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## Space as a Literary Device

Authors make stylistic choices to describe distance that modulate reader perception. As a result, how do readers perceive distance between spatial entities in narrative text? We annotated passages with masked locations for distance to assess perceived distance.

## Example Annotation Passage

[...] were calmer and more composed than they had ever been since my journey to the sea of ice. A few days before we left <LOC 1> on our way to <LOC 2> , I received the following letter from Elizabeth: My dear Friend, It gave me the greatest pleasure to receive a letter [...]
Masked GPEs (as identified by BookNLP)
Less than 10 tokens between GPEs
Annotation Task
We annotated 98 randomly selected passages that
contained one of eight selected location pairs. Both
locations were masked and annotators were asked to
estimate distance on the following scale:

| Rating | Distance (in <br> miles) | Example |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $0-1$ | NA |
| 2 | $1-50$ | SF and San Jose (40 mi.) |
| 3 | $50-500$ | DC and NYC (200 mi.) |
| 4 | $500-2,000$ | Miami and NYC (1100 mi.) |
| 5 | $2,000-4,000$ | SF and Miami (2600 mi.) |
| 6 | $4,000+$ | L.A. and London (5,400 mi.) |


| Initial Findings |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Location Pair | \# Annotations | Mean Rating | Std |  |
| Paris/London | 22 | 3.37 | 0.570 |  |
| England/France | 12 | 3.80 | 0.707 |  |
| France/London | 11 | 3.56 | 0.629 |  |
| France/Germany | 10 | 3.75 | 0.786 |  |
| France/Italy | 10 | 3.95 | 0.394 |  |
| Germany/Italy | 9 | 3.81 | 0.403 |  |
| Brighton/London | 9 | 3.22 | 0.548 |  |
| Switzerland/Paris | 8 | 3.58 | 0.669 |  |



## Limitations \& Next Steps

- Our focus on GPEs was limiting because they represent only a subset of locations mentioned in literature.
- Annotations were not equally distributed across the scale, partially because we selected only frequently occurring pairs. Reevaluation of the scale and frequency threshold is needed.

