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Abstract

Despite their financial power, screen adaptations (i.e., text narratives that are adapted into audio-visual narratives) are vastly under-investigated in the social sciences. Those few studies that have looked at screen adaptations have not investigated the impact that narrative differences between the media have on various outcomes. The purpose of this study is to look at the effect of screen adaptation and the effects that narrative differences have on various outcome measures. How repeated exposure to the same narrative in different mediums and how narrative differences impact transportation, identification, enjoyment, and recall was investigated. It was predicted that transportation, identification, and enjoyment would all be higher after the second exposure, regardless of medium and differences. It was asked whether one medium would lead to higher levels of identification over the other. It was also predicted that higher enjoyment would predict the desire to finish the narrative. Independent variables impacting recall were explored. A two-by-two experimental design (text then film, film then text, same, different) was utilized, where participants either first saw the video or read the text and then encountered the other and were either exposed to the text that was the same as the video or a text that contained key textual differences. A total of 105 undergraduate students participated in the study. Results indicate that while transportation was significantly higher after the second exposure, identification and enjoyment did not differ between the
first and second exposures. Neither medium lead to higher levels of identification. Enjoyment positively predicted the desire to finish the narrative. Results also indicate that recalling the video version lead to participants more often correctly mentioning narrative details as compared to those asked to recall the text. Findings, theoretical contributions, and future research are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The process of adapting a written story into an audio-visual story is generally a murky subject. Many practical considerations are at play (e.g., technical or medium based constraints, copyright issues, financial considerations, etc.), as are many literary considerations (e.g., fidelity, authorship, etc.). Most often when reading about screen adaptations, one will find an exhaustive discussion about the adaptation’s fidelity to the novel, listing and criticizing differences, ignoring the fact that many inconsistencies in the stories stem from inherent differences between the media.

So it is ruled that, among other things, novels are verbal and use words while films [and television shows] are visual and rely on images; novels can express internal knowledge of a character, but screen adaptations have to imply feelings or motivations from a character’s actions…; films can only use the present tense; voice-overs are noncinematic; and cinema and television rely on realism while literature requires the readers’ imagination. (Geraghty, 2008, p. 1-2)

The act of film adaptation (or screen adaptation as we will refer to it, extending the concept of adaptation to television shows based on novels) can be found in even the earliest of films (e.g., A Trip to the Moon, Méliès, 1902) and has only been gaining momentum in recent years. In the last 20 years, 51% of the 2,000 highest grossing films have been adaptations. Between 2004 and 2013, adaptations outnumbered original
screenplays (Fellows, 2014). As these numbers suggest, there is not only an artistic, but also a financial consideration when looking at screen adaptations. Adaptations are often seen as the "products of businessmen, not artists" (Griffith, 1997, p. 17). They are often produced with the mindset that they have a built in (i.e., guaranteed) audience and are pre-sold products.

On a more literary note, the original novel or written work is often viewed as more artistic over the adaptation. The act of comparison alone perpetuates this view. This again gets at the issue of fidelity in screen adaptation, but also the more complex issues of authorship in adaptation and simplification of the original work. As Bluestone aptly points out in his seminal book, "[w]hat he adapts is a kind of paraphrase of the novel-the novel viewed as raw material" (Bluestone, 1957, p. 61). Bluestone also highlights that most times, when an adaptation is unfaithful to the book it is due to the constraints of the audio-visual medium (e.g., time constraints, narrative expectations, etc.) and not of the lack of respect to the original work (as most bibliophiles like to think).

Moving from the critical cultural to the empirical social scientific perspective, screen adaptation has been a vastly overlooked area of research. One of the only pieces that extensively look at the issue, Green et al.’s (2008) work was pioneering in some aspects, but ignored other important aspects of screen adaptation. The authors’ main questions regarded the effect that repeated exposure to the same narrative has on transportation and how individual differences (i.e., need for cognition and imagery ability) moderate transportation. While these are very important questions to ask, other
important issues were not considered or were only discussed as future avenues of research, which have not been followed through since.

The current paper seeks to explore several theoretical questions concerning the affective and cognitive reception of a single narrative that exists as both a written, literary work and as an audio-visual work. By synthesizing work in several related theoretical realms (i.e., transportation, identification, enjoyment, and memory), several hypotheses and research questions are posed regarding the unique nature of screen adaptations. After the literature is summarized and the hypotheses presented, an experiment to test these hypotheses will be summarized, the results of which are also presented, followed by a brief discussion section that will cover the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, as well as the possible strengths and limitations of the study.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Overview

Transportation

Transportation theory has been a very influential theory in the social scientific study of narratives. As proposed by Green and Brock (2000), transportation is the feeling of being lost in a story world which they view as a “distinct mental process, an integrative melding of attention, imagery, and feelings,” (p. 701). This process can be both physical and psychological. The key to the author’s conceptualization of transportation, along with immersion or absorption, is its role in narrative persuasion. Because the reader/viewer is psychologically distanced from reality, they are less likely to counterargue the story’s persuasive elements and thus will be more likely to believe the story’s claims.

The persuasive element in transportation is the most commonly used aspect of the theory. Studies that use transportation as a theoretical base have shown support for transportation’s main prediction that higher levels of transportation lead to story consistent beliefs (Green & Brock, 2000, Appel & Richter, 2007, Dahlstrom, 2012, Marsh & Fazio, 2006, Escalas, 2004, etc.). Many of these studies illustrate that these beliefs also persist and even increase over time (Appel & Richter, 2007, Jensen, et al., 2011). The story consistent beliefs do not even have to be true to be believed, as found by Marsh & Fazio (2006) and Marsh, Butler, & Umanath (2013). This tendency of the
audience to acquire story consistent beliefs has been extended into research on stigmatized groups, where higher transportation into a story about mentally ill individuals lead to participants exhibiting less social distancing behaviors (Caputo & Rouner, 2011).

While the persuasion element of the theory has been the most influential, some studies have used transportation theory for its immersion aspect. Immersion into the narrative is seen as a positive affective state (Green, et al., 2006) that is central to narrative engagement (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2009). Two such studies look explicitly at transportation as an outcome variable (as compared to a step in the process of persuasion). Wissmath, et al. (2009) looked at the effect of audio-visual translation method (i.e., subtitling or dubbing) on viewers’ immersion into a foreign film. They found that transportation was significantly higher in the dubbing condition. Another study that used transportation as an outcome variable was the Green, et al. (2008) piece discussed in the introduction. Green and her colleagues (2008) found that movie goers who had read *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* reported higher transportation into the film, suggesting that repetition of a narrative aids transportation. In a laboratory experiment (different from their field study of *Harry Potter*), they found that transportation was higher for those who read and then watched a narrative than those who watched then read, read then reread, and those who watched then re-watched a narrative.

Considering the empirical evidence that transportation is higher the second time someone encounters a story (specifically when someone encounters first encounters the text version and then encounters the video version), the question then becomes why this happens. Instinctively, it would make sense that they may be less transported because
they know what will happen, but as we have seen empirically this is not the case in some circumstances. Several arguments can be made as to why this is. As discussed more in depth later, the idea of mental models and processing fluency could be a possible answer. The first time someone encounters a narrative, they will construct a mental model of the story (Zwaan, et al., 1995, Zwaan, 1999, Rinck, et al., 2001). Constructing a mental model does require some cognitive effort. Processing fluency then argues that when this process of creating a mental model unfolds smoothly, transportation will be created (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008). Therefore on the second exposure to the narrative, they only have to activate various aspects of the mental model and not construct or (potentially) update it resulting in a smoother mental process. This smoother mental process would require much less cognitive effort, thus freeing up more cognitive space to the experience of transportation (Green, et al., 2008).

Based on this logic as well as previous findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Transportation will be higher after the second exposure, regardless of the order in which they encounter the media.

Identification

Identification in a narrative context is defined as “seeing the character’s perspective as one’s own, to share his or her existence,” (Green, et al., 2004, p. 319). It requires that the reader/viewer “forget [themselves] and becomes the other,” and “culminates in a cognitive and emotional state in which the audience member is aware not of him- or herself as an audience member, but rather imagines being one of the
characters,” (Cohen, 2001, 247/252). Identification is seen as a dynamic process, in which one has varying levels of identification with various characters as the narrative unfolds (Cohen, 2009).

The connection between transportation and identification has been proposed by many scholars and supported in many studies. Research has shown that similar to transportation, identification can be an important process in narrative persuasion (deGraaf, et al., 2012, Cohen, 2001, Igartua, 2010). Researchers also argue that transportation (i.e., immersion) can foster identification in some cases (Green, et al., 2004, Cohen, 2001, Cohen, 2009, Igartua, 2010).

As discussed below, empathy is important to the identification process (Cohen, 2001). If you cannot understand what a character is feeling and why, it would be very difficult to be able to place yourself in his or her position. Establishing empathy is a process that we are still unraveling, but one thing is clear: knowing what emotion the other person is feeling is key. Extending this to the current question, a second exposure to a narrative and the characters therein should lead to a better understanding of the narrative as a whole and of the characters and their emotions in particular. By better understanding the characters and their emotions, it would theoretically be easier to identify with the characters.

Due to this connection to transportation and the better understanding of the characters that a second exposure would theoretically lead to, the following hypothesis is proposed.
H2: Identification will be higher after the second exposure, regardless of the order in which they encounter the media.

When it comes to identification, several factors are seen as being important to allow a reader/viewer connect with a character. Primary among these factors is empathy, or “the ability to adopt and understand the perspective of others,” by “mentally representing his or her emotional state,” (Mano, et al., 2009, p. 813). Thus understanding another’s emotions are key to empathy. Extending this back to the study of adaptations in a more literary sense, one of the main advantages of novels over films is that they are better suited to present a narrative from a first person perspective. Films can achieve this through voice overs, but these are seen as uncinematic, and are discouraged and rarely used (Geraghty, 2008, Whelehan, 1999). By using the first person or third person omniscient perspective, novels grant readers privileged access to the main characters thoughts and emotions. So if a literary character or the narrator explicitly tells the reader what they/the characters are thinking and feeling, it could then be hypothesized that novels would lend themselves to establishing higher levels of identification by aiding empathy.

A question thus emerges: what if the novel is written from a third person perspective and contains no explicit references to the characters’ emotions? Some researchers believe that readers track and develop mental models of emotional information similar to how they track changes in time, space, goals, etc. (Vega, et al., 1996 & Gernsbacher, et al., 1992). When the character’s emotions are not explicitly described, the reader then uses his or her understanding of the character’s “actions, goals,
and relationships with other characters” (Vega, et al, 1996, p. 304) to mentally represent the character’s emotions. This process of tracking emotions was originally thought only to happen when emotions were explicitly described, but studies have shown that this is not the case and that readers use their understanding of a text to fill in the gaps of what the character feels (Vega, et al., 1996).

On the other hand, many contemporary psychologists have put forth the hypothesis that physically mimicking another’s emotions may be central to the process of developing empathy (MacDonald, 2003; Meltzoff & Decety, 2003, Sonnby-Borgstrom, 2002). In most experiments, the participant is exposed to a video of someone expressing an emotion through facial expressions (e.g., smiling or frowning) and their zygomatic activity (i.e., mimicking behavior) is measured. People who express more empathy for the person register more zygomatic activity. The ability to see the face of the other person is an important, but not necessarily required step in the process of mimicry. Using this more extreme position of the development of empathy, the question becomes what about those who cannot see (i.e. the blind)? Because of their physical limitations, can they not feel empathy? This question has been anecdotally examined by Cole (2001). Cole proposes that when one does not have eyesight, hearing (and other senses) become more sensitive so they are able to mimic emotions through slight changes in the voice. Some studies have shown that this position, though not empirical, may have some merit (Hatfield, et al., 2009).

The concept of mimicking emotions as a step in developing empathy has found some support, at least when it comes to mimicking the facial movements of another.
Dimberg (2012) found that zygomatic activity was greater for individuals high in trait empathy when they were exposed to happy faces than for low empathy individuals. The idea of physiological responses as being a central part of affective states (e.g., empathy and emotion) can be found as early as the work of Darwin (1872) and James (1884).

So in summary, novels are generally accepted as being able to better illustrate the characters emotions and feelings as these states can be explicitly stated. Even when the characters’ emotions are not explicitly described, readers mentally track implicit emotional states by using their understanding of the characters’ actions and goals. While explicitly describing internal emotional states can be achieved through narration on screen, this is generally not done (and seen as lazy writing in some circles). Thus audio-visual narratives are seen as lacking in their ability to convey internal states leaving a lot to be inferred based on facial expression. But as discussed, being able to see and mimic facial expression has been shown to be important in the process of empathy. So does being able to explicitly read about a character’s emotions lead to greater identification or does being able to see, and thus mimic, the character’s facial expression lead to greater identification. Thus the following question is asked:

RQ1: Will one medium lead to higher levels of identification over another?

Enjoyment

In the extant literature, media enjoyment has not been uniformly explicated (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004). Enjoyment is referred to as a variety of terms all used interchangeably including “like, enjoyment, appreciation, attraction, and preference,” (Nabi & Krcmar,
This breadth of theoretical terms makes defining enjoyment difficult, but all these terms refer to a positive affective state.

Green et al. defines enjoyment as, “a pleasurable affective response to a [media] stimulus,” (Green, et al., 2004). This definition, though, only considers the affective aspect of enjoyment. Nabi and Krcmar also take into consideration the cognitive and behavioral aspects of enjoyment. Not only should one experience specific affective states (that do not have to be positive), but one also makes cognitive judgements about certain aspects and in turn acts in certain ways when they enjoy a narrative. Of particular importance to the subject of screen adaptations is the behavior component as Nabi and Krcmar point out “media enjoyment may serve as an indicator of consumption and potential profit,” (2004, p. 288). As discussed in the introduction, films based on literary work are often made due to their “pre-sold” status, meaning readers of the book are assumed to automatically go see the film regardless of other factors. So going to see the film version (or tuning into the television version) of a work is a behavior that is (presumed by producers) to stem from enjoyment of the novel. This behavioral component of enjoyment then leads to the following hypothesis:

RQ2: For participants who first encounter the written text, will enjoyment correspond to the desire finish the narrative and vice versa?

Like identification, transportation is often connected to enjoyment. Green, et al. (2004), suggest that both transportation and identification are important to the process of enjoying a narrative. Further, Igartua (2010) and Cohen (2001/2009) find that
identification is predictive of enjoyment (i.e., higher levels of identification correspond to higher levels of enjoyment).

There are other more practical conditions to consider when thinking about enjoyment, especially when thinking about enjoyment as repeated exposure. We read our favorite novels and watch our favorite films or television series again and again. Why is this? Presumably, it is comforting to pick up our favorite novel and know what is going to happen. With repeated readings or viewing we may better understand the narrative more and more with each successive encounter thus lending repeated exposure to the cognitive aspect of enjoyment (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004). We may also do this so as to encounter our favorite characters again (similar to parasocial interaction (Cohen, 2009)). Finding new details can be exciting and increase our appreciation for the work.

Thus, extending the first and second hypotheses and considering the benefits of repeated exposure to a narrative, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Enjoyment will be higher after the second exposure.

Situation Models

When reading a story (or watching a film), the reader/viewer creates what is called a situational model of what is happening. The situational model is constantly being updated with the incoming information they are encountering (Zwaan, et al., 1995, Zwaan, 1999, Rinck, et al., 2001). This allows them to comprehend the story. There are many proposed models of what this situational model looks like, but one of the most
popular is the event indexing model (Zwaan, et al., 1995). The event indexing model proposes five indices that readers/viewers are constantly surveilling and updating; time, space, protagonist, goals, and causation (Zwaan, et al., 1995, Zwaan, 1999). When a change occurs in one of the indices, the appropriate index will be activated and updated with the new information. Thus when there is a situational discontinuity, processing is more intensive than when everything is logically sound (Zwaan, et al., 1995). This can occur when contradictory information is encountered.

Processing Fluency By using the event indexing model as a starting point, Busselle and Bilandzic (2008) discuss what they call processing fluency. They describe processing fluency as a redefinition of transportation, basically a state where one experiences “a fluent and smooth construction of mental models or experiencing a state of flow in this activity,” (Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008, p. 272). This flow like state is interrupted when inconsistencies in the story are encountered. This is because this inconsistency forces the reader/viewer to overhaul their situational model on one or several specific indices. So if a character has red hair early in the text/film, but has blonde hair later in the narrative this inconsistency forces the reader/viewer to rewrite the character index to include this new information, leading to increased processing time, and to a decrease in transportation. Busselle and Bilandzic proposed that not only will transportation be negatively impacted by inconsistencies, but identification will also be negatively impacted due to its connection to transportation. There has been empirical support for processing fluency. Both Zwaan, et al. (1995) and Rinck, et al. (2001) have found that when inconsistencies
are encountered in a written narratives, reading times increase significantly, especially when reading the sentence in which in inconsistency is found.

As discussed in the introduction, fidelity is a big issue when it comes to screen adaptation. How closely the audio-visual version adheres to the information found in the text is one of the most discussed topics when looking at screen adaptation. Changes in the story, characters, causal chain of events, etc. are bound to change when adapting a text due to issues like narrative structure, casting choices, technological limitations, time limitations, etc. Due to this almost certainty that changes are bound to be encountered, and thus to negatively impact processing fluency, the following hypotheses are proposed.

H4: More differences between media will more negatively impact transportation during the second viewing compared to few differences between the media.

H5: More differences between media (in how both the character looks and acts) will more negatively impact identification during the second viewing compared to fewer differences.

Cognitive Responses

Learning As Marsh and Fazio (2006) point out, people do learn from fictional narratives, especially when the narratives “refer to people, places, and concepts that exist (or have existed) in the real world,” (p. 1140). This is especially true when it comes genres such as historical fiction. By using fictional narrative to learn, people are putting themselves at risk for learning untrue facts. Even when they are asked to monitor for false facts, people
still tend to believe false information and use the information on tests (Gilbert, Tafarodi, & Malone, 1993, Marsh & Fazio, 2006, Marsh, Butler, & Umanath, 2013) and express more skepticism towards true facts (Hinze, et al., 2014).

By extending this research into fictional narrative learning to the question at hand has interesting implications for screen adaptations (both of text to screen adaptations and adaptations of historical events). When using a film to supplement readings (whether these are literary pieces or textbooks) in a classroom setting, the question of contradicting facts emerges. Since film as a medium has very specific narrative structure expectations, many times certain facts (or literary events) are changed, overlooked, glossed over, or left out to serve the narrative as a whole. These changes then lead to contradicting information which can result in viewers learning false information. As both Butler, et al. (2009) and Umanath, et al. (2012) found, having previous knowledge of the topic does not stop students from learning critical errors and reproducing the error on subsequent knowledge tests.

Broadening this perspective, if one is to consider content differences between the novel and its screen adaptation similar to misinformation as discussed above, interesting implications arise. If leaving out or changing a plot point from the written work during the process of adaptation is equivalent to presenting false information being present in a film, it would stand to reason then that the viewer will remember the change or difference between page and screen even if it contradicts what they read. Having read the book before seeing the film or vice versa, the viewer may be considered to have previous knowledge of the topic just as a history student may be considered to have previous
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knowledge after reading a textbook. This previous knowledge of the narrative, like previous knowledge of a historical event, will then not prevent the viewer from “learning false information”, i.e., remembering the difference between the written and screen versions of the narrative.

*Primacy versus Recency* Research into the order in which media messages are encountered and how order effects influence recall and attitude change has been taking place since the beginning of communication research. Two opposing hypotheses have since emerged: primacy and recency. Primacy argues that the first message encountered will be the more powerful and well-remembered while recency argues it is the most recently encountered message that is the more powerful. Many researchers have tried to find support for either hypothesis, but evidence remains mixed (Crano, 1977, Goodwin, 1976, Panagopoulos, 2011, Allen, 1973).

*Inherent Differences Between Media* Inherent characteristics of the media themselves may also impact how the viewer remembers information. Audio-visual presentations by nature are more vivid and have more sensory richness than written works. By taking advantage of both sight and hearing, the audio-visual presentation is much more detailed and allows for more nuance in how the story is presented. By visually presenting the story, the audio-visual medium grants the viewer a fully realized world, one the viewer does not have to imagine. By presenting a fully realized story the audio-visual presentation may lead to an ease of narrative processing (Green, 2008).
Along with vividness, mental effort is another factor that might have some bearings on how the narrative is remembered. A common claim is that written works are much more mentally effortful than audio-visual presentations. The audience member has to put forth the effort to read the words that are presented, comprehend them, and then create a mental picture of what the story world and characters of the story look like (Green, 2008). In comparison, the world and characters of a story presented in an audio-visual format are all fully realized and the viewer only has to watch as the story unfolds. Having to imagine the story world themselves can also make the act of reading more personalized and absorbing as compared to watching someone else’s representation of the story. This lack of effort needed to visual the story makes watching an audio-visual presentation less mentally straining.

These main two inherent differences in the media make predicting which medium is remembered more (or remembered better) difficult. On one hand, the vividness of the audio-visual presentation may make for a more memorable experience. On the other hand, the act of reading and imagining the story and its world as well as the corresponding mental effort may lead to a more personal and memorable experience.

The previous discussions on learning from fictional narratives, the debate over primacy and recency, and inherently different characteristics of the two media lead to the question of how do readers/viewers recall information that they encounter in two different media. Particularly, the following research question is posed.
RQ3: When asked to recall the narrative after a long period of time after both exposures, how will the narrative be recalled? Will the first (or second) version encountered be recalled, one medium recalled over the other, or a merged memory of the two mediums?
Chapter 3: Methods

Participants & Procedure

105 undergraduates at a large Midwestern university were recruited for the study and finished the first three parts. Of the 105, 90 finished all four parts. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions (text then film with no differences (i.e., same), text then film with differences (i.e., different), film then text with no differences, and film then text with differences). A 2 (text-film or film-text) x 2 (same or different) experimental design was used.

Participants first came into the lab and either read the text version or watched the film version. They then filled out a questionnaire. They were asked to return to the lab sometime later and were exposed to the other version of the narrative and again filled out a questionnaire. A few days after the second exposure to the narrative, they were asked to fill out a final short questionnaire.

The average age of participants was 21 years, with ages ranging from 18 to 45. As for the breakdown of racial backgrounds, 82 participants reported their race as White/Caucasian, six as Hispanic/Latino, six as Black/African-American, and two as “Other”. Males comprised 40.8% of the sample and 61 (58.1%) identified as female, with two participants refusing to answer. Of the 105 participants, 52 viewed the video
first while 53 read the story first. 55 were assigned to the same condition and 50 were assigned to the different condition. 85 participants (81%) of participants had some form of previous exposure to the stimuli.

Stimulus Materials

The stimuli were chosen based on the availability of the same narrative in different media (i.e., a film or television show was created based off a novel) and the relative lack of popularity among college aged adults. While both options are arguably popular (both novels are bestsellers), they have not had the attention or relative popularity of similar narratives (e.g., *The Hunger Games, Game of Thrones*). This is important so that the researchers can control the order in which the participants encounter the narrative and so that any information concerning the narrative is coming directly from the treatment and not from previous knowledge or preconceived notions.

Corresponding excerpts from the novel and film *Holes* (Sachar, 1998/Davis, 2003) were chosen. The book was published in 1998 and received wide acclaim. It is written for the lower spectrum of the young adult audience (which starts at about 12 years of age). The film was made in 2003 and met with moderate success. The excerpts cover the story of Katherine Barlow. She is a school teacher in the town of Green Lake during the early 1900s. She slowly falls in love with Sam the Onion Man, who is African American. One day after they are seen kissing, an angry mob burns down the schoolhouse. Katherine runs to the sheriff, who drunkenly tells her they are going to hang Sam because he was caught kissing a white woman. Katherine runs to warn Sam, only to
see him already rowing across the lake with a towns-person in pursuit. Katherine
witnesses the towns-person shoot Sam. She collapses in tears. This version of the story
shall serve as the same condition as the film closely follows the excerpt as written.

For the different condition, the story was rewritten slightly so that the reason Sam
is killed differs from the film (and the original version of the text). Instead of being killed
for kissing a white woman, the story has been rewritten so that Katherine is married and
Sam is killed for kissing a married woman. His race is never mentioned within the story
and the only physical description of the character is that he is strong.

Measures

Dependent measures Participants’ transportation was measured using the 11-item Green
& Brock’s scale (2000) and were assessed using seven Likert-type items on a seven point
scale (1=”Strongly Disagree” to 7=”Strongly Agree”). Sample items include, “While
viewing, I felt as if I was part of the action” and “I could picture myself in the events
portrayed in the show.” Transportation was measured after both the first and second
exposure. The Cronbach’s alpha for the first exposure is .86 and is .83 for the second
exposure.

Identification with the protagonist was measured using Cohen’s identification
scale (2001) and were assessed using seven Likert-type items on a seven point scale
(1=”Strongly Disagree” to 7=”Strongly Agree”). Sample items include, “I think I have a
good understanding of character X.” and “During viewing, I felt I could really get inside
character X’s head.” Identification was measured for both of the main characters in the
narrative, Katherine and Sam. The Cronbach’s alpha for identification with Katherine during the first exposure is .88 and is .87 for the second exposure. Cronbach’s alpha for identification with Sam during the first exposure is .87 and is .86 for the second exposure.

Three semantic differential items were used to measure enjoyment of the narrative. Participants rated how enjoyable, entertaining, and interesting the found the narrative, with the scale ranging from one to seven. The Cronbach’s alpha for the first exposure is .88 and is .93 for the second exposure.

Recall was measured using both open ended and close ended questions. The open ended questions in the first two sections asked participants to describe the story as they just encountered it (i.e., either as they read it or as they saw it). Participants were also asked to describe the character Sam from the story. During the final questionnaire, they were exclusively asked to describe the story and Sam from either the text version or the video version; which media they were asked to recall was randomly assigned.

Open ended responses were coding by three trained undergraduate research assistants. They coded for the presence or absence of comments in two categories; marriage and race. These categories were chosen as they represent the two substantial differences that were manipulated. By coding these categories, it is then possible to try and tap the participants’ free recall of the narrative. This then allows for the third research question (concerning how the narrative will be recalled) to be tested. Krippendorf’s alpha was run for each category and the coders achieved acceptable reliability (marriage, α = 1.00; race, α = .80).
Responses were coded in the marriage category when it was mentioned that the female character, Katherine, was married. Examples include: “It was wrong for Katherine to kiss someone while she was married but everyone would’ve seemed okay with it if she would've kissed Trout instead of Sam” and “A school teacher enlists the help of an onion picker to fix up her school house. Slowly, they fall in love, despite her marriage.” Similarly, the race category was defined as when Sam’s race was mentioned. Examples include: “Miss Katherine, a school teacher falls in love with a black man named Sam.” and “Sam comes off as a young, confident, strong, African-American man who is a victim of the times as far as racial discrimination.”

After being asked to freely recall the story, participants were then asked specific, multiple choice questions about the story. These questions include: “Why was Sam killed?” and “What race was Sam?”. During the delayed post-test, they were two questions asked about the text version of the story (“In the written version of the story, why was Sam killed?, “In the written version of the story, what race was Sam?”) and two asked about the film (“What kind of animal was Mary Lou in the film?”, “What was the name of the town in the film?”), with everybody receiving the same exact questions.

Participants were also asked about their desire to finish the narrative. They rate the following question on a one to seven Likert scale (1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 7 = “Strongly Agree”), “After reading/seeing this excerpt, I plan on reading/seeing the rest of the book/film.”
The relationships between transportation, identification, and enjoyment after first exposure (*Table 1*) and after second exposure (*Table 2*) in the form of correlation matrixes are included in appendix A.

*Possible Mediators or Moderators* Due to past research showing possible mediating or moderating effects of certain individual differences (Green, et al., 2008), several characteristics will be measured. Need for cognition, information seeking behavior, trait empathy, transportability, and media preferences will be measured using established scales. Along with these personal characteristics, possible confounding variables will be measured. These included whether they sought out information on the stimuli between exposures, desire to continue reading the full novel/watching the television show after exposure, and liking of the characters/actors involved in the narrative.
Chapter 4: Results

The first hypothesis predicted that transportation will be higher after the second exposure. H1 was tested using 2x2x2 mixed ANOVA, looking at transportation after first and second exposures (i.e., time) by which medium they first encountered by whether they were in the same or different condition. There was a significant effect of time on transportation, $F(1,96) = 42.27, p < .001$, indicating that the levels of transportation for the first ($M = 4.27, SD = .64$) and second exposures ($M = 4.92, SD = .81$) are significantly different. There were not significant interactions for the medium they first encountered and whether they were in the different condition. Thus the hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis two stated that identification will be higher after the second exposure. Again the hypothesis was tested using a mixed ANOVA, this time a 2x2x2x2 was used (time (i.e., identification at first and second exposure), whether they were in the same or different condition, the medium they first encountered, and identification with Sam and Katherine). For main effects of time on identification with Katherine, the results indicated that the difference in the mean identification score at first exposure ($M = 5.44, SD = 1.00$) was not significantly different from the identification score at the second exposure ($M = 5.38, SD = .94$), $F(1,95) = .10, p = .75$. The test indicated that again the mean identification score for Sam for the first exposure ($M = 5.34, SD = 1.00$) was not significantly different from the mean identification score at the second exposure ($M =
5.36, \( SD = .93 \), \( F(1,95) = 1.59, \ p = .21 \). There were no significant interactions for identification with Sam, however a significant interaction was found with Katherine. Time significantly interacted with the order in which they encountered the medium, \( F(1,95) = 7.36, \ p < .05 \). Participants who encountered the video first reported a decrease in identification at the second exposure (\( M = 38, \ SE = .13 \)) as compared to the first exposure (\( M = 5.61, \ SE = .13 \)). Those who first read the text saw an increase in identification at the second exposure (\( M = 5.37, \ SE = .13 \)) as compared to the first exposure (\( M = 5.18, \ SE = .13 \)). There was also a significant interaction between time, the order in which they encountered the media, and whether they were in the different condition, \( F(1,95) = 4.66, \ p < .05 \). Those who saw the video first and were in the different condition reported a decrease in their identification scores after the second exposure (\( M = 5.35, \ SE = .19 \)) as compared to the first exposure (\( M = 5.83, \ SE = .19 \)). While the hypothesis was not supported, interesting interactions were found.

The third hypothesis stated that enjoyment will be higher after the second exposure. To test the hypothesis, the same procedure as the previous two hypotheses was run. The paired t-test indicated that the mean enjoyment scores for the first exposure (\( M = 5.90, \ SD = 1.18 \)) and the second exposure (\( M = 5.68, \ SD = 1.29 \)) were significantly not different, \( t(98) = 1.62, \ p = .11 \). Thus H3 was not supported.

Hypothesis four stated that the different condition will more negatively impact transportation during the second viewing compared to the same condition. The hypothesis was tested using an oneway ANOVA, looking at the mean transportation score at the second exposure by condition, which was dummy coded. Results show that there is not a
significant difference in transportation scores between the different condition ($M = 4.69, SD = .83$) and the same condition ($M = 4.66, SD = .82$), $F(1,99) = .04, p = .85$. The hypothesis was not supported.

H5 proposed that during the second viewing, identification will be lower in the different condition compared to the same condition. Again, the hypothesis was tested using an oneway ANOVA, looking at the mean identification score for Katherine and Sam by condition, which was dummy coded. The mean identification score with Kate for the different condition ($M = 5.32, SD = 1.06$) was not significantly different from the same condition ($M = 5.47, SD = .82$), $F(1,99) = .65, p = .42$. The same held true for identification with Sam; the different condition ($M = 5.35, SD = 1.03$) and the same condition ($M = 5.38, SD = .87$) were not significantly different, $F(1,99) = .03, p = .88$. The hypothesis was not supported.

The first research question asked whether one medium would lead to higher levels of identification. The research question was tested using a mixed ANOVA, looking at the interaction between time and condition (whether they read the text or watched the video). Results indicate that there is not a significant interaction when controlling for previous exposure to the narrative for identification with Katherine, $F(1,95) = 1.98, p = .16$. Looking at identification with Sam there was a significant interaction, $F(1,95) = 10.85, p < .001$. Examining means reveals that after the first exposure, identification with Sam was higher for those who watched the video clip ($M = 5.61, SD = 1.00$) than those who read the excerpt ($M = 5.06, SD = .93$). The same held true for the second exposure, those who read the excerpt reported lower levels of identification ($M = 5.35, SD = .82$) than
those who watched the clip ($M = 5.37, SD = 1.04$). So, the video led to greater identification with both first and second exposures.

The second research question asked whether enjoyment of the narrative would correspond to the desire to finish reading/watching the narrative. A simple linear regression was used to test this hypothesis, with desire to finish the narrative as the dependent variable and enjoyment as the independent variable. The desire to finish the narrative was significantly predicted by enjoyment, $\beta = .61, p < .001, F(1,100) = 19.43, p < .001$, explaining 16% of the variance in the dependent variable. Thus the hypothesis was supported.

The third and final research question asked whether the video or text would be remembered better and whether participants would have a merged memory of the two. To test the question, the coded responses to the open-ended responses to the question asking participants to describe the story were used. These responses were coded as to whether they mentioned either of the details that were manipulated to be different in the text condition (i.e., Katherine’s marital status and Sam’s race). Those who were in the different condition read a text where Katherine was married and Sam’s race was not mentioned. Those in the same condition read the original text where Katherine was single and Sam’s race was explicitly mentioned as African-American. Everyone saw the same video, which followed the same story as the same condition text. A chi-squared test for independence was run, testing possible recall IVs which included the order in which they encountered the media, the medium they were asked to recall, and whether a merged memory was the result. The first round of chi-squared tests concern whether the
participants correctly remembered if Katherine was married (80% did). The IV in the analysis was a dummy coded variable where if they saw they video first the variable equaled one and if they read the story first the variable equaled zero. The results indicate that the order in which participants encountered the versions has no relationship to whether they correctly commented on Katherine’s marriage, $\chi^2(1) = .80, p = .37$. However, it was found that medium had a relationship to whether participants correctly remembered Katherine’s marriage, $\chi^2(1) = 8.46, p < .05$, with a higher proportion (92.7% of participants) of those who were asked to recall the video correctly commenting on Katherine’s marriage than those asked to recall the text (66.7% of participants). A 2x2 chi-squared was also pursued to investigate possible interactions between the order in which participants encountered the medium and the different condition. Results indicated that there was not a significant interaction, $\chi^2(1) = .64, p = .42$.

The same procedures were run looking at whether the participants correctly commented on Sam’s race (76% did). Again, the order in which participants encountered the media was found not to have a relationship to mentioning Sam’s race, $\chi^2(1) = .26, p = .61$. When it came to the relationship between medium and recall, the video did not have relationship with commenting on Sam’s race, $\chi^2(1) = 2.07, p = .15$. So participants were no more likely to correctly comment of Sam’s race regardless of the order in which they encountered the media and which version they were asked to recall. A 2x2 chi-squared investigated possible interactions between the order in which participants encountered the medium and the different condition. Results indicated that there was not a significant interaction, $\chi^2(1) = .04, p = .85$. 29
Two closed ended questions concerning Sam’s race and the reason for his murder were also used to test the possibility of an effect of the order in which they encountered the media. The questions were asked the same way to all participants, asking them to recall the written version, thus they cannot be used to test the possible effect of medium. The questions were again coded as to whether the answer to the multiple choice question was correct (Race: 69% correct; Killed: 85% correct). From there, a chi-squared test was again run. For the question concerning Sam’s race, the order in which they encountered the media did not have a relationship with whether they correctly answered the question, \( \chi^2(1) = .30, p = .59 \). The same held true for the other close ended question, asking why Sam was killed; there was no relationship between the order in which the media were encountered and whether they answered the question correctly, \( \chi^2(1) = .04, p = .85 \).

To test the possibility of a merged memory of the two mediums, the coding categories of marriage and race were added together into one variable. If the resulting variable was either a 0 or a 2, then it was assumed that the participants had a potentially merged memory of the two versions. The logic behind this is that a response that was coded as 0 in both categories (didn’t mention Katherine’s marital status nor Sam’s race) and 1 in both categories (mentioned both Katherine’s marriage and Sam’s race) had recalled a detail present in the video that wasn’t in the text (Sam’s race) and also recalled a detail from the text that wasn’t in the video (Katherine’s marriage or lack thereof).

From here, the variable was then dummy coded as either 0 (non-merged memory) or 1 (merged memory) Again, a chi-squared test of independence was run with the dummy coded merged memory variable by the different condition (the only condition where is
was possible to tell if a merged memory was the results of both exposures). Results also indicate that the different condition had no relationship to whether participants had a merged memory, $\chi^2(1) = 1.06, p = .30$. 


Chapter 5: Discussion

With Hollywood’s and popular culture’s dependence on “pre-sold” properties (i.e., screen adaptations), it is increasingly important to understand how people are cognitively and affectively influenced by these properties. This study was designed to investigate these potential effects of screen adaptations, specifically how differences between the mediums impact these effects. Generally, it was found that encountering the same narrative in different formats and the existence in narrative differences does not negatively impact transportation, identification, or enjoyment. For the outcomes concerning recall, it was found that when asked to summarize the story, those who summarized the video were more likely to correctly comment on an important detail from the story.

As media consumers, we often encounter the same message or narrative multiple times. Depending on the message or narrative, we can actually choose to consume the message (like when it is in the form of our favorite movie or television show) as many times as we want. It then becomes important to understand how repeated being exposure to the same message affects transportation, identification, enjoyment, and even memory for the message. By looking at film adaptations and the existence of differences, we can start to pinpoint what characteristics of repeated messages may help or hinder transportation, identification, and enjoyment. It has been shown that in the case of film
adaptations, the second exposure to the narrative increases transportation and enjoyment for those who read then watched the same narrative (Green, et al., 2008) and when considering parasocial relationship literature (Cohen, 2009), it seems that identification would increase as well. But none of these three things have been looked at in the context of differences between the two forms of the narrative, which cultural scholars, film critics and the viewing public take very seriously when it comes to the adaptations of beloved books.

To answer these questions surrounding the impact of repeat exposure of the same narrative, it was first hypothesized that transportation, identification, and enjoyment would all be higher after the second exposure to the narrative. Transportation was found to be significantly higher after the second exposure as compared to the first. In contrast, it was surprisingly found that identification and enjoyment were not significantly different between the first and second exposure. The finding around transportation partially replicate previous research (Green, et al., 2008) that found that transportation was higher after the second exposure to the same narrative. They also partially contradict the same research as they found transportation was only higher when participants read and then watched the same narrative, where it was here found that transportation was higher regardless of the order in which they encountered the media. Following Green et al.’s (2008) study, the finding around enjoyment is especially surprising as it contradicts their findings. The finding concerning identification is also surprising given the plethora of literature surrounding parasocial relationships that suggests that multiple exposures to a
media character (i.e., interactions with the character) would increase liking and the sense of being in some form of “social” relationship with said character (Giles, 2002).

The failure to find any significant findings for identification and enjoyment could have happened for a number of other reasons as well. A vast majority (81%) of our participants had previous exposure to the story whereas past research contained a much smaller proportion of participants with previous exposure (i.e., 21% in Green, et al. (2008)). Those who had previous exposure to the story could have been less engaged for a number of reasons (e.g., lack of suspense, boredom). It may also just be that both versions are equally engaging and lead to similar levels of identification and enjoyment, regardless if differences exist.

Expanding into the realms of differences between media, that is things that were changed during the adaptation process, it was predicted that those who encountered differences in the media would experience lower transportation and identification during the second exposure compared to those who did not encounter such differences. Shockingly, no significant differences were found in transportation or identification levels. Given literature looking at processing fluency and event indexing this is more surprising. Past research suggests that when readers or viewers encounter contradictory messages between narratives (e.g. a change in location or a change in the temporal order of events), they have to update one or more situational model indices (Zwann, et al., 1995; Rinick, et al., 2001; Busselle & Bilandzic, 2008). The act of updating the index then reduces transportation. However, empirical support for this exists in reaction time data, measuring time in milliseconds, during the actual exposure to the narrative (Zwann,
et al., 1995; Rinick, et al., 2001). As we did not measure reaction time (i.e., real time data) and instead used a self-report format, our measures are not as sensitive to minute changes as those used in past research. Thus it maybe that measuring transportation at one point in time, after the narrative has ended, and using self-report measures are not sensitive enough measures to capture differences.

The fact that our manipulation may not have been a large enough difference could have come into play with these null findings surrounding differences between the versions. Meaning the arguably subtle changes in the story (making one character married, thus changing the causal event in the story which leads to another character’s death) might not have been large enough of a difference to trigger an update in the corresponding index, and thus not impacting transportation. Future research should then look into using another stimuli, one that a college population is not as familiar with, that is manipulated to include a much stronger difference in the two versions of the narrative.

These findings are important to the study of repeat exposure in consideration of transportation, identification, and enjoyment. As significant differences were found between the two exposures, transportation (but not identification or enjoyment) was here positively impacted by repeat exposure, as has been hypothesized. In the past, transportation has been found to be higher for written narratives when compared to video narratives, and thus more persuasive (Tukachinsky, 2014). These results have been found in a persuasive context though, so maybe written narratives fostering more transportation may not hold true for more purely entertainment narratives an indicated by the results. Second exposure to a narrative has also been shown to increase enjoyment of the story.
when participants first read and then watch the same narrative (Green, et al., 2008), however our contradictory findings indicate that further research is needed into how repeat exposure impacts enjoyment of a narrative.

The null findings surrounding identification in terms of repeat exposure may have implications for the concept as a whole and its connections to parasocial relationships. As the second exposure did not increase identification, it is seen that repeat exposure does not afford certain possible benefits (e.g., further understanding of the character). However, as most of our sample had previous exposure to the narrative, the hypothesis (i.e., identification would be higher after second exposure) could be true, but the change in identification levels could not be captured by the current study. The same could be said for the medium in which the story is presented; neither medium lead to increased or decreased levels of identification which means that neither are particularly beneficial of detrimental to the process of identification.

Since identification did not increase, this could either support the predictions of parasocial relationships (i.e., that repeat exposure to a character leads to the development of a relationship and that PSR is different from identification) or contradict them. In parasocial relationships, multiple exposures to the narrative (i.e., parasocial interactions) are important to the relational development with the media character. Since identification with the character did not increase after the second exposure, this could mean that repeated exposure to the same information about the character is qualifiedly different from exposure to new a new episode. As identification is defined as seeing yourself in there character’s shoes (Cohen, 2001), this could also implicate identification as being
quantifiably different than PSR as PSR has the audience member seeing themselves in an interpersonal relationship with the character (Giles, 2002). However, as identification can be an important part of the parasocial relationship the null finding surrounding identification can possibly contradict the central hypothesis of PSR that repeated “interactions” with media characters foster parasocial relationships (Rubin, et al., 1985).

The finding that identification with Sam was higher after participants saw the video than after they read the text. This lends support to the position that video leads to higher levels of identification. It is surprising though that we only found significant results for identification for Sam and not for Katherine. Some factors surrounding the differences in her character might have impacted this. As the different condition portrayed her as a married woman falling in love with a man who is not her husband, people may have judged her as immoral and thus were less likely to identify with her.

The second research question sought to gain insight into the connection between the attitudinal and behavioral aspects of enjoyment (Nabi & Krcmar, 2004) and asked whether participants’ enjoyment of the narrative would correspond to a desire to finish reading/watching the narrative. Here, we found that yes enjoyment does correspond to desire to finish the narrative. This illustrates that when audiences enjoy a narrative, they may be more likely to seek out the film version (or original text) of the narrative, extending support to the behavioral aspect of enjoyment, as proposed by Nabi and Krcmar (2004). This finding, though, is based on a relatively weak measure of behavioral intentions. The item asked whether they would like to finish reading/watching the narrative and not whether they would like to see/read the other version of it. So, while it
could be argued that desire to finish the narrative would correspond to the desire to see/read the other version, we do have the data to back up that assertion. Here, future research should make sure to include behavioral intention measures in their questionnaire.

More practical, day-to-day questions are also tied to the question of film adaptation. As discussed earlier, fictional narrative films are often used in classrooms to supplement readings (either literature or more expository, textbook readings). When considering the use of films in the classroom, the issue of differences between the mediums becomes very salient. If there is a contradiction between the textbook and the film, what will the student remember? As previous research has shown, people tend to learn and recall false information encountered in narratives (Gilbert, Tafarodi, & Malone, 1993, Marsh & Fazio, 2006, Marsh, Butler, & Umanath, 2013). Does this remain true when the information is encountered in two different media? In certain circumstances, evidence points to yes (Butler, et al., 2009, Umanath, Butler, & Marsh, 2012), but the fact that we are still questioning it means it deserves more study.

The third research question attempted to add to this debate. It was asked how might the story be recalled after some time; would participants remember the first medium they were exposed to? Would they remember one medium over the other? Results indicate that the order of the media does not matter, however video may be more memorable. However this statement should be treated with caution. As recall was tapped with a broad thought listing task (that asked participants to summarize either the text or video), it is hard to say whether they remembered certain target details and just failed to
mention them or if they did not remember those details. This especially holds true for Katherine’s marital status, which was overlooked in the closed ended items. When closed-ended questions were used to investigate recall, they were asked in a way (only asking all participants to recall one medium) that prevented them to be used to confirm all of the analyses done on the open ended recall items. This prevents further analyses on the finding that video may be more memorable. Future research should look into using a more concrete measure of recall that is counter balanced between asking about each medium to confirm these findings.

However if we assume the best case scenario, that is that video was better remembered than text, this has serious implications for many areas. As discussed above, videos are often used to supplement educational texts. Our findings may help explain why students tend to remember false details found in historical films, even when warned about false details previous to exposure (Umanath, Butler, & Marsh, 2012). If video is indeed more memorable than text, history and English classes should proceed with even more caution when using films to supplement readings. If video is more memorable than text, this can also have implications for persuasion. If a video is more memorable, then it may be more influential for the persuasion purposes to create persuasive videos instead of persuasive texts (e.g., information pamphlets, op-eds). This could also lend support to the need to expand theories of situation models into the video realm. Most research into situation models, like the event indexing model, have been done using text stimuli (Zwann, et al., 1995; Rinick, et al., 2001). While it is admittedly more difficult to perform
this research on videos, if video is more memorable how situational models are
constructed and updated for this medium is even more important.

By examining and manipulating differences between the written and audio-visual
version of the narrative, this study sought to make a novel contribution. However, in light
of the results we see that differences might not make that much of a difference for
transportation, identification, and enjoyment. Theoretically, this implicates the idea of
processing fluency and comprehension’s connection to transportation. If narrative
differences do not trigger an update of situational model indexes in order to properly
comprehend the story, then the idea of narrative inconsistencies does not include
differences between versions of the story. This could also mean that people construct two
separate situational models, one for the written version and one for the video version.

Research into the effects of film adaptations has been shamefully neglected. Many
surface level questions surrounding the issue exist, as do more complicated questions,
both of which deserving of more attention than has been given to them in the past.
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Appendix A: Tables

**Table 1**
Correlations for Variables of Interest at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Identification with Katherine</th>
<th>Identification with Sam</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.481**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification with Katherine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification with Sam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.536**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 2**
Correlations for Variables of Interest at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Identification with Katherine</th>
<th>Identification with Sam</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.662**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification with Katherine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.851**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification with Sam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>.851**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.475**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.662**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.** Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).
Appendix B: Measures

Transportation (Green & Brock, 2000)

While I was reading the narrative, I could easily picture the events in it taking place.

While I was reading the narrative, activity going on in the room around me was on my mind. (-)

I could picture myself in the scene of the events described in the narrative.

I was mentally involved in the narrative while reading it.

After finishing the narrative, I found it easy to put it out of my mind. (-)

I wanted to learn how the narrative ended.

The narrative affected me emotionally.

I found myself thinking of ways the narrative could have turned out differently.

I found my mind wandering while reading the narrative. (-)

The events in the narrative are relevant to my everyday life.

The events in the narrative have changed my life.

While reading the narrative I had a vivid image of CHARACTER.

Identification (Cohen, 2001)

While viewing program X, I felt as if I was part of the action.

While viewing program X, I forgot myself and was fully absorbed.

I was able to understand the events in the program in a manner similar to that in which character X understood them.
I think I have a good understanding of character X.

I tend to understand the reasons why character X does what he or she does.

While viewing the show I could feel the emotions character X portrayed.

During viewing, I felt I could really get inside character X’s head.

At key moments in the show, I felt I knew exactly what character X was going through.

While viewing the program, I wanted character X to succeed in achieving his or her goals.

When character X succeeded I felt joy, but when he or she failed, I was sad.

Enjoyment

How enjoyable did you find the book/film?

How interesting did you find the book/film?

How entertaining did you find the book/film?

Trait Empathy (Davis, 1980)

Fantasy

When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.

I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.

I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don’t often get completely caught up in it. (-)

After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.

I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.

Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. (-)
When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.

Perspective Taking

Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

If I’m sure I’m right about something, I don’t waste much time listening to other people’s arguments. (-)

I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.

I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.

I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the “other guy’s” point of view. (-)

I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.

When I’m upset at someone, I usually try to “put myself in his shoes” for a while.

Empathetic Concern

When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them.

When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don’t feel very much pity for them. (-)

I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.

I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.

Sometimes I don’t feel sorry for other people when they are having problems. (-)

Other people’s misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (-)

I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.

Need for Cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1984)

I would prefer complex to simple problems.
I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.

Thinking is not my idea of fun. (-)

I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. (-)

I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely chance I will have to think in depth about something. (-)

I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.

I only think as hard as I have to. (-)

I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long term ones. (-)

I like tasks that require little thought once I’ve learned them. (-)

The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.

I really enjoy a task that involved coming up with new solutions to problems.

Learning new ways to think doesn’t excite me very much. (-)

I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.

The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.

I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.

I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort. (-)

It’s enough for me that something gets the job done; I don’t care how or why it works. (-)

I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.

Media Preferences (Green, et al., 2008)

Given the choice, would you rather watch the movie than read the book.
How eager you would be to read the book after viewing a movie you enjoyed. (-)
How eager you would be to watch a movie based on a book you enjoyed.
How eager you would be to see a movie you enjoyed for a second time.
How eager you would be to read a book you enjoyed for a second time. (-)

Mental Imagery Ability (Pavio & Harshman, 1983)

My thinking often consists of mental pictures or images.
I find it difficult to form a mental picture of anything. (-)
I can close my eyes and easily picture a scene I have experienced.
When someone describes something that happens to him, I sometimes find myself vividly imagining the events that happened.
I have only vague visual impressions of scenes I have experienced. (-)
I don’t believe that anyone can think in terms of mental pictures. (-)
When reading fiction I usually form a mental picture of a scene or room that has been described.
I read rather slowly. (-)
I do not have a vivid imagination. (-)

Effort (Green, et al., 2008)

I put a lot of effort into the movie clip I just saw/narrative I just read.

Liking of actors/characters (McCroskey & McCain, 1974)

Social Attraction

I think s/he could be a friend of mine.
I would like to have a friendly chat with her/him.
S/he wouldn’t fit in with my circle of friends.

Physical Attraction

I think s/he is quite pretty/handsome.
I don’t like the way s/he looks.
S/he is repulsive to me.

Previous Exposure

Books

Please indicate which books you have read.

*State of Fear* by Michael Crichton

*Holes* by Louis Sachar

*Go Set a Watchman* by Harper Lee

*Love After Dark* by Marie Force

*Paper Towns* by John Green

*Friction* by Sandra Brown

*Who Do You Love* by Jennifer Weiner

*The Outsiders* by S.E. Hinton

*Grey* by E.L. James

*All the Light We Cannot See* by Anthony Doerr

Films

Please indicate which films you have seen.

*Jurassic Park*

*A League of Their Own*

*Holes*

*Looper*

*E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial*

*Eat Pray Love*
Selma

Return to Sender

The Fighter

Aloha

Recall

Thought Listing

First Exposure

Please describe what happens in the video/story you just watched/read.

Please describe the character of Sam.

Second Exposure

Please describe what happens in the video/story you just watched/read.

Please describe the character of Sam.

Third Exposure

Please describe the written (text) version of the story.

Please describe the character of Sam from the written (text) version of the story.

Close Ended Measures

(In the written version of the story,) [w]hy was Sam killed?

a. He was black and kissed a white woman

b. He stole

c. He kissed a married woman

d. He kissed a little girl

(In the written version of the story,) [w]hat race was Sam?

a. White

b. Black
c. Asian

d. Arab

What kind of animal was Mary Lou (in the film)?

a. Dog

b. Cow

c. Horse

d. Donkey

What was the name of the town (in the film)?

a. Green Lake

b. Lakeside

c. Lakewood

d. Green Acres

Custom Measures

After reading/seeing this excerpt, I plan on reading/seeing the rest of the book/film.

Since I was last here, I have looked up information about the story.

Since I was last here, I have read the book *Holes*.

Since I was last here, I have seen the film *Holes*. 
Appendix C: Text of Similar Condition

One hundred and ten years ago, Green Lake was the largest lake in Texas. It was full of clear cool water, and it sparkled like a giant emerald in the sun. It was especially beautiful in the spring, when the peach trees, which lined the shore, bloomed with pink and rose-colored blossoms.

There was always a town picnic on the Fourth of July. They’d play games, dance, sing, and swim in the lake to keep cool. Prizes were awarded for the best peach pie and peach jam.

A special prize was given every year to Miss Kate Barlow for her fabulous spiced peaches. No one else even tried to make spiced peaches, because they knew none could be as delicious as hers.

Every summer Miss Katherine would pick bushels of peaches and preserve them in jars with cinnamon, cloves, nutmeg, and other spices which she kept secret. The jarred peaches would last all winter. They probably would have lasted a lot longer than that, but they were always eaten by the end of winter.

It was said that Green Lake was “heaven on earth” and that Miss Katherine’s spiced peaches were “food for the angels.”

Katherine Barlow was the town’s only school teacher. She taught in an old one-room schoolhouse. It was even old then. The roof leaked. The windows wouldn’t open. The door hung crooked on its bent hinges.

She was a wonderful teacher, full of knowledge and full of life. The children loved her.

She taught classes in the evening for adults, and many of the adults loved her as well. She was very pretty. Her classes were often full of young men, who were a lot more interested in the teacher than they were in getting an education.

But all they ever got was an education.

One such young man was Trout Walker. His real name was Charles Walker, but everyone called him Trout because his two feet smelled like a couple of dead fish.
This wasn’t entirely Trout’s fault. He had an incurable foot fungus. In fact, it was the same foot fungus that a hundred and ten years later would afflict the famous ballplayer Clyde Livingston. But at least Clyde Livingston showered every day.

“I take a bath every Sunday morning,” Trout would brag, “whether I need to or not.”

Most everyone in the town of Green Lake expected Miss Katherine to marry Trout Walker. He was the son of the richest man in the county. His family owned most of the peach trees and all the land on the east side of the lake.

Trout often showed up at night school but never paid attention. He talked in class and was disrespectful of the students around him. He was loud and stupid.

A lot of the men in town were not educated. That didn’t bother Miss Katherine. She knew they’d spent most of their lives working on farms and ranches and hadn’t had much schooling. That was why she was there – to teach them.

But Trout didn’t want to learn. He seemed to be proud of his stupidity.

“How’d you like to ride my new boat this Saturday?” he asked her one evening after class.

“No, thank you,” said Miss Katherine.

“We’ve got a brand-new boat,” he said. “You don’t even have to row it.”

“Yes, I know,” said Miss Katherine.

Everyone in town had seen – and heard – the Walkers’ new boat. It made a terrible loud noise and spewed ugly black smoke over the beautiful lake.

Trout had always gotten everything he ever wanted. He found it hard to believe that Miss Katherine had turned him down. He pointed his finger at her and said, “No one ever says ‘No’ to Charles Walker!”

“I believe I just did,” said Katherine Barlow.

* * *

There was a doctor in the town of Green Lake. His name was Dr. Hawthorn. And whenever people got sick, they would go see Doc Hawthorn. But they would also see Sam, the onion man.
“Onions! Sweet, fresh onions!” Sam would call, as he and his donkey, Mary Lou, walked up and down the dirt roads of Green Lake. Mary Lou pulled a cart full of onions.

Sam’s onion field was somewhere on the other side of the lake. Once or twice a week he would row across the lake and pick a new batch to fill the cart. Sam had big strong arms, but it would still take all day for him to row across the lake and another day for him to return. Most of the time he would leave Mary Lou in a shed, which the Walkers let him use at no charge, but sometimes he would take Mary Lou on his boat with him.

Sam claimed that Mary Lou was almost fifty years old, which was, and still is, extraordinarily old for a donkey.

“She eats nothing but raw onions,” Sam would say, holding up a white onion between his dark fingers. “It’s nature’s magic vegetable. If a person ate nothing but raw onions, he could live to be two hundred years old.”

Sam was not much older than twenty, so nobody was quite sure that Mary Lou was really as old as he said she was. How would he know?

Still, nobody ever argued with Sam. And whenever they were sick, they would go not only to Doc Hawthorn but also to Sam.

Sam always gave the same advice: “Eat plenty of onions.”

He said that onions were good for the digestions, the liver, the stomach, the lungs, the heart, and the brain. “If you don’t believe me, just look at old Mary Lou here. She’s never been sick a day in her life.”

He also had many different ointments, lotions, syrups, and pastes all made out of onion juice and different parts of the onion plant. This one cured asthma. That one was for warts and pimples. Another was a remedy for arthritis.

He even had a special ointment which he claimed would cure baldness. “Just rub it on your husband’s head every night where he’s sleeping, Mrs. Collingwood, and soon his hair will be as thick and long as Mary Lou’s tail.”

Doc Hawthorn did not resent Sam. The folks of Green Lake were afraid to take chances. They would get regular medicine from Doc Hawthorn and onion concoctions from Sam. After they got over their illness, no one could be sure, not even Doc Hawthorn, which of the two treatments had done the trick.
Doc Hawthorn was almost completely bald, and in the morning his head often smelled like onions.

* * *

Whenever Katherine Barlow bought onions, she always bought an extra one or two for Mary Lou to eat them out of her hand.

“Is something wrong?” Sam asked her one day as she was feeding Mary Lou. “You seem distracted.”

“Oh just the weather,” said Miss Katherine. “It looks like rain clouds moving in.”

“Me and Mary Lou, we like the rain,” said Sam.

“Oh, I like it fine,” said Miss Katherine, as she rubbed the donkey’s rough hair on top of its head. “Its just that the roof leaks in the schoolhouse.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

“What are you going to do?” Katherine joked. “Fill the holes with onion paste?”

Sam laughed. “I’m good with my hands,” he told her. “I built my own boat. If it leaked, I’d be in big trouble.”

Katherine couldn’t help but notice his strong, firm hands.

They made a deal. He agreed to fix the leaky roof in exchange for six jars of spiced peaches.

It took Sam a week to fix the roof, because he could only work in the afternoons, after school let out and before night classes began. Sam wasn’t allowed to attend classes because he was a Negro, but they let him fix the building.

Miss Katherine usually stayed in the schoolhouse, grading papers and such, while Sam worked on the roof. She enjoyed what little conversation they were able to have, shouting up and down to each other. She was surprised by his interest in poetry. When he took a break, she would sometimes read a poem to him. On more than one occasion, she would start to read a poem by Poe or Longfellow, only to hear him finish it for her, from memory.

She was sad when the roof was finished.

“Is something wrong?” he asked.
“No, you did a wonderful job,” she said. “It’s just that… the windows won’t open. The children and I would enjoy a breeze now and then.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

She gave him two more jars of peaches and Sam fixed the windows.

It was easier to talk to him when he was working on the windows. He told her about his secret onion field on the other side of the lake, “where the onions grow all year round, and the water runs uphill.”

When the windows were fixed, she complained that her desk wobbled.

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

The next time she saw him, she mentioned that “the door doesn’t hang straight,” and she got to spend another afternoon with him while he fixed the door.

By the end of the first semester, Onion Sam had turned the old rundown schoolhouse into a well-crafted, freshly painted jewel of a building that the whole town was proud of. People passing by would stop and admire it. “That’s our schoolhouse. It shows how much we value education here in Green Lake.”

The only person who wasn’t happy with it was Miss Katherine. She’d run out of things needing to be fixed.

She sat at her desk one afternoon, listening to the pitter-patter of the rain on the roof. No water leaked into the classroom, except for the few drops that came from her eyes.

“Onions! Hot sweet onions!” Sam called, out on the street.

She ran to him. She wanted to throw her arms around him but couldn’t bring herself to do it. Instead she hugged Mary Lou’s neck.

“Is something wrong?” he asked her.

“Oh, Sam,” she said. “My heart is breaking.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

She turned to him.

He took both her hands, and kissed her.
Because of the rain, there was nobody else out on the street. Even if there was Katherine and Sam wouldn’t have noticed. They were lost in their own world.

At that moment, however, Hattie Parker stepped out of the general store. They didn’t see her, but she was them. She pointed her quivering finger in their direction and whispered. “God will punish you!”

* * *

There were no telephones, but word spread quickly through the small town. By the end of the day, everyone in Green Lake had heard that the schoolteacher had kissed the onion picker.

Not one child showed up for school the next morning.

Miss Katherine sat alone in the classroom and wondered if she had lost track of the day of the week. Perhaps it was Saturday. It wouldn’t have surprised her. Her brain and heart had been spinning ever since Sam kissed her.

She heard a noise outside the door, then suddenly a mob of men and women came storming into the school building. They were led by Trout Walker.

“There she is!” Trout shouted. “The Devil Woman!”

The mob was turning over desks and ripping down bulletin boards.

“She’s been poisoning your children’s brains with books,” Trout declared.

They begin piling all the books in the center of the room.

“Think about what you are doing!” cried Miss Katherine.

Someone made a grab for her, tearing her dress, but she managed to get out of the building. She ran to the sheriff’s office.

The sheriff had his feet up on his desk and was drinking from a bottle of whiskey. “Mornin’, Miss Katherine,” he said.

“They’re destroying the schoolhouse,” she said, gasping for breath. “They’ll burn it to the ground if someone doesn’t stop them!”

“Just calm your pretty self-down a second,” the sheriff said in a slow drawl. “And tell me what you’re talking about.” He got up from his desk and walked over to her.
“Trout Walker has –“

“Now don’t go saying nothing be about Charles Walker, said the sheriff.

“We don’t have much time!” urged Katherine. “You’ve got to stop them.”

“You’re sure pretty,” said the sheriff.

Miss Katherine stared at him in horror.

“Kiss me,” said the sheriff.

She slapped him across the face.

He laughed. “You kissed the onion picker. Why won’t you kiss me?”

She tried to slap him again, but he caught her by the hand.

She tried to wriggle free. “You’re drunk!” she yelled.

“I always get drunk before a hanging.”

“A hanging? Who –“

“It’s against the law for a Negro to kiss a white woman.”

“Well then you’ll have to hang me, too,” said Katherine. “Because I kissed him back.”

“It ain’t against the law for you to kiss him,” the sheriff explained. “Just for him to kiss you.”

“We’re all equal under the eyes of God,” she declared.

The sheriff laughed. “Then if Sam and I are equal, why won’t you kiss me?” He laughed again. “I’ll make you a deal. One sweet kiss, and I won’t hang your boyfriend. I’ll just run him out of town.”

Miss Katherine jerked her hand free. As she hurried to the door, she heard the sheriff say, “The law will punish Sam. And God will punish you.”

She stepped back into the street and saw smoke rising from the schoolhouse. She ran down to the lakefront, where she saw Mary Lou’s body lying on the ground. The donkey had been shot in the head.
Sam was his boat in the water, half way across the lake. His powerful arms rowed away from the shore. But his powerful arms were no match for Trout Walker’s motorized boat. They were little more than halfway across the lake when Miss Katherine heard the loud bang of a gun.

“Sam!” cried Katherine. She collapsed onto the ground, tears pooling in her eyes.

That all happened one hundred and ten years ago. Since then, not one drop of rain has fallen on Green Lake.
Appendix D: Text of Different Condition

One hundred and ten years ago, Green Lake was the largest lake in Texas. It was full of clear cool water, and it sparkled like a giant emerald in the sun. It was especially beautiful in the spring, when the peach trees, which lined the shore, bloomed with pink and rose-colored blossoms.

There was always a town picnic on the Fourth of July. They’d play games, dance, sing, and swim in the lake to keep cool. Prizes were awarded for the best peach pie and peach jam.

A special prize was given every year to Mrs. Katherine Barlow for her fabulous spiced peaches. No one else even tried to make spiced peaches, because they knew none could be as delicious as hers.

Every summer Mrs. Katherine would pick bushels of peaches and preserve them in jars with cinnamon, cloves, nutmeg, and other spices which she kept secret. The jarred peaches would last all winter. They probably would have lasted a lot longer than that, but they were always eaten by the end of winter.

It was said that Green Lake was “heaven on earth” and that Mrs. Katherine’s spiced peaches were “food for the angels.”

Mrs. Katherine Barlow was the town’s only school teacher. She taught in an old one-room schoolhouse. It was even old then. The roof leaked. The windows wouldn’t open. The door hung crooked on its bent hinges.

She was a wonderful teacher, full of knowledge and full of life. The children loved her.

She taught classes in the evening for adults, and many of the adults loved her as well. She was very pretty and very married, but very lonely as her husband was away often on business. Her classes were often full of young men, who were a lot more interested in the teacher than they were in getting an education.

But all they ever got was an education.
One such young man was Trout Walker. His real name was Charles Walker, but everyone called him Trout because his two feet smelled like a couple of dead fish.

This wasn’t entirely Trout’s fault. He had an incurable foot fungus. In fact, it was the same foot fungus that a hundred and ten years later would afflict the famous ballplayer Clyde Livingston. But at least Clyde Livingston showered every day.

“I take a bath every Sunday morning,” Trout would brag, “whether I need to or not.”

Most everyone in the town of Green Lake felt sorry that Mrs. Katherine’s husband was never around and hoped that she would fall for Trout Walker. He was the son of the richest man in the county. His family owned most of the peach trees and all the land on the east side of the lake.

Trout often showed up at night school but never paid attention. He talked in class and was disrespectful of the students around him. He was loud and stupid.

A lot of the men in town were not educated. That didn’t bother Mrs. Katherine. She knew they’d spent most of their lives working on farms and ranches and hadn’t had much schooling. That was why she was there – to teach them.

But Trout didn’t want to learn. He seemed to be proud of his stupidity.

“How’d you like to ride my new boat this Saturday?” he asked her one evening after class.

“No, thank you,” said Mrs. Katherine.

“We’ve got a brand-new boat,” he said. “You don’t even have to row it.”

“Yes, I know,” said Mrs. Katherine.

Everyone in town had seen – and heard – the Walkers’ new boat. It made a terrible loud noise and spewed ugly black smoke over the beautiful lake.

Trout had always gotten everything he ever wanted. He found it hard to believe that Mrs. Katherine had turned him down, even if she was married. Everyone knew she was very lonely. He pointed his finger at her and said, “No one ever says ‘No’ to Charles Walker!”

“I believe I just did,” said Katherine Barlow.

***
There was a doctor in the town of Green Lake. His name was Dr. Hawthorn. And whenever people got sick, they would go see Doc Hawthorn. But they would also see Sam, the onion man.

“Onions! Sweet, fresh onions!” Sam would call, as he and his donkey, Mary Lou, walked up and down the dirt roads of Green Lake. Mary Lou pulled a cart full of onions.

Sam’s onion field was somewhere on the other side of the lake. Once or twice a week he would row across the lake and pick a new batch to fill the cart. Sam had big strong arms, but it would still take all day for him to row across the lake and another day for him to return. Most of the time he would leave Mary Lou in a shed, which the Walkers let him use at no charge, but sometimes he would take Mary Lou on his boat with him.

Sam claimed that Mary Lou was almost fifty years old, which was, and still is, extraordinarily old for a donkey.

“She eats nothing but raw onions,” Sam would say, holding up a white onion between his dark fingers. “It’s nature’s magic vegetable. If a person ate nothing but raw onions, he could live to be two hundred years old.”

Sam was not much older than twenty, so nobody was quite sure that Mary Lou was really as old as he said she was. How would he know?

Still, nobody ever argued with Sam. And whenever they were sick, they would go not only to Doc Hawthorn but also to Sam.

Sam always gave the same advice: “Eat plenty of onions.”

He said that onions were good for the digestions, the liver, the stomach, the lungs, the heart, and the brain. “If you don’t believe me, just look at old Mary Lou here. She’s never been sick a day in her life.”

He also had many different ointments, lotions, syrups, and pastes all made out of onion juice and different parts of the onion plant. This one cured asthma. That one was for warts and pimples. Another was a remedy for arthritis.

He even had a special ointment which he claimed would cure baldness. “Just rub it on your husband’s head every night where he’s sleeping, Mrs. Collingwood, and soon his hair will be as thick and long as Mary Lou’s tail.”

Doc Hawthorn did not resent Sam. The folks of Green Lake were afraid to take chances. They would get regular medicine from Doc Hawthorn and onion concoctions
from Sam. After they got over their illness, no one could be sure, not even Doc Hawthorn, which of the two treatments had done the trick.

Doc Hawthorn was almost completely bald, and in the morning his head often smelled like onions.

* * *

Whenever Katherine Barlow bought onions from Sam, she always bought an extra one or two for Mary Lou to eat them out of her hand.

“Is something wrong?” Sam asked her one day as she was feeding Mary Lou. “You seem distracted.”

“Oh just the weather,” said Mrs. Katherine. “It looks like rain clouds moving in.”

“Me and Mary Lou, we like the rain,” said Sam.

“Oh, I like it fine,” said Mrs. Katherine, as she rubbed the donkey’s rough hair on top of its head. “It’s just that the roof leaks in the schoolhouse.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

“What are you going to do?” Katherine joked. “Fill the holes with onion paste?”

Sam laughed. “I’m good with my hands,” he told her. “I built my own boat. If it leaked, I’d be in big trouble.”

Katherine couldn’t help but notice his strong, firm hands.

They made a deal. He agreed to fix the leaky roof in exchange for six jars of spiced peaches.

It took Sam a week to fix the roof, because he could only work in the afternoons, after school let out and before night classes began.

Mrs. Katherine usually stayed in the schoolhouse, grading papers and such, while Sam worked on the roof. She enjoyed what little conversation they were able to have, shouting up and down to each other. She was surprised by his interest in poetry. When he took a break, she would sometimes read a poem to him. On more than one occasion, she would start to read a poem by Poe or Longfellow, only to hear him finish it for her, from memory.

She was sad when the roof was finished.
“Is something wrong?” he asked.

“No, you did a wonderful job,” she said. “It’s just that…the windows won’t open. The children and I would enjoy a breeze now and then.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

She gave him two more jars of peaches and Sam fixed the windows.

It was easier to talk to him when he was working on the windows. He told her about his secret onion field on the other side of the lake, “where the onions grow all year round, and the water runs uphill.”

When the windows were fixed, she complained that her desk wobbled.

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

The next time she saw him, she mentioned that “the door doesn’t hang straight,” and she got to spend another afternoon with him while he fixed the door.

By the end of the first semester, Onion Sam had turned the old rundown schoolhouse into a well-crafted, freshly painted jewel of a building that the whole town was proud of. People passing by would stop and admire it. “That’s our schoolhouse. It shows how much we value education here in Green Lake.”

The only person who wasn’t happy with it was Mrs. Katherine. She’d run out of things needing to be fixed.

She sat at her desk one afternoon, listening to the pitter-patter of the rain on the roof. No water leaked into the classroom, except for the few drops that came from her eyes.

“Onions! Hot sweet onions!” Sam called, out on the street.

She ran to him. She wanted to throw her arms around him but couldn’t bring herself to do it. Instead she hugged Mary Lou’s neck.

“Is something wrong?” he asked her.

“Oh, Sam,” she said. “My heart is breaking.”

“I can fix that,” said Sam.

She turned to him.

He took both her hands, and kissed her.
Because of the rain, there was nobody else out on the street. Even if there was Katherine and Sam wouldn’t have noticed. They were lost in their own world.

At that moment, however, Hattie Parker stepped out of the general store. They didn’t see her, but she was them. She pointed her quivering finger in their direction and whispered. “God will punish you!”

* * *

There were no telephones, but word spread quickly through the small town. By the end of the day, everyone in Green Lake had heard that the married schoolteacher had kissed the onion picker.

Not one child showed up for school the next morning.

Mrs. Katherine sat alone in the classroom and wondered if she had lost track of the day of the week. Perhaps it was Saturday. It wouldn’t have surprised her. Her brain and heart had been spinning ever since Sam kissed her.

She heard a noise outside the door, then suddenly a mob of men and women came storming into the school building. They were led by Trout Walker.

“There she is!” Trout shouted. “The Devil Woman!”

The mob was turning over desks and ripping down bulletin boards.

“She’s been poisoning your children’s brains with books,” Trout declared.

They begin piling all the books in the center of the room.

“Think about what you are doing!” cried Mrs. Katherine.

Someone made a grab for her, tearing her dress, but she managed to get out of the building. She ran to the sheriff’s office.

The sheriff had his feet up on his desk and was drinking from a bottle of whiskey. “Mornin’, Mrs. Katherine,” he said.

“They’re destroying the schoolhouse,” she said, gasping for breath. “They’ll burn it to the ground if someone doesn’t stop them!”

“Just calm your pretty self-down a second,” the sheriff said in a slow drawl. “And tell me what you’re talking about.” He got up from his desk and walked over to her.
“Trout Walker has –“

“Now don’t go saying nothing be about Charles Walker,” said the sheriff.

“We don’t have much time!” urged Katherine. “You’ve got to stop them.”

“You’re sure pretty,” said the sheriff.

Mrs. Katherine stared at him in horror.

“Kiss me,” said the sheriff.

She slapped him across the face.

He laughed. “You kissed the onion picker. Why won’t you kiss me?”

She tried to slap him again, but he caught her by the hand.

She tried to wriggle free. “You’re drunk!” she yelled.

“I always get drunk before a hanging.”

“A hanging? Who –“

“It’s against the law for a man to kiss a married woman.”

“Well then you’ll have to hang me, too,” said Katherine. “Because I kissed him back.”

“That’s for your husband to deal with,” the sheriff explained. “Not the law.”

“We’re all equal under the eyes of God,” she declared.

The sheriff laughed. “I’ll make you a deal. One sweet kiss, and I won’t hang your boyfriend. I’ll just run him out of town.”

Mrs. Katherine jerked her hand free. As she hurried to the door, she heard the sheriff say, “The law will punish Sam. And God will punish you.”

She stepped back into the street and saw smoke rising from the schoolhouse. She ran down to the lakefront, where she saw Mary Lou’s body lying on the ground. The donkey had been shot in the head.

Sam was his boat in the water, half way across the lake. His powerful arms rowed away from the shore. But his powerful arms were no match for Trout Walker’s motorized
boat. They were little more than halfway across the lake when Mrs. Katherine heard the 

loud bang of a gun.

“Sam!” cried Katherine. She collapsed onto the ground, tears pooling in her eyes.

That all happened one hundred and ten years ago. Since then, not one drop of rain has 
fallen on Green Lake.