length. Each narrative selected was equivalent to what students would be expected to read in the grade level (based on the education system in the United States) corresponding with its assigned score. In the challenging fiction condition, participants read an excerpt from Nothing Living Lives Alone, by Wendell Berry (p. 13, “ONE WARM spring Saturday afternoon [...] invested in it, and started back”; Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level = 9.0). In the nonfiction control condition, participants read an article from Smithsonian Magazine (Bamboo Steps Up, by Cathie Gandel; Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level = 10.0). In the easy fiction condition, participants read The Chameleon, by Anton Chekhov (Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level = 3.5). Thus, the challenging fiction and nonfiction control stories were pieces of high-school difficulty, while the easy fiction story was at an elementary grade-level.

**Positive and Negative Affect Scale**
In keeping with Kidd and Castano’s (2013) original design, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988) was used to assess participants’ state affect. They reported their current affective state by rating the degree to which they were feeling each of 10 positive emotions, such as “enthusiastic,” and 10 negative emotions, such as “jittery,” on a scale from 1 (**very slightly or not at all**) to 5 (**extremely**). Scores on the two 10-item subscales were averaged to compute a Positive Affect score (Cronbach’s α = .92) and a Negative Affect score (Cronbach’s α = .95). Watson et al. (1988) reported alpha reliabilities of .89 for Positive Affect and .85 for Negative Affect.

**Narrative Transportation Scale**
Participants reported their reading experience on the Narrative Transportation Scale (NTS; Green & Brock, 2000). Specifically, they rated a set of 11 general items on a 7-point scale, ranging from 0 (**not at all**) to 6 (**very much**). These items captured multiple facets of participants’ reactions to their assigned story worlds, such as emotional engagement, attention, suspense, dissociation, and mental imagery. One example item of this scale is, “I wanted to learn how the narrative ended.” Green and Brock (2000) reported a Cronbach’s α of .76. The Cronbach’s α for the scale in the present study was .79.

**Attention Check Questions**
Participants answered five 2-choice questions that were related to the content of their assigned narratives by way of gauging their level of comprehension.

**Demographic Questions**
Participants were asked whether they had been exposed to any of the assigned narratives prior to their participation in the study. Participants also answered questions pertaining to their age, gender, race, and religious tradition.

**Procedure**
All study procedures and materials were approved by Davidson College’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, and all APA ethical standards were followed. Participants read a consent form which stated that they were participating in a study about “individual responses to scenes and stories” to obscure the research questions and hypotheses. Participants checked a box, confirming that they were at least 18 years old and agreed to participate. They then completed the IRI (Davis, 1983) and the Spot-the-Differences Filler Task. Next, they were randomly assigned to one of the three story conditions (challenging fiction, easy fiction, nonfiction control) and asked to read the corresponding narrative. Participants completed the affect scale (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988) and the transportation scale (NTS; Green & Brock, 2000) after reading the narratives. Finally, there was an assessment of participants’ comprehension of their assigned texts, familiarity with each narrative, and a brief demographic questionnaire prior to debriefing.

**Results**
Table 1 shows significant Pearson correlations across study variables. In line with our prediction, there was a significant positive correlation between aggregate empathy scores on the IRI and narrative transportation scores, $r = .39, p < .001$. Three of the IRI subscale scores (e.g., fantasy, perspective-taking, and empathic concern) were also independently and positively correlated with narrative transportation scores ($p < .001$), but the
personal distress subscale was not \( (p = .11) \). The IRI subscale that correlated most highly with narrative transportation was fantasy, \( r = .40, p < .001 \). These results supported the first hypothesis that trait empathy would be correlated with narrative transportation. In addition, there was a significant positive correlation between positive affect and narrative transportation, \( r = .53, p < .001 \), whereas there was no correlation between negative affect and narrative transportation \( (p = .081) \).

A one-way ANOVA investigating differences in mean narrative transportation scores across the three story conditions revealed a significant main effect of condition on narrative transportation, \( F(2, 891) = 5.79, p = .003, \eta^2 = .013 \). The effect size was small and the achieved power was acceptable \( (1 - \beta = .87) \). Contrary to our predictions, a Bonferroni post hoc test indicated that participants who read easy fiction reported significantly lower narrative transportation \( (M = 4.03, SD = 1.07) \) than participants who read challenging fiction \( (M = 4.29, SD = 0.97, p = .008) \), or nonfiction \( (M = 4.27, SD = 1.01, p = .013) \). The mean-difference between challenging fiction and nonfiction readers was nonsignificant \( (p > .99) \), indicating that narrative transportation did not differ across these groups. In other words, reading challenge level (rather than reading genre) was critical in eliciting narrative transportation.

We performed a second one-way ANOVA to examine potential differences in positive affect scores across the three conditions. Similar to the findings obtained for narrative transportation, this analysis yielded a significant main effect of condition on positive affect, \( F(2, 891) = 12.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = .026 \). The effect size was small, while the achieved power was nearly equal to one \( (1 - \beta > .99) \). A Bonferroni post hoc test suggested a pattern that mirrored the one shown for narrative transportation, with participants assigned to read easy fiction reporting lower positive affect \( (M = 2.73, SD = 0.88) \) than participants assigned to read challenging fiction \( (M = 3.02, SD = 0.93, p = .001) \) and nonfiction \( (M = 3.08, SD = 0.94, p < .001) \). Similar to the narrative transportation ANOVA, no significant differences in affect were found between challenging fiction and nonfiction readers, \( p > .99 \). Again, reading challenge level (rather than reading genre) was critical in eliciting positive emotions. A third ANOVA on negative affect showed no effect of condition on negative affect, \( F(2, 891) = 1.03, p = .358 \). Given that challenging fiction and nonfiction conditions were consistently different from easy fiction condition on narrative transportation and positive affect measures, the following mediation analyses were completed by comparing the combined challenging text conditions with the easy fiction condition.

To explore the potential mediating effects of affect on the relationship between difficulty level and narrative transportation, we conducted a simple mediation analysis using PROCESS (Model 4, Hayes, 2018). We combined the challenging fiction and nonfiction categories (coded as 0) and compared this grouping to easy fiction (coded as 1). As shown in Figure 1, positive affect was found to mediate the relationship between condition and narrative transportation. The direct effect of condition on narrative transportation was rendered nonsignificant by the mediation, \( b = -.09, se = .07, p = .215 \), as the confidence intervals included zero \( (95\% CI [-.23, .05]) \). The indirect effect of condition on narrative transportation through positive affect was significant, \( b = -.16, se = .04 \). The range of the bootstrapped confidence intervals for this effect

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal Reactivity (IR)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IR: Fantasy</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IR: Perspective-Taking</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IR: Empathic Concern</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IR: Personal Distress</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PANAS Positive Affect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PANAS Negative Affect</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items 2 through 5 are subscales of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI). \( p < .05, p < .001 \).
versus nonchallenging stories and narrative mediated the relationship between the challenging than readers of easy fiction. Positive affect conditions) reported higher narrative transportation than those assigned to read easy and challenging fiction did not report higher levels of narrative transportation than those assigned to read nonfiction. Instead, readers of challenging fiction and nonfiction (high difficulty conditions) reported higher narrative transportation than readers of easy fiction. Positive affect mediated the relationship between the challenging versus nonchallenging stories and narrative transportation. This finding indicated that emotional response may vary as a function of reading difficulty and that this variation can subsequently bring about distinct narrative transportation experiences while reading a narrative text.

The correlation detected between trait empathy and narrative transportation supports and extends prior literature that has demonstrated similar results with films (Hall & Bracken, 2011; Taylor, 2015), as well as studies that have examined the relationship between some components of trait empathy and narrative transportation into written pieces (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013; Johnson, 2012). Although these results did not replicate Black and Barnes’ (2015a) finding that literary fiction engenders higher narrative transportation than nonfiction, they did provide evidence that positive affect may be a central factor that undergirds the experience of narrative transportation into particular texts. In addition, by matching narratives on the basis of their respective lengths and reading challenge levels, the present procedure successfully removed a confound present in prior studies comparing fiction narratives of varying complexity with consistently difficult nonfiction texts (Panero et al., 2016).

The mediating role of positive affect on the relationship between reading difficulty and narrative transportation highlights the importance of emotional experience while reading (Mar & Oatley, 2008; Mar et al., 2011; Oatley, 1999). In particular, Green et al. (2004) discussed positive affect as a probable antecedent of enjoyment, a construct crucial to theories arguing that people selectively gravitate toward certain communication messages as a form of mood management (Zillmann, 1988). Consistent with this view, our mediation revealed an association between positive mood and an immersive reading experience. Furthermore, the finding of comparable levels of narrative transportation and positive affect across challenging fiction and nonfiction supports theoretical accounts claiming that nonfictional narratives may serve people’s enjoyment needs, just as much as fictional narratives (Green et al., 2004). On the other hand, the findings for easy fiction imply that not all pieces of literary fiction produce levels of positive affect and narrative transportation that surpass those triggered by exposure to a nonfiction text.

Implications
A key implication of this work is that the readability of a text can exert an important influence on readers’ emotional responses and, consequently, on their narrative transportation experiences. By comparing hard nonfiction with both a challenging and an easy fiction piece, we removed the confound of story genre and readability present in the experiments conducted by Kidd and Castano (2013), who compared easy fiction with consistently hard nonfiction (Panero et al., 2016). The primary challenge in the selection of this study’s reading materials involved the high degree of variation in story length and difficulty scores present in Kidd and Castano’s (2013) stimuli; even one fiction piece that was identified by Panero et al. (2016) as being within the difficulty range of many nonfiction texts (Nothing Living Lives Alone) was substantially longer than 1,000 words and needed to be excerpted to be closer to its less challenging counterpart. The
results showed that even a nonfictional article can provoke a higher degree of immersion into a text than a seemingly less challenging fictional text. The mediational results provided some support for the much-discussed notion that emotions form an integral part of the reading act (Miall & Kuiken, 2002; Oatley et al., 2018; Oatley & Djikic, 2018) by pointing out the distinct role of positive affect on narrative transportation. The absence of any related effects for negative affect appears to suggest that negative affect is not likely to induce narrative transportation, at least in this initial examination. Yet, this conclusion can hardly be drawn for all cases of media exposure. There are examples of fiction whereby enjoyment—and presumably narrative transportation—seem to be derived from the experience of sad emotions (Mar et al., 2011). There are also ways in which positive and negative feelings can coexist in an individual reader’s response to a narrative text. For instance, Koopman’s (2016) qualitative work showed that participants assigned to a literary text condition experienced more ambivalent emotions than participants exposed to a less literary version of the same text. Although the present study emphasized a binary categorization of affect, our findings prompt investigation into the role of negative (or mixed) emotions in reading and the extent to which they might even facilitate the experience of narrative transportation.

Limitations and Future Directions
This study evaluated the effects of a subset of the textual pieces used by Kidd and Castano (2013) to assess the potential confound of story type and reading difficulty that are broadly represented in the extant literature. Although the present investigation was successful in demonstrating the effects of these confounds, the small effect sizes and the narrow range of stories featured create additional questions about the full relationship between baseline empathy, genre, affect, and narrative transportation. The most important limitation of the present study may be that the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, our core index for classifying texts as “challenging” or “easy,” is unlikely to offer a global assessment of a text’s overall difficulty level. Sentences can be grammatically simple, yet the ideas presented may be complex. Unfortunately, the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level tool does not capture this fact; the “easy” Chekhov text in the present study may actually be the “hard” text by other measures. Future work should use more holistic measures of reading challenges, which tap into a narrative’s conceptual as well as grammatical aspects of intricacy.

In addition to our concern regarding the operationalization of reading difficulty, it may be important to consider other variables to which narrative transportation is related. Prior research teams have mentioned the relatively unexplored impact of reflective function (Kidd et al., 2016) and the role of the medium (print or electronic) through which a story is accessed (Mangen & Kuiken, 2014). The main theme of a certain story, first- versus third-person narration, the specifics of plot development, and the author’s sociocultural background may also be important variables. Additionally, future research may benefit from considering the use of questionnaires that measure attitudes toward various aspects of the reading experience (i.e., insight, imagery vividness; Miall & Kuiken, 1995), specific emotions experienced during reading (Miall & Kuiken, 2002), and narrative absorption (Kuijpers et al., 2014).

Conclusion
This study demonstrates that narrative transportation is a highly complex psychological experience, which is correlated with individual empathic tendencies and influenced by the positive emotions elicited by a story and its associated reading difficulty level. Narrative transportation was similar for readers of challenging fiction and nonfiction, indicating that reading difficulty may be more important than genre in producing narrative transportation. It may also be the case that nonfiction can be just as transporting as fiction. Given that this study makes only a first step toward approaching the role of reading difficulty in narrative transportation, future research attempts in this area might benefit from alternative operationalization of reading difficulty. Future studies may seek to clarify the factors that differentiate affective reactions to various genres, as well as the specific emotional content of these reactions. An examination of other variables that are related to immersion into a piece can also be vital in acquiring a greater understanding of how readers respond to the multifaceted world of fiction.
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