

Aarhus School of Architecture // Design School Kolding // Royal Danish Academy

Type Tricks

Beier, Sofie

Publication date:
2022

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Beier, S. (2022). *Type Tricks: User Design*. BIS Publishers.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Sofie Beier



100+
tips

Type Tricks

User design

Type Tricks

User design

BIS Publishers
Borneostraat 80-A
1094 CP Amsterdam
The Netherlands
T +31 (0)20 515 02 30
bis@bispublishers.com
www.bispublishers.com

ISBN 978-90-6369-636-8

Copyright © 2022 Sofie Beier and BIS Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owners. Every reasonable attempt has been made to identify owners of copyright. Any errors or omissions brought to the publisher's attention will be corrected in subsequent editions.

Thanks to
Peter Graabæk, Octavio Pardo, Rasmus Spanggaard Troelsen for
useful comments.

Sofie Beier

Type Tricks

User design

BISPUBLISHERS

INTRODUCTION

Academic legibility research is often communicated in complex language and hidden in peer-reviewed journals unknown to most designers.

This book aims to translate these studies into an easily approachable format so that you do not have to struggle through dense reading before you identify the most relevant points.

The mentioned research projects represent a selection of what is available at the time of writing. This book contains a snapshot of what we know now, and does not cover all there is to know about legibility research as we continue with new discoveries.

If you want to learn more, please navigate to the reference list at the back of the book.

Content

Ways of reading

- 1 Running text** 8
- 2 Skim-reading** 20
- 3 Expressive typefaces** 34

Limitations of the media

- 4 Reading from afar** 50
- 5 Micro-type** 72
- 6 Spatial graphics** 82

Limitations of the reader

- 7 Older age** 96
- 8 Low-vision** 110
- 9 Children** 124
- 10 Dyslexia** 136

- References** 144

REFERENCES

The devil is in the details,
and the details are in the
primary sources.

On the following pages,
you can find references to
a selection of the academic
papers that have informed
the content of this book.

Ways of reading

1. Running text

- p. 9-10 **Rayner**, K., Pollatsek, A., Ashby, J., & Clifton Jr, C. (2012). *Psychology of reading*. Psychology Press, East Sussex, UK.
- p. 11 **Bouma**, H. (1970). Interaction effects in parafoveal letter recognition. *Nature*, 226(5241), 177-178.
- p. 12-13 **Rayner**, K., Slattery, T. J., & Bélanger, N. N. (2010). Eye movements, the perceptual span, and reading speed. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 17(6), 834-839.
- p. 14 **Parker**, A. J., Slattery, T. J., & Kirkby, J. A. (2019). Return-sweep saccades during reading in adults and children. *Vision research*, 155, 35-43.
- Heller**, D., & Radach, R. (1999). Eye movements in reading. *Current Oculomotor Research*, Springer, Boston, MA, 341-348.
- p. 15 **Tinker**, M. A. (1963). *Legibility of Print*, Iowa State University Press, Iowa State University Press, 86-87.
- p. 16 **Beier**, S., & Larson, K. (2013). How does typeface familiarity affect reading performance and reader preference? *Information Design Journal*, 20(1), 16-31.
- p. 17 **Minakata**, K., & Beier, S. (2021). The effect of font width on eye movements during reading. *Applied Ergonomics*, 97, 103523.
- p. 18 **Perea**, M. (2013). Why does the APA recommend the use of serif fonts?. *Psicothema*, 25(1), 13-17.
- p. 19 **Wilkins**, A., Smith, K., & Penacchio, O. (2020). The influence of typography on algorithms that predict the speed and comfort of reading. *Vision*, 4(1), 18.
- Wilkins**, A. J., Smith, J., Willison, C. K., Beare, T., Boyd, A., Hardy, G., & Harper, S. (2007). Stripes within words affect reading. *Perception*, 36(12), 1788-1803.

2. Skim-reading

- p. 21 **Pelli**, D. G., Burns, C. W., Farell, B., & Moore-Page, D. C. (2006). Feature detection and letter identification. *Vision Research*, 46(28), 4646–4674.
- p. 22 **Beier**, S., Bernard, J. B., & Castet, E. (2018). Numeral legibility and visual complexity. In *DRS Design Research Society*, Limerick.
- p. 23 **Beier**, S., & Larson, K. (2010). Design improvements for frequently misrecognized letters. *Information Design Journal*, 18(2), 118–137.
- p. 24 **Beier**, S., & Oderkerk, C. A. (2022). Closed letter counters impair recognition. *Applied Ergonomics*, 101, 103709.
- p. 25 **Beier**, S., & Oderkerk, C. A. (2021). High letter stroke contrast impairs letter recognition of bold fonts. *Applied Ergonomics*, 97, 103499.
- p. 26 **Oderkerk**, C. A., & Beier, S. (2021). Fonts of wider letter shapes improve letter recognition in parafovea and periphery. *Ergonomics*, 1–9.
- p. 27 **Nielsen**, J. (2006). *F-Shaped Pattern For Reading Web Content*, Jakob Nielsen's Alertbox. <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/f-shaped-pattern-reading-web-content-discovered>
- p. 28 **Dyson**, M. C., & Beier, S. (2016). Investigating typographic differentiation: Italics are more subtle than bold for emphasis. *Information Design Journal*, 22(1), 3–18.
- Macaya**, M., & Perea, M. (2014). Does bold emphasis facilitate the process of visual-word recognition? *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 17, 1–5.
- p. 29 **Dyson**, M. C., & Beier, S. (2016). Investigating typographic differentiation: Italics are more subtle than bold for emphasis. *Information Design Journal*, 22(1), 3–18.

- p. 30 **Ko**, Y. H. (2017). The effects of luminance contrast, colour combinations, font, and search time on brand icon legibility. *Applied Ergonomics*, 65, 33–40.
- p. 31 **Ling**, J., & van Schaik, P. (2007). The influence of line spacing and text alignment on visual search of web pages. *Displays*, 28(2), 60–67.
- p. 32–33 **Burmistrov**, I., Zlokazova, T., Ishmuratova, I., & Semenova, M. (2016). Legibility of light and ultra-light fonts: Eye tracking study. In *proceedings of the 9th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*, Gothenburg Sweden (pp. 1–6).
- p. 33 **Buchner**, A., & Baumgartner, N. (2007). Text-background polarity affects performance irrespective of ambient illumination and colour contrast. *Ergonomics*, 50(7), 1036–1063.

3. Expressive typefaces

- p. 35 **Reichle**, E. D. (2021). *Computational models of reading: A handbook*. Oxford University Press, UK.
- p. 36 **Brumberger**, E. R. (2003). The rhetoric of typography: The persona of typeface and text. *Technical Communication*, 50(2), 206–223.
- p. 37 **Doyle**, J. R., & Bottomley, P. A. (2004). Font appropriateness and brand choice. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(8), 873–880.
- p. 38 **Velasco**, C., Woods, A. T., Hyndman, S., & Spence, C. (2015). The taste of typeface. *i-Perception*, 6(4), 2041669515593040.
- p. 39 **Hazlett**, R. L., Larson, K., Shaikh, A. D., & Chaparro, B. S. (2013). Two studies on how a typeface congruent with content can enhance onscreen communication. *Information Design Journal*, 20(3), 207–219.

- p. 40-41 **Minakata**, K., Oderkerk, C.A.T., Beier, S. (unpublished) *Testing a variable font's complexity factor: Single-letter and word recognition performance decreases as a function of increasing level of complexity*. Fonts by Octavio Pardo.
- p. 42 **Beier**, S., Sand, K., & Starrfelt, R. (2017). Legibility Implications of Embellished Display Typefaces. *Visible Language*, 51(1), 112.
- p. 43 **Thiessen**, M., Beier, S., & Keage, H. (2020). A Review of the Cognitive Effects of Disfluent Typography on Functional Reading. *The Design Journal*, 23(5), 797-815.
- Taylor**, A., Sanson, M., Burnell, R., Wade, K. A., & Garry, M. (2020). Disfluent difficulties are not desirable difficulties: the (lack of) effect of Sans Forgetica on memory. *Memory*, 28(7), 850-857.
- Geller**, J., Davis, S. D., & Peterson, D. J. (2020). Sans forgetica is not desirable for learning. *Memory*, 28(8), 957-967.
- p. 44 **Keage**, H. A., Coussens, S., Kohler, M., Thiessen, M., & Churches, O. F. (2014). Investigating letter recognition in the brain by varying typeface: An event-related potential study. *Brain and Cognition*, 88, 83-89.
- p. 45 **Song**, H., & Schwarz, N. (2008). If it's hard to read, it's hard to do: Processing fluency affects effort prediction and motivation. *Psychological Science*, 19(10), 986-988.
- p. 46 **Reber**, R., & Schwarz, N. (1999). Effects of perceptual fluency on judgments of truth. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 8(3), 338-342.
- p. 47-48 **Song**, H., & Schwarz, N. (2008). Fluency and the detection of misleading questions: Low processing fluency attenuates the Moses illusion. *Social Cognition*, 26(6), 791-799.

Limitations of the media

4. Reading from afar

- p. 52 **Majaj**, N. J., Pelli, D. G., Kurshan, P., & Palomares, M. (2002). The role of spatial frequency channels in letter identification. *Vision Research*, 42(9), 1165–1184.
- Beckmann**, P. J., Legge, G. E., & Luebker, A. (1991). 7.5: Reading: Letters, Words, and Their Spatial-Frequency Content. *SID 91 Digest* (pp. 106–108).
- p. 53 **Beier**, S., & Oderkerk, C. A. (2021). High letter stroke contrast impairs letter recognition of bold fonts. *Applied Ergonomics*, 97, 103499.
- p. 54 **Oderkerk**, C. A., & Beier, S. (2021). Fonts of wider letter shapes improve letter recognition in parafovea and periphery. *Ergonomics*, 1–9.
- p. 55 **Beier**, S., & Oderkerk, C. A. (2022). Closed letter counters impair recognition. *Applied Ergonomics*, 101, 103709.
- p. 56 **Bix**, L., Lockhart, H., Selke, S., Cardoso, F., & Olejnik, M. (2003). Is x-height a better indicator of legibility than type size for drug labels?. *Packaging Technology and Science: An International Journal*, 16(5), 199–207.
- p. 58 **Beier**, S., & Larson, K. (2010). Design improvements for frequently misrecognized letters. *Information Design Journal*, 18(2), 118–137.
- p. 62–65 **Beier**, S., & Oderkerk, C. A. (2019). Smaller visual angles show greater benefit of letter boldness than larger visual angles. *Acta Psychologica*, 199, 102904.
- p. 67 **Tejero**, P., Insa, B., & Roca, J. (2018). Increasing the default interletter spacing of words can help drivers to read traffic signs at longer distances. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 117, 298–303.

- p. 68 **Beier, S., & Dyson, M. C.** (2014). The influence of serifs on 'h' and 'l': useful knowledge from design-led scientific research. *Visible Language*, 47(3), 74–95.
- p. 71 **Obeidat, M., Rys, M., & Russell, E. R.** (2015). *Over-head guide sign retroreflectivity and illumination* (No. K-TRAN: KSU-11-6). Kansas Department of Transportation, US.

5. Micro-type

- p. 76 **Beier, S., & Oderkerk, C. A.** (2019). The effect of age and font on reading ability. *Visible Language*, 53(3), 50–68.
- p. 77 **Morris, R. A., Aquilante, K., Yager, D., & Bigelow, C.** (2002, May). P-13: Serifs Slow RSVP Reading at Very Small Sizes, but Don't Matter at Larger Sizes. In *SID Symposium Digest of Technical Papers* (Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 244–247). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- p. 78–79 **Minikata & Beier** (2022) The dispute about sans serif versus serif fonts: An interaction between the variables of serif and stroke contrast. *Acta Psychologica*, 228, 103623
- p. 80 **Dobres, Reimer, B., Parikh, L., Wean, E., & Chahine, N.** (2015). The incredible shrinking letter: how font size affects the legibility of text viewed in brief glances. In *8th International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training, and Vehicle Design*.

6. Spatial graphics

- p. 86 **Department of Justice.** (2010). *2010 ADA standards for accessible design. Information and Technical Assistance on the Americans with Disabilities Act*.
- p. 88 **Parra, M. A., Cubelli, R., & Della Sala, S.** (2011). Lack of color integration in visual short-term memory binding. *Memory & Cognition*, 39(7), 1187–1197.

- p. 89 **Healey**, C. G. (1996, October). Choosing effective colours for data visualization. In *Proceedings of Seventh Annual IEEE Visualization'96* (pp. 263–270). San Francisco, US.
- Dzulkifli**, M. A., & Mustafar, M. F. (2013). The influence of colour on memory performance: A review. *The Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 20(2), 3.
- p. 91 **van Goor**, M. D. N., Walraven, J., Molenbroek, J. F., & van Eijk, D. J. (2005). Inclusive colour design accommodating the colourblind. In *International Conference on Inclusive Design*, Royal College of Art, London, UK.
- Ojanpää**, H., & Näsänen, R. (2003). Effects of luminance and colour contrast on the search of information on display devices. *Displays*, 24(4–5), 167–178.
- p. 92 **Buchner**, A., Mayr, S., & Brandt, M. (2009). The advantage of positive text-background polarity is due to high display luminance. *Ergonomics*, 52(7), 882–886.
- Dobres**, J., Chahine, N., & Reimer, B. (2017). Effects of ambient illumination, contrast polarity, and letter size on text legibility under glance-like reading. *Applied Ergonomics*, 60, 68–73.
- Piepenbrock**, C., Mayr, S., Mund, I., & Buchner, A. (2013). Positive display polarity is advantageous for both younger and older adults. *Ergonomics*, 56(7), 1116–1124.
- Piepenbrock**, C., Mayr, S., & Buchner, A. (2014). Positive display polarity is particularly advantageous for small character sizes: implications for display design. *Human factors*, 56(5), 942–951.
- p. 93 **Dobres**, J., Chahine, N., & Reimer, B. (2017). Effects of ambient illumination, contrast polarity, and letter size on text legibility under glance-like reading. *Applied Ergonomics*, 60, 68–73.

- p. 94 **Burmistrov**, I., Zlokazova, T., Ishmuratova, I., & Semenova, M. (2016). *Legibility of light and ultra-light fonts: Eyetracking study*. In *proceedings of the 9th Nordic conference on human-computer interaction* (pp. 1–6), Gothenburg Sweden.

Limitations of the reader

7. Older age

- p. 97-99 **Calabrese**, A., Cheong, A. M., Cheung, S. H., He, Y., Kwon, M., Mansfield, J. S., ... & Legge, G. E. (2016). Baseline MNREAD measures for normally sighted subjects from childhood to old age. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 57(8), 3836–3843.
- p. 100 **Owsley**, C., Sekuler, R., & Siemsen, D. (1983). Contrast sensitivity throughout adulthood. *Vision Research*, 23(7), 689–699.
- p. 101 **Calabrese**, A., Cheong, A. M., Cheung, S. H., He, Y., Kwon, M., Mansfield, J. S., ... & Legge, G. E. (2016). Baseline MNREAD measures for normally sighted subjects from childhood to old age. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 57(8), 3836–3843.
- p. 102 **Rayner**, K., Castelhana, M. S., & Yang, J. (2010). Preview benefit during eye fixations in reading for older and younger readers. *Psychology and Aging*, 25(3), 714.
- p. 103 **Rayner**, K., Reichle, E. D., Stroud, M. J., Williams, C. C., & Pollatsek, A. (2006). The effect of word frequency, word predictability, and font difficulty on the eye movements of young and older readers. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(3), 448.
- p. 104 **Ball**, K. K., Beard, B. L., Roenker, D. L., Miller, R. L., & Griggs, D. S. (1988). Age and visual search: Expanding the useful field of view. *Journal of the Optical Society of America. A, Optics and image science*, 5(12), 2210–2219.

- p. 105 **Wolfe**, B., Dobres, J., Kosovicheva, A., Rosenholtz, R., & Reimer, B. (2016). Age-related differences in the legibility of degraded text. *Cognitive Research: principles and implications*, 1(1), 1-13.
- p. 106 **Department of Justice**. (2010). *2010 ADA standards for accessible design. Information and Technical Assistance on the Americans with Disabilities Act, Washington DC, US*.
- p. 107 **Rayner**, K., Reichle, E. D., Stroud, M. J., Williams, C. C., & Pollatsek, A. (2006). The effect of word frequency, word predictability, and font difficulty on the eye movements of young and older readers. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(3), 448.
- p. 108 **Connelly**, S. L., Hasher, L., & Zacks, R. T. (1991). Age and reading: the impact of distraction. *Psychology and Aging*, 6(4), 533.

8. Low-vision

- p. 112 **Rubin**, G. S., & Legge, G. E. (1989). Psychophysics of reading: VI. The role of contrast in low vision. *Vision Research*, 29(1), 79-91.
- p. 113-114 **Legge**, G. E., et al. (1985) Psychophysics of reading: II. Low vision. *Vision Research*, 25(2), 253-265.
- p. 115 **Kumar**, G., & Chung, S. T. (2014). Characteristics of fixational eye movements in people with macular disease. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 55(8), 5125-5133.
- Trauzettel-Klosinski**, S., Teschner, C., Tornow, R. P., & Zrenner, E. (1994). Reading strategies in normal subjects and in patients with macular scotoma-assessed by two new methods of registration. *Neuro-Ophthalmology*, 14(1), 15-30.

- p. 116 **Rovamo**, J., Virsu, V., & Näsänen, R. (1978). Cortical magnification factor predicts the photopic contrast sensitivity of peripheral vision. *Nature*, 271(5640), 54–56.
- p. 117 **Bernard**, J. B., Aguilar, C., & Castet, E. (2016). A new font, specifically designed for peripheral vision, improves peripheral letter and word recognition, but not eye-mediated reading performance. *PloS One*, 11(4), e0152506.
- p. 118–119 **Beier**, S., Oderkerk, C. A., Bay, B., & Larsen, M. (2021). Increased letter spacing and greater letter width improve reading acuity in low vision readers. *Information Design Journal*, 26(1), 73–88.
- p. 120 **Legge**, G. E., Ahn, S. J., Klitz, T. S., & Luebker, A. (1997). Psychophysics of reading: XVI. The visual span in normal and low vision. *Vision Research*, 37(14), 1999–2010.
- p. 121 **Calabrèse**, A., Bernard, J. B., Hoffart, L., Faure, G., Barrouh, F., Conrath, J., & Castet, E. (2010). Small effect of interline spacing on maximal reading speed in low-vision patients with central field loss irrespective of scotoma size. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*, 51(2), 1247–1254.
- p. 122–123 **Minakata**, K., Eckmann-Hansen, C., Larsen, M., Bek, T. & Beier, S. (unpublished) *The effect of serifs and stroke contrast on low vision reading*.

9. Children

- p. 125 **Reichle**, E. D., Liversedge, S. P., Drieghe, D., Blythe, H. I., Joseph, H. S., White, S. J., & Rayner, K. (2013). Using EZ Reader to examine the concurrent development of eye-movement control and reading skill. *Developmental Review*, 33(2), 110–149.
- p. 126 **Doron**, R., Spierer, A., & Polat, U. (2015). How crowding, masking, and contour interactions are related: A developmental approach. *Journal of Vision*, 15(8), 5–5.

- p. 127 **Hughes**, L., & Wilkins, A. (2000). Typography in children's reading schemes may be suboptimal: Evidence from measures of reading rate. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 23(3), 314–324.
- Katzir**, T., Hershko, S., & Halamish, V. (2013). The effect of font size on reading comprehension on second and fifth grade children: Bigger is not always better. *PLoS One*, 8(9), e74061.
- Wilkins**, A., Cleave, R., Grayson, N., & Wilson, L. (2009). Typography for children may be inappropriately designed. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(4), 402–412.
- p. 128 **Doron**, R., Spierer, A., & Polat, U. (2015). How crowding, masking, and contour interactions are related: A developmental approach. *Journal of Vision*, 15(8), 5–5.
- p. 129 **Kwon**, M., Legge, G. E., & Durbell, B. R. (2007). Developmental changes in the visual span for reading. *Vision Research*, 47(22), 2889–2900.
- p. 130 **Doron**, R., Spierer, A., & Polat, U. (2015). How crowding, masking, and contour interactions are related: A developmental approach. *Journal of Vision*, 15(8), 5–5.
- Häikiö**, T., Bertram, R., Hyönä, J. & Niemi, P. (2009). Development of the letter identity span in reading: Evidence from the eye movement moving window paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 102(2), 167–181.
- p. 131 **Duñabeitia**, J. A., Dimitropoulou, M., Estévez, A., & Carreiras, M. (2013). The influence of reading expertise in mirror-letter perception: Evidence from beginning and expert readers. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 7(2), 124–135.
- Richmond**, J. E., & Taylor, M. (2014). Visual recognition difficulties: Identifying primary school learners' directional confusion in writing letters and numbers. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 44(3), 2–6.

- p. 132 **Danna, J., Massendari, D., Furnari, B., & Ducrot, S.** (2018). The optimal viewing position effect in printed versus cursive words: Evidence of a reading cost for the cursive font. *Acta Psychologica*, 188, 110–121.
- p. 133 **Wilkins, A., Cleave, R., Grayson, N., & Wilson, L.** (2009). Typography for children may be inappropriately designed. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(4), 402–412.
- p. 134 **Beier, S., & Larson, K.** (2010). Design improvements for frequently misrecognized letters. *Information Design Journal*, 18(2), 118–137.
- p. 135 **Wilkins, A., Cleave, R., Grayson, N., & Wilson, L.** (2009). Typography for children may be inappropriately designed. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(4), 402–412.

9. Dyslexia

- p. 137 **Prado, C., Dubois, M., & Valdois, S.** (2007). The eye movements of dyslexic children during reading and visual search: impact of the visual attention span. *Vision Research*, 47(19), 2521–2530.
- p. 138 **Bosse, M. L., Tainturier, M. J., & Valdois, S.** (2007). Developmental dyslexia: The visual attention span deficit hypothesis. *Cognition*, 104(2), 198–230.
- p. 139 **O'Brien, B. A., Mansfield, J. S., & Legge, G. E.** (2005). The effect of print size on reading speed in dyslexia. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 28(3), 332–349.
- p. 140–141 **Galliussi, J., Perondi, L., Chi, G., Gerbino, W., & Bernardis, P.** (2020). Inter-letter spacing, inter-word spacing, and font with dyslexia-friendly features: testing text readability in people with and without dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 70(1), 141.

- p. 141 **Terepocki**, M., Kruk, R. S., & Willows, D. M. (2002). The incidence and nature of letter orientation errors in reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(3), 214–233.
- p. 142 **Zorzi**, M., Barbiero, C., Facoetti, A., Lonciari, I., Carrozzi, M., Montico, M., ... & Ziegler, J. C. (2012). Extra-large letter spacing improves reading in dyslexia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(28), 11455–11459.
- Perea**, M., Panadero, V., Moret-Tatay, C., & Gómez, P. (2012). The effects of inter-letter spacing in visual-word recognition: Evidence with young normal readers and developmental dyslexics. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(6), 420–430.
- Jo**, S. J., White, A. L., Strodtman, D. J., & Yeatman, J. D. (2018). Optimizing text for an individual's visual system: The contribution of visual crowding to reading difficulties. *Cortex*, 103, 291–301.
- p. 143 **Schneps**, M. H., Thomson, J. M., Sonnert, G., Pomplun, M., Chen, C., & Heffner-Wong, A. (2013). Shorter lines facilitate reading in those who struggle. *PLoS One*, 8(8), e71161.

