

Readability and Optimal Text Settings

-Taryn Bipat

[Literature Review](#)

[Study Comparison Table](#)

Introduction

With the development of the web and new technological hardware, the spread of information is boundless and instantaneous. It has now become easier than ever for anyone to gather digital content. There now exists a large body of information accessible at your fingertips and you can gain new information faster than ever. Wikipedia¹ is considered one of the more text-heavy web pages, where users can read information on just about any subject. The expansion of information has led to new questions about how humans can easily access digital information on different types of digital devices through scanning and reading digital text.

This document is the start of the literature review conducted on this topic. This annotated bibliography gave me the opportunity to understand some of the core concepts of this topic. The academic and industry publications cover some of the key findings about optimal web settings.

Process

In a month's time it is just not feasible to cover the entirety of the type of research that is there. To better scope this study within a months time frame, I began with the literature presented in the project scope and

worked outwards. I began to see many papers cross-sited across papers and ones that showed up repeatedly. During the first two weeks of this project, I began reading the literature in the project proposal document. Through those references, I compiled a list of 47 papers that together could weave a cohesive story about readability and optimal text settings. These 47 papers additionally demonstrate how broad this research is. The topics cover different disciplines from computer science, communication, design and beyond.

Structure

This annotated bibliography is organized in three parts: a table of contents by theme; an alphabetical review of 50 relevant or influential articles, papers and book chapters; and a list of further reading. Each bibliography has the full reference, a summary of the study and how they tied to the ultimate goal of this literature review and an overview of the methodology.. I additionally add information so that these papers will be easily accessible.

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page

Table of Contents by Theme

Accessibility

1. Ardit and Lu, 2007	05
2. Granquist et al., 2018	19
3. Legge, 2016	26
4. Miniukovich et al., 2017	31
5. Ricardo and Baeza-Yates, 2016	36
6. Rello and Bigham, 2017	37
7. Wu et al., 2020	44

Language

8. Abubaker and Lu, 2012	04
9. Lemmerich et al., 2019	27
10. Liu et al., 2016	30
11. Reiber-Kuijpers et al., 2021	35

Methodology

12. Flanders and Willis, 1998	18
13. Nielsen and Pernice, 2009	34

Reading & Scanning

14. Hill, 1994	21
15. Holmqvist et al., 2013	23
16. Li et al., 2019	28
17. Moran, 2020	32
18. Salmeron et al., 2017	40
19. Shrestha et al., 2007	42
20. Singer and Alexander, 2017	42
21. TeBlunthuis et al., 2019	43

Screen Size

22. Chen et al., 2014	14
-----------------------	----

23. Darroch et al., 2005	15
24. Hasagawa et al.m 2008	20
25. Öquist, 2006	35
26. Shaikh and Chaparro, 2004	41

Web Factors

27. Ali et al., 2013	05
28. Banerjee et al., 2011	06
29. Bernard et al., 2003	07
30. Bernard et al., 2002	08
31. Bernard et al., 2001	09
32. Beymer et al., 2011	00
33. Bhatia et al., 2011	00
34. Boyarski et al., 1997	00
35. Burmistrov et al., 2016	12
36. Chapparo et al., 2005	13
37. Dyson, 2004	16
38. Dyson and Haselgrove, 2001	16
39. Dyson and Kipping, 1998	17
40. Hill and Scharff, 1997	21
41. Hojjati and Muniandy, 2014	22
42. Hussain et al., 2011	25
43. Jang et al. 2007	25
44. Ling and van Schaik, 2007	29
45. Nanavati and Bias, 2005	33
46. Rello and Marcos, 2012	38
47. Rello et al., 2016	39

A

<i>Citation</i>	Abubaker and Lu, 2012
<i>Full Reference</i>	Abubaker, A. A., & Lu, J. (2012, May). The optimum font size and type for students aged 9-12 reading Arabic characters on screen: A case study. In Journal of Physics: Conference Series (Vol. 364, No. 1, p. 012115). IOP Publishing.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Language
<i>Keywords</i>	Readability; Arabic; Font size; Length; Font type; Reading speed; Reading errors
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/364/1/012115/meta
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	<p>The Arabic language has a different set of characters with a unique cursive font. Additionally, Arabic is written in a script from right to left and also read that way. Abubakar and Lu focused on web factors such as font size, line length and font type in the Arabic language. In their study, they used two font types (Arabic Traditional and Simplified Arabic) in 10-, 14-, 16- and 18- point fonts. They had participants read text blocks aloud. Then they measured reading errors and reading speed. Their findings focus on students and found that smaller sizes in any font type was not readable for 10-12 year olds. On the other hand, font sizes 16- and 18- are more readable than any smaller-sized font, the averages of error size 18 improve in all font types, while age has a significant impact on reading speed. Simplified Arabic font is reported as readable to students aged 10-12, especially in sizes 14 and 18. Interestingly, compared to the findings of studies presented about English, Arabic needs to be presented in a larger size font for students to have good readability.</p>
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: participants read fonts in different font sizes, types and line lengths. Then the authors measured reading errors and reading speed.

Citation

Ali et al., 2013

Full Reference

Ali, A. Z. M., Wahid, R., Samsudin, K., & Idris, M. Z. (2013). Reading on the Computer Screen: Does Font Type Have Effects on Web Text Readability?. *International Education Studies*, 6(3), 26-35.

Type

Journal article

Theme

Web Factors

Keywords

Font; Readability; San serif; Serif; Text; Web

Link to Paper

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1067757>

In Repository?

Yes – PDF

Summary

The authors wanted to better understand how font type impacts text readability. Ali et al. tested four fonts, Georgia (serif) and Verdana (san serif) for the first respondents and Times New Roman (serif) and Arial (san serif) for the second respondents. Georgia and Verdana were designed for computer screens. Unlike other researchers, the findings from this study showed that there was no significant difference between the readability between serif and san serif font of both screen display category and print display category. However, the findings do show that Verdana was the best choice for websites with long text. Since there was no significant difference in readability, Ali et al. suggest that both San serif and serif fonts are options for web usage.

Methods

Empirical study: The authors created reading passages or text blocks using those two fonts. The passages were the same size and approximately the same difficulty to read. They had each participant read both blocks of text and the participant could rest between each activity.

Citation

Ardit and Lu, 2008

Full Reference

Arditi, A., & Lu, J. (2008, September). Accessible web browser interface design for users with low vision. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors and*

	Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting (Vol. 52, No. 6, pp. 576-580). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	User interface; Readability; Low vision
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/154193120805200614
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Technology helps low vision users be more efficient and effective when reading online. Ardit and Lu developed a technology called Basic LowBrowse View that will help users with low vision read web pages faster. Using principles and guidelines for low vision people, their tool divides a web page into multiple frames. The top frame is for reading text, while the bottom frame has the entire web page with all the original content. The reading frame uses a single size font of the user's choice, with configurable reading frame size, font size, colors, contrast and letter spacing. Their findings show that LowBrowse View significantly helped people with low vision with digital readability.
<i>Methods</i>	No methodology: The authors built a technology to help support low vision users.

B

<i>Citation</i>	Banerjee et al., 2011
<i>Full Reference</i>	Banerjee, J., Majumdar, D., Pal, M. S., & Majumdar, D. (2011). Readability, subjective preference and mental workload studies on young indian adults for selection of optimum font type and size during onscreen reading. Al Ameen Journal of Medical Sciences, 4(2), 131-143.
<i>Type</i>	Journal article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Serif fonts; Sans serif fonts; Reading; Ranking; Overall mental workload

<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.researchgate.net/publication/50853367_Readability_Subjective_Preference_and_Mental_Workload_Studies_on_Young_Indian_Adults_for_Selection_of_Optimum_Font_Type_and_Size_during_Onscreen_Reading
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The authors test various fonts and sizes to find the optimal combination for onscreen reading. Two types of fonts were used, serif fonts: Times New Roman , Georgia and Courier New and the Sans serif fonts included Arial, Verdana and Tahoma. These fonts were presented in 10-, 12- and 14- point sizes. Their findings highlighted that Serif fonts were better for readability compared to Sans serif. They recommended 14- point font size for onscreen reading and Courier New for the fastest reading time. Verdana was recommended based on subjects' ranking and mental workload scoring.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Within subject design, font conditions were compared by having participants read eighteen passages. The text of each passage consisted of a font from one of the eighteen type and font size conditions.
<i>See Also</i>	Josephson, S. (2008). Keeping your readers' eyes on the screen: An eye-tracking study comparing san serif and serif typefaces. <i>Visual Communication Quarterly</i> , 15(1&2), 67-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15551390801914595

<i>Citation</i>	Bernard et al., 2003
<i>Full Reference</i>	Bernard, M. L., Fernandez, M., Hull, S., & Chaparro, B. S. (2003, October). The effects of line length on children and adults' perceived and actual online reading performance. In <i>Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting</i> (Vol. 47, No. 11, pp. 1375-1379). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
<i>Type</i>	Conference Proceedings
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Line length; Readability; Children; Performance; Online; Adults
<i>Link to Paper</i>	

	https://journals-sagepub-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1177/154193120304701112
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Bernard et al. (2003) investigated line length effects on reading time, reading efficiency and perceived reading efficiency for children and adults. In this study, the findings showed no significant differences for reading time or efficiency for either population. However, adult users preferred shorter line lengths rather than full-screen line lengths. Additionally, adults perceived that the full text lengths resulted in better scrolling amounts than narrower line lengths. The narrowest line length condition was perceived as promoting the highest amount of reader concentration, while the medium line-length condition was considered to be the most optimally presented length for reading. Unlike the adults, children had no significant difference in perceived readability (Bernard et al., 2003).
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Line conditions were compared by having participants read three passages, each with different line lengths. The conditions were counterbalanced by means of a Latin square design. Both the adults' and children's passages were 12-point Arial, which was black on a white background.
<i>Citation</i>	Bernard et al., 2002
<i>Full Reference</i>	Bernard, M., Lida, B., Riley, S., Hackler, T., & Janzen, K. (2002). A comparison of popular online fonts: Which size and type is best. Usability news, 4(1), 2002.
<i>Type</i>	Journal article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Font type; Readability
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-Comparison-of-Popular-Online-Fonts%3A-Which-Size-is-Bernard-Lida/21a32bc134881ef07726c0e45e3d01923418f14a
<i>In Repository?</i>	No

Summary Bernard et al. compared different fonts at the 10-, 12-, and 14- point sizes. They compared the most commonly used serif and san serif fonts to understand differences in “reading effectiveness, reading time, perceptions of font legibility, font attractiveness, and general preference. They had 60 volunteer participants with normal or corrected vision read twelve passages. For reading efficiency, they found no significant font size or type effects. Fonts at the 12-point size were read faster than fonts at the 10-point size. In addition, a font type x size interaction was found for the perception of font legibility. In general, however, Arial, Courier, and Georgia were perceived as the most legible.

Methods Experimental design: participants read twelve passages in different fonts and sizes.

See Also Bernard, M., Liao, C. H., & Mills, M. (2001, March). The effects of font type and size on the legibility and reading time of online text by older adults. In CHI'01 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems (pp. 175-176).

Citation **Bernard et al., 2001**

Full Reference Bernard, M., Mills, M., Frank, T., & McKown, J. (2001). Which fonts do children prefer to read online. Usability News, 3(1), 2001.

Type Journal Article

Theme Web Factors

Keywords Children; Font type; Readability; Web

Link to Paper <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.529.6655&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

In Repository? Yes – PDF

Summary Research has also shown that different populations benefit from different font sizes. Bernard et al., 2001 conducted a similar study with the older population. They tested a 12- and 14- point font for sans and serif fonts and found that a significant main effect of size was found for font legibility in that 14-point fonts were more legible to read than 12-point fonts. A marginal interaction was also found for reading time in that participants read 12-point serif fonts significantly slower than 14-point serif or sans serif fonts.

Methods | Experimental design: Participants were asked to read passages with different fonts and with different sizes. The participants were asked about their perceptions and qualitative feedback.

Citation | **Beymer et al., 2008**

Full Reference | Beymer, D., Orton, P. Z., & Russell, D. M. (2007, September). An eye tracking study of how pictures influence online reading. In IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction (pp. 456-460). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Type | Conference Proceedings

Theme | Web Factors

Keywords | Eye tracking; Viewing pictures; Online reading.

Link to Paper | https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniel-Russell-15/publication/221053664_An_Eye_Tracking_Study_of_How_Pictures_Influence_Online_Reading/links/58061cee08ae5ad1881620b5/An-Eye-Tracking-Study-of-How-Pictures-Influence-Online-Reading.pdf?origin=publication_detail

In Repository? | Yes – PDF

Summary | Beymer et al. (2008) actually show that there were no significant effects when comparing font size and font type. While using smaller font size (10 points), fixation durations were significantly longer as compared to 14- points, whereas there were no significant differences in serif vs. sans serif fonts. In almost all of the studies that analyzed the effects of font size on reading, the findings show that font size is also highly dependent on the font type that is being used.

Methods | Experimental design: between-subjects design, each participant was assigned a one-page story and asked to read the story. Eye-tracking data was collected.

Citation | **Bhatia et al., 2011**

<i>Full Reference</i>	Bhatia, S. K., Samal, A., Rajan, N., & Kiviniemi, M. T. (2011). Effect of font size, italics, and colour count on web usability. <i>International journal of computational vision and robotics</i> , 2(2), 156-179.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Web usability; Web factors; User interfaces; Font selection; Colour selection
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3866130/
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	<p>The authors wanted to better understand the impact of font size, font style and color count on reading comprehension. They showed participants various web pages with a combination of these factors. They found that larger text sizes are more readable than smaller sizes. However, font size for a web page has no statistically significant effect on the subjects' performance of knowledge, comprehension, and analysis tasks for a web page. Bhatia et al. tested italics by giving participants three web pages with no italics, moderate italics (web page with short phrases italicized) and high italics (web page with full italicized sentences). On the other hand, they found that italics did not have an effect on subjects' performance of knowledge and comprehension tasks. Students viewing pages with no italics performed better than those viewing pages with moderate italics. In addition, students viewing pages with high italic performed better than the students viewing pages with moderate italics. Italics did not have a significant effect on students' response times to the web page. Overall based on the likeability and ease of use self-reported scores, there was no significant effect of italicized text. Essentially, italics had no impact on efficiency and satisfaction. Lastly, color count had no effect on the performance of the subjects for knowledge, comprehension, and analysis type tasks.</p>
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Font tasks were developed to measure effectiveness on the three web factors.

Citation | **Boyarski et al., 1998**

<i>Full Reference</i>	Boyarski, D., Neuwirth, C., Forlizzi, J., & Regli, S. H. (1998, January). A study of fonts designed for screen display. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems (pp. 87-94).
<i>Type</i>	Conference Proceedings
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	On-line typography, reading performance assessment, legibility, readability, CRT display, font design, anti-aliased, on-line help, World Wide Web
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/274644.274658
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Boyarski et al. (1998) studied plain Verdana font against Verdana Italic. They asked participants to complete a reading comprehension test with both of these font styles on a screen display. The finding from this study that readers preferred Verdana and had overall better readability.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical design: Participants were asked to read the test, then they were given the Nelson-Denny Test of reading comprehension and a subjective perception questionnaire.

<i>Citation</i>	Burmistrov et al., 2016
<i>Full Reference</i>	Burmistrov, I., Zlokazova, T., Ishmuratova, I., & Semenova, M. (2016, October). Legibility of light and ultra-light fonts: Eyetracking study. In proceedings of the 9th Nordic conference on human-computer interaction (pp. 1-6).
<i>Type</i>	Journal article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Font weight; Light fonts; Ultra-light fonts; Legibility; Text-background contrast; Text-background polarity, Eyetracking; Cognitive load.
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl-acm-org.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1145/2971485.2996745
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

<i>Summary</i>	Burmistrov et al. used eye-tracking to understand the legibility of light and ultra light fonts. They used an infrared-video-based eye tracker (SMI iView-X Hi-Speed 1250) at a sampling rate of 500 Hz and an instrument spatial resolution of 0.01 degrees. The authors used the eye-tracking device to calculate search time, duration of fixations and saccadic amplitude. Their findings, unlike other studies, also includes the saccadic amplitude: the distance traveled by the eye between two fixation points. The results of our preliminary study show that light and ultra-light fonts are less legible than their regular and bold counterparts in two variations of text-background contrast (low vs high) and two variations of text background polarity (positive vs negative). Oculomotor indicators like mean fixation duration and saccade amplitude show that light and ultra-light fonts also induce higher cognitive load.
<i>Methods</i>	Eye-tracking with a word search task Empirical study: Participants were asked to read the text in different font types and styles. Texts were prepared from the Nelson-Denny Test. After each reading, participants completed the comprehension test.

C

<i>Citation</i>	Chaparro et al., 2005
<i>Full Reference</i>	Chaparro, B. S., Shaikh, A. D., & Baker, J. R. (2005). Reading online text with a poor layout: Is performance worse. Usability News, 7(1), 1-4.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Layout; Readability; Comprehension; White space; Reading time
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.561.5593&rep=rep1&type=pdf
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

<i>Summary</i>	Chapparo et al., conducted a study that demonstrated that whitespace does not typically lead to better reading times and comprehension. Participants were given an “enhanced” page layout that included headers, indentation, and figure placement and a normal layout. The findings showed that reading and comprehension was not impacted by the layout. However, participants preferred the “enhanced” format as it made it easier and more comfortable to read.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Participants were asked to read pages with different layouts. Then they were then given a comprehension test.
<i>See Also</i>	Chaparro, B., Baker, J. R., Shaikh, A.D., Hull, S., & Brady, L. (2004). Reading Online Text: A Comparison of Four White Space Layouts. Usability News, v. 6.2, (available at http://psychology.wichita.edu/surl/usabilitynews/62/whitespace.asp)

<i>Citation</i>	Chen et al., 2014
<i>Full Reference</i>	Chen, G., Cheng, W., Chang, T. W., Zheng, X., & Huang, R. (2014). A comparison of reading comprehension across paper, computer screens, and tablets: Does tablet familiarity matter?. <i>Journal of computers in education</i> , 1(2), 213-225.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Screen Size
<i>Keywords</i>	Paper; Computer screens; Tablet; Reading comprehension; Familiarity
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Chen et al. found that familiarity with screen size is a factor that just generally influences how well someone can read from a particular screen size. Users who are more familiar with a certain screen size will have increased readability.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Participants were asked the read text and then a reading comprehension test was given. The questions ranged from shallow level comprehension and summarization as deep level comprehension.

D

<i>Citation</i>	Darroch et al., 2005
<i>Full Reference</i>	Darroch, I., Goodman, J., Brewster, S., & Gray, P. (2005, September). The effect of age and font size on reading text on handheld computers. In IFIP conference on human-computer interaction (pp. 253-266). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
<i>Type</i>	Book Chapter
<i>Theme</i>	Screen Size
<i>Keywords</i>	Font size; Age; Handheld computers; Screen size
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://link-springer-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/book/10.1007/11555261
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Darroch et al. found there is no one perfect font size on handheld devices. Their findings show that there was no significant difference in 6- to 16- point and scrolling behavior did not impact font size.. However, older people did prefer larger size texts than younger people. They additionally tried to better understand the impact scrolling had one making font size more readable. They found that the amount of text presented did not make too much of a difference so scrolling did not really have an impact. They suggest to future designers that with a screen resolution of 640x480, there should be a range of 8-, 10- and 12- point fonts to make sure that older and younger people can easily read and comprehend text on a smaller device.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Participants were asked to read different passages on the handheld device in different font sizes. Reading speed and reading accuracy were recorded.

*Citation***Dyson, 2004***Full Reference*

Dyson, M. C. (2004). How physical text layout affects reading from screen. *Behaviour & information technology*, 23(6), 377-393.

Type

Journal Article

Theme

Web Factors

Keywords

Layout; Readability; Screen reading

Link to Paper

<https://www-tandfonline-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1080/01449290410001715714>

In Repository?

Yes – PDF

Summary

Dyson reviewed empirical evidence on various layout web factors such as columns, line length, window size and line spacing. Their findings from the literature suggest that spacing between the lines of a text, also impacts speed of reading on-screen. Furthermore, double spacing led to faster reading times than single spacing. This study stands out because they also compared window size, showing that window size changes the line length and also the need for scrolling. Users typically prefer larger screens and smaller screens lead to slower reading times. Each of these web factors influence each other but Dyson typically looked at them individually based on research that was currently available in 2004.

Methods

Literature Review

*Citation***Dyson and Haselgrove, 2001***Full Reference*

Dyson, M. C., & Haselgrove, M. (2001). The influence of reading speed and line length on the effectiveness of reading from screen. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 54(4), 585-612.

Type

Journal Article

Theme

Web Factors

Keywords

Comprehension; Legibility; Typography; Reading rate; Scrolling; Skimming

<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www-science-direct-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/science/article/pii/S1071581901904586
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	While readers typically have preferences for short and long lines, research has been inconclusive about the optimal line length for faster reading. Dyson and Haselgrove investigated the impact of a fast and normal reading speed on different line lengths on comprehension, reading rate and scrolling patterns. Overall, their findings show that comprehension is reduced if reading fast. Additionally, a line length of 55 characters per line was the best length for both normal and fast reading. This medium length was the best for speed and comprehension. These findings demonstrate that the needs of the reading task (comprehension or speed) may lead to different needs for line length. Overall, the literature again does not suggest one perfect line length and this remains true for other web factors, as well.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Participants were asked to read fast and normal and the line length varied for each text they had to read. The authors collected comprehension, reading speed and scrolling patterns.

<i>Citation</i>	Dyson and Kipping, 1998
<i>Full Reference</i>	Dyson, M. C., & Kipping, G. J. (1998). The effects of line length and method of movement on patterns of reading from screen. <i>Visible language</i> , 32(2), 150.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Line length; Readability; Scrolling
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.proquest.com/openview/49f4fd2296eb9ecef039e3cd3921fe0b/1?cbl=1821103&pq-origsite=gscholar
<i>In Repository?</i>	No

<i>Summary</i>	The authors found that longer line length on monitors resulted in faster reading times. Dyson and Kipping ran two different studies to explore how line length impacts reading and scrolling on digital texts. This research was conducted in the late 1990s and has become the foundation for out line length research. Their findings show that longer lines (100 characters) were read faster than shorter lines (25 characters). However, across these two conditions there was no significant difference in comprehension of the digital text. Moderate lines (55) characters had the best readability of all conditions. Additionally, their findings show that scrolling does impact readability and leads to novel eye movements. Their study reflects the need to understand the difference between paper and digital text and their line length findings are not the same as previously studied with paper.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Within-subjects design, participants were asked to read texts with different line lengths.

F

<i>Citation</i>	Flanders and Willis, 1998
<i>Full Reference</i>	Flanders, V., & Willis, M. (1998). Web pages that suck: Learn good design by looking at bad design. SYBEX Inc.
<i>Type</i>	Book
<i>Theme</i>	Methodology
<i>Keywords</i>	Usability; Heuristic evaluation; Guidelines; Web factors
<i>Link to Paper</i>	http://www.webpagesthatsuck.com/
<i>In Repository?</i>	No

<i>Summary</i>	Flanders and Willis conducted a literature review to better understand web usability. They explored “bad design” to better understand how to do good design. They found eight factors that are critical to good readability including font or text style. They noted that actually web pages that they defined as having good usability, typically do not have italicized words. They also noted that white space is one of the factors critical to web usability.
<i>Methods</i>	Heuristic evaluation of websites. The authors used readability guidelines to see if websites followed the various design principles for good readability.

G

<i>Citation</i>	Granquist et al., 2018
<i>Full Reference</i>	Granquist, C., Wu, Y. H., Gage, R., Crossland, M. D., & Legge, G. E. (2018). How people with Low vision achieve magnification in digital reading. <i>Optometry and vision science: official publication of the American Academy of Optometry</i> , 95(9), 711.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Low vision; Reading; Acuity; Magnification
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30169350/
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Granquist et al. conducted an Online survey to understand user’s vision history and also acuity and magnification. Their findings demonstrate that people self-reported being engaged in digital reading and typically had to enlarge physical character size or reduce the viewing distance by putting their faces closer to the screen.
<i>Methods</i>	The survey asked subjects to arrange a text passage for typical reading and to report viewing distance, screen dimensions, and the number of characters per line.

H

<i>Citation</i>	Hasagawa et al., 2008
<i>Full Reference</i>	Hasegawa, S., Fujikake, K., Omori, M., & Miyao, M. (2008). Readability of characters on mobile phone liquid crystal displays. <i>International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics</i> , 14(3), 293-304.
<i>Type</i>	Doctoral Dissertation
<i>Theme</i>	Screen Sizes and Language
<i>Keywords</i>	VDT small display; legibility; reading speed; viewing distance; graphic text
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18954539/
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The width of line strokes in various languages' characters smight be harder to read on smaller screens. Hasegawa et al. studied readability of English and Japanese text on mobile phones with liquid crystal displays. They conducted an experimental study and measured subjective evaluation, reading speed, number of errors and viewing distance. They tested English and Japanese settings on two different types of displays on different resolutions with various font sizes and fonts. Their results showed that readability was better when the resolution of the screen was higher. Additionally, as font size decreased on the screen, young subjects had to move the screen closer to their faces to read. However, older subjects increased the viewing distance irrespective of the size of characters. Characters of 3-5 mm are appropriate for the young but inadequate for the elderly. Moreover, the readability of Japanese characters improved when they were vertically enlarged to approximately twice the width on a mobile phone.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: graphic characters were displayed on mobile phones and read aloud by users.

<i>Citation</i>	Hill and Scharff, 1997
<i>Full Reference</i>	Hill AL, Scharff LV. Readability of screen displays with various foreground/background color combinations, font styles, and font types. Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on Undergraduate Research. 1997;Vol. 2:742–746.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Foreground/background color combinations; Font types; Word styles; Readability
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.laurenscharff.com/research/AHNCUR.html
<i>In Repository?</i>	No – but text can be found at the linked website.
<i>Summary</i>	Some authors have done research to better understand readability and word style. Hill and Scharff studied foreground/background color combinations, font types and word styles on the readability websites. In their study with 42 participants scanning a website for target words, they found that participants were quicker to respond to plain text than to italics. They also found main effects for font type and color combination. The authors also note that there is no one color combination, font type or word style to use but all conditions impact each other.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: A large scale survey was used to choose the foreground/background color combinations. Then participants were asked to scan a screen of text and find a target shape word.

<i>Citation</i>	Hill, 1994
<i>Full Reference</i>	Hill, A. L. (1997). Readability of screen displays with various foreground-background color combinations, font styles, and font types. In

	Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on Undergraduate Research (pp. 742-746).
<i>Type</i>	Masters Thesis
<i>Theme</i>	Scanning
<i>Keywords</i>	Readability; Screen display; Foreground/background color; Font style; Font types
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.proquest.com/docview/250765601?parentSessionId=XxVUHfbDjmiHHGOhwO2izl1bZECIjENsAQDdLjUoVdA%3D&pq-origsite=primo&accountid=14784
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes - PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Unlike most studies that did not specifically call out scanning, Hill analyzed readability for various web factor combinations of foreground/background color combinations, font styles and font types. They had participants scan simulated websites for a specific target word. Readability was based on reaction time. Their findings showed generally there was no one combination of foreground, background color, font or word style that leads to a fasted reaction time. However, it is important to note that this methodology allowed researchers to specifically understand scanning. The limitation of this scanning test is that when users are put in the context of a laboratory setting, they may instead feel the need to deep read rather than just quickly browse.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Within subject design, used three independent variables leading to a 3 (background luminance levels) x 2 (text/background combinations) x 6 (luminance contrasts) mixed factorial design. Participants scanned each onscreen text paragraph for the hidden target shape word. Once they located the target word, they quickly and accurately as possible used the mouse to click on the corresponding shape at the bottom of the screen.
<i>Citation</i>	Hojjati and Muniandy, 2014

<i>Full Reference</i>	Hojjati, N., & Muniandy, B. (2014). The effects of font type and spacing of text for online readability and performance. <i>Contemporary Educational Technology, 5</i> (2), 161-174.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Font type; Readability; Spacing; On-screen text; Serif; San serif
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105535.pdf
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The authors conducted this study to better understand how students read online as they now spend more time viewing text on computer screens than on printed media, Hojjati, N., & Muniandy, B. look at the effects of font-type and spacing of text for digital readability. Two font types were selected: Times New Roman (serif) and Verdana (san serif) for participants of the study. It was found that Verdana was the student's preferred font-type for reading long text on the computer screen.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental study: A repeated experimental design where students read digital passages in two different font types, one serif and one san-serif.

<i>Citation</i>	Holmqvist et al., 2003
<i>Full Reference</i>	Holmqvist, K., Holsanova, J., Barthelson, M., & Lundqvist, D. (2003). Reading or scanning? A study of newspaper and net paper reading. In <i>The Mind's Eye</i> (pp. 657-670). North-Holland.
<i>Type</i>	Book Chapter
<i>Theme</i>	Scanning
<i>Keywords</i>	Newspaper; Scanning; Behaviors
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444510204500359
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary

Holmqvist et al. (2003) demonstrated that users reading digital papers scan more and read less than traditional newspaper readers. They also further explain reasons for why this may be true. According to Holmqvist et al. (2003), “traditional printed media exist in parallel to the new media. Reading traditional newspapers implies looking for headlines, briefs, photos, and drop quotes. On the one hand, the new media differ considerably from the traditional printed media. Online readers read from a computer screen and move around by clicking on links and menu buttons.” (Holmqvist et al., 2003). Essentially, these new types of features of a web page such as buttons, hyperlinks, headers and more lead to users jumping around a page.

Furthermore, readers themselves reported that reading on paper “is something they do with pleasure and, if possible, in a situation that allows distraction (along with breakfast, in a coffee break after lunch, on the train, or in the subway). It is a relaxing activity to traverse through the folds and it usually takes quite a long time”. With web news, they read usually when they have much less breaks. They can easily get to the media online whenever they have a quick moment (Holmqvist, 2003). It is also important to note that user’s self-reported feelings also demonstrate why it is important for users to need high readability, so they can quickly scan and comprehend online news when they have a quick break in their daily lives.

Methods

Eye-tracking The authors created two recordings of eye movement data from readers of two net papers and two newspapers. 12 subjects read the net papers and 15 subjects read the newspapers. Eye movement was captured and a post questionnaire was given to both groups. The post-questionnaire asked about their experience. Participants noted that the eye tracking device did not bother their reading in the post-questionnaire. The fixation was captured for all participants.

See Also

Kurniawan, S. H., & Zaphiris, P. (2001). Reading online or on paper: which is faster?.

Kong, Y., Seo, Y. S., & Zhai, L. (2018). Comparison of reading performance on screen and on paper: A meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, 123, 138-149.

<i>Citation</i>	Hussain et al., 2011
<i>Full Reference</i>	Hussain, W., Sohaib, O., Ahmed, A., & Qasim Khan, M. (2011). Web readability factors affecting users of all ages. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Content usability; Web readability; Web accessibility
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://opus.lib.uts.edu.au/handle/10453/117586
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	One of the easiest ways to improve web usability is through readability. Hussain et al. analyzed eight readability factors i.e. color contrast, white space, line spacing, font style, font size, text width, headings, graphics and animation. These eight factors are compared to understand their impact on different age group reading performance. The chosen eight factors were based on prior literature around online readability. Based on their literature review, they demonstrate how for each population type (children, teenagers and older users) requires different designs with varying web factors for their online content.
<i>Methods</i>	Literature Review

J

<i>Citation</i>	Jang et al., 2007
<i>Full Reference</i>	Jang, Y. G., Kim, H. Y., & Yi, M. K. (2007). A color contrast algorithm for e-learning standard. International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, 7(4), 195-201.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	E-learning; Color contrast; Color temperature; Learning disorders; Accessibility; Readability

<i>Link to Paper</i>	http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.599.4529&rep=rep1&type=pdf
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Jang et al., 2007, combined usability guidelines and proposed their own color contrast guideline that utilizes color temperature. They test their color contrast algorithm on normal adults and children that have sensitivities to color contrast (Jang et al., 2007).
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Evaluated the satisfaction frequency of current web-safe colors. Then conducted a readability evaluation to test color contrast. Participants were asked to read sentences presented on the screen with different color contrast combinations.

L

<i>Citation</i>	Legge, 2016
<i>Full Reference</i>	Legge, G. E. (2016). Reading digital with low vision. <i>Visible language</i> , 50(2), 102.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Low vision
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5726769/
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Prior research had delved into how current technology helps support users with low vision. Currently, digital documents allow users to change many features including font size, character and line spacing, font style, color contrast and page layout to meet any individualistic needs of a reader. According to Legge, for users with low vision they typically need larger font sizes or screen sizes than those with normal vision. For those with loss of vision, magnification to over 20- points may be needed. Also, those with loss of vision need to bring the phone closer to their face or pinch-to-zoom.

Additionally, Legge focused on spacing for users of low vision because of the concept of crowding (Bouma, 1970). According to Bouma, 1970 crowding is the interfering effects of one target on the identification of a nearby target in the visual field. The spatial extent of crowding increases in peripheral vision (Bouma, 1970). Thus, content needs to be farther apart to be easily recognizable. Legge's findings also show that there is no significant difference for larger line separation but double spacing can have a small advantage.

The author also noted that high contrast is often essential for those with low vision. In short, people with low vision have reduced contrast sensitivity, and a more pressing need for high-contrast text. Reading will often benefit from a brighter display, and from care in controlling ceiling light from external glare sources.

Methods Literature review

Citation

Lemmerich et al., 2019

Full Reference Lemmerich, F., Sáez-Trumper, D., West, R., & Zia, L. (2019, January). Why the world reads Wikipedia: Beyond English speakers. In Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (pp. 618-626).

Type Journal Article

Theme Language

Keywords Wikipedia; Reading; Global

Link to Paper <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3289600.3291021>

In Repository? Yes – PDF

<i>Summary</i>	The authors deployed a large-scale survey across Wikipedia to create a typology of readers on the platform. Lemmerich et al. demonstrated that each language edition of Wikipedia has unique motivations for readers coming to the platform demonstrating that Wikipedia is used differently around the world. Readers in countries with a lower human development index (HDI) were more likely to read for in-depth understanding compared to readers in high-HDI countries. The findings of this paper are critical to this bibliography for two reasons (1) it shows that online readership comes from all corners of the globe and (2) the behaviors across different languages may be different.
<i>Methods</i>	Large scale multiple-choice survey: Sent to readers of 14 Wikipedia languages and receiving more than 210,000 responses. The authors additionally used quantitative data found from Wikipedia logs that trace a sample of users through their usage of the platform. Furthermore, they use country-level datasets to understand socio-economic and cultural indicators.

<i>Citation</i>	Li et al., 2019
<i>Full Reference</i>	Li, Q., Morris, M. R., Fourney, A., Larson, K., & Reinecke, K. (2019, May). The impact of web browser reader views on reading speed and user experience. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-12).
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Reading
<i>Keywords</i>	Reader View; Online Reading; Dyslexia; Website Design
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3290605.3300754
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary

The authors tested how often Reader View finds webpages transformable. Reader View changes the standard reading to web factors that are easier to read such as font size and white space. The authors did their own heuristic evaluation on 100 websites. Additionally, they ran an empirical test with participants to understand the impact of the reader view. Typically these Reader Views reduce the complexity of web pages by removing menus, images and content. They tested a Reader View web page with a normal web page with participants both with and without dyslexia. For both participants, the simple Reader View web page helped both populations increase their reading speed by 5%, and overall, users reported improved readability and visual attractiveness.

Methods

In another study, prior to running an experimental design study, Li et al., 2019 tested how often Reader View finds webpages transformable. Reader View changes the standard reading to web factors that are easier to read such as font size and white space. The authors did their own heuristic evaluation on 100 websites. Li et al. (2019), after doing a heuristic evaluation of website reader view, the authors conducted a 10-minute within subjects study to better understand the two conditions of Standard Web Page vs. Reader View.

Participants were given the text in each condition then asked to read the webpage word by word and then respond to a few comprehension questions. After they finished reading the passages, they author also presented users with a survey that had 7 readability questions, 9 user experiences question and 1 RSD question for the last condition they read

N

Citation

Ling and van Schaik, 2007

Full Reference

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.

Type

Journal Article

Theme

Web Factors

Keywords

Web Usability; Text presentation; Line spacing; Alignment

<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www-sciencedirect-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/science/article/pii/S0141938207000133
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Ling and van Schaik conducted an experimental design study that focused on visual search tasks rather than just reading word for word. Interestingly, the visual search task reflects most closely to what we would consider scanning. In a visual search task, participants are asked to quickly browse an interface gathering key insights about features such as menu buttons, hyper texts and labels. Ling and Shaik, 2007 also demonstrated that line spacing had a significant impact on task performance. Wider line spacing led to better comprehension accuracy and faster reading times. Their findings show that participants performed better with double line spacing than with 1.5 spacing, and better with 1.5 than single spacing.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: Within subjects task with independent variable of line spacing. The between subjects factor was text alignment of left aligned and justified. Participants were presented with different readings. They had to perform a visual search task that required them to find a hyperlink on the screen.
<i>Citation</i>	Liu et al., 2016
<i>Full Reference</i>	Liu, N., Yu, R., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Effects of font size, stroke width, and character complexity on the legibility of Chinese characters. <i>Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries</i> , 26(3), 381-392.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Language
<i>Keywords</i>	Stroke; Width; Font Size
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/hfm.20663
<i>In Repository?</i>	No

<i>Summary</i>	Liu et al. investigated font size, stroke width and character complexity. Character complexity is based on the number of strokes in the character. Their findings confirm that font size and character complexity had significant effects on legibility, while stroke width did not show any significant differences. However, the interactions between the different factors did show significant effects. Stroke width is critical to the legibility for characters with high-level complexity, whereas font size is the critical factor influencing the legibility for characters with low-level complexity. The combination of 12-point font size and 1:10 stroke width resulted in the best legibility for both character complexity levels. These findings demonstrate the importance of understanding other web factors such as character complexity and stroke width. These other forms of web factors also demonstrate the need to understand different web factors across different language texts.
<i>Methods</i>	Empirical study: participants were required to search for characters in digital texts. The search time per target character, correct response number, and correct response rate were used to measure the legibility.

M

<i>Citation</i>	Miniukovich et al., 2017
<i>Full Reference</i>	Miniukovich, A., De Angeli, A., Sulpizio, S., & Venuti, P. (2017, June). Design guidelines for web readability. In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems (pp. 285-296).
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Web; Readability; Accessibility; Dyslexia; WCAG 2.0.
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3064663.3064711
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary According to Miniukovich et al. (2017), “high readability becomes a necessity for the users with reading difficulties.” The authors noted that there are few websites designed for high readability and typically they are under-investigated when thinking about Web Usability. For users, with additional needs for reading and writing, being able to have high readability allows them to reduce users’ frustration and time wasting (Miniukovich et al., 2017). In this paper, the authors developed a set of 61 guidelines that discuss proper web factor characteristics for users with Dyslexia. Their unique methodology of guideline-building workshops and the push for accessibility is why this paper was included in the literature review.

Methods Another methodology, reviewed in the literature, was the formation of web usability guidelines. Experts in usability, practitioners and researchers came together using their own knowledge to build a set of guidelines to learn from.

They initially began with two researchers reviewing the entire corpus of guidelines and excluded those belonging to one of three categories. Then the experts were invited to resolve contradictions and review the validity of guidelines. Each guideline was printed on a card, they reviewed them individually and then discussed further.

See Also Miniukovich, A., Scaltritti, M., Sulpizio, S., & De Angeli, A. (2019, May). Guideline-based evaluation of web readability. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1-12).

Citation **Moran, 2020**

Full Reference Moran, K. (2020). How people read online: new and old findings. Nielsen Norman Group. (Accessed March 11th, 2022).

Type Web Article

Theme Scanning

Keywords Eye tracking; Readability; Scanning; Longitudinal

Link to Paper <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/how-people-read-online/>

In Repository? No

<i>Summary</i>	The Nielsen Norman group has been doing research on web readability for over 20 years. In 1997, Jakob Nielsen posted a report that discussed how users read on the web. This data was recently updated in 2020 by Kate Moran from the Nielsen Norman group. I use this data as a foundation for a lot of this literature review. In this article, Kate Moran discusses the changes from 1997-2020. Typically, the findings are the same. People still scan their content online but the content online has changed a bit. Currently, there are new layouts, formats and technologies presented. The findings show a new set of eye-tracking data that shows that there are new patterns in scanning text. For example, there is now a lawn-mower pattern where users begin in the top left cell, move to right until the end of the row then drop down to the next row and continue this pattern.
<i>Methods</i>	Eye-tracking: Large scale eye-tracking study to understand general eye movement patterns.

N

<i>Citation</i>	Nanavati and Bias, 2005
<i>Full Reference</i>	Nanavati, A. A., & Bias, R. G. (2005). Optimal line length in reading-A literature review. <i>Visible Language</i> , 39(2), 120.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Web Factors
<i>Keywords</i>	Line length; Eye movement; Readability, Screen size
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ749012
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary Nanavati and Bias conducted a literature review that encompasses more modern computer research. In this literature review, they attempt to answer two questions: what is the optimal reading length and how many columns should content be presented in for faster reading? Their findings on line length research showed that on computer monitors should not be more than 70 characters. If lines are not the appropriate length on digital screens, this could lead to different eye movement patterns that are not comfortable for users.

Methods Literature Review

Citation **Nielsen and Pernice, 2009**

Full Reference Nielsen, J., & Pernice, K. (2009). Eyetracking web usability. New Riders.

Type Book

Theme Methodology

Keywords Eyetracking; Readability; Eye movement

Link to Paper https://learning.oreilly.com/library/view/eyetracking-web-usability/9780321549730/?sso_link=yes&sso_link_from=UnivofWashington

In Repository? No – book found online but not a downloadable link

Summary Eye-tracking technology has become an important tool in conducting usability studies. Eye-tracking allows usability researchers to record and analyze a person's eye movements. These systems typically capture a person's fixations, saccades and scanpaths. In this book, the authors delve into a relatively new technology, at the time, eye-tracking. They cover literature around eye-tracking and detail the technology and its various uses in 2009. Additionally, Jakob Nielsen and Kara Pernice conduct a large scale usability methodology with eye-tracking technology to collect 1.5 million eye movement instances or around 300 GBs of data. In their three year study, they are able to use the eye movement instances to create heat maps and eye gaze plots to show eye movement patterns when people interact with web pages.

<i>Methods</i>	They were able to not only demonstrate the value of eye-tracking but additionally show what may be usable or not in the design of web pages. Eyetracking
----------------	---

O

<i>Citation</i>	Öquist, 2006
<i>Full Reference</i>	Öquist, G. (2006). Evaluating readability on mobile devices (Doctoral dissertation, Institutionen för lingvistik och filologi).
<i>Type</i>	Doctoral Dissertation
<i>Theme</i>	Screen Size
<i>Keywords</i>	RSVP; Leading; Scrolling; Paging; Mobile devices; Readability
<i>Link to Paper</i>	http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.134.4359
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	Öquist, 2006 produced their dissertation on evaluating readability on mobile devices. Through 5 different studies performed on mobile devices, they found that mobile phones led to a 10% decrease in reading speed compared to PDAs that have a 50% larger screen. In their research, Öquist tested different types of text presentation types commonly found on mobile phones: Scrolling, Paging, RSVP and Leading. Öquist (2006) found that for longer texts, there were no significant differences in reading speed on mobile devices in the different formats. Thus, they proposed a Adaptive RSVP that performed better and reduced task load then the common Fixed RSVP.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design: Within-subject repeated-measurement, participants were given texts to read using different presentation styles on mobile phones.

R

<i>Citation</i>	Reiber-Kuijpers et al., 2021
-----------------	-------------------------------------

<i>Full Reference</i>	Reiber-Kuijpers, M., Kral, M., & Meijer, P. (2021). Digital reading in a second or foreign language: A systematic literature review. <i>Computers & Education</i> , 163, 104115.
<i>Type</i>	Journal article
<i>Theme</i>	Language
<i>Keywords</i>	Applications in subject areas; Information literacy; Media in education; Teaching/learning strategies; 21st century abilities
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131520303134
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The authors demonstrated the importance of reading for second language learners through a systematic literature review that noted several characteristics of second language digital reading environments, tasks, and readers. One type of characteristics they focused on were format and layout of online text for second language learners. There is research currently on this topic that shows how web factors need to be designed for high readability for second language learners. Some of the key points in the literature review include that integrated formats allowed for better online comprehension. Additionally, sometimes web factors like text color, fonts and images can be helpful but additionally the overuse of these web factors can make it difficult to read and can be distracting to second language learners. There are different ways to make it easier for second language learners to scan especially using nonlinear texts. Overall, visual elements of digital pages multi-media appeared to enhance motivation and participation. Reading online is critical for online learning and thus this literature review demonstrates not only the importance of making digital content readable but also across different languages. For those learning a second language, high readability is necessary for comprehension and legibility.
<i>Methods</i>	Systematic Literature Review

Citation

Rello and Baeza-Yates, 2016

Full Reference

Rello, L., & Baeza-Yates, R. (2016). The effect of font type on screen readability by people with dyslexia. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing (TACCESS)*, 8(4), 1-33.

<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Dyslexia; Learning disability; Best practices; Web accessibility; Typeface font; Readability; Legibility; Eye-tracking
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2897736
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The eye movements of readers with dyslexia are different from regular readers. People with dyslexia, as well as beginner readers, make longer fixations and more fixations than normal readers. The fonts that are more readable for people with dyslexia are also beneficial for people without dyslexia. For the tested fonts, sans serif, monospaced, and roman font styles significantly improved the reading performance over serif, proportional, and italic fonts. The findings from this study show that a combination of font types create a more accessible font type for users with or without Dyslexia.
<i>Methods</i>	Eye-tracking: to measure the effect of typespace on reading speed, They were asked to read the 12 texts in silence and complete the comprehension control questions after each text. In answering the question they could not look back on the text. Their reading was recorded by the eye-tracker.

<i>Citation</i>	Rello and Bigham, 2017
<i>Full Reference</i>	Rello, L., & Bigham, J. P. (2017, October). Good background colors for readers: A study of people with and without dyslexia. In Proceedings of the 19th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on computers and accessibility (pp. 72-80).
<i>Type</i>	Conference Proceedings
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Background colors; Dyslexia; Readability; Reading Speed
<i>Link to Paper</i>	3132525.3132546
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary | Similarly, in another study by Rello and Bigham (2017), they measure the impact of background colors on screen readability. They conducted a large scale user study with 341 participants, 84 of those self-reported as having dyslexia. Their findings show that using certain background colors have a significant impact on people with and without dyslexia. Warm background colors, Peach, Orange and Yellow, significantly improved reading performance over cool background colors, Blue, Blue Grey and Green.

Methods | Empirical: The independent variable was background color. There were 10 different backgrounds used. A within-subject design was used so each participant read all 10 texts on 10 different backgrounds. Then participants had to answer comprehension questions. The authors measured reading time and mouse distance (the number of pixels that the mouse traveled over the text).

Citation | **Rello and Marcos, 2012**

Full Reference | Rello, L., & Marcos, M. C. (2012, October). An eye tracking study on text customization for user performance and preference. In 2012 Eighth Latin American Web Congress (pp. 64-70). IEEE.

Type | Journal Article

Theme | Web Factors

Keywords | User Interfaces; Usability; Text Customization; Read-ability Performance; User Preference; Eye Tracking; Grey Scales; Colors; Font Size; Character, Line and Paragraph Spacing; Column Width

Link to Paper | <https://flatisbad.com/resources/Rello-LA-WEB12.pdf>

In Repository? | Yes – PDF

Summary | Rello and Marcos used eye-tracking to test four values for line spacing: 0.8, 1, 1.2 and 1.4 lines. Participants preferred 1.4 lines among lines. Similar to other research in this literature review, Rello and Marcos note that there is no concluding evidence for the interaction of other web factors. These authors propose a set of guidelines that will combine the data from different web factors to customize text for the best readability. This is not the only study in this literature review that notes that web factors are strongly tied to each other. Thus, most research studies combine more than one web factor to better understand their impact on each other.

Methods | Empirical study: utilizing eye tracking testing and questionnaires

Citation | **Rello et al., 2016**

Full Reference | Rello, L., Pielot, M., & Marcos, M. C. (2016, May). Make it big! The effect of font size and line spacing on online readability. In Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 3637-3648).

Type | Journal Article

Theme | Web Factors

Keywords | Readability; comprehension; font size; line spacing; online reading; text presentation; eye-tracking; Wikipedia

Link to Paper | <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2858036.2858204>

In Repository? | Yes – PDF

Summary Rello et al. tested objective and subjective readability and comprehension for articles within Wikipedia. They tested font sizes from 10 to 26 points and line spacings from 0.8 to 1.8 in the Arial font. Their findings provide evidence that readability, measured via mean fixation duration, increased significantly with font size. Further, comprehension questions had significantly more correct responses for font sizes 18 and 26. For line spacing, they found marginal effects, suggesting that the two tested extremes (0.8 and 1.8) impair readability. These findings provide evidence that text-heavy websites should use fonts of size 18 or larger and use default line spacing when the goal is to make a web page easy to read and comprehend. This study is different from most of the other studies explored in this literature review because they covered fonts way above 14.

Interestingly, up to a font size of 18 points, subjective and objective readability and comprehension improved continuously. Beyond 22- there were no further effects of the objective measures and a decrease of subjective readability. Line spacing, in contrast, had no effect on the subjective readability but extreme spacings negative affected objective and subjective comprehension. The authors recommend using 18 points font size and default line spacing if the goal is to optimize readability and comprehension of web text content.

Methods Eye-tracking

S

Citation **Salmerón et al., 2017**

Full Reference Salmerón, L., Naumann, J., García, V., & Fajardo, I. (2017). Scanning and deep processing of information in hypertext: an eye tracking and cued retrospective think-aloud study. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 33(3), 222-233.

Type Journal Article

Theme Scanning

Keywords Scanning; Deep processing; Student; Learning

Link to Paper <https://www.uni-frankfurt.de/67186547/salmeron-2015---JCAL.pdf>

In Repository? Yes – PDF

<i>Summary</i>	The authors demonstrate that there are also special instances where it is important for users to quickly scan but also deeply process. In one study there, they demonstrate how high school students articulate scanning and deeper processing of answering questions using a Wikipedia document, and how their reading comprehension skills and the question type interact with these processes. The authors found that scanning of information led to poor comprehension while deep processing allowed users to perform better. Scanning led to lower performance especially for those that are good comprehenders, while the positive effect of deep processing was independent of reading comprehension skills.
<i>Methods</i>	Experimental design, Eye-tracking & Think aloud: Students were given a reading comprehension test. Then asked to answer questions about specific Wikipedia articles. Then they completed a retrospective think-aloud protocol. They watched a screen recording video of their learning session that included one dot representing their gaze. Students needed to remember what they were learning in that video.
<i>Citation</i>	Shaikh and Chaparro, 2004
<i>Full Reference</i>	Shaikh, A. D., & Chaparro, B. S. (2004, September). A survey of online reading habits of Internet users. In Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting (Vol. 48, No. 5, pp. 875-879). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Screen Size
<i>Keywords</i>	Readability; Paper; Digital reading
<i>Link to Paper</i>	http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.964.7704&rep=rep1&type=pdf
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary | In general, we know that reading on screens leads to different behaviors. Shaikh and Chaparro (2004) found that screens typically used to consume different types of information than on paper. In their 2004 survey, their findings demonstrated that longer articles, such as technical reports and journal articles are typically read on paper. While, online news, newsletters and other types of shorter readings are preferred onscreen.

Methods | Large scale-survey

Citation | **Shreshta et al., 2007**

Full Reference | Shrestha, S., Lenz, K., Chaparro, B., & Owens, J. (2007, October). "F" pattern scanning of text and images in web pages. In Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting (Vol. 51, No. 18, pp. 1200-1204). Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Type | Conference Proceedings

Theme | Scanning

Keywords | F-pattern; Scanning; Readability; Text-based; Image-based; Web

Link to Paper | <https://journals-sagepub-com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/doi/abs/10.1177/154193120705101831>

In Repository? | Yes – PDF

Summary | Shreshta et al. (2007) conducted a study to better understand how users can text. Participants were asked to search or browse either a text-based or image-based web page the authors found. The findings show a uniform scan path with longer fixations on the images Nielsen's 'F' pattern (2006) was confirmed in both the text-browse and text-search tasks.

Methods | Experimental design: Participants were asked to browse a text-based page or an image-based page and search for a particular piece of information. They were given 20 seconds for each task.

Citation | **Singer and Alexander, 2017**

<i>Full Reference</i>	Singer, L. M., & Alexander, P. A. (2017). Reading on paper and digitally: What the past decades of empirical research reveal. <i>Review of educational research</i> , 87(6), 1007-1041.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Reading
<i>Keywords</i>	Editing activities; Editor behavior; Social networking
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0034654317722961
<i>In Repository?</i>	No
<i>Summary</i>	The authors of this paper conducted a systematic literature to understand the role that print and digital content plays in reading comprehension. Singer & Alexander's findings show that depending on the context or task conditions, the type of content can result in varied comprehension. Their findings also show that there is not a clear definition of reading or digital reading and most of the studies were experimental designs created by that specific researcher. They also note that in general, the literature review is really broad - across many different devices and contexts.
<i>Methods</i>	Systematic Literature Review

T

<i>Citation</i>	TeBlunthuis et al., 2019
<i>Full Reference</i>	TeBlunthuis, N., Bayer, T., & Vasileva, O. (2019, August). Dwelling on Wikipedia: investigating time spent by global encyclopedia readers. In <i>Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Open Collaboration</i> (pp. 1-14).
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Scanning
<i>Keywords</i>	Peer production; Wikipedia; Readership; Digital divides; Quantitative methods; Web analytics; Dwell time

<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3306446.3340829
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF
<i>Summary</i>	The authors spent time trying to understand Wikipedia reader's dwell time or the time users spend on a given page on the platform. In this paper, the authors create a model of reading times on Wikipedia and show the various reading patterns. They furthermore show the reading patterns across language editions. Their findings show that Global South readers are more likely to use Wikipedia to gain in-depth understanding of a topic. Additionally, Global South readers spend more time per page view and that this difference is amplified on desktop devices, which are thought to be better suited for in-depth information seeking tasks. This paper also demonstrates that readers read in-depth and scan content on online platforms such as Wikipedia.
<i>Methods</i>	Authors collected reading time data across various language editions. They then created a stratified sample of that data and completed a regression analysis.

W

<i>Citation</i>	Wu et al., 2020
<i>Full Reference</i>	Wu, Y. H., Granquist, C., Gage, R., Crossland, M. D., & Legge, G. E. (2020). Online survey of digital reading by adults with low vision. <i>Optometry and vision science: official publication of the American Academy of Optometry</i> , 97(4), 249.
<i>Type</i>	Journal Article
<i>Theme</i>	Accessibility
<i>Keywords</i>	Low vision; Readability; Online survey
<i>Link to Paper</i>	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30169350/
<i>In Repository?</i>	Yes – PDF

Summary

Wu et al. (2020) conducted an online survey with 133 participants with low vision to better understand the history of those individuals' vision loss and how they use various assistive technologies. Their survey demonstrates the diversity in the population of people with low vision. Their findings show that people with vision loss suffered from mainly three diseases: albinism, retinitis pigmentosa and glaucoma. Participants ranged from 18 to 98 years old. Each participant, additionally, reported using vision, audio or braille to read. Most users did 50% of their reading visually and most spent more time doing digital reading than paper reading. Most participants used at least one technology from each of our digital content magnifiers and hard-copy content magnifiers for visual reading.

Methods

Large-scale Survey