# Chapter 11 Further Readings

(Note: This bibliography will be updated regularly.)

### Measuring the reading difficulty of a text

How do you measure the reading level of a text? Some metrics use fairly superficial aspects of the linguistic code. But the researchers of the following paper argue for a more complete analysis that also takes into account discourse processing:

Graesser, A. C., & McNamara, D. S. (2011) Computational analyses of multilevel discourse comprehension. Topics In Cognitive Science, 3, 371–398.

### Reverse cohesion effect

The reverse cohesion effect suggests that readers who know a lot about a certain topic benefit from reading a text in which they have to infer many of the connections between sentences. The following papers look at other factors that play a role in determining the benefits of implicitness:

Kamalski, J., Sanders, T., & Lentz, L. (2008) Coherence, prior knowledge, and comprehension of informative and persuasive texts. Discourse Processes, 45, 323–345.

O’Reilly, T., & McNamara, D. S. (2007) Reversing the reverse cohesion effect: Good texts can be better for strategic, high-knowledge readers. Discourse Processes, 43, 121–152.

### Effects of prior knowledge

In this chapter, you learned how prior background knowledge can have a dramatic effect in text comprehension. This paper suggests that prior knowledge can also affect the depth of people’s engagement with stories and the degree to which they internalize beliefs that are consistent with the story:

Green, M. C. (2004) Transportation into narrative worlds: The role of prior knowledge and perceived realism. Discourse Processes, 38, 247–266.

### Shallow processing and anaphora

Are pronouns always fully and automatically resolved? Two papers using different methods to investigate pronoun resolution and depth of processing:

Klin, C., Guzman, A. E., Wingartner, A. M., & Ralano, A. S. (2006). When anaphor resolution fails: Partial encoding of anaphoric inferences. Journal of Memory and Language, 54, 131–143.

Stewart, A. J., Holler, J., & Kidd, E. (2007). Shallow processing of ambiguous pronouns: Evidence for delay. The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 60, 1680–1696.

### Models of discourse processing

This paper is a readable survey and presentation of ideas arguing for the important role of memory-based processing:

Gerrig, R. J., & O’Brien, E. J. (2005). The scope of memory-based processing. Discourse Processes, 39, 225–242.

An important paper articulating the constructionist approach:

Graesser, A.C., Singer, M., Trabasso, T. (1994). Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. Psychological Review, 101, 371–395.

This paper argues for a model that combines ideas from both memory-based and constructionist theories:

Van den Broek, P. (2005). Integrating memory-based and constructionist approaches in accounts of reading comprehension. Discourse Process, 39, 299–316.

Some researchers disagree with the interpretation of the results of O’Brien and colleagues (2004), who argue that irrelevant information is automatically activated through resonance in memory. The following two articles show an exchange of opinions about exactly what that study reveals:

Zwaan, R.A., & Madden, C. J. (2004). Updating situation models. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 30, 283–288.

O’Brien, E.J., Cook, A.E., & Peracchi, K.A. (2004). Updating situation models: Reply to Zwaan & Madden (2004). Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 30, 289–291.
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