**Unit four – fonts assessment**

For the project on Unit Four, I considered the suitability of four fonts for my webpage – two sans serifs and two serifs. These were selected after visually sampling text “GUNBAE!!!” on the GoogleFonts webpage as, for me, that word and the visual qualities of how that word is projected to ­the user, will be core to projecting the intended spirit of the bar. Specific characteristics that I sought included:

* Clarity
* Simplicity (but not dull)
* Informal (but not casual or childish)
* Evokes an event or excitement

As instructed, the typefaces were applied to all the text on the page for reflection, and are summarised as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1. **Fresca normal 400** |
| Positives: | * Text is clearly presented and fully legible, particularly lowercase. * Not serious in the tone. Evokes a more informal and playful feel. |
| Negatives: | * Although not childish, it is too playful for the intended audience of a bar. I would expect to see this text used in a Harry Potter novel instead. * Certain letters – lower-case ‘y’ ‘j’ and ‘f’ – in particular, have ‘tails’ which are too long and rounded. |
|  |  |
|  | 1. **Oswald bold 700** |
| Positives: | * Simple and no frills: a real font for an important announcement * Catches the attention, particularly the title section. |
| Negatives: | * Perhaps too loud and intense for the body text * Character are too ‘in-your-face’ becomes almost tiring to look at. * When applied to the entire text, hard to distinguish heading from the body, even when the text is re-sized. * The general vibe of the typeface is cold. * Given the way in which the page is framed, can also draw comparisons with warnings and public announcements by the police, evoking a negative vibe. |
|  |  |
|  | 1. **Kotta One normal 400** |
| Positives: | * Still maintains a good level of legibility and clarity * While not apparent when applied to all the text, the |
| Negatives: | * Design is too elaborate for either the title or the main body text. When used with the whole text, it projects a ‘fancy dining’ feel which does not reflect the service nor unlikely to endear it to the target audience. |
|  |  |
|  | 1. **Sanchez normal 400** |
| Positives: | * The text is clear very clear and simple when compared to the Kotta One above   . |
| Negatives: | * Spacing of the three period (‘...’) is makes for difficult reading. * Very dull. Not dissimilar to what would be expected from a type-writer or a computer screen from a 1980s Sci-Fi thriller. However the Sci-Fi theme is not suitable for the target audience. |

**CONCLUSION**

It is clear that each typeface and font has their pros and con, and further exploration of Google font revealed a wealth of combinations and permutations to improve the desired presentation of the webpages and effectively the business’ core message and values. While it was not possible under the constraints of the present exercise to explore each of these options in detail, what is clear is that the typographical needs of the title will likely differ greatly from the needs of individual sections of the body – and that sometimes sans-serif on sans-serif (as opposed to sans-serif on serif) may be more conducive to bring out the right degree of contrast for the page.

For the present exercise, I decided that a combination of ‘Owald Bold 700’ for the title, Fresca normal 400 for the body text and Kotta One normal 400 for the features section would be most effective.

I have attached a screenshot of the page applying this arrangement as instructed.