Sans Forgetica is Not Desirable for Learning

Jason Geller¹, Sara D. Davis², & Daniel Peterson²

¹ Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University

² Skidmore College

Memory, in press

Author Note

Jason Geller 0000-0002-7459-4505

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jason Geller, Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, 152 Frelinghuysen Road, Busch Campus. Piscataway, New Jersey 08854 E-mail: jason.geller1@rutgers.edu

Abstract

Do students learn better with material that is perceptually hard to process? While evidence is mixed, recent claims suggest that placing materials in Sans Forgetica, a perceptually difficult-to-process typeface, has positive impacts on student learning. Given the weak evidence for other similar perceptual disfluency effects, we examined the mnemonic effects of Sans Forgetica more closely in comparison to other learning strategies across three preregistered experiments. In Experiment 1, participants studied weakly related cue-target pairs with targets presented in either Sans Forgetica or with missing letters (e.g., cue: G_RL, the generation effect). Cued recall performance showed a robust effect of generation, but no Sans Forgetica memory benefit. In Experiment 2, participants read an educational passage about ground water with select sentences presented in either Sans Forgetica typeface, yellow pre-highlighting, or unmodified. Cued recall for select words was better for pre-highlighted information than an unmodified pure reading condition. Critically, presenting sentences in Sans Forgetica did not elevate cued recall compared to an unmodified pure reading condition or a pre-highlighted condition. In Experiment 3, individuals did not have better discriminability for Sans Forgetica relative to a fluent condition in an old-new recognition test. Our findings suggest that Sans Forgetica really is forgettable.

Keywords: Disfluency, Desirable Difficulties, Learning and Memory, Education, Recall/Recognition

Sans Forgetica is Not Desirable for Learning

Students want to remember more and forget less. Being able to recall and apply previously learned information is key for successful academic performance at all levels. Many students are attracted to learning interventions that require minimal effort, but such approaches are rarely the best ways to achieve durable learning (Geller, Toftness, et al., 2018). Research in both the laboratory and classroom supports the paradoxical idea that making the encoding or retrieval of information more difficult, not easier, has the desirable effect of improving long-term retention (Bjork & Bjork, 2011). Notable examples of desirable difficulties include the generation effect (improved memory for information that has been actively generated rather than passively read; see Bertsch et al., 2007; Slamecka & Graf, 1978), and the testing effect (improved memory for information that was actively recalled rather than passively re-read; see Kornell & Vaughn, 2016).

Research has conclusively established that when encoding is sufficiently effortful, memory outcomes improve. More recently, attention has focused on just *how* effortful that processing needs to be to observe mnemonic benefits. Specifically, researchers have examined whether subtle perceptual manipulations that change the physical characteristics of to-be-learned stimuli (rendering them harder to read or more disfluent) can similarly improve retention. Some research suggests it can. Diemand-Yauman et al. (2011), for instance, demonstrated that placing words in atypical typefaces (e.g., Comic Sans, Montype Corsiva) resulted in better memory than if the material was in a common typeface. A similar perceptual disfluency effect has been found with other perceptual manipulations including masking (e.g., presenting a stimulus very briefly (~100 ms) and forward or backing masking it; Mulligan, 1996), inversion (Sungkhasettee et al., 2011), blurring (Rosner 2015), and handwriting (Geller, Still et al., 2018). The predominant

theoretical explanation unifying these effects is that disfluency triggers metacognitive monitoring (“This is difficult to process”), which subsequently cues the learner to engage in deeper (i.e., more semantic) processing of material (but see Geller, Still, et al., 2018 for an alternative account).

Though this makes for a compelling story, other research casts serious doubt on disfluency as an effective pedagogical tool (e.g., Magreehan et al., 2016; Rhodes & Castel, 2008, 2009; Rummer et al., 2016; Yue et al., 2013). A recent meta-analysis by Xie et al. (2018), including 25 studies and 3,135 participants, found a small, non-significant effect of perceptual disfluency on recall ($d = -0.01$) and transfer ($d = 0.03$). Most damning, despite having no mnemonic effect, perceptual disfluency manipulations generally produced longer reading times ($d = 0.52$) and lower judgments of learning (JOLs) ($d = -0.43$).

In trying to make sense of these disparate results, it is important to consider boundary conditions of the disfluency effect (see Geller & Still, 2018). As Geller, Still, et al. (2018) argue, not all perceptual disfluency manipulations are created equal. Looking at memory outcomes for information presented in print or disfluent handwritten cursive that was either easy or hard-to-read, Geller, Still, et al. showed both easy and hard-to-read cursive were better remembered than print, but easy-to-read cursive was better remembered than hard-to-read cursive. This pattern suggests that disfluency manipulations can enhance memory, but such manipulations need to be optimally disfluent to exert a positive effect on memory.

Recently, a team of psychologists, graphic designers, and marketers set to create a new typeface specifically optimized to improve retention through perceptual disfluency. According to an interview from Earp (2018), to create the optimal typeface, the team conducted a cued recall experiment ($N = 96$) wherein participants read 20 related word pairs (e.g., *girl* - *guy*) each for 100

ms in a normal typeface (Albion) or one of three different disfluent typefaces (slightly disfluent, moderately disfluent, or extremely disfluent). They found an inverted U-shaped pattern wherein the moderately disfluent typeface was better remembered than the slightly and extremely disfluent typefaces. Further, they found that pairs in the moderately disfluent font were recalled slightly better than the normal font, although whether this meets the criteria for statistical significance is unclear. As a result of the memory boost, the team coined this moderately disfluent typeface Sans Forgetica. Sans Forgetica typeface itself is a variant of sans serif typeface with intermittent gaps in letters that are back slanted (see Figure 1). The intermittent gaps of Sans Forgetica are thought to require readers to generate or fill in the missing pieces, thereby producing a memory advantage. This mechanism of action is thought to be similar to that of the generation effect, wherein information is better remembered when actively generated rather than passively read (Slamecka & Graf, 1978).

To examine the effects of Sans Forgetica under more educationally realistic conditions, the Sans Forgetica team presented participants ($N = 303$) with 5 passages (~250 words in total) where one paragraph of three was presented in either the Sans Forgetica typeface or left in an unmodified (Arial) typeface (manipulated between subjects; Earp, 2018). For the Sans Forgetica condition, after each passage was read, participants were asked one question about the information written in the Sans Forgetica typeface and another question about the information written in Arial typeface. Performance was compared to the group that was presented with information in a Arial font. Placing text passages in the Sans Forgetica typeface resulted in better memory than if materials were presented in a normal typeface.

Since the release of the Sans Forgetica typeface, there has been a great deal of attention from the press. Sans Forgetica received coverage from major news sources like the *Washington*

Post National Public Radio, and *The Guardian*. In 2019, Sans Forgetica won the GoodDesign, Best in Class Award (Good Design, 2019). Commercially, Sans Forgetica typeface is freely available to users, and is marketed as a study tool. Despite all the attention and marketing, empirical evidence for Sans Forgetica typeface is lacking.

Initial evidence for the Sans Forgetica typeface comes from the aforementioned unpublished studies by the Sans Forgetica development team (Earp, 2018). Note that none of these claims were subjected to the peer-review process. However, some evidence for the effectiveness of the Sans Forgetica typeface comes from a study conducted by Eskenazi and Nix (2020), who found that words and definitions in Sans Forgetica typeface led to better orthographic discriminability (i.e., choosing the correct spelling of a word) and semantic acquisition (i.e., retrieving the definition of a word), but only if participants were good spellers. This suggests that the utility of the Sans Forgetica typeface as a study tool may be quite limited. Recently, Taylor et al. (2020) conducted one of the first conceptual replications of the Sans Forgetica team's initial findings. They found that while Sans Forgetica is perceived as more effortful or difficult (Experiment 1), memory performance was not enhanced for highly related word pairs (Experiment 2) or prose passages (Experiments 3-4). In fact, Sans Forgetica seemed to impair rather than enhance memory for words on a cued recall test (Experiment 2). Based on these findings, it does not appear that Sans Forgetica typeface acts as a desirable difficulty.

The Present Studies

The question of Sans Forgetica's effectiveness at producing a mnemonic benefit has clear educational implications. Demonstrating support for a purported study aid as quick and easy as swapping to-be-learned text from one typeface to another would be a boon for students. However, recent research calls into question the legitimacy of this typeface as a study aid at all

(Taylor et al., 2020). Given the mixed evidence, the current set of studies aimed to further investigate the mnemonic benefit of the Sans Forgetica effect on memory.

Across three experiments we expand upon the initial findings of Taylor et al. (2020). In Experiment 1 we presented weakly related cue-target pairs (as opposed to highly related cue-target pairs) in normal (Arial) and Sans Forgetica typefaces for a longer duration (5 seconds). In Experiment 2, we examined Sans Forgetica using a more complex prose passage. Importantly, we also compared the Sans Forgetica effect with other, well established and empirically supported learning techniques: generation (Experiment 1) and pre-highlighting (Experiment 2). In Experiment 3, we examined whether the Sans Forgetica effect might arise in a recognition test. To date, no studies have used recognition memory tests to evaluate the effectiveness of the Sans Forgetica font. Given the prevalence of recognition tests in educational settings (e.g., multiple-choice tests), this has particular applied value.

Experiment 1

In Experiment 1 we were interested in answering two questions. Does Sans Forgetica facilitate the retention of weakly associated cue-target pairs? If so, is this facilitation similar in magnitude to another desirable difficulty phenomenon—the generation effect? Taylor et al. (2020; Experiment 2) used cue-target pairs that were highly associated and failed to find a memory benefit for Sans Forgetica typeface. It has been argued (e.g. Carpenter, 2009) that weakly related cue-target pairs produce more elaborative processing and lead to better memory, especially when the targets to be remembered require generation or retrieval (called the elaborative retrieval hypothesis). It is possible, then, that the use of highly associated pairs in Taylor et al. (2020) and the Sans Forgetica team (Earp, 2018) served to dampen the Sans

Forgetica typeface effect. In Experiment 1 we examined the mnemonic benefit of Sans Forgetica and generation by looking at cued recall performance with weakly associated cue-target pairs. In addition, we opted to present pairs for five seconds rather than the 100 ms duration used by Taylor et al. (2020) and Sans Forgetica team (Earp, 2018). With a 100 ms duration, participants might have struggled to read the word pairs properly, or to process the word pairs deeply enough, for any benefits of Sans Forgetica to take effect.

Method

Sample size, experimental design, hypotheses, outcome measures, and analysis plan for each experiment were pre-registered and can be found on the Open Science Framework (Experiments 1 and 2: <https://osf.io/d2vy8/>; Experiment 3: <https://osf.io/dsxrc/>). All raw and summary data, materials, and R scripts for pre-processing, analysis, and plotting can be found at <https://osf.io/d2vy8/>.

Participants

We recruited subjects on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) platform, all of whom completed the study using Qualtrics survey software. A total of 232 people completed the experiment in return for U.S.\$1.00. Sample size was based on a priori power analyses conducted using PANGAEA v0.2 (Westfall, 2015). Sample size was calculated based on the smallest effect of interest (SESOI; Lakens & Evers, 2014). In this case, we were interested in powering our study to detect a medium sized interaction effect between the generation effect and the Sans Forgetica effect ($d = .35$). We choose this effect size as our SESOI due in part to the small effect sizes seen in actual classroom studies (Butler et al., 2014). Therefore, assuming an alpha of .05 and a desired power of 90%, a sample size of 230 is required to detect whether an interaction effect size

of .35 differs from zero. No participants met our pre-registered exclusion criteria (i.e., did not complete the experiment, started the experiment multiple times, experienced technical problems, or reported familiarity with the stimuli), yielding 116 participants in each between-subjects condition.¹

Design

Fluency (fluent vs. disfluent) was manipulated within subjects and Disfluency Type (Generation vs. Sans Forgetica) was manipulated between subjects. For the Sans Forgetica condition, disfluent targets were presented in Sans Forgetica typeface while fluent targets were presented in Arial typeface. In the Generation condition, disfluent targets were presented in Arial typeface with missing letters (vowels replaced by underscores) and fluent targets were intact. See Figure 1 for an example of the stimuli used.

Materials and Procedure

Participants were presented with 22 weakly related cue-target pairs taken from Carpenter et al. (2006).² The pairs were all nouns, 5–7 letters and 1–3 syllables in length, high in concreteness (400–700), high in frequency (at least 30 per million), and had similar forward ($M = 0.031$) and backward ($M = 0.033$) association strengths. Two counterbalanced lists were created for each Disfluency Type (Generation and Sans Forgetica) so that each item could be presented in each fluency condition without repeating any items for an individual participant.

¹ Due to a programming error, the English fluency question was not asked.

² Two cue-target pairs (e.g., *range-rifle* and *train-plane*) had to be thrown out as they were not presented due to a coding error. This left us with 22 weakly related cue-target pairs.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: the generation condition or the Sans Forgetica condition. Prior to studying the pairs, participants were instructed to mentally “fill in” the targets to come up with the correct target. Participants were also told to study word pairs so that later they could recall the target when presented with the cue. The experiment began with the presentation of the word pairs, presented one at a time, for five seconds each. After a short two-minute distraction task (anagram generation), participants completed a self-paced cued recall test. During cued recall, participants were presented 22 cues, one at a time in a random order and asked to type in the target word. All cue words were presented in Arial font, regardless of Disfluency Type group. A short demographics survey followed this final test, after which participants were debriefed.

Scoring

Spell checking was automated with the hunspell package in R (Ooms, 2018). Using this package, each response was corrected for misspellings. Corrected spellings are provided in the most probable order; therefore, the first suggestion was always selected as the correct answer. As a second pass, we manually examined the output to catch incorrect suggestions. If the response was close to the correct response, it was marked as correct.

Analytical Strategy

For all the experiments, an alpha level of .05 is maintained. Cohen’s d and generalized eta-squared (η_g^2 ; Olejnik & Algina, 2003) are used as effect size measures. Alongside traditional analyses that utilize null hypothesis significance testing (NHST), we also report the Bayes factors for each analysis. All prior probabilities are Cauchy distributions centered at zero, and effect

sizes are specified through the r-scale, which is the interquartile range (i.e., how spread out the middle 50% of the distribution is). For the null model, the prior is set to zero. All data were analyzed in R (vers. 3.5.0; R Core Team, 2019). All R packages used in this paper can be found under the disclosures section.

Results and Discussion

Per our preregistration, cued recall accuracy was analyzed with a 2 (Fluency: Fluent vs. Disfluent) $\times$ 2 (Disfluency Type: Generation vs. Sans Forgetica) mixed ANOVA. There was no difference in cued recall between the Generation and Sans Forgetica groups, $F(1, 230) = 0.19$, $\eta_g^2 < .001$, $p = .752$. Individuals recalled more disfluent target words than fluent target words, $F(1, 230) = 25.31$, $\eta_g^2 = .02$, $p < .001$. This effect was qualified by an interaction between Difficulty Type and Fluency, $F(1, 230) = 25.06$, $\eta_g^2 = .02$, $p < .001$. A Bayesian ANOVA indicated strong evidence for the interaction model over the main effects model, $BF_{10} > 100$. As seen in Fig. 2, the magnitude of the generation effect was larger ($d = 0.67$) than the Sans Forgetica effect, which was, in fact, negligible ($d = 0.002$).

While the benefit of generating information was clear, there was no benefit of studying items in the Sans Forgetica typeface. Thus, presenting weakly associated targets in Sans Forgetica for two seconds produced no memory benefit. This null result was confirmed by a Bayesian analysis denoting strong evidence for the presence of the interaction compared to a main effects model. Although participants' overall accuracy was low in the current experiment (38%), it is important to note that the level of performance was comparable to what was observed by Carpenter et al. (2006) using the same materials (30% overall for restudy vs. tested trials). In addition, accuracy was comparable to Experiment 2 from Taylor et al. (2020) who used highly

related cue target pairs (~45%). Finally, overall performance was strong enough to reveal a significant generation effect, minimizing concerns that a difficult task might be suppressing an otherwise robust effect of Sans Forgetica. Taken together, these results suggest that (1) presenting materials in Sans Forgetica does not lead to better memory and (2) the effect of Sans Forgetica on memory is most likely not a desirable difficulty.

Experiment 2

Experiment 1 failed to reveal a memory benefit for the Sans Forgetica typeface. One potential limitation is that the atomistic stimuli employed in Experiment 1 (cue-target word pairs) may not provide an ecologically valid lens under which to study real classroom learning. To address this, in Experiment 2, we examined the mnemonic effects of Sans Forgetica using more complex prose materials. Like before, we wanted to compare the (potential) benefits of Sans Forgetica to something with empirical scrutiny. Accordingly, in Experiment 2, we examined how Sans Forgetica stacked up against pre-highlighting.

One of the purported functions of the Sans Forgetica typeface is to call attention to information one needs to remember. This is functionally similar to pre-highlighting, whereby important study information is highlighted prior to studying. Pre-highlighting is often used by instructors and textbook creators to enhance learning. Indeed, when students read pre-highlighted passages, there is some evidence that they recall more of the highlighted information and less of the non-highlighted information when compared to students who receive an unmarked copy of the same passage (Fowler & Barker, 1974; Silvers & Kreiner, 1997). To this end, Experiment 2 compared cued recall performance on a prose passage where some of the sentences were either presented in Sans Forgetica, pre-highlighted in yellow, or unmodified text. We hypothesized that

255 both Sans Forgetica and pre-highlighting should enhance memory for selected passages
256 compared to an unmodified passage.

257 **Method**

258 *Participants*

259 We preregistered a sample size of 510 (170 per group) based on our SESOI ($d = 0.35$).
260 When initial data collection finished, 683 undergraduate students had participated for partial
261 completion of course credit. After excluding participants based on our preregistered exclusion
262 criteria (see above), we were left with unequal group sizes. Because of this, we ran six
263 more participants per group, giving us 528 participants—176 participants in each of the three
264 conditions.

265 266 *Materials*

267 Participants read a passage on ground water (856 words) taken from the U.S. Geological
268 Survey (see Yue, Storm, Kornell, & Bjork, 2014). Eleven critical phrases,³ each containing a
269 different keyword, were selected from the passage (e.g., the term *recharge* was the keyword in
270 the phrase “Water seeping down from the land surface adds to the ground water and is called
271 recharge water”) and were presented in yellow (pre-highlighted), Sans Forgetica typeface, or
272 unmodified typeface. The questions were selected based on sentences in the original passage that

³ Originally, we had 12 critical phrases, but a pilot test showed that one of the questions appeared twice and accuracy was low. Instead of adding another question, we removed one question from the final test and added an attention check question to ensure participants were paying attention. The reduced number of questions made the task a bit easier for participants.

contained keywords (usually bolded). The 11 fill-in-the blank questions were created from these phrases by deleting the keyword and asking participants to provide it on the final test (e.g., Water seeping down from the land surface adds to the ground water and is called _____ water). There was one attention check question at the beginning of the final test.

Design and Procedure

Participants completed the experiment online via the Qualtrics survey platform. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: pre-highlighting, Sans Forgetica, or unmodified text. Participants read a passage on ground water. All participants were instructed to read the passage as though they were studying material for a class. After 10 minutes, all participants were given a question asking them to provide a judgement of learning after reading the passage: “How likely is it that you will be able to recall material from the passage you just read on a scale of 0 (not likely to recall) to 100 (likely to recall) in 5 minutes?” Participants were then given a short distraction task (anagrams) for three minutes. Finally, all participants were given 11 fill-in-the-blank test questions, presented one at a time.

Scoring

Spell checking was automated with the same procedure as Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

Per our preregistration, cued recall accuracy was analyzed with a one-way ANOVA (Passage Type: Pre-highlighting vs. Sans Forgetica vs. Unmodified). The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 525) = 3.16$, $\eta_g^2 = .012$, $p = .043$. We hypothesized that pre-highlighted and Sans Forgetica sentences would be better remembered than normal sentences and that there would be

no differences in recall between the highlighted and Sans Forgetica sentences. Our hypotheses were partially supported (see Figure 3). We found that pre-highlighted sentences were better remembered than sentences presented in unformatted text, $M_{\text{diff}} = .07$, $t(525) = 2.45$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI[.003, .14], $p_{\text{tuk}}^4 = .039$, $d = 0.27$. There was weak evidence for no effect between sentences presented in Sans Forgetica and pre-highlighted, $M_{\text{diff}} = .05$, $t(525) = 1.71$, $SE = 0.03$, 95% CI[-.02, -.12], $p_{\text{tuk}} = .202$, $d = 0.17$, $BF_{01} = 2.36$. Critically, there was no difference between sentences presented normally or in Sans Forgetica, $M_{\text{diff}} = .021$, $t(525) = 0.741$, $SE = 0.028$, 95% CI[-0.05, 0.09], $p_{\text{tuk}} = .739$, $d = 0.08$, $BF_{01} = 6.47$.

In short, we did not find that select information presented in Sans Forgetica produced better memory than select information left unmodified or pre-highlighted. The finding that Sans Forgetica typeface does not enhance memory for prose passages replicates the findings of Taylor et al. (2020) (Experiments 3 and 4). We did, however, observe better memory for pre-highlighted information compared to words presented unmodified. While we preregistered that both pre-highlighting and Sans Forgetica would help draw attention to the material and enhance memory, our results did not support this. One explanation for this is that pre-highlighting is a stronger study cue than Sans Forgetica. Individuals (particularly students) have more familiarity with pre-highlighted or bolded sentences, whereas presentations of study material in an uncommon typeface like Sans Forgetica are more uncommon. Another explanation is attention was drawn to the information presented in Sans Forgetica just as much as it was drawn to the pre-highlighted information, however, because Sans Forgetica is not commonly used as a study tool, the font might not have been effective at communicating to people that the information is important and

⁴ Tukey adjusted p -values.

they should engage with it more deeply. Taken together, this provides further evidence that Sans Forgetica is not an effective learning strategy.

Exploratory Analysis

In Experiment 2 we also asked students about their metacognitive awareness of the manipulations known as JOLs (see Fig. 4). To examine differences, we conducted separate independent t -tests. Looking at JOLs, the unmodified passage was given higher JOLs than the pre-highlighted passage, $M_{\text{diff}} = 7.08$, $t(525) = -1.28$, $SE = 2.78$, 95% CI[0.547, 13.61], $p_{\text{tuk}} = .030$, $d = 0.28$. There were no reliable differences between the pre-highlighted passage and Sans Forgetica, $M_{\text{diff}} = -3.52$, $t(525) = -1.27$, $SE = 2.78$, 95% CI[-10.05, 3.02], $p_{\text{tuk}} = .415$, $d = -0.13$, or between the passage in Sans Forgetica and the passage presented normally, $M_{\text{diff}} = -3.56$, $t(525) = -1.27$, $SE = 2.78$, 95% CI[-10.09, 2.97], $p_{\text{tuk}} = .406$, $d = -0.14$. That is, passages in Sans Forgetica typeface did not produce lower JOLs compared to an unmodified or pre-highlighted passage. This replicates what Taylor et al. (2020; Experiment 1) found using a between-subjects design. With a between-subjects design, however, it is not uncommon to observe no JOL differences between fluent and disfluent materials (Magreehan et al., 2016; Yue et al., 2013). Interestingly, individuals gave lower JOLs to pre-highlighted information compared to materials presented in an unmodified typeface. One potential reason for pre-highlighted information receiving lower JOLs than the unmodified passage is that pre-highlighted information served to focus participants' attention to specific parts of the passage. Given the question (i.e., "How likely is it that you will be able to recall material from the passage you just read on a scale of 0 (not likely to recall) to 100 (likely to recall) in 5 minutes?"), participants might have thought pre-highlighting would hinder their ability to answer questions on the whole passage.

Experiment 3

Both Experiments 1 and 2 utilized cued recall for the final criterion test. In previous studies, perceptual disfluency has been shown to enhance performance on yes/no recognition tests, even when there is no recall benefit (e.g., Nairne, 1988). This is thought to be because the learner is focusing on surface-level aspects during the initial perceptual identification process. This strategy should aid later recognition, but not recall, for disfluent items, given that recall relies on the encoding of similarities among items rather than perceptually distinctive features. In Experiment 3, we tested whether Sans Forgetica would lead to similar benefits in recognition memory. It is possible that Sans Forgetica serves to increase surface-level familiarity of a word and thus recognition, while recall is unchanged. We hypothesized that there would be no recognition benefit for Sans Forgetica.

Method

Participants

Sixty participants ($N = 60$) participated for partial completion of course credit. Sample size was determined by a similar procedure to the above experiments. No participants were removed for failing to meet the exclusion criteria noted above.

Materials

Stimuli were 188 single-word nouns taken from Geller et al. (2018). All words were from the English Lexicon Project database (Balota et al., 2007). Both word frequency (all words were high frequency; mean log HAL frequency = 9.2) and length (all words were four letters) were controlled.

Design and Procedure

Disfluency (Sans Forgetica vs. Fluent) was the single variable, manipulated within-subjects. We presented participants with 188 words, 94 at study (47 in each script condition) and 188 at test (94 old and 94 new). Words were counterbalanced across the disfluency and study/test conditions, such that each word served equally often as a target and a foil in both typefaces. The experiment was created and conducted using the Gorilla Experiment Builder (Anwyl-Irvine et al., 2020; <http://www.gorilla.sc>). The experiment protocol and tasks are available to preview and copy from Gorilla Open Materials at <https://gorilla.sc/openmaterials/72765>. Word order was completely randomized, such that Arial and Sans Forgetica words were randomly intermixed in the study phase, and Arial and Sans Forgetica old and new words were randomly intermixed in the test phase, with old words always presented in the same script at test as they were at study.

During the study phase, a fixation cross appeared at the center of the screen for 500 ms. The fixation cross was immediately replaced by a word in the same location. To continue to the next trial, participants pressed the continue button at the bottom of the screen to proceed to the next trial. Each trial was self-paced (see the General Discussion for the study time data). After the study phase, participants completed a short three-minute distractor task wherein they wrote down as many U.S. state capitals as they could. Afterward, participants took an old-new recognition test. At test, a word appeared in the center of the screen that either had been presented during study (“old”) or had not been presented during study (“new”). Old words occurred in their original script, and following the counterbalancing procedure, each new word was presented in Arial typeface or Sans Forgetica typeface. For each word presented, participants chose from one of two boxes displayed on the screen: a box labeled “old” to indicate that they had studied the word during study, and a box labeled “new” to indicate they did not remember studying the word.

Words stayed on the screen until participants gave an “old” or “new” response. All words were individually randomized for each participant during both the study and test phases. After the experiment, participants were debriefed.

Results and Discussion

Performance was examined with d' , a memory sensitivity measure derived from signal detection theory (Macmillan & Creelman, 2005). Hits or false alarms at ceiling or floor were changed to .99 or .01. Hits and false alarm rates along with sensitivity (d') can be seen in Figure 5.

Consistent with our preregistered hypothesis, there was no difference in d' between Sans Forgetica and Arial typefaces, $M_{\text{diff}} = 0.02$, $t(59) = 0.28$, $SE = 0.05$, 95% CI[-0.10, 0.13], $p = .780$. There was strong evidence for no effect ($BF_{01} = 13.68$).

Exploratory Analysis

While memory sensitivity was our main DV of interest, we also explored whether typeface affected participants tendency to respond “old” or “new” on the recognition memory test (c parameter)⁵. The c parameter reflects a participant’s bias to say “old” or “new.” As the bias to say “old” increases (more liberal responding), c values are less than 0. As the bias to say “new” increases (more conservative responding), c values are greater than 0 (Stanislaw & Todorov, 1999). Examining c differences between Sans Forgetica and Arial typefaces using a dependent sample t test, we found that participants were more liberal (i.e., were more likely to respond “old”) when responding to stimuli in Sans Forgetica compared to Arial, $M_{\text{diff}} = -0.27$, $t(59) = -5.52$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = .007$, 95% CI[-0.38, -0.18], $d = -0.71$. Thus, seeing Sans Forgetica typeface

⁵ Formula was taken from Stanislaw & Todorov (1999).

increases the likelihood of participants responding that they have studied the stimulus., when they did not.

Overall, we did not find that studying words in Sans Forgetica typeface produced better recognition memory. If anything, we found some evidence that Sans Forgetica may be detrimental to memory (also see Taylor et al., 2020). This study provides further evidence that Sans Forgetica typeface is not desirable for memory, regardless of the final test format.

General Discussion

The creators of the Sans Forgetica typeface, as well as the media, have made strong claims regarding the mnemonic benefits of Sans Forgetica. Across three experiments, we found insufficient evidence to support such claims. In Experiment 1, we showed that Sans Forgetica typeface did not enhance memory in a cued recall task with weakly related cue-target pairs. In Experiment 2, Sans Forgetica typeface did not enhance memory for a complex prose passage, nor did it produce lower JOLs. Using a different criterion test in Experiment 3, Sans Forgetica typeface similarly failed to enhance recognition memory. Importantly, these conclusions are borne out of data from over 800 participants sampling both from traditional university populations and online. Even with every opportunity to reveal itself, we did not find any evidence for a mnemonic benefit of Sans Forgetica typeface.

These findings complement and extend the findings from Taylor et al. (2020). Across four studies, these authors found that while individuals perceived Sans Forgetica as being more difficult, there was no evidence that it was beneficial for remembering highly associated word pairs or remembering information from text passages. Our findings converge to suggest the Sans Forgetica typeface is not a desirable difficulty.

424 Theoretically, these findings add to the literature showing that perceptual disfluency has
425 little impact on actual memory performance (e.g., Magreehan et al., 2016; Rhodes & Castel,
426 2008, 2009; Rummer et al., 2016; Xie et al., 2018; Yue et al., 2013). Importantly, we did find a
427 memory advantage for other learning techniques such as generation (Experiment 1) and pre-
428 highlighting (Experiment 2) whose efficacy is robustly supported in the literature. That is, the
429 conditions were ripe for a Sans Forgetica effect to emerge if it were an actual mnemonic effect.

430 What might account for the null effect of Sans Forgetica typeface on memory? Geller et
431 al. (2018) proposed that in order for a disfluent stimulus to engender better memory, encoding of
432 the stimulus must be sufficiently difficult in order to trigger increased metacognitive monitoring
433 and control processes. A necessary requirement for this to occur is a perceptually disfluent
434 stimulus. Drawing valid conclusions about disfluency, then, requires the use of objective
435 disfluency measures. In many studies, perceptual disfluency is tested subjectively (via JOLs or
436 difficulty ratings), but never explicitly tested. Thus, it could be that the failure to observe an
437 effect in the current set of studies is because Sans Forgetica typeface is simply not perceptually
438 disfluent. Although we did not preregister explicit tests of objective disfluency, we have some
439 preliminary evidence that Sans Forgetica is not disfluent. In Experiment 3, we collected self-
440 paced study times for each stimulus.⁶ Self-paced study times have been used as an objective
441 proxy for disfluency (see Carpenter & Geller, 2020). Looking at the difference in self-paced
442 reading times, we did not observe a significant difference between Sans Forgetica typeface ($M =$
443 1481 ms, $SD = 1750$ ms) and Arial typeface ($M = 1500$ ms, $SD = 2344$ ms), $t(59) = 0.47$, $p =$

⁶ We did not collect study times in Experiments 1 and 2 because of the designs used. In

Experiment 3 we were able to use the Gorilla platform that boasts millisecond accuracy (Anwyl-Irvine et al., 2020)

.640, 95% CI[-63, 102], $BF_{01} = 6.67$. The absence of a study time disparity suggests the Sans Forgetica typeface is not disfluent and may not not elicit the necessary metacognitive processing needed to produce better memory. It is worth noting, however, that self-paced study times might reflect variables other than, or in addition to, processing disfluency. Although self-paced study provides one way of measuring processing fluency, more precise measures of processing disfluency should be considered as well (but see Eskenazi & Nix, 2020 for eye-tracking evidence for Sans Forgetica typeface in good spellers).

While there appears to be weak evidence for the efficacy of Sans Forgetica, it is possible that there are important boundary conditions we have not considered. A number of boundary conditions that determine when perceptual disfluency will and will not be a desirable difficulty have been established over the past several years (see Geller et al., 2018, Geller & Still, 2018). In the current set of experiments, we examined whether cue strength, study time, and type of test influenced whether or not we could find a mnemonic effect of Sans Forgetica on memory. We did not find any evidence that the memory benefit from Sans Forgetica is influenced by these factors. Despite this, future research should examine the role of individual difference measures (e.g., working memory capacity; Lehmann et al., 2016) along with other design features not tested (e.g. test delay, testing expectancy).

Conclusion

Students are attracted to learning interventions that are easy to implement (Geller et al., 2018). It is no surprise, then, that Sans Forgetica has garnered so much media attention. However, in our current age of uncertainty about the quality of information, it is important to properly evaluate scientific claims made by the media, even if that information comes from widely trusted news sources. As scientists, our job is to properly evaluate the evidence and

correct erroneous information. Accordingly, we are compelled to argue against the claims made by the Sans Forgetica team and various news outlets and conclude that Sans Forgetica should not be used as a learning technique to bolster learning. Our results suggest that placing material in Sans Forgetica typeface does not lead to more durable learning. It is our recommendation that students looking to remember more and forget less use learning tools such as testing or spacing that have stood the test of time.

Disclosures

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by grant number 220020429 from the James S. McDonnell Foundation awarded to the third author.

Conflicts of Interest. The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or the publication of this article.

Author Contributions. JG wrote the first draft of the manuscript and conducted all statistical analyses. SD collected data and programmed Experiment 1. JG collected data and programmed Experiments 2 and 3. JG, SD, and DP conceptualized the studies, reviewed, and edited the manuscript.

R Packages and Acknowledgements. The results were created using R (Version 4.0.0; R Core Team, 2019) and the R-packages *afex* (Version 0.27.2; Singmann, Bolker, Westfall, Aust, & Ben-Shachar, 2019), *BayesFactor* (Version 0.9.12.4.2; Morey & Rouder, 2018), *data.table* (Version 1.12.8; Dowle & Srinivasan, 2019), *dplyr* (Version 1.0.0; Wickham et al., 2019), *effects* (Version 4.1.4; Fox & Weisberg, 2018; Fox, 2003; Fox & Hong, 2009), *emmeans* (Version 1.4.7; Lenth, 2020), *ggplot2* (Version 3.3.2; Wickham, 2016), *ggpol* (Version 0.0.6; Tiedemann, 2019), *here* (Version 0.1; Müller, 2017), *janitor* (Version 2.0.1; Firke, 2020), *knitr* (Version 1.28; Xie, 2015), *lattice* (Version 0.20.41; Sarkar, 2008), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9942; Aust & Barth, 2020), *patchwork* (Version 1.0.0; Pedersen, 2019), *qualtRics* (Version 3.1.3; Ginn & Silge, 2020), *readr* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham, Hester, & Francois, 2018), *Rmisc* (Version 1.5; Hope, 2013), *see* (Version 0.5.0; Lüdecke, Makowski, Waggoner, & Ben-Shachar, 2020), *stringr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham, 2019b), *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.0; Wickham, 2017).

References

- Anwyl-Irvine, A. L., Massonnié, J., Flitton, A., Kirkham, N., & Evershed, J. K. (2020). Gorilla in our midst: An online behavioral experiment builder. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(1), 388–407. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01237-x>
- Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>
- Balota, D. A., Yap, M. J., Cortese, M. J., Hutchison, K. A., Kessler, B., Loftis, B., ... Treiman, R. (2007). The english lexicon project. Springer New York LLC. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193014>
- Bates, D., & Maechler, M. (2019). *Matrix: Sparse and dense matrix classes and methods*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Matrix>
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Bertsch, S., Pesta, B. J., Wiscott, R., & McDaniel, M. A. (2007). The generation effect: A meta-analytic review. *Memory and Cognition*, 35(2), 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193441>
- Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2011). 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*. (pp. 56–64). New York, NY, US: Worth Publishers.

- 528 Butler, A. C., Marsh, E. J., Slavinsky, J. P., & Baraniuk, R. G. (2014). Integrating Cognitive
529 Science and Technology Improves Learning in a STEM Classroom. *Educational*
530 *Psychology Review*, 26(2), 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9256-4>
- 531 Carpenter, S. K. (2009). Cue Strength as a Moderator of the Testing Effect: The Benefits of
532 Elaborative Retrieval. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and*
533 *Cognition*, 35(6), 1563–1569. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017021>
- 534 Carpenter, S. K., Pashler, H., & Vul, E. (2006). What types of learning are enhanced by a cued
535 recall test? *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 13(5), 826–830.
536 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03194004>
- 537 Diemand-Yauman, C., Oppenheimer, D. M., & Vaughan, E. B. (2011). Fortune favors the:
538 Effects of disfluency on educational outcomes. *Cognition*, 118(1), 111–115.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2010.09.012>
- 540 Dowle, M., & Srinivasan, A. (2019). *Data.table: Extension of 'data.frame'*. Retrieved from
541 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=data.table>
- 542 Earp, J. (2018). Q&A: Designing a font to help students remember key information.
- 543 Eskenazi, M. A., & Nix, B. (2020). Individual differences in the desirable difficulty effect during
544 lexical acquisition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and*
545 *Cognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000809>
- 546 Firke, S. (2020). *Janitor: Simple tools for examining and cleaning dirty data*. Retrieved from
547 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor>

- 548 Fowler, R. L., & Barker, A. S. (1974). Effectiveness of highlighting for retention of text material.
549 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(3), 358–364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036750>
- 550 Fox, J. (2003). Effect displays in R for generalised linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software*,
551 8(15), 1–27. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v08/i15/>
- 552 Fox, J., & Hong, J. (2009). Effect displays in R for multinomial and proportional-odds logit
553 models: Extensions to the effects package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 32(1), 1–24.
554 Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v32/i01/>
- 555 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2018). Visualizing fit and lack of fit in complex regression models with
556 predictor effect plots and partial residuals. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 87(9), 1–27.
557 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v087.i09>
- 558 Fox, J., Weisberg, S., & Price, B. (2019). *CarData: Companion to applied regression data sets*.
559 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=carData>
- 560 Geller, J., Still, M. L., Dark, V. J., & Carpenter, S. K. (2018). Would disfluency by any other
561 name still be disfluent? Examining the disfluency effect with cursive handwriting.
562 *Memory and Cognition*, 46(7), 1109–1126. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-018-0824-6>
- 563 Geller, J., & Still, M. L. (2018). Testing Expectancy, but not Judgements of Learning, Moderate
564 the Disfluency Effect. In J. Z. Chuck Kalish Martina Rau & T. Rogers (Eds.), *CogSci*
565 *2018* (pp. 1705–1710).
- 566 Geller, J., Toftness, A. R., Armstrong, P. I., Carpenter, S. K., Manz, C. L., Coffman, C. R., &
567 Lamm, M. H. (2018). Study strategies and beliefs about learning as a function of

- 568 academic achievement and achievement goals. *Memory*, 26(5), 683–690.
569 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2017.1397175>
- 570 Ginn, J., & Silge, J. (2020). *Qualtrics: Download 'qualtrics' survey data*. Retrieved from
571 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=qualtrics>
- 572 Good Design. (2019). Sans Forgetica – good design. Retrieved 23 May 2020, from [https://good-](https://good-design.org/projects/sansforgetica/)
573 [design.org/projects/sansforgetica/](https://good-design.org/projects/sansforgetica/).
- 574 Grolemund, G., & Wickham, H. (2011). Dates and times made easy with lubridate. *Journal of*
575 *Statistical Software*, 40(3), 1–25. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i03/>
- 576 Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2019). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved from
577 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>
- 578 Hope, R. M. (2013). *Rmisc: Rmisc: Ryan miscellaneous*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Rmisc)
579 [project.org/package=Rmisc](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Rmisc)
- 580 Kornell, N., & Vaughn, K. E. (2016). How Retrieval Attempts Affect Learning: A Review and
581 Synthesis. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation - Advances in Research and Theory*,
582 65, 183–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2016.03.003>
- 583 Lakens, D., & Evers, E. R. K. (2014). Sailing From the Seas of Chaos Into the Corridor of
584 Stability: Practical Recommendations to Increase the Informational Value of Studies.
585 *Perspectives on Psychological Science : A Journal of the Association for Psychological*
586 *Science*, 9(3), 278–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614528520>

- 587 Lehmann, J., Goussios, C., & Seufert, T. (2016). Working memory capacity and disfluency
588 effect: an aptitude-treatment-interaction study. *Metacognition and Learning*, 11(1), 89–
589 105. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-015-9149-z>
- 590 Lenth, R. (2020). *Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means*. Retrieved
591 from <https://github.com/rvlenth/emmeans>
- 592 Lüdtke, D., Makowski, D., Waggoner, P., & Ben-Shachar, M. S. (2020). *See: Visualisation*
593 *toolbox for 'easystats' and extra geoms, themes and color palettes for 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved
594 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=see>
- 595 Macmillan, N. A., & Creelman, C. D. (2005). *Detection theory: A user's guide, 2nd ed.* (pp. xix,
596 492–xix, 492). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- 597 Magreehan, D. A., Serra, M. J., Schwartz, N. H., & Narciss, S. (2016). Further boundary
598 conditions for the effects of perceptual disfluency on judgments of learning.
599 *Metacognition and Learning*, 11(1), 35–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-015-9147-1>
- 600 Makowski, D., Lüdtke, D., & Ben-Shachar, M. S. (2020). *Modelbased: Estimation of model-*
601 *based predictions, contrasts and means*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=modelbased)
602 [project.org/package=modelbased](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=modelbased)
- 603 Morey, R. D., & Rouder, J. N. (2018). *BayesFactor: Computation of bayes factors for common*
604 *designs*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=BayesFactor>
- 605 Mulligan, N. W. (1996). The effects of perceptual interference at encoding on implicit memory,
606 explicit memory, and memory for source. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning*
607 *Memory and Cognition*, 22(5), 1067–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.22.5.1067>

- 608 Müller, K. (2017). *Here: A simpler way to find your files*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here)
609 [project.org/package=here](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here)
- 610 Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2019). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble)
611 [project.org/package=tibble](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble)
- 612 Nairne, J. S. (1988). The Mnemonic Value of Perceptual Identification. *Journal of Experimental*
613 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 14(2), 248–255.
614 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.14.2.248>
- 615 Oehlschlägel, J. (2017). *Bit64: A s3 class for vectors of 64bit integers*. Retrieved from
616 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bit64>
- 617 Oehlschlägel, J. (2020). *Bit: A class for vectors of 1-bit booleans*. Retrieved from
618 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bit>
- 619 Olejnik, S., & Algina, J. (2003). Generalized eta and omega squared statistics: Measures of effect
620 size for some common research designs. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.8.4.434>
- 621 Ooms, J. (2018). *Hunspell: High-performance stemmer, tokenizer, and spell checker*. Retrieved
622 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=hunspell>
- 623 Pedersen, T. L. (2019). *Patchwork: The composer of plots*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=patchwork)
624 [project.org/package=patchwork](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=patchwork)
- 625 Plummer, M., Best, N., Cowles, K., & Vines, K. (2006). CODA: Convergence diagnosis and
626 output analysis for mcmc. *R News*, 6(1), 7–11. Retrieved from [https://journal.r-](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/)
627 [project.org/archive/](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/)

- 628 R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria:
629 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 630 Rhodes, M. G., & Castel, A. D. (2008). Memory Predictions Are Influenced by Perceptual
631 Information: Evidence for Metacognitive Illusions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
632 *General*, 137(4), 615–625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013684>
- 633 Rhodes, M. G., & Castel, A. D. (2009). Metacognitive illusions for auditory information: Effects
634 on monitoring and control. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 16(3), 550–554.
635 <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.16.3.550>
- 636 Rosner, T. M., Davis, H., & Milliken, B. (2015). Perceptual blurring and recognition memory: A
637 desirable difficulty effect revealed. *Acta Psychologica*, 160, 11–22.
638 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2015.06.006>
- 639 Rummer, R., Schweppe, J., & Schwede, A. (2016). Fortune is fickle: null-effects of disfluency on
640 learning outcomes. *Metacognition and Learning*, 11(1), 57–70.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-015-9151-5>
- 642 Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. New York: Springer. Retrieved
643 from <http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org>
- 644 Silvers, V. L., & Kreiner, D. S. (1997). The effects of pre-existing inappropriate highlighting
645 on reading comprehension. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 36(3), 217–223.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388079709558240>
- 647 Singmann, H., Bolker, B., Westfall, J., Aust, F., & Ben-Shachar, M. S. (2019). *Afex: Analysis of*
648 *factorial experiments*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=afex>

- 649 Slamecka, N. J., & Graf, P. (1978). The generation effect: Delineation of a phenomenon. *Journal*
650 *of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning & Memory*, 4(6), 592–604.
651 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.4.6.592>
- 652 Stanislaw, H., & Todorov, N. (1999). Calculation of signal detection theory measures. *Behavior*
653 *Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 31(1), 137–149.
654 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03207704>
- 655 Sungkhasettee, V. W., Friedman, M. C., & Castel, A. D. (2011). Memory and metamemory for
656 inverted words: Illusions of competency and desirable difficulties. *Psychonomic Bulletin*
657 *and Review*, 18(5), 973–978. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0114-9>
- 658 Taylor, A., Sanson, M., Burnell, R., Wade, K. A., & Garry, M. (2020). Disfluent difficulties are
659 not desirable difficulties: the (lack of) effect of Sans Forgetica on memory. *Memory*, 1–8.
660 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2020.1758726>
- 661 Tiedemann, F. (2019). *Ggpol: Visualizing social science data with 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from
662 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpol>
- 663 Westfall, J. (2016). *PANGEA: Power ANalysis for GEneral Anova designs*. Retrieved from
664 <http://jakewestfall.org/pangea/>
- 665 Wickham, H. (2011). The split-apply-combine strategy for data analysis. *Journal of Statistical*
666 *Software*, 40(1), 1–29. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i01/>
- 667 Wickham, H. (2016). *Ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.
668 Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>

- 669 Wickham, H. (2017). *Tidyverse: Easily install and load the 'tidyverse'*. Retrieved from
670 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse>
- 671 Wickham, H. (2019a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors)*. Retrieved
672 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- 673 Wickham, H. (2019b). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*.
674 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- 675 Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2019). *Dplyr: A grammar of data*
676 *manipulation*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>
- 677 Wickham, H., & Henry, L. (2019). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr)
678 [project.org/package=tidyr](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr)
- 679 Wickham, H., Hester, J., & François, R. (2018). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved
680 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- 681 Xie, H., Zhou, Z., & Liu, Q. (2018). Null Effects of Perceptual Disfluency on Learning Outcomes
682 in a Text-Based Educational Context: a Meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*,
683 30(3), 745–771. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-018-9442-x>
- 684 Xie, Y. (2015). *Dynamic documents with R and knitr* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman;
685 Hall/CRC. Retrieved from <https://yihui.name/knitr/>
- 686 Yue, C. L., Castel, A. D., & Bjork, R. A. (2013). When disfluency is-and is not-a desirable
687 difficulty: The influence of typeface clarity on metacognitive judgments and memory.
688 *Memory and Cognition*, 41(2), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-012-0255-8>

nation – state nation – st_t_

Figure 1. Example of cue-target pairs. Left: Sans Forgetica condition. Right: Generation condition. Sans Forgetica is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (CC BY-NC; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>)

Figure 2. Accuracy on cued recall test. Violin plots represent the kernel density of average accuracy (black dots) with the mean (white dot) and Cousineau-Morey within-subject 95% CIs.

Figure 3. Proportion recalled as a function of passage type. Violin plots represent the kernel density of average accuracy (black dots) with the mean (white dot) and 95% CIs.

Figure 4: Judgements of learning as a function of passage type. Violin plots represent the kernel density of average accuracy (black dots) with the mean (white dot) and 95% CIs.

Figure 5. A. Mean proportions of “old” responses. Violin plots represent the kernel density of average probability (black dots) with the mean (white dots) and within-subject 95% CIs. B.

722 Memory sensitivity (d'). Violin plots represent the kernel density of average accuracy (black
723 dots) with the mean (white dot) and Cousineau-Morey within-subject 95% CIs.

724