

**Please direct all correspondence to:**

Raymond A. Mar

York University, Psychology

4700 Keele St. W.

Toronto, ON

Canada M3J1P3

P: 416-736-2100 x20769

F: 416-736-5814

E: mar@yorku.ca

**Word Count:**

2,500 words

2,394 (Text) / 106 (Abstract)

**References:**

45

**Stories and the Promotion of Social Cognition**

Raymond A. Mar<sup>1</sup>

York University, Psychology

## **Stories and the Promotion of Social Cognition**

### **ABSTRACT**

Engaging with fictional stories and the characters within them might help us better understand our real-world peers. Because stories are about characters and their interactions, understanding stories might help us to exercise our social cognitive abilities. Correlational studies with children and adults, experimental research, and neuropsychological investigations have all helped develop our understanding of how stories relate to social cognition. However, there remain a number of limitations to the current evidence, some puzzling results, and several unanswered questions that should inspire future research. This review traces multiple lines of evidence tying stories to social cognition and also raises numerous critical questions for the field moving forward.

Keywords: Stories, Narrative Fiction, Social Cognition, Mentalizing, Theory-of-Mind,

## HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The idea that stories might help us to better understand others has very early origins (Hakemulder, 2000). Aristotle (330 BCE/1987) wrote in *Poetics* that “man tends most towards representation and learns his first lessons through representation” (pg. 4). *Poetics* elucidated the craft of dramatic stories, which Aristotle described as language that represents and imitates life. In psychology, stories are typically defined as representations of temporally coherent events centred around the goals of a protagonist, which follow a formal grammar or schema consisting of several related elements, including a setting, an inciting incident, rising action, resolution, and denouement (e.g., Rumelhart, 1975; Trabasso & Van den Broek, 1985). Aristotle’s claim is that stories<sup>2</sup> can represent and communicate useful truths about the world, despite the fact that fiction is fabricated and not a fully accurate representation of reality (Oatley, 1999). Richard Gerrig (1993) has argued that understanding stories relies on the same cognitive processes used to understand the real world. Because stories are typically about people, their mental states and their relationships (Hogan, 2003), social cognition might be one set of processes engaged by narrative (Zunshine, 2006). This includes inferring the mental states of others, known as mentalizing or theory-of-mind (Carruthers & Smith, 1996), which is the focus of this review. (Related processes such as empathy and putatively-related behaviors like prosociality are also discussed.) Because engagement with narrative fiction involves a deeply embodied mental simulation (Zwaan, 2004), and narratives provide abstracted representations of real-world situations and individuals, stories could support “the recording, abstraction, and communication of complex social information in a manner that offers [imagined] personal enactments of experience, rendering it more comprehensible” (Mar & Oatley, 2008, pg. 173). These ideas all point to a shared implication: exposure to stories might help foster an understanding of others. Intriguingly, this idea contradicts the

observation that time spent engaging with narratives cannot be spent engaged in direct social interaction, an idea that motivates the “socially-awkward bookworm” stereotype (Mar, Oatley, Hirsh, dela Paz, & Peterson, 2006). In evaluating evidence for an association between stories and social cognition, preschool-aged children appear to be a promising population to study since they acquire social cognitive capacities at a distinct developmental stage.

### **CHILDREN’S STORYBOOKS AND THEORY-OF-MIND**

At around 4 years of age, children acquire the understanding that others have mental states that might differ from their own; this is known as acquiring a theory-of-mind (Carruthers & Smith, 1996). If stories help us to understand others, then we would expect children who are exposed to more stories to develop a theory-of-mind more rapidly than other children. This appears to be true, with parents who are better at recognizing the names of children’s book authors tending to have children who perform better on a battery of theory-of-mind tasks (Mar, Tackett, & Moore, 2010). Importantly, parental ability to recognize the names of adult book authors does not predict child theory-of-mind performance, ruling out parental memory abilities or reading habits in explaining this result. This finding has been replicated in other countries and with different approaches. For example, an Israeli study found that maternal expertise in choosing children’s literature predicted better empathy and socioemotional adjustment in children, as rated by their teachers (Aram & Aviram, 2009). Similarly, a Spanish study found that parental reports of child reading predicted child false-belief reasoning (Adrian, Clemente, Villanueva, & Rieffe, 2005). As theory-of-mind and language are closely linked (Milligan, Astington, & Dack, 2007), it is important to account for language abilities in these studies. The theory-of-mind tasks employed here rely on responding to a vignette after successfully demonstrating comprehension of the narrative, ruling out this important confound. Perhaps more

importantly, most of these studies also controlled for the child's verbal abilities in their analyses.

But what lies behind this association? Researching the context in which children are exposed to storybooks has proven enlightening. For example, parent-child conversations during joint-reading predicts theory-of-mind development (Adrien, Clemente, & Villaneuva, 2007), with narrative storybooks eliciting more of such talk (Nyhout & O'Neill, 2013). For children, parental prompting to consider mental states during joint-reading might be what promotes socioemotional development.

Developmental research on this topic is mostly correlational, so causal directionality cannot be inferred and third-variable explanations cannot be ruled out. Alternative explanations include children with better mentalizing ability requesting books more often, or parental social ability being tied genetically to a child's social ability and also predicting a greater likelihood of parent-child reading. Future studies that employ a longitudinal intervention or time-lagged panel correlation design may help to clarify the causal direction of these associations.

## **ADULT READING AND SOCIAL COGNITION**

### **Correlational Studies**

Although adults already possess a theory-of-mind, individual differences in mentalizing ability exist and if narratives help bolster this ability we would expect to see a correlation between the two. Measuring mentalizing in adults is difficult, however, and most of the studies discussed here rely on a single measure (unless otherwise mentioned): the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Task (RMET: Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001). The RMET has people guess the mental state of a person based on a photograph of their eye-region, choosing from 4 options. This task has known limitations,

including an association with verbal intelligence (Baker et al., 2014) and concerns that it may reflect emotion recognition more than mentalizing (Oakley, Brewer, Bird, & Catmur, 2016). Future work should include a greater variety of mentalizing measures.

As predicted, an empirical study found that lifetime exposure to narrative fiction predicts mentalizing abilities in adults (Mar et al., 2006). Importantly, exposure to expository nonfiction showed no such association. This result has often been replicated, with a meta-analysis averaging the results of 14 such studies on mentalizing and 22 similar studies on empathy confirming that lifetime exposure to narrative fiction predicts both (Mumper & Gerrig, 2017). The average strength of the association between narrative fiction and mentalizing ability was a correlation of .21, at the low end of the middle-third of correlations typically observed (Hemphill, 2003). Exposure to nonfiction was also correlated with both mentalizing and empathy, although the association was half as strong. This nonfiction correlation may result from the shared variance that exists between narrative fiction and expository nonfiction. In studies controlling for this shared variance, only fiction remains a predictor of mentalizing (Mumper & Gerrig, 2017).

### **Neuropsychological Evidence**

Neuroscience evidence also supports a link between stories and social cognition. A review of narrative processes based on both brain-damaged patients and neuroimaging studies implicated a set of brain areas associated with mentalizing (Mar, 2004; cf. Mason & Just, 2009). This overlap in neural substrates was later confirmed by quantitative meta-analyses of neuroimaging studies (Ferstl et al., 2008; Mar, 2011). More focused neuroimaging research has also found shared neural activation for these two processes within the same individuals. For example, Ferstl and von Cramon (2002) demonstrated that one key region in the mentalizing network supports both mental inference and the processing of coherently-

linked sentences. This study highlights the importance of interpreting any neural overlap cautiously: a single brain region might perform different functions depending on the current context and goals. Another neuroimaging study established a link between the correlational evidence tying lifetime reading to mentalizing and the neural activation observed during reading (Tamir, Bricker, Dodell-Feder, & Mitchell, 2016). Participants who had historically read more narrative fiction activated the mentalizing network to a greater degree when reading passages that contained social content. This greater activation also helped to partially explain the correlation between lifetime reading and mentalizing ability. A separate line of evidence comes from individuals with autism spectrum disorder, whose mentalizing deficits are often accompanied by deficits in narrative processing, consistent with a possible relation between the two processes (Barnes, 2012). These neuroscientific investigations provide some convergent evidence that stories and social cognition are related, but constitute only partial evidence when considered alone and are just one part of a larger picture.

## **Experiments**

Researchers have also investigated this topic with experimental methods in an attempt to clarify the causal direction of the associations observed in correlational studies. Typically, participants are randomly assigned to read either a short piece of narrative fiction or a control text, then complete a mentalizing task immediately afterwards. Some studies have reported a boost in mentalizing ability after reading stories relative to control conditions (Kidd & Castano, 2013). However, other studies have reported mixed findings (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013; Djikic, Oatley, & Moldoveanu, 2013) and direct replications of the most successful experiments have failed to replicate these results (Panero et al., 2016; Samur, Tops, & Koole, 2018). Experiments that have successfully demonstrated a positive causal influence of stories on social cognition have employed a within-subjects design in which the

same people read both a story and a control text (Black & Barnes, 2015b), or a longitudinal design in which people read an entire book over a two week span (with mentalizing measured using false-belief tasks and a full-face version of the RMET; Pino & Mazza, 2016). These more powerful research designs may be required to detect any direct influence of reading narrative fiction on social cognition within a short span of time, and how long these effects last is not known. If stories influence social cognitive processes as a result of frequent engagement over prolonged periods of time, short-term experimental manipulations may not be well-suited for detecting any effect. Unless, that is, stories place readers into a social-processing mindset, in which case the adoption of this mindset might be detectable immediately after reading a text. Some experiments have presented stories with content that explicitly promotes empathy for others and demonstrated a causal link to empathic abilities or prosocial behavior (e.g., Johnson et al., 2013a). However, these texts likely do not resemble most published works and such designs raise concerns that participants might become aware of the study goals due to the content presented and act accordingly, a problem known as participant reactivity to demand characteristics.

## **FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

### **Other Narrative Media**

Although there exists promising research on this topic, there remain many outstanding questions and directions for future research. This review has focused primarily on texts, but what about narratives presented in other mediums? In children, exposure to movies shows the same association with theory-of-mind development as exposure to storybooks (Mar et al., 2010). Exposure to children's television, however, exhibits either no such relation (Mar et al., 2010) or a negative association with theory-of-mind (Rosenqvist et al., 2016). In adults, however, two experiments established that watching award-winning

narrative television results in better mentalizing compared to watching a documentary or nothing at all (Black & Barnes, 2015a). It remains an open question whether some forms of children's television, perhaps shows oriented toward promoting social understanding, might demonstrate similar effects as children's films. Stories also appear within a myriad of other media (e.g., theatre, graphic novels, podcasts) and the potential for narrative to promote social cognition in these formats should be investigated. The narrative aspect of videogames, for example, has already shown some promise in fostering theory-of-mind (Bormann & Greitemeyer, 2015).

### **Genre**

Another outstanding question is whether this effect differs by genre. This would mean that some genres are more “mentalist” and therefore more likely to promote social cognition, as some have argued (Zunshine, 2006). Although literary fiction has been theorized to be better suited for promoting inferences than popular fiction (Kidd & Castano, 2013), both would appear to be about human psychology and mental states. Moreover, how to best distinguish literary from popular fiction is not obvious.

Early studies conceptualized narrative fiction in a very broad sense, collapsing across many diverse genres. A few studies have begun to examine genre more closely, albeit with mixed results. The experimental studies by Kidd and Castano (2013) found that it was award-winning literary fiction that promoted better mentalizing ability rather than popular fiction, but other experiments did not replicate this finding (Panero et al., 2016; Samur et al., 2018). In a correlational study, lifetime exposure to romance novels emerged as the most robust predictor of mentalizing ability, with suspense/thriller and literary fiction also implicated but with less confidence (Fong, Mullin, & Mar, 2013). However, a different correlational study found just the opposite, with lifetime exposure to literary fiction

predicting mentalizing ability and exposure to popular fiction showing no such relation (Kidd & Castano, 2017). Experimentally manipulating the literary quality of a text by altering the incidence of unusual linguistic constructions has shown some promise in demonstrating a causal influence of literary writing on self-reported empathic understanding (Koopman, 2016); this approach should be explored further in other studies. Neuroimaging research has also investigated genre, with suspenseful segments of a story more likely to activate social cognitive brain areas compared to non-suspenseful segments of the same story (Lehne et al., 2015). Future work will hopefully clarify the role of genre by adopting a more nuanced approach to considering different types of text.

### **Looking Forward**

In addressing how stories and social cognition relate, different research approaches will bring unique strengths and weaknesses, and so a diversity of methods is needed. Although correlational approaches do not permit causal inferences, they have the advantage of studying spontaneous and voluntary real-world behavior. Experiments that present a brief text to participants allow for causal inferences when they are well-designed, but may do a poor job of revealing effects if it is frequent and prolonged exposure to stories that promotes social cognition. Longitudinal intervention studies that assign people to read for an extended period seem promising, as do within-subjects designs that better control for individual differences. But for all experiments, especially when explicitly presenting social content, care must be taken to rule out participant reactivity. Another issue is that evidence derived from studying children may not generalize to adults, as distinct processes could underlie similar-looking phenomena. Potential moderators should also be investigated, such as how immersed people become in a narrative (Bal & Veltkamp, 2013; Gerrig, 1993; Green & Brock, 2000). Greater efforts to measure outcomes that might be downstream

consequences of improved social cognition, such as altruistic behavior (Barraza, Alexander, Beavin, Terris, & Zak, 2015), would also be welcome. If stories promote social cognition, then story-based interventions might promote perspective-taking between different groups (Paluck & Green, 2009) or in special populations who struggle with social cognition (e.g., autism; Tsumeni et al., 2014). This remains a promising potential based on preliminary evidence and the future looks bright for research on stories and social cognition.

## NOTES

1. Please address correspondence to Raymond A. Mar, York University, Department of Psychology, 4700 Keele St. W., Toronto, ON, Canada, M3J1P3. E-mail: mar@yorku.ca.
2. Although I primarily discuss narrative fiction throughout, often in contrast to expository nonfiction, it is the narrative aspect that is hypothesized to be key rather than the fictionality of a story. Narrative nonfiction (e.g., biography) would be expected to produce similar effects as narrative fiction.

## REFERENCES

- Adrian, J. E., Clemente, R. A., Villanueva, L., & Rieffe, C. (2005). Parent–child picture-book reading, mothers’ mental state language and children’s theory of mind. *Journal of Child Language, 32*, 673–686. doi:10.1017/S0305000905006963
- Aram, D. & Aviram, S. (2009). Mothers’ storybook reading and kindergartners’ socioemotional and literacy development. *Reading Psychology, 30*, 175–194. doi:10.1080/02702710802275348
- Aristotle (330 BCE/1987). *Poetics* (R. Janko, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Hackett.
- Baker, C. A., Peterson, E., Pulos, S., & Kirkland, R. A. (2014). Eyes and IQ: A meta-analysis of the relationship between intelligence and “Reading the Mind in the Eyes”. *Intelligence, 44*, 78–92. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2014.03.001
- Bal, P. M., & Veltkamp, M. (2013). How does fiction reading influence empathy? An experimental investigation on the role of emotional transportation. *PLoS ONE, 8*, e55341. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0055341
- Barnes, J. L. (2012). Fiction, imagination, and social cognition: Insights from autism. *Poetics, 40*, 299–316. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2012.05.001
- Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Hill, J., Raste, Y., & Plumb, I. (2001). The “Reading the Mind in the Eyes” Test Revised version: A study with normal adults, and adults with Asperger's syndrome or high-functioning autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 42*, 241–251. doi:10.1017/S0021963001006643
- Barraza, J. A., Alexander, V., Beavin, L. E., Terris, E. T., & Zak, P. J. (2015). The heart of the story: Peripheral physiology during narrative exposure predicts charitable giving. *Biological Psychology, 105*, 138–143. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2015.01.008

- Black, J. E., & Barnes, J. L. (2015a). Fiction and social cognition: The effect of viewing award-winning television dramas on theory of mind. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *9*, 423–429. doi:10.1037/aca0000031
- Black, J. E., & Barnes, J. L. (2015b). The effects of reading material on social and non-social cognition. *Poetics*, *52*, 32–43. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2015.07.001
- Bormann, D., & Greitemeyer, T. (2015). Immersed in virtual worlds and minds: Effects of in-game storytelling on immersion, need satisfaction, and affective theory of mind. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *6*, 646–652. doi:10.1177/1948550615578177
- Carruthers, P., & Smith, P.K. (Eds.). (1996). *Theories of theories of mind*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferstl, E. C., & von Cramon, D. Y. (2002). What does the frontomedian cortex contribute to language processing: coherence or theory of mind? *Neuroimage*, *17*, 1599–1612. doi:10.1006/nimg.2002.1247
- Fong, K., Mullin, J. B., & Mar, R. A. (2013). What you read matters: The role of fiction genres in predicting interpersonal sensitivity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *7*, 370–376. doi:10.1037/a0034084
- Gerrig, R.J. (1993). *Experiencing narrative worlds*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 701–721. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.79.5.701
- Hakemulder, J. (2000). *The Moral Laboratory: Experiments examining the effects of reading literature on social perception and moral self-concept*. Utrecht Publications in General and Comparative Literature, *34*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Hemphill, J. F. (2003). Interpreting the magnitudes of correlation coefficients. *American Psychologist*, *58*, 78–80. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.78
- Hogan, P.C. (2003). *The mind and its stories: Narrative universals and human emotion*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kidd, D. C. & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science*, *342*, 377–380. doi:10.1126/science.1239918
- Kidd D. C. & Castano, E. (2017). Different stories: How levels of familiarity with literary and genre fiction relate to mentalizing. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, *11*, 474–486. doi:10.1037/aca0000069
- Koopman, E. M. (2016). Effects of “literariness” on emotions and on empathy and reflection after reading. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, *10*, 82–98. doi: 10.1037/aca0000041
- Lehne, M., Engel, P., Rohrmeier, M., Menninghaus, W., Jacobs, A. M., Koelsch, S. (2015): Reading a suspenseful literary text activates brain areas related to social cognition and predictive inference. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, e0124550. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0124550
- Mar, R. A. (2004). The neuropsychology of narrative: Story comprehension, story production and their interrelation. *Neuropsychologia*, *42*, 1414–1434. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2003.12.016
- Mar, R. A. (2011). The neural bases of social cognition and story comprehension. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *62*, 103–134. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145406
- Mar, R. A., Oatley, K., Hirsh, J., dela Paz, J., & Peterson, J. B. (2006). Bookworms versus nerds: Exposure to fiction versus non-fiction, divergent associations with social ability, and the simulation of fictional social worlds. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 694–712. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.002

- Mar, R. A. & Oatley, K. (2008). The function of fiction is the abstraction and simulation of social experience. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*, 173–192. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00073.x
- Mar, R. A., Tackett, J. L., & Moore, C. (2010). Exposure to media and theory-of-mind development in preschoolers. *Cognitive Development*, *25*, 69–78. doi:10.1016/j.cogdev.2009.11.002
- Mason, R. A. & Just, M. A. (2009). The role of the theory-of-mind cortical network in the comprehension of narratives. *Language and Linguistic Compass*, *3*, 157–174. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818x.2008.00122.
- Milligan, K., Astington, J. W., & Dack, L. A. (2007). Language and theory of mind: Meta-analysis of the relation between language ability and false-belief understanding. *Child Development*, *78*, 622–646. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01018.x
- Mumper, M. L. & Gerrig, R. J. (2017). Leisure reading and social cognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, *11*, 109-120. doi:10.1037/aca0000089
- Oakley, B. F. M., Brewer, R., Bird, G., & Catmur, C. (2016). Theory of mind is not theory of emotion: A cautionary note on the Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *125*, 818–823. doi:10.1037/abn0000182
- Oatley, K. (1999). Why fiction may be twice as true as fact: Fiction as cognitive and emotional simulation. *Review of General Psychology*, *3*, 101–117. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.3.2.101
- Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A critical look at evidence from the field and the laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 339–367. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

- Panero, M. E., Weisberg, D.S., Black, J., Goldstein, T.R., Barnes, J. L., Brownell, H., & Winner, E. (2016). Does reading a single passage of literary fiction really improve theory of mind? An attempt at replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, e46-e54. doi:10.1037/pspa0000064
- Peskin, J. & Astington, J. W. (2004). The effects of adding metacognitive language to story texts. *Cognitive Development*, *19*, 253–273. doi:10.1016/j.cogdev.2004.01.003
- Pino, M. C. & Mazza, M. (2016). The use of “literary fiction” to promote mentalizing ability. *PLoS ONE*, *11*, e0160254. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0160254
- Rosenqvist, J., Lahti-Nuuttila, P., Holdnack, J., Kemp, S. L., & Laasonen, M. (2016). Relationship of TV watching, computer use, and reading to children's neurocognitive functions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *46*, 11–21. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2016.04.006
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1975). Notes on a Schema for Stories. In D. G. Bobrow & A. Collins (Eds.), *Representation and Understanding: Studies in cognitive science* (pp. 2–34). New York: Academic Press.
- Samur, D., Tops, M., & Koole, S. L. (2018). Does a single session of reading literary fiction prime enhanced mentalising performance? Four replication experiments of Kidd and Castano (2013). *Cognition and Emotion*, *32*, 130–144. doi:10.1080/02699931.2017.1279591
- Tamir, D.I., Bricker, A.B., Dodell-Feder, D., Mitchell, J.P. (2016). Reading fiction and reading minds: The role of the default network. *Social Cognitive Affective Neuroscience*, *11*, 215–224. doi:10.1093/scan/nsv114

- Trabasso, T. & Van den Broek, P.W. (1985). Causal thinking and the representation of narrative events. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 24, 612-630. doi:10.1016/0749-596X(85)90049-X
- Tsunemi, K., Tamura, A., Ogawa, S., Isomura, T., Ito, H., Ida, M., & Masataka, N. (2014). Intensive exposure to narrative in story books as a possibly effective treatment of social perspective-taking in schoolchildren with autism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1–8. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00002
- Zunshine, L. (2006). *Why we read fiction: Theory of mind and the novel*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press
- Zwaan, R.A. (2004). The immersed experiencer: Toward an embodied theory of language comprehension. In B.H. Ross (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 44, pp. 35–62). New York: Academic Press.

## RECOMMENDED READINGS

1. Hakemulder, J. (2000). *The Moral Laboratory: Experiments examining the effects of reading literature on social perception and moral self-concept*. Utrecht Publications in General and Comparative Literature, 34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

This book provides excellent theoretical background for literature's influence on social and moral constructs, while also reporting original empirical research on this topic.

2. Keen, S. (2007). *Empathy and the novel*. New York: Oxford University Press.

A book-length critique of the proposed link between stories and empathy, arguing that changes in real-world empathy for individuals is unlikely and unsupported by the available evidence.

3. Koopman, E. M. E., & Hakemulder, F. (2015). Effects of literature on empathy and self-reflection: A theoretical-empirical framework. *Journal of Literary Theory*, 9, 79-111.  
doi:10.1515/jlt-2015-0005

This essential review paper presents a theoretical model on how literature might influence empathy and self-reflection.

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

An expanded theoretical review of how narrative fiction relates to social cognition with an emphasis on embodied simulation and discussion of supporting evidence.

5. Willems, R. M. & Jacobs, A. M. (2016). Caring About Dostoyevsky: The Untapped Potential of Studying Literature. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20, 243–245.

doi:10.1016/j.tics.2015.12.009

A call-to-arms for cognitive scientists and neuroscientists to consider employing literature in order to better understand the mind.