

Berezner T.A.¹, Gorbunova E.S.¹ The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect

Березнер Т.А.¹, Горбунова Е.С.¹ Наличие изображений не является модератором эффекта не-безлости

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

The disfluency effect refers to an enhancement in memory retention when information processing is made challenging. Disfluency is typically induced by altering the perceptual characteristics of information. While the disfluency effect has been demonstrated in several studies, the increasing number of subsequent unsuccessful replications raises concerns. Among the potential reasons for the frequent failure to detect the disfluency effect, we consider the presence of images accompanying text information as a possible moderator. We assume that the disfluency effect will only manifest in the absence of images.

Two experiments were conducted wherein participants were presented with information written either in *Arial* (fluent condition) or *Comic Sans* (disfluent condition). The information was also either accompanied by images or presented without images. In the first experiment, the participants ($n = 144$) were asked to memorize 40 words, while in the second experiment ($n = 142$) they were presented with 7 fictional facts about the Earth. In both cases, the hypotheses were not confirmed — the disfluency effect did not manifest under any conditions.

Keywords: disfluency effect, fonts, images, memory, learning, desirable difficulties

Introduction

Processing fluency is defined as a metacognitive, subjective experience of the ease of information processing [Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009]. It is considered that a sense of fluency leads to making more intuitive judgments [Alter et al., 2007], to evaluating information as more plausible [Reber & Schwarz, 1999], pleasant [Reber et al., 2004], typical [Oppenheimer & Frank, 2008] and frequent [Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009]. Disfluency, that is, difficulty in processing, contributes to the deeper analytical processing of information [Alter et al., 2007].

It has been suggested that disfluency, due to this deeper processing of information, may also lead to better retention, which was shown in a laboratory experiment and in school settings [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011], on the basis of which the authors proposed using disfluency as a way to improve the educational outcomes in pedagogical practice. The explanation of the disfluency effect lies in Bjork's approach of desirable difficulties. He showed that productive learning is possible when students experience certain difficulties, overcoming which contributes to the better assimilation of the material [Bjork, 1994; Bjork & Bjork, 2011]. This is because overcoming difficulties leads to deeper information processing, consequently, better long-term memorization, which is predicted within the

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect Levels of Processing model [Craik & Lockhart, 1972; Craik & Tulving, 1975]. Hence, disfluency, acting as a signal of the difficulty of learning, provokes deeper processing of the information, which leads to better memorization. That is why disfluency is considered an example of a desirable difficulty in learning.

In the initial study in which this effect was discovered [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011], disfluency was produced using fonts of a certain type: **Comic Sans**, Bodoni, **Haettenschweiler**, *Monotype Corsiva*, as well as using italics and changing the font from black to gray. In other studies, disfluency was created by a variety of manipulations, see the table 1 below.

Table 1

Different ways to create the disfluency in several studies

Disfluency conditions	Studies
Fonts, such as <i>Brush</i> , <i>Brush Script</i> , <i>Comic Sans MS</i> , <i>Lucida Blackletter</i> , <i>Edwardian Script</i> , <i>Mistral</i> , Sans Forgetica and others	Berezner & Gorbunova, 2021; Eitel et al., 2014; Eitel and Köhl, 2016; Faber et al., 2017; Geller et al., 2020; Lehmann et al., 2016; Miele et al., 2013; Oppenheimer & Frank, 2008; Pieger et al., 2016; Pieger et al., 2017; Rummer et al., 2016; Sanchez & Jaeger, 2015; Sanchez & Naylor, 2018; Seufert et al., 2017; Taylor et al., 2020
Font size, italics, or gray text	Alter et al., 2007; Eitel et al., 2014; Faber et al., 2017; Halamish, 2018; Halamish et al., 2018; Katzir et al., 2013; Lehmann et al., 2016; Magreehan et al., 2016; Miele et al., 2013; Oppenheimer & Frank, 2008; Rhodes & Castel, 2008; Seufert et al., 2017; Sirota et al., 2021
The imitation of illegible handwriting	Geller et al., 2018
A combination of font color and background color	Magreehan et al., 2016; Reber & Schwarz, 1999
The imitation of a printer with not enough toner	Oppenheimer & Frank, 2008
Blurred words	Strukelj et al., 2016; Yue et al., 2013
180 degrees inverted words	Sungkhasettee et al., 2011

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect. After the discovery of the disfluency effect, many researchers tried to replicate the original results from Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011) in various contexts. For instance, in a study by French et al. (2013), the effect was tested on children with dyslexia. The effect was found for the control group and for children with dyslexia, furthermore, for the latter the improvement in retention due to the deterioration of the font was even greater. Retention improvement was stable for 6 weeks, as demonstrated in a follow-up study by French (2013). Weissgerber & Reinhard (2017) also showed this long-term effect — perceptual disfluency contributed to better information retention after 2 weeks. The disfluency effect was also tested in several other studies: for inverted words [Sungkhasettee et al., 2011]; for students learning Japanese as a foreign language, in special fonts for Japanese [Lee, 2013]; a 5 pt font led to better memorization than 18 pt [Halamish, 2018]; and an inverted U-shaped pattern was found, that is, average disfluency led to better memorization than weak or strong disfluency [Seufert et al., 2016].

However, in a large number of studies the influence of disfluency on memorization or learning performance was not statistically significant [Ball et al., 2014; Berezner & Gorbunova, 2021; Eitel et al., 2014; Eitel & Kühl, 2016; Faber et al., 2017; Geller et al., 2018; Geller et al., 2020; Halamish et al., 2018; Katzir et al., 2013; Magreehan et al., 2016; Meyer et al., 2015; Miele et al., 2013; Pieger et al., 2016; Pieger et al., 2017; Rhodes & Castel, 2008; Rummer et al., 2016; Sanchez & Jaeger, 2015; Sanchez & Naylor, 2018; Sirota et al., 2021; Strukelj et al., 2016; Taylor et al., 2020; Yue et al., 2013]. A meta-analysis of many of these studies (39 experiments from 25 articles involving 3,135 participants) showed a null effect of perceptual disfluency on learning outcomes [Xie et al., 2018]. These problems in replicating the disfluency effect require some theoretical explanation. Skeptical assessments were made of the claim that disfluency is a desirable difficulty [Bjork & Yue, 2016]. It is possible that disfluency does not actually affect high-level processes, does not lead to deeper processing of information, but only slows down the speed of reading. Other researchers have suggested that the disfluency effect may have moderators [Kühl et al., 2014; Oppenheimer & Alter, 2014].

In a study by Lehmann et al. (2016), the capacity of working memory was considered as a possible moderator. The authors hypothesized that the disfluency effect will manifest in those subjects who have a larger working memory, because the processing of information presented disfluently leads to a greater cognitive load, to the involvement of more cognitive resources, and then, only if there is a sufficient capacity of working memory, will the subjects be able to benefit from the disfluency of information. This assumption was confirmed, the disfluency effect was observed when the working memory capacity was higher. Strukelj et al. (2016) did not replicate these results. They found that the disfluency effect did not manifest under any conditions, concluding that working memory capacity

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect was not a moderator. They also used an eye-tracker, which made it possible to identify that the first two parts of the text presented to the subjects (text was divided into 4 parts) were read faster, and the remaining two were read slower when the text was presented in a disfluent condition compared to the fluent condition. This pattern correlates with what Yue et al. (2013) found, where the disfluency effect did not appear immediately. Based on this, Strukelj et al. (2016) suggested that disfluency becomes a desirable difficulty only after a considerable period spent on lengthy educational materials, while when learning shorter materials, it simply serves as a metacognitive cue. Thus, the disfluency effect should be studied using longer texts and longer periods of time, as in the studies of Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011), French (2013), and Weissgerber & Reinhard (2017).

Other studies failed to find a disfluency effect using other possible moderators, for example, test expectancy [Eitel & Kühl, 2016]. The predicted result was found that for high test expectancy, educational outcomes increase, whereas there was no effect of test expectancy on the disfluency effect. The meta-analysis by Xie et al. (2018), mentioned above, not only considered the presence of the disfluency effect, but also its possible moderators, among which were prior knowledge, learning material domain, the pacing of presentation, study design, and the use of distraction tasks. The influence of none of the possible moderators were significant. A recent study showed that the level of English as a foreign language is also not a moderator of the disfluency effect [Berezner & Gorbunova, 2021].

In this study we consider the influence of another possible moderator, which has received little attention in previous studies. We check whether the presence of images is a moderator for the disfluency effect. A significant number of texts in the modern world are accompanied by illustrations, while it is widely known that their presence has a positive effect on the memorization of information [Glenberg & Langston, 1992; Paivio, 1975; Paivio, 2006]. It can be explained both by Paivio's dual-coding theory and the idea of images contributing to the formation of mental models of the content of texts [Glenberg & Langston, 1992]. More specifically, the presence of images, according to the theory of dual-coding, creates an additional opportunity for memorizing the same information by using a different, visual system, complementing memorization by using a verbal system [Paivio, 1975; Paivio, 2006]. Also, the presence of meaningful, instructional images, and not just decorative ones, contributes to a more complete formation of a mental model of the information that is being processed at the moment [Glenberg & Langston, 1992]. Therefore, memorization of some text can be enhanced due to the fact that an image with the same meaning will be presented. In some studies of the disfluency effect, texts were accompanied by images for reasons of environmental validity [e.g., Eitel & Kühl, 2016], but the authors did not take this fact into account in any way when interpreting the data. Thus, the purpose of our research is to study the interaction of the disfluency effect and the presence of

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect images in the memorizing of verbal information. We expect that since the presence of images in itself can be a strong factor influencing successful memorization, a rather weak disfluency effect will not be detected in the case when the information was accompanied by images.

Experiment 1

In the first experiment, the subjects were asked to memorize verbal information presented fluently or disfluently, which was accompanied by images or not. In accordance with methodology widely used in studies of the disfluency effect, which consists in using three stages in the experiment — the presentation of stimuli, distraction tasks, and tests — we conducted an online experiment described below. The manipulation of perceptual disfluency is also common: the Arial font as a fluent, Comic Sans as a disfluent (considered as disfluent in Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011; Faber et al., 2017; Rummer et al., 2016). We emphasize that it was fundamentally important to check the Comic Sans font, since it was declared disfluent and led to better memorization in the work in which this effect was first demonstrated [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011]. Arial was chosen as it belongs to the same group of sans serif fonts as Comic Sans. Consequently, the serif element, which can affect reading speed and other parameters, was absent. This is an important methodological property, since typographers have criticized many works in the field of disfluency studies for comparing fonts from different families [Thiessen et al., 2020]. We put forward the following experimental hypotheses:

- 1) Information accompanied by images will be remembered better than information without them (according to the dual-coding theory by Paivio).
- 2) If images are present, there will be no differences in the memorization of information between fonts of different types, that is, the presence of images is a moderator for the disfluency effect (according to the moderated disfluency hypothesis).
- 3) If there are no images, then the information presented disfluently will be remembered better (according to the consideration of disfluency as a desirable difficulty).

Participants

The study involved 144 participants (114 women) aged 17 to 30 years ($M = 20.146$, $SD = 2.075$). The subjects participated voluntarily and were recruited via social networks. Some of the subjects

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect participated without inducement, while others had the opportunity to receive additional points for the Experimental Psychology or Usability course, at the Department of Psychology, HSE University.

Procedure

Experiment 1 took place online on the platform '1ka'. The subjects were asked to memorize words, then solve a distraction task, and then reproduce as many words as they could remember. The experiment began with detailed instructions and filling out an informed consent form. The subjects agreed with the confidentiality conditions and confirmed that they understood the instructions. Then the subjects reported their gender and age, which was followed by the presentation of words. Each word was presented for 5 seconds, the subjects had no opportunity to return to the previously read word. They were also forbidden to record the content of words in any way (for example, by taking a screenshot). In total, 40 Russian words were presented (see Appendix 1), denoting common objects (for example, household items or animals). After presenting the words, the subjects had to wait for 2 minutes (a time interval standard for research in this area, e.g., Ball et al., 2014; Eitel & Köhl, 2016; Geller et al., 2018; Sungkhasettee et al., 2011), perform a distraction task — the addition or subtraction of 5 pairs of two-digit numbers. Finally, the testing phase followed. As part of the free recall, the subjects had to list as many words as possible that they remembered. For this they had to enter the words in a field on the screen. It should be noted that the subjects were warned in the instructions that the memorization of words would be checked. Thus, all the subjects had a high degree of test expectancy. After that, the subjects were thanked for their participation and offered, if desired, to write to the experimenter with any questions about the goals or results of the study.

The study design was between-subject, in accordance with the levels of two independent variables (fluency: Arial vs. Comic Sans and the presence of images: images or gray rectangles), 4 experimental groups were formed. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of the experimental groups. The dependent variable was the number of words memorized by the subjects.

Stimuli

All the words were taken from a special database of stimuli for psycholinguistic research [Akinina et al., 2014]. The criteria for selecting the words were the following. All the words presented to the subjects were of 2 syllables and 4 letters/phonemes. Balancing words in all length parameters was necessary so that the subjects spent the same amount of time reading each word. The words were not balanced for frequency or representability as the list of 40 words (see Appendix 1 for all words)

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect presented to each group of subjects was the same, that is, differences in these parameters between the lists of words could not affect the results. Each word was a noun. The words in the fluent condition were written in 20 pt Arial font. The words in the disfluent condition were written in 20 pt Comic Sans font. All other characteristics of fonts, including their color (black), brightness, tilt, etc. were identical. In groups 1 and 3, the words were accompanied by images. These images were taken from the same stimuli database as the words [Akinina et al., 2014], and were black-and-white drawings of objects designated by the words (see Appendix 2 for all images). The size of the images was 152 by 200 pixels in each trial. All other image characteristics (brightness, saturation, etc.) were identical between trials and between experimental groups. All the words were presented in the center of the screen, the images were located below them (see Figure 1). In groups 2 and 4, instead of images, gray rectangles of 152 by 200 pixels were presented, in order to level the conditions among themselves by the presence of a certain nonverbal pattern of gray under the word.



Fig. 1. Example of a trial in Experiment 1 (word in Arial font + image). The Russian word ‘Арфа’ means ‘Harp’. See Appendices 1 and 2 for all used words and images

Results

Data processing and analysis were carried out in the JASP (version 0.13.1). First, we considered whether the subjects solved the distracting tasks. On average, 4.8 tasks (SD = 0.5) out of 5 were solved correctly. Thus, this suggests that the subjects were really distracted by solving examples, and did not write answers at random. On average, the subjects memorized 14.65 words (SD = 5.83) out of 40. Before the main data analysis, the variances of the experimental groups were checked by the Leven test for homogeneity – the Leven test showed homogeneity of variances ($F = 0.56, p = .643$). Then a two-factor 2 (fluency: fluency/disfluency) x 2 (images: yes/no) ANOVA was performed. A significant influence of the presence of images was found $F(1, 140) = 5.83, p = .017, \eta_p^2 = 0.040$ – words accompanied by images were remembered significantly better ($M = 15.75, SD = 5.78$) than words accompanied by a gray rectangle ($M = 13.46, SD = 5.70$). No significant influence of the font

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect fluency factor was found $F(1, 140) = 0.51, p = .477, \eta_p^2 = 0.004$. The interaction of factors was also insignificant $F(1, 140) = 0.15, p = .695, \eta_p^2 = 0.001$. In Figure 2, a comparison of the average values between the groups can be seen. We also performed a Bayesian ANOVA, which showed us barely worth mentioning evidence for the images influence ($BF_{10} = 2.36$) and substantial evidence for the absence of the influence of font ($BF_{01} = 4.76$), barely worth mentioning for font and images model ($BF_{01} = 1.85$) and also substantial evidence for the absence of the influence for font, images and their interaction model ($BF_{01} = 7.35$). Therefore, Bayesian analysis supports an observation for the significant influence of images presence and null-effect of disfluency.




Fig. 2. The average values for the groups in Experiment 1. The error bars here and further denote 95% confidence intervals

In this experiment, the subjects also made mistakes when reproducing words — these were both small errors (plural instead of singular: harps for harp) and recording words that were not in the list presented. For exploratory purposes, we considered whether the font type or the presence of images affected the number of errors—here only extra words. On average, the subjects made 0.42 mistakes each, 104 people made no mistakes, 26 people made 1 mistake, and 14 made 2 or more (one subject made 4 mistakes). Two Mann-Whitney U-tests were performed, since the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that the distribution of this dependent variable differs from normal ($p < .05$). Neither the images ($U = 247, p = .541$) nor the font type ($U = 286, p = .173$) affected the number of errors.

Discussion

In the first experiment, the subjects had to memorize the words presented to them, which were written either in a fluent or disfluent font and accompanied by an image of the objects or a gray rectangle. A

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect significant effect of the presence of images on memorization was found, namely, words were remembered better if their images were presented with them. This result confirms our first hypothesis and is consistent with the predictions of dual-coding theory. The subjects from the groups with images had the opportunity to memorize objects with both systems at once: verbal and imagery. Indirectly, the idea that the subjects in the process of free reporting relied on drawings is confirmed by the presence of errors by some subjects. In fact, some errors could arise as an association with the drawing, for example, "pomegranate" could be recognized in the drawing "kiwi", and "tree" could be seen in the drawing for the word "burrow". Almost all errors were words consisting of a larger number of letters, that is, it is unlikely that they arose due to consonance.

Although the second hypothesis also found empirical confirmation, there is no reason to assert that the presence of images is a moderator of the disfluency effect. There were no differences in the memorization of words depending on the fluency of the font if the words were accompanied by images or not. The third hypothesis was not confirmed, the effect of disfluency was not detected under any conditions, which means that for groups with images, its absence cannot be explained by images being a moderator. It is more logical to say that the disfluency effect was not observed in principle in this experiment, regardless of the images. This result is consistent with many studies and the meta-analysis that showed a zero effect of disfluency [Xie et al., 2018], however, this can be explained not only by the absence of the disfluency effect. First, the subjects were presented with 4-letter words. Perhaps, for the positive effect of disfluency on memorization, in order to cause deeper processing, verbal information of a much larger volume is needed – complete texts or, at least, sentences. Secondly, each word was presented only for 5 seconds. Although this time is sufficient for the subjects to read a short word, it may not be sufficient to produce deeper processing. Thirdly, the Comic Sans font itself might not be disfluent, despite the opinion that it is [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011]. Arial and Comic Sans fonts are quite similar, which eliminates as much as possible the influence of various typographic characteristics (for example, the presence of serifs), however the difference in the fluency of their processing may be insignificant.

In order to overcome these limitations and further study the interaction of the fluency of verbal information and the presence of images, a second experiment was conducted. It presented several sentences to check whether the disfluency effect would manifest itself in longer texts. The presentation of information was increased to 30 seconds so that the subjects had the opportunity to read the sentences several times. However, the Comic Sans font was not replaced as it could be disfluent and improve the memorization of sentences. Nevertheless, in order to check whether the subjects consider this font poorly legible, they were asked additional questions.

Experiment 2

Participants

The study involved 142 participants (104 women) aged 16 to 47 years ($M = 21.338$, $SD = 3.852$). The subjects participated voluntarily; they were recruited via social networks. Some of the subjects participated without inducement, while others could receive additional points for the Experimental Psychology or Usability course, at the Department of Psychology, HSE University.

Procedure

The procedure of experiment 2 was similar to experiment 1. Instead of 40 words, the subjects were presented with 7 facts about the Earth, also in Russian (see Appendix 3 for all facts). Each fact was presented for 30 seconds. The distraction task was the same but with different numbers. One of the key experimental differences was that instead of a free report, the subjects were given a test of 14 yes/no questions at the end of the experiment (see Appendix 4 for all test questions).

Stimuli

Facts about the Earth were chosen as stimuli for several reasons: first, this is consistent with previous studies in which subjects were also asked to memorize previously unknown, usually scientific or technical, information [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011; Eitel & Köhl, 2016]; secondly, the task allows us to check the memorization of information of various types: names, numbers, dates, processes, etc. To minimize the possibility of prior knowledge of the participants, all the “facts” were false. However, in order for the facts to seem plausible to the participants, they were created based on real facts by changing some details. Initially, 16 facts were prepared, after which only facts of average plausibility were selected. The selection of facts was based on the degree of their readability and comprehensibility. For this purpose, a pilot study was conducted, described below. After selecting 7 facts (e.g., ‘The only underwater river in the world is located in the Mediterranean Sea. Its length is 400 km, and the distance between the shores is 35 meters’), 14 statement questions were compiled for the yes/no test, 2 for each fact. 7 of these statements were false and 7 were true (e.g., ‘The world's only underwater river is located in the Red Sea’ – False).

Pilot study

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect. Ten people took part in the pilot study. They were presented with the 16 facts compiled as potential stimuli material. On a 7-point Likert scale, they evaluated the plausibility of each fact and its readability. The final list did not include those facts whose plausibility estimates were higher or lower than average for all the facts by one standard deviation. Since the subjectively assessed readability of all the remaining facts was high and did not identify those that should be excluded, the readability of the facts was calculated separately.

The Flesch index and the Gunning fog index, based on similar procedures for calculating the proportion of complex words among all words and words in sentences, were used to assess readability – the ease of reading and understanding. The Flesch index is traditionally interpreted as follows: a score of 0 corresponds to the lowest readability, the text can only be understood by university graduates, a score of 100 corresponds to easy readability, a 10-year-old child can easily understand the text. The Gunning fog index has a slightly different interpretation – a score of 6 corresponds to a text comprehensible by a 6th grader, and a score of 12 or more corresponds to a text comprehensible by a school graduate. It is considered optimal for most people to understand a text, its Flesch index should be 40 or more, and the Gunning fog index less than 8. The number of sentences and words was also counted in all the facts. The final list of 7 facts consisted of two sentences (see Appendix 3 for all facts). On average the facts had 19.14 words ($SD = 1.46$), a Flesch index of 60.18 ($SD = 14.82$), which corresponds to the level of understanding by about 10th graders, and a Gunning index of 6.24 ($SD = 1.09$), which corresponds to 7th grade level. Thus, the selected facts had sufficient readability. Their average plausibility was 4.47 ($SD = 0.39$), that is, the facts were sufficiently plausible, they did not seem to be obvious falsities, but they did not give the impression of absolute truth.

Main experiment

In experiment 2, the subjects had to memorize the content of the facts presented. In the fluent condition, the facts were written in Arial font 20 pt, in the disfluent Comic Sans 20 pt. All other font characteristics were identical. The facts had approximately the same plausibility, readability and length. They were different in terms of the frequency of words used, syntactic structure or other linguistic indicators, since the same set of facts was presented to all experimental groups. In groups 1 and 3, the facts were accompanied by specially selected color images, 200 by 200 pixels (see an example in Fig. 3 and Appendix 5 for all images). By analogy with experiment 1, for groups 2 and 4, a blue square of the same size was presented. The images were presented under the facts in the center

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect of the screen. As noted earlier, after presenting stimuli and a distraction task for 2 minutes, the subjects answered 14 questions (see Appendix 4 for all questions). The subjects were warned in the instructions that their memorization of facts would be checked.



Fig. 3. Example of images used in Experiment 2. See Appendix 5 for all used images

In addition, at the end of the study, the subjects were asked to evaluate the font with which the facts were written by two indicators: pleasantness and legibility. It has been suggested that if the Comic Sans font is indeed disfluent, then the subjects will rate it as less legible and, possibly, as less pleasant, since fluency is associated with greater attractiveness [Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009]. The subjects were also asked to name the facts that they allegedly knew before the start of the study. Another essential difference between Experiment 2 and Experiment 1 was that after presenting each fact, the subjects were asked to evaluate its plausibility on a 10-point scale. Such manipulation was done for two reasons: first, to additionally verify that each fact was considered to be plausible in a large sample, and second, to validate the data of previous studies, according to which fluent information is considered more plausible [Reber & Schwarz, 1999; Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009], as well as verbal information without images [Blinova & Shcherbakova, 2020].

We put forward the following experimental hypotheses.

- 1) Facts accompanied by images will be remembered better than facts without them (according to dual-coding theory).
- 2) If images are present, then there will be no differences in memorizing facts between fonts of different types, that is, the presence of images is a moderator for the disfluency effect (according to the moderated disfluency hypothesis).
- 3) If there are no images, then facts presented disfluently will be remembered better (according to the consideration of disfluency as a desirable difficulty).
- 4) Facts presented fluently will be evaluated as more plausible.
- 5) Facts without images will be evaluated as more plausible.

Results

As in Experiment 1, we first considered whether the subjects solved the distraction tasks. On average, 4.81 examples were correctly solved ($SD = 0.46$). Thus, this suggests that the subjects were really distracted by solving examples and did not write answers at random after the fact presentation. Then we analyzed how many people answered each of the 14 questions correctly. Since the subject could score either 0 or 1 point for each question, the average score was in the range from 0 to 1. On average the subjects scored 0.79 points for each question ($SD = 0.2$). We checked whether any question could be considered an outlier by constructing a box plot and a scatter plot (see Figure 4).




Fig. 4. A box plot and a scatter plot for scores on the questions of the test in the Experiment 2

The first question was an outlier (only 26.6% answered it correctly), and it was removed from further analysis. All other questions remained. On average, the subjects scored 10.8 points ($SD = 1.7$), which indicates that they coped well with the test, and the information (including numerical) was remembered normally. The possible influence of the subjects' prior knowledge of the facts was also considered. Only 13 people said that they had heard something about certain facts. No respondents indicated that they had known any of the numerical data before the experiment, and they also appealed to the content of the facts, and not to reality (for example, some indicated that they had heard about the extinction in the Jurassic period, which, in fact, never happened). Thus, none of these 13 people had genuine prior knowledge of the content of the facts.

The homogeneity of the variances was checked. Leven's test showed that the variances of the experimental groups were homogeneous $F = 1.4, p = .247$. Then a two-factor 2 (fluency: fluency/disfluency) x 2 (images: yes/no) ANOVA was carried out. As in Experiment 1, a significant influence of the image presence factor was found $F(1, 138) = 6.43, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = 0.045$. However, in this experiment, the subjects scored more points in the condition when there were no meaningful images ($M =$

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect (11.2, SD = 1.5) than when there were such images (M = 10.5, SD = 1.8). The influence of the fluency factor was not significant $F(1, 138) = 0.82, p = .366, \eta_p^2 = 0.006$. The interaction of fluency factors and images was also not significant $F(1, 138) = 0.73, p = .396, \eta_p^2 = 0.005$. Figure 5 shows a comparison of average values for groups. Error bars indicate a 95% confidence interval. As for experiment 1, we also performed Bayesian ANOVA in order to test an assumption that there is a null-effect of disfluency. We have observed substantial evidence for the images influence ($BF_{10} = 3.42$), also not worth more than a bare mention for images and font model ($BF_{01} = 1.19$), and substantial evidence for the absence of the font influence ($BF_{01} = 3.94$), and font, images and their interaction factor model ($BF_{01} = 3.44$). Therefore, this Bayesian analysis also supports that there was the influence of images presence, but on the contrary, disfluency seemed to have no effect on test score.




Fig. 5. The average values for the groups in Experiment 2

In order to test the fourth and fifth hypotheses, the influence of font fluency and the presence of images on the plausibility assessment was also considered. Before that, we checked whether the subjects evaluated any fact as significantly more or less plausible than others. The average plausibility score was 5.6 (SD = 1.0) out of 10, that is, the facts were assessed by the subjects as marginally plausible. This means that during the pilot study, facts corresponding to the goals of the main experiment were selected. There were no outliers in terms of its plausibility.

To assess the fluency, and the impact of the presence of images on the plausibility, the scores of all facts were used. To compare the plausibility estimates, t-tests were conducted, since the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that this dependent variable is normally distributed ($p = .127$). For font fluency, the t-test showed no significant differences $t(140) = -0.33, p = .742, d = -0.06$. Similarly, a t-test was conducted to compare plausibility estimates depending on the availability of images, which also showed no significant differences $t(140) = 0.75, p = .454, d = 0.13$. The fourth and fifth hypotheses were not

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect confirmed; the facts were not evaluated as more or less plausible depending on the fluency of fonts or the presence of images (Figure 6).




Fig. 6. Comparison of plausibility estimates depending on the fluency of the font (left) and the presence of images (right)

Finally, we checked whether the subjects rated the Comic Sans font as disfluent. This was checked by the Mann-Whitney criterion, since the Shapiro-Wilk test showed that legibility and pleasantness were not distributed normally. A comparison was made of the ratings of legibility and pleasantness of Arial and Comic Sans fonts. The Arial font was noted by the subjects as more legible ($M = 8.5$, $SD = 1.8$) than Comic Sans ($M = 7.4$, $SD = 3.1$), but this difference was not statistically significant ($U = 2910$, $p = .095$). The Arial font was also noted by the subjects as more pleasant ($M = 7.3$, $SD = 2.0$ vs. $M = 6.7$, $SD = 2.9$), but this difference was not statistically significant ($U = 2715$, $p = .424$).

Discussion

The second experiment was conducted in order to consider the interaction of the disfluency effect and the presence of images in a more complex task – memorizing information from small texts. Since we have proposed three possible explanations at once why the disfluency effect did not manifest itself in the first experiment, we focus on their consideration. This time, the subjects were presented not with short words, but facts in two sentences and about 20 words that were longer than 4 letters. The subjects were also given sufficient time – 30 seconds – to read each fact. Finally, it was additionally checked whether the subjects considered the Comic Sans font to be disfluent. It was rated by subjects as less legible and pleasant than Arial, but these differences were not significant. Due to the insignificant difference, it cannot be argued that Comic Sans was definitely a more disfluent font, and this will be discussed further. It is possible that in the first experiment, the subjects would have evaluated the legibility of Comic Sans in the same way as Arial.

The results obtained from the ANOVA, however, neither confirm the first hypothesis nor coincide with the results of the first experiment. It was shown that the subjects scored higher on the test when

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect the facts were not accompanied by images. This can be explained as follows. In the first experiment, the image exactly corresponded to the word in meaning, it showed the object that was designated by the word, which gave an additional advantage when memorizing. In the second experiment, the image only thematically corresponded to the content of the fact, but did not reflect information—names, numbers, etc. Perhaps the subjects were distracted by looking at the images instead of carefully reading the facts, but the images themselves could not help them remember the information. In future studies, the hypothesis that the presence of images that do not carry a semantic load hinders memorization should be tested separately. This could be done using eye-tracking to understand the proportion of time spent by the subjects looking at the image instead of reading, and the overall dynamics of eye movements. If, instead of simple illustrations, facts presented in the form of infographics, this could improve memorization.

The second hypothesis was confirmed. There were no differences in memorizing facts if there were images. However, again there is no reason to say that this happened because the presence of images moderated the disfluency effect, as it has a stronger beneficial effect on memory. On the contrary, it has been shown that the presence of images affects memorization negatively. The disfluency effect was not detected even in the absence of images, there were no differences in memorization depending on the fluency of the font. The fluent Arial font in the absence of images even led to better memorization than Comic Sans, but this difference was not significant. The third hypothesis was not confirmed. In the two experiments we conducted, the disfluency effect did not manifest itself. The possible reasons for this are discussed below.

The fourth and fifth hypotheses concerned making judgments about plausibility, an aspect that could not be considered in the first experiment, since it presented only words. As noted in previous studies, processing fluency affects a wide range of diverse judgments, including attractiveness, frequency and – the subject of our consideration – truth [Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009]. Since it has been shown that fluently processed judgments are evaluated as more plausible [Reber & Schwarz, 1999], we expected to find the same in our experiment. However, the hypothesis was not confirmed – the facts written in Arial or Comic Sans were evaluated as equally plausible. Although the subjects found the Comic Sans font less legible, perhaps it was not disfluent enough to lead to the assessment of facts as false. An indirect confirmation of this is the absence of differences between fonts in terms of their pleasantness. Reber and Schwarz (1999) manipulated fluency by contrasting the font color with the background, and secondly, within-subject design was used. If we had used a within-subject design, the differences might also have appeared – the subjects could have compared the fluency of different

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect facts and evaluated disfluent ones as less plausible. In future studies, it is worth testing this assumption by replicating the experiment with a within-subject design. The fifth hypothesis concerned the effect on the plausibility assessment of the presence of images. The differences were insignificant and the hypothesis was not confirmed. Once again, it is worth further testing this hypothesis in an experiment with a within-subject design, when each subject could assess the plausibility of the facts by comparing those with and without illustrations. However, in previous studies, differences were obtained in the experiment with a between-subject design [Blinova & Shcherbakova, 2020]. Accordingly, there must be other explanations for our results. The key difference between our experiment and previous studies was that the facts were created by us on the basis of real facts about the Earth, they were not completely fictional. Perhaps it was the similarity of the content to what is happening on our planet, that influenced the plausibility assessment much more than the presence of images (and the fluency of the font). In order to further test hypotheses about the beneficial effect of fluency on the assessment of plausibility and the negative impact of the presence of images, accurate replications of previous studies with completely made-up facts are necessary.

General discussion

We conducted two experiments in which the disfluency effect and the presence of images as its possible moderator were studied. In the first experiment, the subjects were presented with words that were written in a fluent or disfluent font, and which were accompanied by images of the objects depicted by the words or simple gray rectangles. Only the presence of images was statistically significant, confirming that images improve memorization. This is consistent with the dual-coding theory [Paivio, 1975; Paivio, 2006] and the idea that images allow the formation of mental models of the texts content [Glenberg & Langston, 1992]. The fluency of the font and the interaction of factors did not have a significant impact. This was supported by a Bayesian analysis, that there are moderate evidence for the absence of the disfluency effect. Since short words were used in this experiment, an even simpler explanation can be found: those subjects who saw images of objects had two sources of information at once. They did not need to form mental models, they just saw an object and memorized it. It is possible that the subjects in those groups in which the images were presented looked at them longer than at the words. This is indirectly confirmed by the presence of errors in some subjects – naming those words that were not on the list. The fluency of the font did not affect these false memories, although in previous studies disfluency contributed to a greater number of them [Sanchez & Naylor, 2018], but still the task of memorizing words was simple and can hardly be interpreted in terms of false memories. Rather, they were just mistakes related to the fact that the subjects remembered the picture well, but not the word. To test the assumption that in such a cognitive task more

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect attention is paid to images, it would be possible in future studies to use an eye-tracker. The results of the first experiment did not replicate the disfluency effect.

The second experiment was designed to evaluate memorization in the more complex context of sentences. Situations when we need to memorize individual words are rare – in most cases, people read complete texts, therefore, in Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011) and many subsequent studies, longer texts are used as stimuli. There are also studies which required the remembering of a word from a pair (for example, Taylor et al., 2020), but such a task was usually not the only one and was accompanied by an assessment of text memorization. Hence, in our second experiment, instead of words, the subjects were presented with facts written in the same fonts, and accompanied or not by pictures, as in Experiment 1. The disfluency effect was not detected in this experiment either, and Bayesian analysis showed moderate evidence for the null-effect of disfluency. The influence of images on memory contradicted our hypothesis and the results of the first experiment. We explained this phenomenon by the images we chose distracting the subjects, instead of helping to build mental models [Glenberg & Langston, 1992]. In studies revealing the positive role of images, images contain information relevant to the text. In our experiment, the images corresponded to the facts thematically but did not contain any specific information. Images that we used were, probably, decorative for subjects, and not instructional ones. This could be what influenced the negative role of images in memorization in the second experiment. The second experiment also examined the effect of fluency on plausibility. Processing fluency theory predicts that fluent stimuli should be evaluated as plausible [Alter & Oppenheimer, 2009; Reber & Schwarz, 1999], however, this was not observed. Nor was there was any effect on the assessment of plausibility for the presence of images, although this was demonstrated in a previous study [Blinova & Shcherbakova, 2020]. Why was the disfluency effect not replicated in both of our experiments?

It could be argued that our data confirm the results of numerous other studies, including their meta-analysis, in which there was also no disfluency effect. However, our results can be explained by our understanding of disfluency. We understood Comic Sans as a disfluent font, which may have been incorrect. There are reasons to believe that the Comic Sans font is not disfluent. We chose Comic Sans because in the article in which the disfluency effect was first discovered [Diemand-Yauman et al., 2011], this font was not just called disfluent, but also led to a significant improvement in memorization. It is similar to Arial (both are sans serif), which is important, because typographers have criticized fluency studies for using dissimilar fonts from different families, as this can introduce confounding variables [Thiessen et al., 2020]. Nevertheless, Comic Sans is much more legible than many

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect other fonts called disfluent in the literature, for example, *Monotype Corsiva* or **Haettenschweiler**. One of the limitations of our work is the fact that we did not check beforehand whether Comic Sans was actually rated as disfluent. We conducted a post hoc check in the second experiment, which showed that the subjects found it less legible and pleasant than Arial, but these differences were insignificant. Perhaps Comic Sans is still less fluent than Arial, but not enough to act as a desirable difficulty. However, in our subsequent research (Berezner & Gorbunova, in press), still unpublished, we also used Comic Sans as a disfluent font, along with using small letter sizes or yellow font color instead of black. This time we are in all 3 experiments (logical reasoning, problem solving and creativity) also asked to compare the legibility of fonts, and the Comic Sans font was rated as significantly less legible than the fluent condition in which Times New Roman was used. It is important to note that in this study, between-subject design was used, that is, the Comic Sans font was evaluated as poorly legible not against the background of another font, but by itself. Thus, the Comic Sans font is sometimes evaluated as less legible and was also declared as disfluent in the study by Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011), therefore, its use in our work, even though the subjects did not consider it less legible than Arial, is quite justified. At the same time, for completely illegible fonts, such as Sans Forgetica, it is shown that they also do not improve memorization [Berezner & Gorbunova, 2021; Geller et al., 2020; Taylor et al., 2020]. There is reason to believe that either the font type is not the factor that really leads to a feeling of disfluency, or this effect is influenced by numerous other factors that need to be carefully studied. To test the assumptions that disfluency actually has a null-effect on memory, we recommend conducting even more replications with the control of various moderators and conducting Bayesian analysis.

Another possible explanation for the results is an almost instantaneous memory testing. In accordance with established methodology, we used a distraction task between the presentation and testing phases, but this might not be sufficient for disfluency to become a desirable difficulty. According to Bjork (1994), the benefits of desirable difficulties are felt only after a while, perhaps several weeks. This may explain the unsuccessful replication of the disfluency effect, not only by us, but also by other authors. In the second experiment of Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011), the subjects interacted with disfluent fonts for several weeks, in the studies of French (2013) and Weissgerber & Reinhard (2017) also showed the disfluency effect after a few weeks. This does not answer the question why in the first experiment of Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011), which took place in the laboratory, the disfluency effect was also detected, but suggests that sufficient time should pass for its occurrence. In future studies, it is worth accounting for this and testing the memorization of information by the subjects after a few weeks.

Another limitation of our work is that we warned our subjects in advance that their memorization of information would be tested. In the work of Eitel and Kühl (2016), it was assumed that test expectancy is a moderator of the disfluency effect. Their hypothesis was not confirmed, but in general, very few studies have been conducted on the impact of the test expectancy on the disfluency effect. It would make sense to check the effect of this factor in the future. Finally, processing fluency is a metacognitive cue that affects a variety of judgments. For this reason, many studies have evaluated the impact of disfluency on making judgments of learning. In our work, we did not ask the subjects to predict their success during testing. It would be useful to study the effect of disfluency on learning judgments within the procedure we presented from the point of view that it could provide additional evidence about whether the subjects consider the Comic Sans font sufficiently disfluent or not. Perhaps it is more reasonable to use a within-subject design for such a study. Another development in fluency theory would be to study perceptual disfluency not only using texts, but also using disfluent images.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Maria Protopova and Olga Madfes for their help in creating stimuli and collecting data. The authors also thank the anonymous reviewer for his valuable comments on this work, which undoubtedly made it better.

Funding

The study was supported by the HSE Basic Research Program in 2023.

References

- Akinina Yu., Iskra E., Ivanova M., Grabovskaya M., Isaev D., Korkina I., Malyutina S., Sergeeva N. Stimulus database ‘Noun and object’: normative data collection for psycholinguistic variables. In A. Kibrik et al. (Eds.), *Sixth International Conference on Cognitive Science: Abstracts*. Kaliningrad, June 23-27 2014. Issue 6, 112–114.
- Alter A.L., Oppenheimer D.M., Epley N., & Eyre R.N. Overcoming intuition: metacognitive difficulty activates analytic reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2007, No. 136(4), 569–576. DOI: 10.1037/0096-3445.136.4.569

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Alter A.L., Oppenheimer D.M. Uniting the tribes of fluency to form a metacognitive nation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2009, No. 13(3), 219–235. DOI: 10.1177/1088868309341564

Ball B.H., Klein K.N., & Brewer G.A. Processing fluency mediates the influence of perceptual information on monitoring learning of educationally relevant materials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 2014, No. 20(4), 336–348. DOI: 10.1037/xap0000023

Berezner T.A., & Gorbunova E.S. Improving text memorization by changing fonts: the study of Sans Forgetica. *Psikhologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2021, No. 14(78), 2. DOI: 10.54359/ps.v14i78.155

Berezner T.A., & Gorbunova E.S. Reasoning and meta-reasoning are independent from the perceptual factors: perceptual disfluency study, *in press*.

Bjork R.A. 'Memory and metamemory considerations in the training of human beings'. In *Metacognition: Knowing about Knowing*, 1994, 185–205.

Bjork E.L., & Bjork R.A. Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. In *Psychology and the real world: Essays illustrating fundamental contributions to society*, 2011, 56–64.

Bjork R.A., & Yue C.L. Commentary: is disfluency desirable? *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 133–137. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-016-9156-8

Blinova E., & Shcherbakova O. When seeing is not believing: The role of illustrations in judging the reliability of information. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference "Neurobiology of Speech and Language"*, 2020, 50–51.

Craik F.I.M. & Lockhart R.S. Levels of processing: a framework for memory research, *Journal of Verbal learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1972, No. 11(6), 671–684. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5371(72)80001-X

Craik F.I.M. & Tulving E. Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 1975, No. 104(3), 268–294. DOI: 10.1037/0096-3445.104.3.268

Eitel A. & Köhl T. Effects of disfluency and test expectancy on learning with text. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11, 107–121. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-015-9145-3

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Eitel A., Kühn T., Scheiter K., & Gerjets P. Disfluency meets cognitive load in multimedia learning: Does harder-to-read mean better-to-understand? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(4), 488–501. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3004

Diemand-Yauman C., Oppenheimer D.M., Vaughan E.B. Fortune favors the Bold (and the Italicized): effects of disfluency on educational outcomes. *Cognition*, 2011, No. 118(1), 111–115. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2010.09.012

Faber M., Mills C., Kopp K., & D'mello S. The effect of disfluency on mind wandering during text comprehension. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2017, No. 24(3), 914–919. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-016-1153-z

French M.M.J., Blood A., Bright N.D., Futak D., Grohmann M.J., Hsthorpe A., Heritage J., Poland R.L., Reece S., Tabor J. Changing fonts in education: how the benefits vary with ability and dyslexia. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 2013, No. 106(4), 301–304. DOI: 10.1080/00220671.2012.736430

French M.M.J. Changing fonts in education: The time dependence of the benefits. 2013, retrieved from <http://matthewfrench.net/pubs/Changing%20Fonts%20in%20Education%20Time%20Dependence.pdf>

Geller J., Davis S. D., & Peterson D. Sans forgetica is not desirable for learning. *Memory*, 2020, No. 28(8), 957–967. DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2020.1797096

Geller J., Still M. L., Dark V.J., & Carpenter S.K. Would disfluency by any other name still be disfluent? Examining the disfluency effect with cursive handwriting. *Memory & Cognition*, 2018, No. 46(7), 1109–1126. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-018-0824-6

Glenberg A.M., & Langston W.E. Comprehension of illustrated text: Pictures help to build mental models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 1992, No. 31(2), 129–151. DOI: 10.1016/0749-596X(92)90008-L

Halamish V. Can very small font size enhance memory? *Memory & Cognition*, 2018, No. 46(6), 979–993. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-018-0816-6

Halamish V., Nachman H. and Katzir T. The effect of font size on children's memory and metamemory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2018, No. 9, 1577. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01577

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Katzir T., Hershko S., Halamish V. The effect of font size on reading comprehension on second and fifth grade children: bigger is not always better. *PLoS ONE*, 2013, No. 8(9): e74061. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0074061

Kühl T., Eitel A., Scheiter K., & Gerjets P. A call for an unbiased search for moderators in disfluency research: reply to Oppenheimer and Alter (2014). *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(5), 805–806. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-016-9154-x

Lee M.H. Effects of disfluent kanji fonts on reading retention with e-book. In 2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (481–482). IEEE.

Lehmann J., Goussios C., & Seufert T. Working memory capacity and disfluency effect: an aptitude-treatment-interaction study. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 89–105. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-015-9149-z

Magreehan D.A., Serra M.J., Schwartz N.H., & Narciss S. Further boundary conditions for the effects of perceptual disfluency on judgments of learning. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 35–56. DOI: 10.1007/S11409-015-9147-1

Meyer A., Frederick S., Burnham T.C., Guevara Pinto J.D., Boyer T.W., Ball L.J., Pennycook G., Ackerman R., Thompson V.A. & Schuldt J.P. Disfluent fonts don't help people solve math problems. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2015, No. 144(2), e16–e30. DOI: 10.1037/xge0000049

Miele D.B., Metcalfe J., Son L.K. Children's naive theories of intelligence influence their metacognitive judgments. *Children Development*, 2013, No. 84, 1879–1886. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12101

Oppenheimer D.M., & Alter A.L. The search for moderators in disfluency research. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(4), 502–504. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3023

Oppenheimer D.M., & Frank M.C. A rose in any other font would not smell as sweet: Effects of perceptual fluency on categorization. *Cognition*, 2008, No. 106(3), 1178–1194. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2007.05.010

Paivio A. Coding distinctions and repetition effects in memory. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, Academic Press, 1975, No. 9, 179–214. DOI: 10.1016/S0079-7421(08)60271-6

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect Paivio A. Dual coding theory and education. Draft chapter presented at the conference on Pathways to Literacy Achievement for High Poverty Children at The University of Michigan School of Education. 2006.

Pieger E., Mengelkamp C., & Bannert M. Metacognitive judgments and disfluency – Does disfluency lead to more accurate judgments, better control, and better performance? *Learning and Instruction*, 2016, No. 44, 31–40. DOI: 10.1016/J.LEARNINSTRUC.2016.01.012

Pieger E., Mengelkamp C., & Bannert M. Fostering analytic metacognitive processes and reducing overconfidence by disfluency: The role of contrast effects. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2017, No. 31(3), 291–301. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3326

Reber R., & Schwarz N. Effects of perceptual fluency on judgments of truth. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 1999, No. 8(3), 338–342. DOI: 10.1006/ccog.1999.0386

Reber R., Schwarz N., & Winkielman P. Processing fluency and aesthetic pleasure: Is beauty in the perceiver's processing experience? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2004, No. 8(4), 364–382. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0804_3

Rhodes M.G. & Castel A.D. Memory predictions are influenced by perceptual information: Evidence for metacognitive illusions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 2008, No. 137, 615–625. DOI: 10.1037/a0013684

Rummer R., Schweppe J., & Schwede A. Fortune is fickle: null-effects of disfluency on learning outcomes. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 57–70. DOI: 10.1007/S11409-015-9151-5

Sanchez C.A., & Jaeger A.J. If it's hard to read, it changes how long you do it: Reading time as an explanation for perceptual fluency effects on judgment. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2015, No. 22(1), 206–211. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-014-0658-6

Sanchez C.A., & Naylor J.S. Disfluent presentations lead to the creation of more false memories. *PloS ONE*, 2018, No. 13(1), e0191735. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0191735

Seufert T., Wagner F., & Westphal J. The effects of different levels of disfluency on learning outcomes and cognitive load. *Instructional Science*, 2017, No. 45(2), 221–238. DOI: 10.1007/S11251-016-9387-8

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Sirota M., Theodoropoulou A., & Juanchich M. Disfluent fonts do not help people to solve math and
non-math problems regardless of their numeracy. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 2021, No. 27(1), 142–159.
DOI: 10.1080/13546783.2020.1759689

Strukelj A., Scheiter K., Nyström M., & Holmqvist K. Exploring the lack of a disfluency effect:
Evidence from eye movements. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 71–88. DOI:
10.1007/s11409-015-9146-2

Sungkhasettee V.W., Friedman M.C., & Castel A.D. Memory and metamemory for inverted words:
Illusions of competency and desirable difficulties. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 2011,
No. 18(5), 973–978. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-011-0114-9

Taylor A., Sanson M., Burnell R., Wade K. A., & Garry M. Disfluent difficulties are not desirable
difficulties: the (lack of) effect of Sans Forgetica on memory. *Memory*, 2020, No. 28(7), 850–857.
DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2020.1758726

Thiessen M., Beier S., & Keage H. A Review of the Cognitive Effects of Disfluent Typography on
Functional Reading. *The Design Journal*, 2020, No. 23(5), 797–815. DOI:
10.1080/14606925.2020.1810434

Weissgerber S.C., & Reinhard M.A. Is disfluency desirable for learning? *Learning and Instruction*,
2017, No. 49, 199–217. DOI: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.02.004

Xie H., Zhou Z. & Liu Q. Null effects of perceptual disfluency on learning outcomes in a text-based
educational context: a Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2018, No. 30, 745–771. DOI:
10.1007/s10648-018-9442-x

Yue C.L., Castel A.D. & Bjork R.A. When disfluency is – and is not – a desirable difficulty: The
influence of typeface clarity on metacognitive judgments and memory. *Memory & Cognition*, 2013,
No. 41(2), 229–241. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-012-0255-8

Поступила в редакцию: 16 марта 2023 г. Дата публикации: 27 февраля 2024 г.

Information about authors

Berezner Timofei Alexandrovich. Research Assistant, Laboratory for Cognitive Psychology of Digital Interface Users, PhD Student, School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, HSE University, Moscow, Russia.

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
E-mail: tberezner@hse.ru

Gorbunova Elena Sergeevna. PhD in Psychology, Laboratory Head, Laboratory for Cognitive Psychology of Digital Interface Users, Associate Professor, School of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, HSE University, Moscow, Russia

E-mail: esgorbunova@hse.ru

To cite this article

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect. *Psikhologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2023, Vol. 16, No. 92, p. 2. <https://psystudy.ru>

Article addresses: <https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v16i92.1489>

Березнер Т.А.¹, Горбунова Е.С.¹ Наличие изображений не является модератором эффекта не-беглости

¹ Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики», Москва, Россия

Эффект не-беглости – это улучшение запоминания информации, если ее обработка является затруднительной. Не-беглость обычно создается путем изменения перцептивных характеристик информации. Эффект не-беглости был показан в нескольких исследованиях, но число последующих неудачных его репликаций больше. Среди возможных причин, по которым эффект не-беглости часто не удается обнаружить, мы рассматриваем наличие изображений, сопровождающих текстовую информацию, в качестве возможного модератора этого эффекта. Мы предполагаем, что эффект не-беглости проявится только при отсутствии изображений.

Были проведены два эксперимента, в ходе которых участникам была представлена информация, написанная либо шрифтом Arial (беглое условие), либо Comic Sans (не-беглое условие). Информация также либо сопровождалась изображениями, либо нет. В первом эксперименте участников (n = 144) попросили запомнить 40 слов, во втором (n = 142) – 7 вымышленных фактов о Земле. В обоих случаях гипотезы не подтвердились – эффект не-беглости не проявлялся ни при каких условиях.

Ключевые слова: эффект не-беглости, шрифты, изображения, память, обучение, желательные трудности

Благодарности

Авторы благодарят Марию Протопову и Ольгу Мадфес за их помощь в создании стимульного материала и сбора данных. Авторы также благодарят анонимного рецензента за его ценные комментарии о данной работе, которые, несомненно, сделали ее лучше.

Финансирование

Исследование осуществлено в рамках Программы фундаментальных исследований НИУ ВШЭ в 2023 году.

Литература

Акинина Ю.С., Искра Е.В., Иванова М.В., Грабовская М.А., Исаев Д.Ю., Коркина И.Д., Мажютина С.А., Сергеева Н.Ю. Библиотека стимулов «Существительное и объект»: нормирование психолингвистических параметров. // В кн.: Шестая международная конференция по когнитивной науке: Тезисы докладов. Калининград, 23–27 июня 2014 г. / Под общ. ред.: Кибрик и др. Вып. 6. Калининград : [б.и.], 2014, 112–114

Березнер Т., Горбунова Е. Улучшение запоминания текста посредством изменения шрифтов: исследование Sans Forgetica. Психологические исследования, 2021, No. 14(78). <https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v14i78.155>

Alter A.L., Oppenheimer D.M., Epley N., & Eyre R.N. Overcoming intuition: metacognitive difficulty activates analytic reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2007, No. 136(4), 569–576. DOI: 10.1037/0096-3445.136.4.569

Alter A.L., Oppenheimer D.M. Uniting the tribes of fluency to form a metacognitive nation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2009, No. 13(3), 219–235. DOI: 10.1177/1088868309341564

Ball B.H., Klein K.N., & Brewer G A. Processing fluency mediates the influence of perceptual information on monitoring learning of educationally relevant materials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 2014, No. 20(4), 336–348. DOI: 10.1037/xap0000023

Berezner T.A., & Gorbunova E.S. Reasoning and meta-reasoning are independent from the perceptual factors: perceptual disfluency study, *in press*.

Bjork R.A. ‘Memory and metamemory considerations in the training of human beings’. In *Metacognition: Knowing about Knowing*, 1994, 185–205.

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Bjork E.L., & Bjork R.A. Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable
difficulties to enhance learning. In *Psychology and the real world: Essays illustrating fundamental
contributions to society*, 2011, 56–64.

Bjork R.A., & Yue C.L. Commentary: is disfluency desirable? *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016,
No. 11(1), 133–137. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-016-9156-8

Blinova E., & Shcherbakova O. When seeing is not believing: The role of illustrations in judging the
reliability of information. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference "Neurobiology of
Speech and Language"*, 2020, 50–51.

Craik F.I.M. & Lockhart R.S. Levels of processing: a framework for memory research, *Journal of
Verbal learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1972, No. 11(6), 671–684. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-
5371(72)80001-X

Craik F.I.M. & Tulving E. Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Jour-
nal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 1975, No. 104(3), 268–294. DOI: 10.1037/0096-
3445.104.3.268

Eitel A. & Kühl T. Effects of disfluency and test expectancy on learning with text. *Metacognition and
Learning*, 2016, No. 11, 107–121. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-015-9145-3

Eitel A., Kühl T., Scheiter K., & Gerjets P. Disfluency meets cognitive load in multimedia learning:
Does harder-to-read mean better-to-understand? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(4),
488–501. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3004

Diemand-Yauman C., Oppenheimer D.M., Vaughan E.B. Fortune favors the Bold (and the Italicized):
effects of disfluency on educational outcomes. *Cognition*, 2011, No. 118(1), 111–115. DOI:
10.1016/j.cognition.2010.09.012

Faber M., Mills C., Kopp K., & D'mello S. The effect of disfluency on mind wandering during text
comprehension. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2017, No. 24(3), 914–919. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-
016-1153-z

French M.M.J., Blood A., Bright N.D., Futak D., Grohmann M.J., Hsthorpe A., Heritage J., Poland
R.L., Reece S., Tabor J. Changing fonts in education: how the benefits vary with ability and dyslexia.

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
The Journal of Educational Research, 2013, No. 106(4), 301–304. DOI:
10.1080/00220671.2012.736430

French M.M.J. Changing fonts in education: The time dependence of the benefits. 2013, retrieved
from <http://matthewfrench.net/pubs/Changing%20Fonts%20in%20Education%20Time%20Dependence.pdf>

Geller J., Davis S.D., & Peterson D. Sans forgetica is not desirable for learning. *Memory*, 2020, No. 28(8), 957–967. DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2020.1797096

Geller J., Still M.L., Dark V.J., & Carpenter S.K. Would disfluency by any other name still be disfluent? Examining the disfluency effect with cursive handwriting. *Memory & Cognition*, 2018, No. 46(7), 1109–1126. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-018-0824-6

Glenberg A.M., & Langston W.E. Comprehension of illustrated text: Pictures help to build mental models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 1992, No. 31(2), 129–151. DOI: 10.1016/0749-596X(92)90008-L

Halamish V. Can very small font size enhance memory? *Memory & Cognition*, 2018, No. 46(6), 979–993. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-018-0816-6

Halamish V., Nachman H. and Katzir T. The effect of font size on children’s memory and metamemory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2018, No. 9, 1577. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01577

Katzir T., Hershko S., Halamish V. The effect of font size on reading comprehension on second and fifth grade children: bigger is not always better. *PLoS ONE*, 2013, No. 8(9): e74061. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0074061

Kühl T., Eitel A., Scheiter K., & Gerjets P. A call for an unbiased search for moderators in disfluency research: reply to Oppenheimer and Alter (2014). *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(5), 805–806. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-016-9154-x

Lee M.H. Effects of disfluent kanji fonts on reading retention with e-book. In 2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (481–482). IEEE.

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Lehmann J., Goussios C., & Seufert T. Working memory capacity and disfluency effect: an aptitude-treatment-interaction study. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 89–105. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-015-9149-z

Magreehan D.A., Serra M.J., Schwartz N.H., & Narciss S. Further boundary conditions for the effects of perceptual disfluency on judgments of learning. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 35–56. DOI: 10.1007/S11409-015-9147-1

Meyer A., Frederick S., Burnham T.C., Guevara Pinto J.D., Boyer T.W., Ball L.J., Pennycook G., Ackerman R., Thompson V.A. & Schuldt J.P. Disfluent fonts don't help people solve math problems. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2015, No. 144(2), e16–e30. DOI: 10.1037/xge0000049

Miele D.B., Metcalfe J., Son L.K. Children's naive theories of intelligence influence their metacognitive judgments. *Children Development*, 2013, No. 84, 1879–1886. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12101

Oppenheimer D.M., & Alter A.L. The search for moderators in disfluency research. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2014, No. 28(4), 502–504. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3023

Oppenheimer D.M., & Frank M.C. A rose in any other font would not smell as sweet: Effects of perceptual fluency on categorization. *Cognition*, 2008, No. 106(3), 1178–1194. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2007.05.010

Paivio A. Coding distinctions and repetition effects in memory. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, Academic Press, 1975, No. 9, 179–214. DOI: 10.1016/S0079-7421(08)60271-6

Paivio A. Dual coding theory and education. Draft chapter presented at the conference on Pathways to Literacy Achievement for High Poverty Children at The University of Michigan School of Education. 2006.

Pieger E., Mengelkamp C., & Bannert M. Metacognitive judgments and disfluency – Does disfluency lead to more accurate judgments, better control, and better performance? *Learning and Instruction*, 2016, No. 44, 31–40. DOI: 10.1016/J.LEARNINSTRUC.2016.01.012

Pieger E., Mengelkamp C., & Bannert M. Fostering analytic metacognitive processes and reducing overconfidence by disfluency: The role of contrast effects. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2017, No. 31(3), 291–301. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3326

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Reber R., & Schwarz N. Effects of perceptual fluency on judgments of truth. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 1999, No. 8(3), 338–342. DOI: 10.1006/ccog.1999.0386

Reber R., Schwarz N., & Winkielman P. Processing fluency and aesthetic pleasure: Is beauty in the perceiver's processing experience? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2004, No. 8(4), 364–382. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0804_3

Rhodes M.G. & Castel A.D. Memory predictions are influenced by perceptual information: Evidence for metacognitive illusions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 2008, No. 137, 615–625. DOI: 10.1037/a0013684

Rummer R., Schweppe J., & Schwede A. Fortune is fickle: null-effects of disfluency on learning outcomes. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 57–70. DOI: 10.1007/S11409-015-9151-5

Sanchez C.A., & Jaeger A.J. If it's hard to read, it changes how long you do it: Reading time as an explanation for perceptual fluency effects on judgment. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2015, No. 22(1), 206–211. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-014-0658-6

Sanchez C.A., & Naylor J.S. Disfluent presentations lead to the creation of more false memories. *PloS ONE*, 2018, No. 13(1), e0191735. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0191735

Seufert T., Wagner F., & Westphal J. The effects of different levels of disfluency on learning outcomes and cognitive load. *Instructional Science*, 2017, No. 45(2), 221–238. DOI: 10.1007/S11251-016-9387-8

Sirota M., Theodoropoulou A., & Juanchich M. Disfluent fonts do not help people to solve math and non-math problems regardless of their numeracy. *Thinking & Reasoning*, 2021, No. 27(1), 142–159. DOI: 10.1080/13546783.2020.1759689

Strukelj A., Scheiter K., Nyström M., & Holmqvist K. Exploring the lack of a disfluency effect: Evidence from eye movements. *Metacognition and Learning*, 2016, No. 11(1), 71–88. DOI: 10.1007/s11409-015-9146-2

Sungkhasettee V.W., Friedman M.C., & Castel A.D. Memory and metamemory for inverted words: Illusions of competency and desirable difficulties. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 2011, No. 18(5), 973–978. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-011-0114-9

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect
Taylor A., Sanson M., Burnell R., Wade K.A., & Garry M. Disfluent difficulties are not desirable
difficulties: the (lack of) effect of Sans Forgetica on memory. *Memory*, 2020, No. 28(7), 850–857.
DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2020.1758726

Thiessen M., Beier S., & Keage H. A Review of the Cognitive Effects of Disfluent Typography on
Functional Reading. *The Design Journal*, 2020, No. 23(5), 797–815. DOI:
10.1080/14606925.2020.1810434

Weissgerber S.C., & Reinhard M.A. Is disfluency desirable for learning? *Learning and Instruction*,
2017, No. 49, 199–217. DOI: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.02.004

Xie H., Zhou Z. & Liu Q. Null effects of perceptual disfluency on learning outcomes in a text-based
educational context: a Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2018, No. 30, 745–771. DOI:
10.1007/s10648-018-9442-x

Yue C.L., Castel A.D., & Bjork R.A. When disfluency is – and is not – a desirable difficulty: The
influence of typeface clarity on metacognitive judgments and memory. *Memory & Cognition*, 2013,
No. 41(2), 229–241. DOI: 10.3758/s13421-012-0255-8

Сведения об авторах

Березнер Тимофей Александрович. Стажер-исследователь научно-учебной лаборатории ко-
гнитивной психологии пользователя цифровых интерфейсов, аспирант департамента психо-
логии, факультета социальных наук, Национальный исследовательский университет Высшая
Школа Экономики, ул. Мясницкая, д. 20, 101000, Москва, Россия.

E-mail: tberezner@hse.ru

Горбунова Елена Сергеевна. Кандидат психологических наук, заведующий научно-учебной
лабораторией когнитивной психологии пользователя цифровых интерфейсов, доцент департа-
мента психологии, факультета социальных наук, Национальный исследовательский универси-
тет Высшая Школа Экономики, ул. Мясницкая, д. 20, 101000, Москва, Россия

E-mail: esgorbunova@hse.ru

Ссылка для цитирования

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect.

Психологические исследования. 2023. Т. 16, No 92. С. 2. URL: <https://psystudy.ru>

Психологические исследования 2023 Т 16 No. 92


<https://psystudy.ru>


Appendices

Appendix 1. Words-stimuli for Experiment 1 (in Russian)

Арфа	Икра	Овца	Пуля
Бита	Киви	Окно	Река
Бусы	Коза	Орех	Роза
Ваза	Лиса	Осел	Рука
Весы	Лужа	Очки	Рыба
Вино	Лыжи	Паук	Сова
Гиря	Муха	Перо	Утка
Гора	Нога	Пиво	Утюг
Духи	Нора	Пила	Часы
Игла	Нота	Поле	Шуба

Appendix 2. Images-stimuli for Experiment 1





Appendix 3. Facts-stimuli for Experiment 2 (in Russian)

- 1) Небольшое тропическое дерево Саподилла – самое токсичное растение на Земле. Каждая его часть, кроме плодов, ядовита, в том числе и семена.
- 2) Самое массовое вымирание за всю историю Земли произошло в конце Юрского периода. Тогда погибло около 99% животных планеты.

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect

- 3) Каждый месяц ученые открывают 300 новых видов морских животных. Предположительно, более 75% видов все еще не изучены.
- 4) В Средиземном море находится единственная в мире подводная река. Ее длина составляет 400 км, а расстояние между берегами – 35 метров.
- 5) Каждый год на Земле происходит около 500 миллионов землетрясений. Лишь около 100 из них достаточно сильны, чтобы причинить заметные разрушения.
- 6) Южный полюс – это территория Земли, покрытая антарктическим льдом. Он содержит около 20% пресной воды на планете и примерно 50% всего льда.
- 7) Самое засушливое место на планете – пустыня Атакама, расположенная в Чили и Перу. В ней дождя не было никогда.

Appendix 4. Test questions for Experiment 2 (in Russian)

- 1) Самое токсичное растение на Земле называется Сабадилла (да/нет, here and further the correct answer is underlined; ‘да’ means yes, ‘нет’ means no)
- 2) У самого токсичного растения не являются ядовитыми только семена (да/нет)
- 3) Самое массовое вымирание на Земле произошло в конце Юрского периода (да/нет)
- 4) В ходе самого массового вымирания погибло около 90% животных (да/нет)
- 5) Ученые открывают около 300 новых видов морских животных ежемесячно (да/нет)
- 6) 75% видов морских животных еще не изучено (да/нет)
- 7) Единственная в мире подводная река находится в Красном море (да/нет)
- 8) Длина подводной реки составляет 400 километров (да/нет)
- 9) Ежегодно происходит 500 тысяч землетрясений (да/нет)
- 10) Из всех землетрясений лишь 100 в год могут принести ощутимый вред (да/нет)
- 11) Около 50% от общемировых запасов пресной воды находится на Южном полюсе (да/нет)

Berezner T.A., Gorbunova E.S. The presence of images does not moderate the disfluency effect

12) Около 50% от общемирового количества льда находится на Южном полюсе (да/нет)

13) Пустыня Атакама находится в Чили и Перу (да/нет)

14) Последний раз дождь в пустыне Атакама был в 1750 году (да/нет)

Appendix 5. Images-stimuli for Experiment 2