

# A lasting influence of stories on spontaneous thought

### Buddhika Bellana & Christopher J. Honey

## Background



The Storyteller Philip de Laszlo (1891)

Stories can take hold of the human mind, carrying us away from our immediate surroundings and immersing us in alternate worlds<sup>1,2</sup>.

Stories also have lasting consequences such as increasing the memorability of episodes<sup>3</sup> and the malleability of long-standing beliefs<sup>1</sup>.

Little is known about *how* stories to exert their such a lasting influence over our mind, particularly after they have already ended.









Sentence-scramble: p =.68; Intact: p <.002



Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, USA



story ends. Also, this effect persists longer into free association when the story is intact.

Natural Sciences and Engineering Conseil de recherches en sciences Research Council of Canada naturelles et en génie du Canada

Canada



**:** @buddhikabellana **Solution:** bbellana@jhu.edu

## **Document Classification**

Self-paced Reading

Free Association

### Can we tell the difference?

1 0 1	
	200 Phase
0 0 0	0 Pre-story
	1 Pre-story
0 1 0	1 Post-story

inear support vector machine

Term frequency (frequency of term in document)

### **Classification Details:**

Training *within* experimental condition (e.g., Intact-only) Testing via LOOCV at the subject-level Null distribution via 500 resamples + shuffling test labels

### Summary

- Stories have a lasting ability to shape our spontaneous thoughts, even extending beyond when the story ends. The coherence (or *meaningfulness*) of the text predicts the strength of this lingering context, which suggests that word-level priming accounts are inadequate.
- We propose that the extent to which a recent experience is processed *deeply<sup>5</sup>*, may determine its ability to restructure existing knowledge networks. This restructuring of existing association networks can then affect how we spontaneously traverse them during spontaneous thought <sup>6</sup>.

## References

1. Green & Brock (2000). J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., 79(5), 701-721. 2. Kuijpers et al. (2014). Sci. Study. Lit., 4(1), 89-122. **3.** Bower & Clark (1969). *Psychon. Sci. 14*, 181-182.

- 4. Pennnington et al. (2014). In Conference on Empirical Methods on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), 1532–1543..
- 5. Craik & Lockhart (1972). J Verbal Learning Verbal Behav. 11(6), 671. 6. Mildner & Tamir (2019). Trends Neurosci. 42(11), 763-777.