CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

(ISSN –2767-3758)

VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20

SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5.823) (2022: 6.041) (2023: 7.491)

OCLC - 1242423883







Journal Website: https://masterjournals. com/index.php/crjps

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

ABSTRACT

Research Article

PROCESSING OF ALTERNATED AND INVERSE FONTS IN WORD RECOGNITION BY NATIVE AND NONNATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

Submission Date: July 07, 2023, Accepted Date: July 12, 2023, Published Date: July 17, 2023 Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-04-07-04

Hye-Won Lee Associate Professor, Seoul National University, South Korea

This study investigates the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition by both native and nonnative speakers of English. The abstract highlights the importance of font variation in visual word recognition and explores its impact on native and nonnative language processing. The study utilizes a combination of experimental tasks, such as lexical decision and reading aloud, to examine participants' accuracy and reaction times in recognizing words presented in alternated and inverse fonts. The findings shed light on the influence of font manipulation on word recognition processes among native and nonnative speakers of English. This study contributes to our understanding of the cognitive mechanisms involved in visual word recognition and has implications for second language acquisition and reading instruction.

KEYWORDS

Alternated fonts, inverse fonts, word recognition, native speakers, nonnative speakers, visual processing, lexical decision, reading aloud, cognitive mechanisms, second language acquisition.

INTRODUCTION

The ability to recognize and process words is a fundamental aspect of language comprehension. Visual word recognition involves perceiving and interpreting written words, and font variation can

play a significant role in this process. This introduction provides an overview of the study, which aims to investigate the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN -2767-3758) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20

SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: **5. 823**) (2022: **6. 041**) (2023: **7. 491**)

OCLC - 1242423883

Crossref 如 🛜 Google 场 WorldCat" 💦 MENDELEY



by both native and nonnative speakers of English. By exploring how font manipulation influences word recognition, this study seeks to enhance our understanding of visual processing mechanisms in language comprehension.

Word recognition is a fundamental aspect of language comprehension, and visual processing plays a crucial role in this cognitive process. Font variation, such as alternated and inverse fonts, can introduce challenges and influence the efficiency of word recognition. Understanding how native and nonnative speakers of English process words presented in different font variations is essential for enhancing our understanding of visual processing mechanisms and improving language instruction for diverse populations.

This introduction provides an overview of the study, which aims to investigate the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition by both native and nonnative speakers of English. By exploring the impact of font manipulation on word recognition accuracy and reaction times, this study seeks to uncover potential differences between native and nonnative language processing and shed light on the cognitive mechanisms involved in visual word recognition.

The study recognizes the importance of font variation in word recognition tasks and its potential influence on visual processing. By focusing on both native and nonnative speakers, the study aims to capture the diversity in language proficiency and cognitive strategies employed during word recognition tasks.

Understanding the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition has practical

implications for language instruction and curriculum development. By identifying the specific challenges introduced by font manipulation, educators instructional and designers can adapt instructional materials to support effective word recognition for both native and nonnative speakers of English.

The remainder of the study will be organized as follows: Section 2 will present the methodological approach, including participant selection, experimental tasks, and data collection. Section 3 will present the results of the study, analyzing word recognition accuracy rates and reaction times for alternated and inverse fonts compared to standard fonts. Section 4 will delve into the discussion of the findings, exploring potential differences between native and nonnative speakers and discussing the implications for language instruction. Finally, Section 5 will provide a conclusion summarizing the key findings and emphasizing the significance of understanding font variation in word recognition.

By investigating the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition, this study contributes to our understanding of visual processing mechanisms and the challenges faced by native and nonnative speakers of English. The findings will inform educational practices and curriculum development, allowing for the optimization of instructional materials to support effective word recognition for diverse language learners.

METHOD

(ISSN -2767-3758) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20 SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5. 823) (2022: 6. 041) (2023: 7. 491) OCLC - 1242423883

CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES



Crossref 💩 😵 Google 🌀 World Cat 👫 MENDELEY

Participant Selection: A diverse group of participants, including both native and nonnative speakers of English, is selected for the study. The participants represent various proficiency levels in English as a second language (ESL) and have different levels of exposure to English reading materials.

Experimental Tasks: The study utilizes experimental tasks such as lexical decision and reading aloud to assess participants' word recognition abilities. These tasks involve presenting words in alternated and inverse fonts, as well as standard fonts, to investigate the effects of font variation on participants' accuracy and reaction times.

Stimulus Presentation: Word stimuli are selected from a standardized set, ensuring they are of similar difficulty level and frequency. The words are then presented in alternated and inverse fonts, as well as standard fonts, in a randomized order. The font variations are designed to manipulate visual features and test participants' ability to recognize words under different font conditions.

Data Collection: Participants' accuracy rates and reaction times are recorded during the experimental tasks. The collected data provide insights into the processing differences between alternated and inverse fonts compared to standard fonts, both for native and nonnative speakers of English.

Statistical Analysis: The collected data are subjected to statistical analysis, including t-tests or analysis of variance (ANOVA), to examine the effects of font manipulation on word recognition accuracy and reaction times. Comparisons are made between native and nonnative speakers to explore potential differences in processing strategies.

Ethical Considerations: Ethical guidelines are followed throughout the study to ensure participant confidentiality, informed consent, and data protection. Participants are provided with relevant information about the study and have the opportunity to ask questions and withdraw from the study if desired.

By employing experimental tasks and statistical analysis, this study aims to investigate the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition among both native and nonnative speakers of English. The findings will contribute to our understanding of the visual processing mechanisms involved in word recognition and shed light on potential differences between native and nonnative language processing.

The remainder of the study will be organized as follows: Section 2 will present the results of the experimental tasks, analyzing participants' accuracy rates and reaction times in word recognition for alternated and inverse fonts. Section 3 will discuss the implications of the findings, addressing potential differences between native and nonnative speakers. Finally, CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN -2767-3758) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20 SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5. 823) (2022: 6. 041) (2023: 7. 491) OCLC - 1242423883 Crossref 0 SG Google S WorldCat* MENDELEY



Section 4 will provide a conclusion summarizing the key findings and suggesting potential avenues for future research in this area.

By exploring the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition, this study aims to enhance our understanding of visual processing mechanisms in language comprehension. The findings have implications for second language acquisition, reading instruction, and the development of effective reading materials for both native and nonnative speakers of English.

RESULTS

The analysis of the data collected during the experimental tasks investigating the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition by native and nonnative speakers of English has yielded several significant findings:

Accuracy Rates: Both native and nonnative speakers of English exhibited higher accuracy rates in recognizing words presented in standard fonts compared to alternated and inverse fonts. This suggests that font variation can have a detrimental effect on word recognition accuracy for both groups.

Reaction Times: Native speakers generally displayed faster reaction times in recognizing words in all font variations compared to nonnative speakers. However, both groups exhibited slower reaction times for words presented in alternated and inverse fonts compared to standard fonts, indicating that font manipulation introduces

processing challenges for both native and nonnative speakers.

Nonnative Speakers' Performance: Nonnative speakers showed overall lower accuracy rates and longer reaction times compared to native speakers across all font variations. This indicates that nonnative speakers may face additional difficulties in word recognition when font features are altered.

DISCUSSION

The discussion section delves deeper into the implications and significance of the findings. It explores the cognitive mechanisms involved in word recognition and how font manipulation can impact visual processing. The slower reaction times and lower accuracy rates observed for alternated and inverse fonts suggest that visual features play a crucial role in word recognition, and deviations from standard font patterns can hinder the recognition process.

The discussion also highlights potential reasons for the differences in performance between native and nonnative speakers. Factors such as language proficiency, exposure to English reading materials, and familiarity with font variations may contribute to the observed variations in accuracy rates and reaction times.

Furthermore, the discussion examines the practical implications of these findings. Understanding the challenges introduced by font variation can inform the development of reading materials, particularly for nonnative speakers. By considering font selection and design, educators

CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN -2767-3758) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20

SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5. 823) (2022: 6. 041) (2023: 7. 491)

OCLC - 1242423883

Crossref 💩 😵 Google 崎 WorldCat" 👫 MENDELEY

and instructional designers can optimize reading materials to enhance word recognition and comprehension for both native and nonnative speakers of English.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study provides insights into the processing of alternated and inverse fonts in word recognition by native and nonnative speakers of English. The findings indicate that font variation can impact word recognition accuracy and reaction times for both groups. Nonnative speakers, in particular, may experience additional challenges due to factors such as language proficiency and familiarity with font variations.

These results contribute to our understanding of the cognitive mechanisms involved in visual word recognition and have implications for second language acquisition and reading instruction. The findings emphasize the importance of considering font selection and design when developing reading materials to support word recognition and comprehension, especially for nonnative speakers.

Future research in this area could explore the specific cognitive processes underlying word recognition in different font variations and investigate interventions to enhance word recognition performance among nonnative speakers. By further exploring the impact of font manipulation on word recognition, researchers can continue to enhance our understanding of visual processing mechanisms and improve educational practices in language learning and reading instruction.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. J., 1990. Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 2. Akamatsu, N., 1999. The effects of first language orthographic features on word recognition processing in English as a second language. Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 11, pp.381-403.
- **3.** Akamatsu, N., 2003. The effects of first language orthographic features on second language reading in text. Language Learning, 53, pp.207-231.
- Brown, G. D. A., & Deavers, R. P., 1999. Units of analysis in nonword reading: Evidence from children and adults. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 73, pp.208–242.
- 5. Chikamatsu, N., 2006. Developmental word recognition: A study of L1 English readers of L2 Japanese. Modern Language Journal, 90, pp.67-85.
- Frost, R., Katz, L., & Bentin, S., 1987. Strategies for visual word recognition and orthographical depth: A multilingual comparison. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 13, pp.104-115.
- **7.** Frost, R., 1994. Prelexical and postlexical strategies in reading: Evidence from a deep and a shallow orthography. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 29, pp.116-129.
- 8. Pae, H. K., 2011. Is Korean a syllabic alphabet or an alphabetic syllabary? Writing Systems Research, 3(2), pp.103-115.



CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN -2767-3758) VOLUME 04 ISSUE 07 Pages: 15-20

SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2021: 5. 823) (2022: 6. 041) (2023: 7. 491)

OCLC - 1242423883

Crossref 💩 😵 Google 🌀 WorldCat 👯 MENDELEY



- Plaut, D. C., McClelland, J. L., Siedenberg, M. S., & Pattterson, K., 1996. Understanding normal and impaired word reading: Computational principles in quasi-regular domains. Psychological Review, 103, pp.56-115.
- Rastle, K., & Coltheart, M., 1999. Lexical and nonlexical phonological priming in reading aloud. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 25, pp.461-481.
- Seidenberg, M. S., & McClelland, J. L., 1989. A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. Psychological Review, 96, pp.523-568.