Evidence-Based Learning: A Comprehensive Guide to Effective Knowledge Acquisition and Retention

----

Chapter 1: Briefing Document on the Science of Learning

1.1. Executive Summary

Effective learning is an active, effortful process, not a passive one. Decades of cognitive science research converge on a clear set of principles for acquiring and retaining knowledge. The most potent strategies are those that require active recall, such as self-testing, which consistently outperform passive re-reading. Long-term retention is not achieved through last-minute "cramming" but through spaced repetition—reviewing material at increasing intervals over time. For learning to occur, the cognitive load on our limited working memory must be carefully managed; instructional design should minimize extraneous distractions and maximize the effort dedicated to building mental models, or schemas. Finally, while practice is essential for developing expertise, its role is more nuanced than commonly believed. Deliberate practice is a significant factor, but it accounts for only a fraction of the differences in performance, with factors like intelligence and the predictability of the task environment playing crucial roles. Ultimately, successful learning depends on a combination of effective strategies, well-designed instruction, and a learner's autonomous and growth-oriented mindset.

1.2. The Cognitive Architecture of Learning

To design and implement effective learning strategies, one must first understand the fundamental architecture of the human mind. Learning is fundamentally a process of moving information from a temporary, conscious processing space into a vast, permanent storage system. The interplay between these two memory systems—working memory and long-term memory—governs our ability to acquire new knowledge and skills. Grasping this cognitive model is not merely an academic exercise; it is a strategic imperative for any educator or learner aiming to optimize the process of knowledge acquisition.

1. **Working Memory vs. Long-Term Memory:** Human memory can be divided into two critical components. **Working memory** is the system that processes conscious thought. It is where we hold and manipulate information for a very short duration. Its primary characteristic is its severe limitation; research suggests it can only hold about four "chunks" of new information at any given time. In contrast, **long-term memory** is a vast, semi-permanent warehouse where knowledge is stored. Unlike working memory, there are no known limits to the amount of information that can be stored in long-term memory.
2. **The Role of Schemas:** Knowledge is stored in long-term memory in the form of **schemas**. A schema is a mental framework that organizes elements of information according to how they will be used. Building increasingly complex schemas is the hallmark of skilled performance. For example, a child learning to read first builds schemas for individual letters. These simple schemas are then combined to form higher-order schemas for words, which are then combined into schemas for sentences. Through extensive practice, this process becomes automated, allowing a skilled reader to derive meaning from text with minimal conscious effort.

3. **Bypassing Limitations:** The construction and automation of schemas is the primary mechanism by which learners can bypass the inherent limitations of working memory. While a string of random letters like **y-m-r-e-o-m** requires working memory to process six separate items, the word **m-e-m-o-r-y** is processed as a single chunk because we have a pre-existing schema for it. This "chunking" frees up precious working memory capacity, enabling us to process more complex information and engage in higher-order thinking.

Understanding this architecture highlights the importance of managing the flow of information to avoid overwhelming working memory, which is the subject of Cognitive Load Theory.

1.3. Managing Cognitive Load for Optimal Learning

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), developed by psychologist John Sweller in the 1980s and 1990s, provides a powerful framework for instructional design. The theory's central tenet is that learning is most effective when it aligns with our cognitive architecture—specifically, the severe limitations of working memory. CLT seeks to develop instructional techniques that reduce unproductive mental effort and direct a learner's finite cognitive resources toward the activities that are most essential for building knowledge.

1. **The Three Types of Cognitive Load:** CLT identifies three distinct types of load that can be placed on working memory. The goal of effective instruction is to manage the total load so that it remains within the learner's capacity.

Load Type	Description	Instructional Goal
Intrinsic Load	The inherent complexity of the material itself, combined with the learner's level of prior knowledge.	**Manage**: Break down complex material using simple-to-complex or part-to-whole approaches.
Extraneous Load	The "bad" load generated by poor instructional design that does not contribute to learning (e.g., confusing layouts, distracting information).	**Minimize**: Remove distractions and design materials that are clear, integrated, and easy to process.
Germane Load	The "good" load imposed by the learning process itself—the effortful work of constructing and automating new schemas.	**Maximize**: Design activities that direct a learner's full attention to schema construction and deep processing.

Practical Implications of CLT: Decades of research in CLT have produced a set of evidence-backed instructional principles designed to manage cognitive load and enhance learning:

- **The Worked Example Effect:** For novices, studying step-by-step solved problems is significantly more effective than unguided problem-solving. This is because worked examples reduce extraneous cognitive load, allowing the learner to focus their attention on understanding the solution process rather than struggling to find it.

- **The Split-Attention Effect:** Learning is inhibited when students are required to mentally integrate separate sources of information, such as a diagram and a separate block of explanatory text. This splits their attention and increases extraneous load. This effect can be eliminated by physically integrating the text and diagram.
- **The Redundancy Effect:** Presenting the same information in multiple forms (e.g., a diagram and text that needlessly repeat each other, or a presenter reading text verbatim from a slide) is anything but harmless. This redundancy overloads working memory and inhibits learning. Unnecessary information should be removed.
- **The Modality Effect:** Working memory has both a visual and an auditory channel. Presenting information using both channels (e.g., showing a graphic while explaining it with narration) can effectively increase working memory capacity and reduce extraneous load compared to presenting the same information in a single mode (e.g., a graphic with written text).
- **The Expertise Reversal Effect:** This is a critical exception to the above principles. Instructional methods that are highly effective for novices can become counter-productive for experts. For example, an expert learner may find a worked example to be redundant, as they have already automated the problem-solving schema. For experts, more independent problem-solving is often more effective.

While managing how information is presented is crucial, the ultimate responsibility for learning rests on the active strategies the learner employs.

1.4. The Power of Active Learning and Desirable Difficulties

The most potent driver of long-term, durable learning is active engagement with the material. Passive consumption—such as re-reading a textbook, watching a lecture, or reviewing notes—creates a false sense of familiarity but does little to build lasting knowledge. This section explores specific, evidence-backed strategies that transform study from a passive act of reception into an active process of construction and retrieval.

1. **The Principle of Desirable Difficulties:** The concept of "desirable difficulties" posits that learning experiences characterized by difficulties that induce extra, productive effort can improve long-term retention. Attempting to recall information is more difficult than simply re-reading it, making it a desirable difficulty. This should not be confused with "undesirable difficulties," such as divided attention or a confusing text font, which hinder learning without providing any benefit.
2. **Core Active Learning Techniques:** The following techniques have been repeatedly shown to be superior to passive study methods for creating long-lasting memory.
    1. **Retrieval Practice (The Testing Effect):** The act of actively retrieving information from memory is one of the most powerful learning tools available. This "testing effect" works because the effort of retrieval forces the brain to actively locate and rebuild the pathways to a specific schema in long-term memory. This effortful reconstruction strengthens the schema and makes it more easily accessible in the future, unlike passive re-reading, which does not require

the same level of reconstruction and therefore results in weaker encoding. Practical applications include using flashcards, completing practice tests, or simply pausing to ask "What are the key ideas here?" and answering from memory.

2. **Spaced Repetition (Distributed Practice):** First identified by Hermann Ebbinghaus in 1885, the "forgetting curve" shows that memory decays exponentially without reinforcement. Spaced repetition counteracts this by reviewing information at increasing intervals over time. This stands in stark contrast to massed practice, or "cramming," where study is condensed into a single session. A 2020 study on university physics students found that those who used a spaced repetition app ("spacers") significantly outperformed both non-users and "crammers." Spacers achieved an adjusted mean exam score of 70%, compared to 64% for crammers and 61% for non-users. This advantage persisted even in a surprise delayed test, demonstrating the power of spacing for long-term retention.

3. **Teaching Others / Immediate Use:** According to the "Learning Pyramid" model, teaching others and using information immediately are the most effective methods, leading to up to 90% retention. While the specific percentages of the Learning Pyramid model are debated and not rigorously supported by empirical research, its conceptual hierarchy is sound: active methods that force engagement, like teaching, are vastly superior to passive methods like reading. To teach a concept, a learner must first confront their own mistakes, organize the knowledge coherently, and articulate it in their own words. This process of clarification and application forces the brain to concentrate and solidifies understanding in a way that passive listening cannot.

4. **Interleaving:** This is the practice of alternating between different types of problems or content during a single study session, rather than blocking practice by type. For example, a math student would benefit more from a problem set that mixes addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division problems than from one that presents all addition problems first, then all subtraction, and so on. While interleaving increases the *intrinsic* and *germane* load in the short term, making it feel harder, it is a "desirable difficulty" because it forces the learner to discard irrelevant information from working memory and reload the correct schema for each new problem type. This repeated loading and reloading process leads to more robust and flexible schema construction than massed practice allows.

3. **Active Learning Tools:** Several practical tools can facilitate these active learning techniques.

   - **Flashcards:** A popular and effective tool, flashcard use is correlated with higher GPAs. They are an excellent medium for both retrieval practice and spaced repetition, especially when using systems like the Leitner method or digital apps that automate the spacing intervals.
   - **Concept Mapping:** This effective but under-utilized technique involves creating a visual map of concepts and the relationships between them. It forces learners to

organize information meaningfully and has been shown to boost student confidence.

- **Active Note-Taking:** Instead of passively transcribing a lecture, active note-taking methods force the learner to process and structure the information as it is received. Effective methods include:
  - **Cornell Notes:** Dividing the page to write detailed notes, key questions/concepts, and a summary.
  - **Outlining:** Structuring information hierarchically with headers and sub-headers.
  - **Mapping:** Visually organizing notes around a central concept.
  - **Sentence Notes:** Writing one distinct sentence for each key point.

These techniques provide the "how" of effective learning, but their success is also deeply intertwined with the "why"—the broader context of practice and the pursuit of expertise.

1.5. Deliberate Practice and the Nuances of Expertise

The long-running "nature vs. nurture" debate has found a focal point in the study of expertise. Among the most influential theories is the Deliberate Practice view, which argues that expert performance is primarily the result of intense, structured training. Popularized as the "10,000-hour rule," this view has profoundly shaped public understanding of skill acquisition. This section critically evaluates the claims of this theory, drawing on large-scale meta-analytic evidence to provide a more nuanced picture of how expertise is developed.

1. **Defining Deliberate Practice:** As proposed by Ericsson and colleagues, deliberate practice is not just any form of practice. It is a highly structured activity designed specifically to improve performance. It involves setting specific goals, obtaining immediate feedback, and concentrating on techniques and weaknesses just beyond one's current level of competence.
2. **Evaluating the Evidence (Meta-Analysis):** A 2014 meta-analysis by Macnamara, Hambrick, and Oswald synthesized decades of research to quantify the actual impact of deliberate practice on performance across various domains. The findings temper the strongest claims of the deliberate practice view.
   - **Overall Impact:** Across all domains studied, deliberate practice was found to be important, but it explained only **12% of the variance** in performance. This leaves a substantial 88% of the difference between individuals to be explained by other factors.
   - **Domain-Specific Impact:** The importance of deliberate practice varies significantly by domain. The more predictable the environment, the more practice seems to matter.

Domain	Variance Explained by Deliberate Practice
Games	26%
Music	21%
Sports	18%
Education	4%
Professions	$< 1\%$

Moderating Factors:The effect of deliberate practice is stronger in activities with highly predictable environments (e.g., running, where the rules and environment are stable) than in those with low predictability (e.g., handling an aviation emergency, where the situation is dynamic and uncertain).

1. **Beyond Practice:** The meta-analysis highlights that practice alone is not sufficient to explain expertise. Other factors that contribute significantly to performance differences include:
    - **Starting Age:** Evidence suggests that there may be an optimal developmental period for acquiring complex skills, as there seems to be for acquiring language.
    - **General Intelligence (g factor):** A powerful predictor of performance in academics, professions, music, and chess.
    - **Working Memory Capacity:** The ability to hold and manipulate information in one's attention is a key predictor of performance, even among highly practiced individuals.

While external factors like the quantity and quality of practice are important, they must be complemented by the learner's internal state and mindset.

1.6. The Learner's Mindset and Autonomy

Even the most scientifically sound learning strategies and instructional designs will fail if the learner is not an active, engaged, and motivated participant. The final, crucial component of effective learning is internal. It involves the learner's beliefs about their own intelligence, their willingness to take ownership of their education, and their ability to learn from feedback and mistakes. This section examines the psychological factors that underpin successful and resilient learning.

1. **The Importance of Autonomy:** As argued by Dr. Tracey Tokuhama-Espinosa, a leading educational researcher, students must become autonomous in their learning. This means taking control of their own learning experiences and assessments. If a class is primarily lecture-based, an autonomous learner will create their own multi-sensory opportunities—such as discussing concepts with peers, creating visual maps, or teaching the material to someone else—to ensure the knowledge "sticks."

2. **Beliefs About Intelligence (Mindset):** A student's implicit beliefs about intelligence are powerful predictors of their motivation and behavior.
   - **Fixed Mindset:** The belief that intelligence is a fixed, innate trait. Students with this mindset tend to avoid challenges and give up easily, as they see effort as a sign of low ability.
   - **Growth Mindset:** The belief that intelligence and ability can be improved through hard work and effective strategies. Students with this mindset are more likely to embrace challenges, persist through setbacks, and ultimately achieve more. Teachers can foster a growth mindset by praising productive effort and strategies rather than innate talent.
3. **The Power of Feedback and Mistakes:** Passive learning methods like reading or listening are ineffective partly because they provide no opportunity for error. Real learning happens when we attempt to do something, make a mistake, and correct it. This process is the very engine of active learning. A "mistake" during self-study is often a failed or partial retrieval attempt. The struggle to recall, the realization of a gap in knowledge, and the subsequent effort to correct the error is the cognitive mechanism that drives the **testing effect**. It is this cycle of attempt, fail, and correct that strengthens memory far more than passive review ever could.
   - Effective feedback is crucial to this process. Good feedback is specific, focused on the task (not the person), and explanatory. It acts as "feed-forward," guiding the learner on what they could do differently next time.
   - The act of making a mistake forces the brain to concentrate and clarifies misunderstandings. It is the core mechanism that distinguishes active methods like retrieval practice from passive ones. Those who refuse to make mistakes often find themselves going in circles, never truly learning.
4. **Debunking Learning Myths:** A clear understanding of the science of learning also requires discarding popular but unsupported myths.
   - **Learning Styles (VARK):** The pervasive idea that individuals have a specific learning style (e.g., Visual, Auditory, Reading, Kinesthetic) is not supported by scientific evidence. While individuals may have preferences, learning is most effective when it is multi-sensory. Engaging multiple neural pathways by, for example, reading about a concept, discussing it, and drawing a diagram, creates more robust and accessible memories than catering to a single "style."
   - **Fixed Developmental Stages:** The notion that certain content is "developmentally inappropriate" based on a child's age is a misconception. This implies a fixed, biologically inevitable sequence of development. A more accurate and productive question for educators to ask is not "Is the student old enough?" but rather, "Has the student mastered the prerequisites?"

Chapter 2: Study Guide for Enhanced Learning

This chapter is designed to help you reinforce and master the key concepts from the Briefing Document through active recall. By engaging with the following quiz, essay prompts, and glossary, you will practice the very techniques proven to enhance long-term retention.

2.1. Knowledge Review Quiz

Instructions: Based on the information in Chapter 1, answer each of the following questions in 2-3 sentences.

1. What is the "testing effect" and why is it considered a "desirable difficulty"?
2. Explain the core difference between working memory and long-term memory according to cognitive science.
3. Define the three types of cognitive load (intrinsic, extraneous, germane) and the instructional goal for each.
4. According to the "Learning Pyramid," why is "teaching others" a more effective learning method than "reading"?
5. What is the "expertise reversal effect"?
6. Briefly describe the findings of the meta-analysis on deliberate practice.
7. What is the difference between spaced repetition and massed practice ("cramming")?
8. Why is a multi-sensory approach to learning considered more effective than catering to a specific "learning style"?
9. How does creating and using schemas help overcome the limitations of working memory?
10. What is the "split-attention effect" and how can it be overcome?

2.2. Answer Key

1. The "testing effect" is the finding that the act of retrieving information from memory (self-testing) improves long-term recall more than simply re-reading it. It is considered a "desirable difficulty" because attempting to recall something is more effortful than passive review, and this productive effort leads to stronger retention.
2. Working memory is the conscious mind, where a small amount of new information (about four chunks) is processed for a very short duration. Long-term memory is a vast, semi-permanent warehouse for storing knowledge, and it has no known capacity limits.
3. **Intrinsic load** is the inherent difficulty of the material, which should be *managed*. **Extraneous load** is the "bad" load from poor instructional design, which should be *minimized*. **Germane load** is the "good" load from the effort of schema construction, which should be *maximized*.
4. "Teaching others" is more effective because it is an active process that forces the learner to confront and correct mistakes, organize their thoughts, and articulate concepts clearly. Reading is a passive activity that does not require this level of engagement, leading to much lower retention (a claimed 90% vs. 10%).

5. The "expertise reversal effect" is the finding that instructional methods that are effective for novices (like worked examples) can become ineffective or even counter-productive for experts, as the guidance becomes redundant and increases extraneous cognitive load.
6. The meta-analysis found that deliberate practice is important but only explains 12% of the variance in performance overall. Its impact varies by domain, being strongest in predictable environments like games (26%) and music (21%) and very weak in professions (<1%).
7. Spaced repetition involves reviewing material at increasing intervals over time, which strengthens long-term memory by combating the natural forgetting curve. Massed practice, or "cramming," involves studying material all at once just before a test, which is far less effective for long-term retention.
8. The theory of "learning styles" is not supported by evidence. A multi-sensory approach is more effective because it creates multiple neural pathways to the same knowledge, reinforcing it in different ways and making recall more reliable.
9. A schema organizes many individual elements of information into a single "chunk" in long-term memory. When this chunk is brought into working memory, it only occupies one of the limited slots, thus effectively bypassing working memory's capacity limits and freeing up resources to process complex information.
10. The "split-attention effect" is an increase in extraneous cognitive load that occurs when a learner must mentally integrate multiple, separate sources of information (e.g., a diagram and separate text). It can be overcome by physically integrating the sources of information.

2.3. Essay and Critical Thinking Questions

These questions are designed to encourage deeper synthesis and application of the concepts. Answers are not provided.

1. Critique the "10,000-hour rule" using the evidence presented in the Macnamara et al. meta-analysis. What other factors must be considered when explaining expert performance, and why?
2. You are an instructional designer tasked with creating a training module for a complex technical skill. Using the principles of Cognitive Load Theory, describe four specific design choices you would make to minimize extraneous load and maximize germane load.
3. A student insists they are a "visual learner" and can only learn from diagrams. Using the information from Dr. Tracey Tokuhama-Espinosa and the "Deans for Impact" report, compose a response that debunks this myth and explains the benefits of a multi-sensory learning approach.
4. Synthesize the findings from the "Spaced Repetition" study on physics students with the principles from the Harvard "5 Tips" article. Argue for why a university should encourage and facilitate spaced, low-stakes testing throughout a semester rather than relying solely on final exams.

5. The Psychotactics article claims, "Real learning comes from making mistakes." Analyze this statement by connecting it to the concepts of retrieval practice, feedback, and the reasons why passive learning is ineffective.

2.4. Glossary of Key Terms

- **Active Note-Taking**: A set of skills for tracking and reinforcing concepts by actively structuring information during a lecture or reading. Methods include Cornell Notes, outlining, mapping, and sentence notes.
- **Active Recall**: The process of actively retrieving information from memory, which is a highly effective learning strategy. Examples include practice testing and using flashcards.
- **Cognitive Load**: The load imposed on working memory during learning. It has three types:
    - **Intrinsic Load**: The inherent complexity of the material.
    - **Extraneous Load**: The "bad" load from poor instructional design.
    - **Germane Load**: The "good" load from the process of schema construction.
- **Concept Mapping**: An active recall technique where a learner creates a visual map of concepts and their relationships, which can boost confidence.
- **Deliberate Practice**: Highly structured activity created specifically to improve performance, involving focused goals, feedback, and challenging tasks just beyond one's current ability.
- **Desirable Difficulties**: Effortful learning processes (like retrieval practice) that are more difficult in the short term but lead to better long-term retention.
- **Ebbinghaus's Forgetting Curve**: A model showing the exponential decay of information from memory over time if no effort is made to retain it.
- **Expertise Reversal Effect**: The principle that instructional methods effective for novices (e.g., worked examples) can become counter-productive for experts.
- **Interleaving**: The practice of alternating between different types of content or problems in a single study session.
- **Learning Pyramid**: A model developed by the NTL Institute that ranks learning methods by their retention rates, with passive methods (lecture, reading) at the bottom and active methods (practice, teaching others) at the top.
- **Long-Term Memory**: The vast, semi-permanent memory system where knowledge is stored in the form of schemas. It has no known capacity limits.
- **Massed Practice (Cramming)**: The ineffective study method of condensing all learning into a single session immediately before an exam.
- **Modality Effect**: The principle that using both auditory (narration) and visual (graphics) channels can increase working memory capacity and improve learning.

- **Multi-sensory Learning**: The approach of learning the same concept through multiple senses, which reinforces knowledge by creating diverse neural pathways. It is considered more effective than catering to a supposed "learning style."
- **Redundancy Effect**: The negative impact on learning that occurs when unnecessary or repeated information is presented, which overloads working memory.
- **Retrieval Practice**: The act of recalling information from memory, a form of self-testing that is more effective for long-term retention than re-reading.
- **Schema**: A mental framework in long-term memory that organizes elements of information according to how they will be used. Building schemas is the essence of learning.
- **Spaced Repetition (Distributed Practice)**: The highly effective practice of reviewing material at increasing time intervals to combat the forgetting curve and build long-term memory.
- **Split-Attention Effect**: The inhibition of learning that occurs when a learner is required to mentally integrate separate sources of information (e.g., a diagram and its explanation in a separate location).
- **Testing Effect**: The finding that the act of taking a test or quiz on material improves long-term retention more than an equivalent amount of time spent re-studying it.
- **Worked Example**: A step-by-step demonstration of how to solve a problem. Studying worked examples is highly effective for novices as it reduces extraneous cognitive load.
- **Working Memory**: The conscious memory system where small amounts of new information are stored and processed for a very short duration. It is severely limited in capacity (about four chunks).

Chapter 3: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

This section addresses ten common and practical questions about applying the science of learning, with answers synthesized directly from the provided research.

3.1. Top 10 Questions on Effective Learning

1. **Q: Is "cramming" for a test ever a good idea? A:** No, not for long-term retention. "Cramming," or massed practice, is significantly less effective than spaced repetition. Research on physics students showed that "crammers" performed worse than those who spaced their practice on the final exam (64% vs. 70%) and dramatically worse on a delayed test (36% vs. 45%). While cramming might help you pass a test tomorrow, the information will decay from memory very quickly, which is detrimental in higher education where knowledge needs to build upon itself.

2. **Q: If learning styles aren't real, what is the best way for me to study? A:** The idea of specific learning styles like VARK (Visual, Auditory, etc.) is a myth not supported by evidence. The best approach is multi-sensory. As Dr. Tracey Tokuhama-Espinosa explains, your brain benefits from learning through all senses. Instead of creating one road to access knowledge, a multi-sensory approach creates multiple avenues (e.g., reading about a concept, discussing it, and then drawing a diagram), which reinforces the information in different neural pathways and improves recall.

3. **Q: What is the single most effective study technique I can use today? A:** Retrieval practice, also known as the "testing effect." The act of actively recalling information from your memory is more powerful than any form of passive review, like re-reading notes or a textbook. You can implement this immediately by using flashcards, doing practice problems, or simply pausing after reading a section and trying to summarize the key points from memory without looking.

4. **Q: How much does practice actually matter compared to natural talent? A:** Practice is crucial, but it's not the whole story. A major meta-analysis found that deliberate practice, on average, explains only about 12% of the difference in performance between individuals. This percentage varies greatly by domain—from 26% in games to less than 1% in professions. Other factors that significantly contribute to expertise include general intelligence, working memory capacity, and the age at which one starts in a domain.

5. **Q: I get overwhelmed with new information in class. What's happening and what can I do? A:** You are likely experiencing cognitive overload, where the amount of new information is exceeding your working memory's limited capacity. According to Cognitive Load Theory, your brain can only process about four new pieces of information at once. To manage this, focus on active note-taking methods (like mapping or outlining) to structure the information, and review the material immediately after class to begin transferring it to long-term memory before it fades. If the instruction is poor (e.g., split-attention or redundancy), you may need to reorganize the material yourself.

6. **Q: Why do I forget things so quickly after I've learned them? A:** This is a natural phenomenon described by Ebbinghaus's "forgetting curve," which shows that information decays exponentially from memory if it is not revisited. To combat this, you must use spaced repetition. By reviewing what you've learned at increasing intervals (e.g., after one day, then six days, then 15 days), you signal to your brain that the information is

important, which reduces the rate of decay and moves the knowledge into durable long-term storage.

7. **Q: Are there any high-tech tools or apps that can help me study better? A:** Yes. Digital tools are particularly effective for implementing spaced repetition. Apps can automate the scheduling of flashcards or practice questions, showing you the ones you struggle with more frequently and spacing out the ones you know well. Research on university physics students demonstrated that a custom-built spaced repetition web app led to significantly higher exam scores and better long-term retention.
8. **Q: I read the textbook, but I still don't do well on tests. What am I doing wrong? A:** You are confusing passive review with active learning. According to the "Learning Pyramid," reading is one of the least effective ways to learn, resulting in a claimed 10% retention. This is because it doesn't require you to make and correct mistakes. Instead of just re-reading, you need to engage in active recall: after reading a chapter, close the book and test yourself on the concepts, explain them aloud, or do practice problems.
9. **Q: Does it matter what font my study materials are in? A:** Based on current research, it appears not to be a significant factor. A study investigating the font Sans Forgetica—designed to be a "desirable difficulty"—found no significant improvement in recall compared to a standard font like Times New Roman. While some "disfluency" effects have been reported in the past, they are not easily replicated. It is more prudent to focus on proven strategies like retrieval practice and spacing rather than font manipulations.
10. **Q: How can I stay motivated to learn difficult subjects? A:** Motivation is closely tied to your mindset and feelings of autonomy. Adopting a "growth mindset"—the belief that your intelligence can be improved with effort—is crucial for persisting through challenges. Also, find ways to make the material personal and applicable to your life to increase its meaning. Finally, teachers can foster motivation by giving specific, task-focused feedback that helps you improve, and by encouraging you to set learning goals (focused on improvement) rather than performance goals (focused on approval).

Chapter 4: Timeline of Key Developments in the Science of Learning

Understanding the historical context of learning science can clarify how today's powerful, evidence-based ideas have evolved over more than a century of research. This timeline presents key milestones mentioned in the source documents that have shaped our modern understanding of knowledge acquisition and retention.

4.1. A Chronology of Learning Research

Year(s)	Development
1885	German psychologist **Hermann Ebbinghaus** conducts the first systematic investigation of memory, developing the "forgetting curve" and demonstrating the exponential decay of information over time.
1960s	The **NTL Institute** in Bethel, Maine, develops the "Learning Pyramid," a conceptual model that categorizes learning methods by their average retention rates, highlighting the superiority of active over passive methods.
1968	**C.A. Mace** is the first to apply the psychological research on spacing to education, formally suggesting that spaced revision of curriculum material is more effective than massed study ("cramming").
1972	**Sebastian Leitner** develops a physical flashcard system that operationalizes the spacing effect for practical use, helping learners build long-term memory.
1980s-1990s	**John Sweller** and his colleagues develop **Cognitive Load Theory**, a foundational theory of instructional design based on the architecture of human memory, particularly the limitations of working memory.
1993	**K. Anders Ericsson, Krampe, & Tesch-Römer** publish their influential paper, "The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance," which becomes the basis for the "10,000-hour rule."
2006	**Henry L. Roediger III & Jeffrey D. Karpicke** publish seminal papers on the "testing effect," providing robust evidence that taking memory tests improves long-term retention more than re-studying.
2014	**Macnamara, Hambrick, & Oswald** publish a landmark meta-analysis that critically evaluates the role of deliberate practice across multiple domains, finding it explains only 12% of performance variance overall.
2020	**Voice & Stirton** publish research demonstrating that a spaced repetition app had a significant, positive effect on the exam performance and long-term retention of university physics students.

Chapter 5: Scientific Sources and References

This chapter provides a comprehensive list of the source materials used to construct this report, followed by a consolidated list of academic references cited within those documents, all presented in a standard scientific format.

5.1. Primary Source Documents

- "5 Tips to Retain What You Learn - Harvard Summer School" (Blog Post)
- "Active recall strategies associated with academic achievement in young adults: A systematic review - PubMed" (Journal Abstract)
- "Assessing 'Desirable Difficulties' To Improve Learning: Testing and Font Effects - Amazon S3" (Research Paper)
- "Cognitive load theory: Research that teachers really need to understand - NSW Department of Education" (Report)
- "Deliberate Practice and Performance in Music, Games, Sports, Education, and Professions: A Meta-Analysis" (Journal Article)
- "How To Retain 90% Of Everything You Learn - Psychotactics" (Blog Post)
- "How to Study Smart: 10 Advanced STANFORD Study Tips" (YouTube Transcript)
- "Spaced Repetition: towards more effective learning in STEM - ERIC" (Journal Article)
- "The Science of Learning - Deans for Impact" (Report)

5.2. Cited References

- Ackerman, P. L. (1987). Individual differences in skill learning: An integration of psychometric and information processing perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin, 102*, 3–27.
- Ackerman, P. L., Kanfer, R., & Goff, M. (1995). Cognitive and noncognitive determinants and consequences of complex skill acquisition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 1*, 270–304.
- Agarwal, P. K., Bain, P. M., & Chamberlain, R. W. (2012). The value of applied research: Retrieval practice improves classroom learning and recommendations from a teacher, a principal, and a scientist. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(3), 437-448.
- Agodini, R., Harris, B., Atkins-Burnett, S., Heaviside, S., Novak, T., & Murphy, R. (2009). *Achievement Effects of Four Early Elementary School Math Curricula: Findings from First Graders in 39 Schools. NCEE 2009-4052*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Ainsworth, S., Bibby, P., & Wood, D. (2002). Examining the Effects of Different Multiple Representational Systems in Learning Primary Mathematics. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 11*(1), 25-61.
- Anderson, J. R. (2000). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

- Anderson, J. R., Bothell, D., Byrne, M. D., Douglass, S., Lebiere, C., & Qin, Y. (2004). An integrated theory of the mind. *Psychological Review, 111*(4), 1036-1060.
- Anderson, R. (1977). The notion of schemata and the educational enterprise: General discussion of the conference. In R. Anderson, R. Spiro & W. Montague (eds), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale N.J., pp. 415-431.
- Anderson, R. (1978). Schema-directed processes in language comprehension. In A. Lesgold, J. Pellegrino, S. Fokkema & R. Glaser (eds), *Cognitive psychology and instruction*, Plenum, New York, pp. 67-82.
- Atkinson, R. K., Derry, S. J., Renkl, A., & Wortham, D. (2000). Learning from Examples: Instructional Principles from the Worked Examples Research. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(2), 181-214.
- Atkinson, R., & Shiffrin, R. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. Spence (ed), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory, vol. 2*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 89-195.
- Baddeley, A. (1983). Working memory. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences, 302*(1110), 311-324.
- Baddeley, A. (2002). Is working memory still working? *European Psychologist, 7*(2), 85-97.
- Baddeley, A., & Hitch, G. (1974). Working memory. In G. Bower (ed), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory, vol. 8*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 47-89.
- Bannert, M. (2002). Managing cognitive load: Recent trends in cognitive load theory. *Learning and Instruction, 12*(1), 139-146.
- Barrett, L., Tudage, M., & Engel, R. (2004). Individual differences in working memory capacity and dual process theories of the mind. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(4), 553-573.
- Bartlett, F. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Becker, G. (1986). Correcting the point-biserial correlation for attenuation owing to unequal sample size. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 55*, 5–8.
- Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2011). Making things hard on yourself, but in a good way: Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. *Psychology and the real world: Essays illustrating fundamental contributions to society, 2*(59-68).
- Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. *Child Development, 78*(1), 246-263.
- Bobis, J., Sweller, J., & Cooper, M. (1994). Demands imposed on primary school students by geometric models. *Contemporary Education Psychology, 19*(1), 108-117.

- Bokosmaty, S., Sweller, J., & Kalyuga, S. (2015). Learning geometry problem solving by studying worked examples: Effects of learner guidance and expertise. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*(2), 307-333.
- Bottge, B. A., Rueda, E., Serlin, R. C., Hung, Y.-H., & Kwon, J. M. (2007). Shrinking Achievement Differences With Anchored Math Problems. *The Journal of Special Education, 41*(1), 31-49.
- Boyd, R. (2008, February 7). Do People Only Use 10 Percent of Their Brains? *Scientific American*.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Brody, N. (1997). Intelligence, schooling, and society. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1046–1050.
- Brünken, R., Plass, J., & Leutner, D. (2003). Direct measurement of cognitive load in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(1), 53-61.
- Bruner, J. (1961). The art of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review, 31*, 21-32.
- Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E. H., VanEpps, E. M., Pollack, J. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Mind-sets matter: A meta-analytics review of implicit theories and self-regulation. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(3), 655-701.
- Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245-281.
- Cameron, J., Banko, K. M., & Pierce, W. D. (2001). Pervasive negative effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: The myth continues. *The Behavior Analyst, 24*(1), 1-44.
- Carlson, R., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2003). Learning and understanding science instructional material. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(3), 629-640.
- Carroll, W. (1994). Using worked examples as an instructional support in the algebra classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(3), 360-367.
- Carrier, M., & Pashler, H. (1992). The influence of retrieval on retention. *Memory & Cognition, 20*(6), 633-642.
- Catrambone, R. (1996). Generalizing solution procedures learned from examples. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 22*(4), 1020-1031.
- Catrambone, R. (1998). The subgoal learning model: Creating better examples so that students can solve novel problems. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 127*(4), 355-376.
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*(3), 354-380.

- Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1991). Cognitive load theory and the format of instruction. *Cognition and Instruction, 8*(4), 293-332.
- Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1992). The Split-Attention Effect as a Factor in the Design of Instruction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 62*(2), 233-246.
- Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1996). Cognitive load while learning to use a computer program. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 10*(2), 151-170.
- Charness, N., Tuffiash, M., Krampe, R., Reingold, E., & Vasyukova, E. (2005). The role of deliberate practice in chess expertise. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 151–165.
- Clark, R., Kirschner, P., & Sweller, J. (2012). Putting students on the path to learning: The case for fully guided instruction. *American Educator, Spring*, 6-11.
- Cohen, G., Steele, C., & Ross, L. (1999). The Mentor's Dilemma: Providing Critical Feedback Across the Racial Divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(10), 1302-1318.
- Colvin, G. (2008). *Talent is overrated: What really separates world-class performers from everybody else*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Cooper, G., & Sweller, J. (1987). Effects of schema acquisition and rule automation on mathematical problem-solving transfer. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(4), 347-362.
- Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences, 24*(1), 87-114.
- Cowan, N. (2008). What are the differences between long-term, short-term, and working memory? *Progress in Brain Research, 169*, 323-338.
- Craik, F. I., Govoni, R., Naveh-Benjamin, M., & Anderson, N. D. (1996). The effects of divided attention on encoding and retrieval processes in human memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 125*(2), 159-176.
- Crissman, J. (2006). *The design and utilization of effective worked examples: A meta-analysis*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln N.E.
- Curtis, J., Lowe, A. and Voice, A. M. (2018). *Analysis of student study habits*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Leeds.
- Davis, K. D., Winsler, A., & Middleton, M. (2006). Students' perceptions of rewards for academic performance by parents and teachers: Relations with achievement and motivation in college. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 167*(2), 211-220.
- Day, S. B., & Goldstone, R. L. (2012). The import of knowledge export: Connecting findings and theories of transfer of learning. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(3), 153-176.
- De Jong, T. (2010). Cognitive load theory, educational research, and instructional design: Some food for thought. *Instructional Science, 38*(2), 105-134.

- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 627-668.
- DeLeeuw, K., & Mayer, R. (2008). A comparison of three measures of cognitive load: Evidence for separable measures of intrinsic, extraneous, and germane load. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 223-234.
- Diemand-Yauman, C., Oppenheimer, D. M., & Vaughan, E. B. (2011). Fortune favors the bold (and the italicized): Effects of disfluency on educational outcomes. *Cognition, 118*(1), 111-115.
- Duffy, L. J., Baluch, B., & Ericsson, K. A. (2004). Dart performance as a function of facets of practice amongst professional and amateur men and women players. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 35*, 232–245.
- Duval, S. J., & Tweedie, R. L. (2000a). A nonparametric “trim and fill” method of accounting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 95*, 89–98.
- Duval, S. J., & Tweedie, R. L. (2000b). Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics, 56*, 455–463.
- Ebbinghaus, H. (1885). *Memory: a contribution to experimental psychology* (H.A. Ruger, C.E. Bussinius & E.R. Hilgard, Trans. in 1964.). New York: Dover Publications.
- Einstein, G. O., Mullet, H. G., & Harrison, T. L. (2022). The testing effect: Illustrating a fundamental concept and changing study strategies. *Teaching of Psychology, 39*(3), 190-193.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(1), 5-12.
- Engle, R. W. (2002). Working memory capacity as executive attention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11*, 19–23.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2007). Deliberate practice and the modifiability of the body and mind: Toward a science of the structure and acquisition of expert and elite performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 38*, 4–34.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance. *Psychological Review, 100*(3), 363-406.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Moxley, J. H. (2012). The expert performance approach and deliberate practice: Some potential implications for studying creative performance in organizations. In M. D. Mumford (Ed.), *The handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 141–167). London, England: Academic Press.
- Eskenazi, M. A., & Nix, B. (2020). Individual differences in the desirable difficulty effect during lexical acquisition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition.*

- EU High Level Group of Experts on Literacy. (2012). *Final Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fernandes, M. A., & Moscovitch, M. (2000). Divided attention and memory: evidence of substantial interference effects at retrieval and encoding. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 129*(2), 155-176.
- Flynn, E., O'Malley, C., & Wood, D. (2004). A longitudinal, microgenetic study of the emergence of false belief understanding and inhibition skills. *Developmental Science, 7*(1), 103-115.
- Francis, D. (2018). Introducing Sans Forgetica. *Word Ways, 51*(4), 10.
- Fredericks, T., Choi, S., Hart, J., Butt, S., & Mital, A. (2005). An investigation of myocardial aerobic capacity as a measure of both physical and cognitive workloads. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 35*(12), 1097-1107.
- Gagné, F. (2009). Talent development as seen through the differentiated model of giftedness and talent. In T. Balchin, B. Hymer, & D. Matthews (Eds.), *The Routledge international companion to gifted education* (pp. 32–41). Abingdon, Oxfordshire, England: Routledge.
- Gallo, M., & Odu, M. (2009). Examining the Relationship Between Class Scheduling and Student Achievement in College Algebra. *Community College Review, 36*(4), 299-325.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. London, England: Macmillan.
- Gardner, H. (1995). "Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition": Comment. *American Psychologist, 50*, 802–803.
- Gaspelin, N., Ruthruff, E., & Pashler, H. (2013). Divided attention: An undesirable difficulty in memory retention. *Memory & Cognition, 41*(7), 978-988.
- Geary, D. (2012). Evolutionary educational psychology. In K. Harris, S. Graham & T. Urdan (eds), *APA Educational Psychology Handbook, vol. 1*, American Psychological Association, Washington D.C., pp. 597-621.
- Gentner, D., Levine, S. C., Dhillon, S., Ping, R., Bradley, C., Poltermann, A., et al. (2015). Rapid learning in a children's museum via analogical comparison. *Cognitive Science.*
- Gerjets, P., Scheiter, K., & Cierniak, G. (2009). The scientific value of cognitive load theory: A research agenda based on the structuralist view of theories. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*(1), 43-54.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York, NY: Little, Brown.
- Glaser, R., & Chi, M. T. (1988). Overview. In *The Nature of Expertise* (pp. xv-xxvii). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Gobet, F., & Campitelli, G. (2007). The role of domain-specific practice, handedness, and starting age in chess. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 159–172.

- Goldstone, R. L., & Son, J. Y. (2005). The Transfer of Scientific Principles using Concrete and Idealized Simulations. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 14*(1), 69-110.
- Grabner, R. H., Stern, E., & Neubauer, A. C. (2007). Individual differences in chess expertise: A psychometric investigation. *Acta Psychologica, 124*, 398–420.
- Graesser, A. C., & Olde, B. A. (2003). How does one know whether a person understands a device? The quality of the questions the person asks when the device breaks down. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(3), 524-536.
- Halamish, V. (2018). Can very small font size enhance memory?. *Memory & Cognition, 46*(6), 979-993.
- Hambrick, D. Z., Oswald, F. L., Altmann, E. M., Meinz, E. J., Gobet, F., & Campitelli, G. (2014). Deliberate practice: Is that all it takes to become an expert? *Intelligence, 45*, 34–45.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112.
- Hopkins, R.F., Lyle, K.B., Hieb, J.L., & Ralston, P.A.S. (2015). Spaced Retrieval Practice Increases College Students' Short- and Long-Term Retention of Mathematics Knowledge. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(4), 853-873.
- Howard, R. W. (2012). Longitudinal effects of different types of practice on the development of chess expertise. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 26*, 359–369.
- Hunt, E. (2011). *Human intelligence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). Dichotomization of continuous variables: The implications for meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 334–339.
- Hutchinson, C. U., Sachs-Ericsson, N. J., & Ericsson, K. A. (2013). Generalizable aspects of the development of expertise in ballet across countries and cultures: A perspective from the expert performance approach. *High Ability Studies, 24*, 21–47.
- Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor: The science of mental ability*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Jeung, H., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1997). The role of visual indicators in dual sensory mode instruction. *Educational Psychology, 17*(3), 329-343.
- Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive load theory: How many types of load does it really need? *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(1), 1-19.
- Kamins, M. L., & Dweck, C. S. (1999). Person versus process praise and criticism: implications for contingent self-worth and coping. *Developmental Psychology, 35*(3), 835-847.

- Kapler, I.V., Weston, T., & Wiseheart, M. (2015). Spacing in a simulated undergraduate classroom: Long-term benefits for factual and higher-level learning. *Learning and Instruction*, *36*, 38-45.
- Karpicke, J. D., Butler, A. C., & Roediger, H. L. (2009). Metacognitive strategies in student learning: Do students practise retrieval when they study on their own? *Memory*, *17*(4), 471-479.
- Karpicke, J. D., & Roediger, H. L. (2008). The critical importance of retrieval for learning. *Science*, *319*(5865), 966-968.
- Kerfoot, B.P., & Brotschi, E. (2009). Online spaced education to teach urology to medical students: a multi-institutional randomized trial. *Am J Surg*, *197*(1), 89-95.
- Kerfoot, B.P., DeWolf, W.C., Masser, B.A., Church, P.A., and Federman, D.D. (2007). Spaced education improves the retention of clinical knowledge by medical students: a randomised controlled trial. *Medical Education*, *41*(1), 23-31.
- Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(2), 75-86.
- Klahr, D., & Nigam, M. (2004). The equivalence of learning paths in early science education: Effects of direct instruction and discovery learning. *Psychological Science*, *15*(10), 661-667.
- Koriat, A. (1993). How do we know that we know? The accessibility model of the feeling of knowing. *Psychological Review*, *100*(4), 609-639.
- Koriat, A., & Levy-Sadot, R. (2001). The combined contributions of the cue-familiarity and accessibility heuristics to feelings of knowing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *27*(1), 34-53.
- Kornell, N., & Bjork, R.A. (2007). The promise and perils of self-regulated study. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *14*(2), 219-224.
- Kühl, T., & Eitel, A. (2016). Effects of disfluency on cognitive and metacognitive processes and outcomes. *Metacognition and Learning*, *11*(1), 1-13.
- Kyun, S., Kalyuga, S., & Sweller, J. (2013). The effect of worked examples when learning to write essays in English literature. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *81*(3), 385-408.
- Laberge, D., & Samuels, J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, *6*(2), 293-323.
- Laidra, K., Pullmann, H., & Allik, J. (2007). Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*, 441–451.
- Lehmann, A. C., & Ericsson, K. A. (1996). Performance without preparation: Structure and acquisition of expert sight-reading and accompanying performance. *Psychomusicology*, *15*, 1–29.
- Leitner, S. (1972). *So lernt man lernen*. Herder.

- Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language*. Oxford, England: Wiley.
- Leppink, J., Paas, F., van Gog, T., van der Vleuten, C., & van Merrienboer, J. (2014). Effects of pairs of problems and examples on task performance and different types of cognitive load. *Learning and Instruction, 30*, 32-42.
- Leslie, K., Low, R., Jin, P., & Sweller, J. (2012). Redundancy and expertise reversal effects when using educational technology to learn primary school science. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *60*(1), 1-13.
- Levitt, S. D., List, J. A., & Neckermann, S. S. (2012). *The Behavioralist Goes to School: Leveraging Behavioral Economics to Improve Educational Performance (NBER Working Paper, 18165)*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Levitt, S. D., & Dubner, S. J. (2009). *SuperFreakonomics: Global cooling, patriotic prostitutes, and why suicide bombers should buy life insurance*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Logan, G. D., & Klapp, S. T. (1991). Automatizing alphabet arithmetic: I. Is extended practice necessary to produce automaticity? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 17*(2), 179-195.
- Mace, C.A. (1968). *The psychology of study*. Penguin.
- Marcus, G. (2012). *Guitar zero: The science of becoming musical at any age*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Martin, A. (2016). *Using Load Reduction Instruction (LRI) to boost motivation and engagement*. British Psychological Society, Leicester UK.
- Maxwell, S.E., and Delaney, H.D. (1990). *Designing experiments and analyzing data: A model comparison perspective*. US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Mayer, R. (2004). Should there be a three-strikes rule against pure discovery learning? The case for guided methods of instruction. *American Psychologist, 59*(1), 14-19.
- Mayer, R., Bove, W., Bryman, A., Mars, R., & Tapangco, L. (1996). When less is more: Meaningful learning from visual and verbal summaries of science textbook lessons. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(1), 64-73.
- Mayer, R., Hegarty, M., Mayer, S., & Campbell, J. (2005). When static media promote active learning: Annotated illustrations versus narrated animations in multimedia instruction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 11*(4), 256-265.
- McDaniel, M. A., Hines, R. J., Waddill, P. J., & Einstein, G. O. (1994). What makes folk tales unique: Content familiarity, causal structure, scripts, or superstructures? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 20*(1), 169-184.
- Meinz, E. J., & Hambrick, D. Z. (2010). Deliberate practice is necessary but not sufficient to explain individual differences in piano sight-reading skill: The role of working memory capacity. *Psychological Science, 21*, 914–919.

- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med 6*: Article e1000097.
- Moreno, R. (2006). Learning in High-Tech and Multimedia Environments. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *15*(2), 63-67.
- Moreno, R. (2010). Cognitive load theory: More food for thought. *Instructional Science, 38*(2), 135-141.
- Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. E. (1999). Cognitive Principles of Multimedia Learning: The Role of Modality and Contiguity. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 358-368.
- Morris, C. D., Bransford, J. D., & Franks, J. J. (1977). Levels of Processing Versus Transfer Appropriate Processing. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 16*(5), 519-533.
- Mousavi, S., Low, R., & Sweller, J. (1995). Reducing cognitive load by mixing auditory and visual presentation modes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(2), 319-334.
- Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Praise for intelligence can undermine children's motivation and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 33-52.
- National Mathematics Advisory Panel. (2008). *Foundations for Success: The Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: Reports of the Subgroups*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Nielson, J. A., Zielinski, B. A., Ferguson, M. A., Lainhart, J. E., & Anderson, J. S. (2013). An Evaluation of the Left-Brain vs Right-Brain Hypothesis with Resting State Functional Connectivity Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *PLOS ONE*, *8*(8).
- Owen, E., & Sweller, J. (1985). What do students learn while solving mathematics problems? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*(3), 272-284.
- Owens, P., & Sweller, J. (2008). Cognitive load theory and music instruction. *Educational Psychology*, *28*(1), 29-45.
- Paas, F. (1992). Training strategies for attaining transfer of problem-solving skill in statistics: A cognitive-load approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *84*(4), 429-434.
- Paas, F., Renkl, A., & Sweller, J. (2003). Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(1), 1-4.
- Paas, F., & Sweller, J. (2012). An evolutionary upgrade of cognitive load theory: Using the human motor system and collaboration to support the learning of complex cognitive tasks. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(1), 27-45.

- Paas, F., Tuovinen, J., Tabbers, H., & van Gerven, P. (2003). Cognitive load measurement as a means to advance cognitive load theory. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(1), 63-71.
- Paas, F., & van Merrienboer, J. (1994). Variability of worked examples and transfer of geometrical problem-solving skills: A cognitive load approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(1), 122-133.
- Paas, F., van Merrienboer, J., & Adam, J. (1994). Measurement of cognitive load in instructional research. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 79*(1), 419-430.
- Pachman, M., Sweller, J., & Kalyuga, S. (2013). Levels of knowledge and deliberate practice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 19*(2), 108-119.
- Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, computers and powerful ideas*. Basic Books, New York.
- Park, B. (2010). *Testing the additivity hypothesis of cognitive load theory*. Doctoral thesis, Saarland University, Saarbrücken.
- Pashler, H., Bain, P. M., Bottge, B. A., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., & McDaniel, M. (2007). *Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington DC: National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning Styles: Concepts and Evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 9*(3), 105-119.
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (2012). *Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Penney, C. (1989). Modality effects and the structure of short-term verbal memory. *Memory and Cognition, 17*(4), 389-422.
- Peters, E. E., & Levin, J. R. (1986). Effects of a mnemonic imagery strategy on good and poor readers' prose recall. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*(2), 179-192.
- Peterson, L., & Peterson, M. (1959). Short-term retention of individual verbal items. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 58*(3), 193-198.
- Piaget, J. (1928). *Judgement and reasoning in the child*. Harcourt, New York.
- Pillay, H. (1994). Cognitive load and mental rotation: Structuring orthographic projection for learning and problem solving. *Instructional Science, 22*(2), 91-113.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., McClearn, G. E., & McGuffin, P. (2008). *Behavioral genetics* (Vol. 5). New York, NY: Worth.
- Pollock, E., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2002). Assimilating complex information. *Learning and Instruction, 12*(1), 61-86.

- Pyke, A., Bourque, G., & LeFevre, J. A. (2019). Expediting arithmetic automaticity: Do inefficient computation methods induce spontaneous testing effects? *Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 31*(1), 104-115.
- Pyke, A. A., & LeFevre, J. A. (2011). Calculator use need not undermine direct-access ability: The roles of retrieval, calculation, and calculator use in the acquisition of arithmetic facts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 607-616.
- Quality Assurance Agency. (2014). *Subject Benchmark Statement: Chemistry*.
- Quality Assurance Agency. (2017). *Subject Benchmark Statement: Physics, Astronomy and Astrophysics*.
- Quilici, J., & Mayer, R. (1996). Role of examples in how students learn to categorize statistics word problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(1), 144-161.
- Rawson, K.A., Vaughn, K.E., and Carpenter, S.K. (2015). Does the benefit of testing depend on lag, and if so, why? Evaluating the elaborative retrieval hypothesis. *Memory & Cognition, 43*(4), 619-633.
- Richland, L. E., Zur, O., & Holyoak, K. J. (2007). Cognitive Supports for Analogies in the Mathematics Classroom. *Science, 316*(5828), 1128-1129.
- Roediger, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006a). The Power of Testing Memory Basic Research and Implications for Educational Practice. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(3), 181-210.
- Roediger, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006b). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological Science, 17*(3), 249-255.
- Roediger, H.L., & Karpicke, J.D. (2018). Reflections on the Resurgence of Interest in the Testing Effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13*(2), 236-241.
- Rogers, B. (2001). *TOEFL CBT Success*. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.
- Rohrer, D. (2009). The Effects of Spacing and Mixing Practice Problems. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 40*(1), 4-17.
- Rohrer, D., Dedrick, R. F., & Stershic, S. (2015). Interleaved practice improves mathematics learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(3), 900-908.
- Rohrer, D., & Taylor, K. (2007). The shuffling of mathematics problems improves learning. *Instructional Science, 35*(6), 481-498.
- Rosenshine, B. (1986). Synthesis of research on explicit teaching. *Educational Leadership, 43*(7), 60-69.
- Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching Students to Generate Questions: A Review of the Intervention Studies. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(2), 181-221.
- Rourke, A., & Sweller, J. (2009). The worked-example effect using ill-defined problems: Learning to recognise designers' styles. *Learning and Instruction, 19*(2), 185-199.

- Schmidt, F. L. (2014). A general theoretical integrative model of individual differences in interests, abilities, personality traits, and academic and occupational achievement: A commentary on four recent articles. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*, 211–218.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 162–173.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1996). Measurement error in psychological research: Lessons from 26 research scenarios. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 199–223.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 262–274.
- Schneider, W., & Fisk, A. D. (1982). Degree of consistent training: Improvements in search performance and automatic process development. *Perception & Psychophysics, 31*, 160–168.
- Schnotz, W., & Kürschner, C. (2007). A reconsideration of cognitive load theory. *Educational Psychology Review, 19*(4), 469-508.
- Schultheis, H., & Jameson, A. (2004). A new instrument for measuring the cognitive load imposed by user interfaces in adaptive hypermedia systems: Physiological and behavioural methods. In P. DeBra & W. Nejdl (eds), *Adaptive hypermedia and adaptive web-based systems, vol. 3137*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 225-234.
- Schworm, S., & Renkl, A. (2007). Learning argumentation skills through the use of prompts for self-explaining examples. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(2), 285–296.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(1), 153-198.
- Shuter, R. (1968). *The psychology of musical ability*. London, England: Methuen.
- Siegler, R. S. (1995). How does change occur: A microgenetic study of number conservation. *Cognitive Psychology, 28*(3), 225-273.
- Simonton, D. K. (2014). Creative performance, expertise acquisition, individual differences, and developmental antecedents: An integrative research agenda. *Intelligence, 45*, 66–73.
- Smiley, P. A., & Dweck, C. S. (1994). Individual differences in achievement goals among young children. *Child Development, 65*(6), 1723-1743.
- Smith, S. M., & Vela, E. (2001). Environmental context-dependent memory: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 8*(2), 203-220.
- Steffe, L., & Gale, J. (eds). (1995). *Constructivism in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale N.J.

- Sternberg, R. J. (1996). The costs of expertise. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports, and games* (pp. 347–354). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stull, A., & Mayer, R. (2007). Learning by doing versus learning by viewing: Three experimental comparisons of learner-generated versus author-provided graphic organisers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(4), 808-820.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257-285.
- Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. *Learning and Instruction, 4*(4), 295-312.
- Sweller, J. (1999). *Instructional design in technical areas*. ACER Press, Camberwell.
- Sweller, J. (2006). The Worked Example Effect and Human Cognition. *Learning and Instruction, 16*(2), 165-169.
- Sweller, J. (2010). Element interactivity and intrinsic, extraneous and germane cognitive load. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(2), 123-138.
- Sweller, J. (2016). Story of a research program. *Education Review, 23*, 1-18.
- Sweller, J., & Chandler, P. (1994). Why some material is difficult to learn. *Cognition and Instruction, 12*(3), 185-233.
- Sweller, J., & Cooper, G. (1985). The use of worked examples as a substitute for problem solving in learning algebra. *Cognition and Instruction, 2*(1), 59-89.
- Sweller, J., van Merrienboer, J. J., & Paas, F. G. (1998). Cognitive Architecture and Instructional Design. *Educational Psychology Review, 10*(3), 251-296.
- Tarmizi, R., & Sweller, J. (1988). Guidance during mathematical problem solving. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 424-436.
- Tindall-Ford, S., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1997). When two sensory modes are better than one. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 3*(4), 257-287.
- Torcasio, S., & Sweller, J. (2010). The use of illustrations when learning to read: A cognitive load approach. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 24*(5), 659-672.
- Tricot, A., & Sweller, J. (2014). Domain-specific knowledge and why teaching generic skills does not work. *Educational Psychology Review, 26*(2), 265-283.
- Tuffiash, M., Roring, R. W., & Ericsson, K. A. (2007). Expert performance in SCRABBLE: Implications for the study of the structure and acquisition of complex skills. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 13*, 124–134.
- Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and semantic memory. In E. Tulving & W. Donaldson (eds), *Organization of memory*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 381-403.
- Tuovinen, J., & Sweller, J. (1999). A comparison of cognitive load associated with discovery learning and worked examples. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 334-341.

- van Gerven, P., Paas, F., van Merrienboer, J., & Schmidt, H. (2002). Cognitive load theory and aging: Effects of worked examples on training efficiency. *Learning and Instruction*, *12*(1), 87-105.
- van Gerven, P., Paas, F., van Merrienboer, J., & Schmidt, H. (2004). Memory load and the cognitive pupillary response in aging. *Psychophysiology, 41*(2), 167-174.
- van Merrienboer, J., Kester, L., & Paas, F. (2006). Teaching complex rather than simple tasks: Balancing intrinsic and germane load to enhance transfer of learning. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 20*(3), 343-352.
- van Merrienboer, J., Kirschner, P., & Kester, L. (2003). Taking the load off a learner's mind: Instructional design for complex learning. *Educational Psychologist, 38*(1), 5-14.
- van Merrienboer, J., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive load theory and complex learning: Recent developments and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(2), 147-177.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science, 331*, 1447-1451.
- Ward, M., & Sweller, J. (1990). Structuring effective worked examples. *Cognition and Instruction, 7*(1), 1-39.
- Waterhouse, L. (2006). Multiple Intelligences, the Mozart Effect, and Emotional Intelligence: A Critical Review. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(4), 207-225.
- Watson, J. B. (1930). *Behaviorism*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Wiliam, D. (2017). *I've come to the conclusion Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory is the single most important thing for teachers to know*. Tweet.
- Willingham, D. T. (2004). Reframing the Mind: Howard Gardner and the theory of multiple intelligences. *Education Next, 4*(3), 19-24.
- Willingham, D. T. (2008, Summer). What is Developmentally Appropriate Practice? *American Educator*, pp. 34-39.
- Willingham, D. T. (2009). *Why Don't Students Like School?*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Yeager, D. S., Johnson, R., Spitzer, B. J., Trzesniewski, K. H., Powers, J., & Dweck, C. S. (2014). The far-reaching effects of believing people can change: Implicit theories of personality shape stress, health, and achievement during adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*(6), 867-884.
- Yeager, D., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., Brzustoski, P., Master, A., et al. (2014). Breaking the Cycle of Mistrust: Wise Interventions to Provide Critical Feedback Across the Racial Divide. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 143*(2), 804-824.
- Yeager, D., Walton, G., & Cohen, G. L. (2013, February). Addressing achievement gaps with psychological interventions. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 62-65.

- Yeung, A., Jin, P., & Sweller, J. (1998). Cognitive load and learner expertise: Split attention and redundancy effects in reading with explanatory notes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *23*(1), 1-21.
- Yue, C. L., Castel, A. D., & Bjork, R. A. (2013). When disfluency is—and is not—a desirable difficulty: The influence of typeface clarity on metacognitive judgments and memory. *Memory & Cognition*, *41*(2), 229-241.
- Zhu, X., & Simon, H. (1987). Learning mathematics from examples and by doing. *Cognition and Instruction*, *4*(3), 137-166.