

Curriculum Design and Cognitive Load Optimization

¹Nweke Francisca Uloaku, ²Owonwami, Isiaka Taiye, ³Christiana Ibi &
⁴Usuman Aliyu

Department of Education Foundation, Faculty of Education
Modibbo Adama University Yola Adamawa State Nigeria
Correspondence email: nwekefrancisca@gmail.com.

Abstract

The increasing complexity of contemporary education, driven by rapid knowledge expansion and technological integration, has intensified the need for curriculum design approaches that align with human cognitive architecture. Traditional content-driven approaches often neglect the limitations of working memory, resulting in cognitive overload and reduced learning effectiveness. This paper examines how curriculum design can support cognitive load optimization through the application of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT). Drawing on foundational and contemporary research, it synthesizes key principles including content simplification, sequencing, chunking, worked examples, redundancy reduction, and scaffolding. It further analyzes curriculum design models such as ADDIE, the spiral curriculum, and constructive alignment framework from a cognitive perspective. The paper also evaluates instructional strategies and the role of educational technology in managing cognitive load. It further highlights systemic challenges in developing contexts, particularly Nigeria. It argues for a shift from content-driven to capacity-driven curriculum design, where instructional decisions are guided by learners' cognitive capacities. The study concludes that cognitively aligned curriculum design enhances learning efficiency, supports meaningful knowledge construction, and provides a sustainable framework for improving educational outcomes.

Keywords: Cognitive, Curriculum, Design, Technology, Theory,

Introduction

The central challenge of twenty-first-century education is no longer access to information, but learners' capacity to process it effectively. Rapid knowledge expansion and technological integration have increased the volume and complexity of information, thereby intensifying cognitive demands. As a result, learners are often required to process dense, multi-layered content within limited time, leading to cognitive overload and reduced learning effectiveness (Sweller, 1988; Sweller *et al.*, 2011; Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020; Skulmowski & Xu, 2022). Consequently, the primary constraint in learning has shifted from information scarcity to limitations in human cognitive processing. This shift reveals a fundamental limitation in traditional curriculum design, which has historically prioritized content coverage over cognitive processing. Such approaches assume that increased exposure

leads to deeper learning; however, when working memory limitations are ignored, they often result in fragmented understanding, superficial learning, and poor retention.

Cognitive psychology identifies working memory as a critical constraint due to its limited capacity and duration. Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) provides a framework for addressing this constraint by emphasizing the alignment of instruction with human cognitive architecture. It posits that learning occurs when information is efficiently processed in working memory and organized into schemas in long-term memory (Sweller, 1988; Sweller *et al.*, 2011). Managing cognitive load is therefore essential for improving learning efficiency (Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020). However, poorly designed digital environments can increase rather than reduce cognitive load, highlighting the importance of cognitively informed instructional design (Skulmowski & Xu, 2022). These challenges are particularly pronounced in developing contexts such as Nigeria, where curriculum overload, large class sizes, limited resources, and inconsistent technological infrastructure further increase cognitive demands on learners. There is therefore a need to shift from content-driven approaches to cognitively optimized curriculum design. By applying principles such as worked examples, chunking, signaling, and structured sequencing, educators can design learning environments that support how learners process and retain information. This paper argues that aligning curriculum design with cognitive principles provides an evidence-based pathway for improving learning outcomes.

Conceptual Clarifications

Curriculum Design

Curriculum design refers to the systematic planning of learning experiences, including objectives, content, instructional strategies, and assessment. It provides the framework through which educational goals are translated into structured learning processes. The classical foundation is rooted in Tyler's objective model, which emphasizes clear goals, alignment, and evaluation (Tyler, 1949). Contemporary perspectives emphasize constructive alignment, ensuring that learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment are coordinated to support meaningful learning (Biggs, 1996; Biggs & Tang, 2011). Misalignment increases unnecessary cognitive demands, while coherent curriculum structures improve clarity and learning efficiency (Müller & Goldenberg, 2021). These foundational curriculum theories are highly relevant because cognitive load optimization cannot occur in poorly structured environments; Tyler's model and constructive alignment establish the essential blueprint ensuring that instructional activities and assessments do not conflict and cause extraneous cognitive strain.

Curriculum Design and Cognitive Load

From a Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) perspective, curriculum design is a process of cognitive structuring. Poor alignment forces learners to expend additional mental effort

reconciling inconsistencies, thereby increasing extraneous cognitive load (Sweller *et al.*, 2011). In contrast, well-designed curricula reduce unnecessary cognitive burden by sequencing content appropriately, aligning instructional activities with outcomes, and structuring knowledge to support schema construction.

Learner-Centered and Context-Sensitive Design

Effective curriculum design must account for learners' prior knowledge and contextual factors. Instructional effectiveness depends on aligning teaching strategies with learners' expertise levels (Kalyuga, 2007). Failure to do so may result in cognitive overload for novices or redundancy effects for advanced learners. Additionally, curriculum design must consider contextual constraints such as class size, resource availability, and technological infrastructure.

Beyond Content Coverage toward Cognitive Structuring

Traditional curricula often emphasize content coverage rather than depth of understanding. However, excessive content can overwhelm learners, leading to superficial learning and poor retention (Sweller *et al.*, 2011). A cognitively informed curriculum shifts toward structured learning, where content is sequenced, organized into meaningful units, and aligned with schema construction.

Cognitive Load Theory: The Triarchic Model

Cognitive load refers to the mental effort imposed on working memory during learning. CLT distinguishes three interacting types of loads as:

- i. **Intrinsic Cognitive Load:** Determined by task complexity and element interactivity. It can be managed through sequencing, segmentation, and scaffolding (Sweller, 1994; Jiang & Kalyuga, 2020).
- ii. **Extraneous Cognitive Load:** Arises from poor instructional design, such as disorganized materials or split-attention formats. It should be minimized (Mayer, 2009; Castro-Alonso *et al.*, 2021).
- iii. **Germane Cognitive Load:** Represents productive cognitive effort devoted to schema construction and automation (Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020).

The Triarchic Model is the core diagnostic framework of this paper. It provides curriculum designers with precise, actionable targets for intervention: managing the intrinsic load of the subject matter, eliminating the extraneous load caused by bad design, and maximizing the germane load to optimize overall learning.

Human Cognitive Architecture and Schema Theory

Learning is governed by the interaction between limited working memory and long-term memory, where knowledge is stored as schemas (Sweller *et al.*, 2011). Schema development enables efficient processing by reducing cognitive load. However, instructional

strategies must align with learner expertise to avoid the expertise reversal effect (Kalyuga *et al.*, 2003). Schema Theory is vital in this write up because it explains the goal of curriculum optimization which is transferring information from a constrained working memory into automated schemas in the long-term memory, which permanently frees up a learner's cognitive capacity.

Theoretical Foundations

Constructivism and Social Constructivism

Constructivist theories view learning as an active process where learners build knowledge based on prior experiences. Social constructivism emphasizes the role of guided learning within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where learners can perform tasks with support (Vygotsky, 1978). CLT complements this by emphasizing that learning is effective only when task demands remain within learners' cognitive capacity. Constructivism grounds CLT within broader pedagogy by reinforcing the argument that while learners must actively construct knowledge, they cannot do so effectively if the curriculum exceeds their ZPD and working memory capacities.

Information Processing Theory

Information Processing Theory conceptualizes learning as the encoding, storage, and retrieval of information within the cognitive system. It distinguishes between limited working memory and long-term memory. Poorly structured information overloads working memory, whereas well-organized content enhances processing efficiency.

This theory acts as the foundational architectural map of the human mind upon which all curriculum design and cognitive load optimization strategies discussed in this paper are built.

Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning (CTML)

The Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning explains how learners process information through dual channels (visual and auditory), each with limited capacity (Mayer, 2009). Based on this, key principles guide design:

- i. **Coherence Principle:** Learning improves when irrelevant information is removed.
- ii. **Signaling Principle:** Learning improves when essential information is highlighted.
- iii. **Redundancy Principle:** Learning is hindered when identical information is presented simultaneously in multiple forms.

CTML is highly relevant because modern curriculum design relies heavily on digital resources. Mayer's principles offer actionable guidelines for structuring materials to prevent extraneous cognitive load in technological environments.

Principles of Cognitive Load Optimization

- i. **Content Simplification and Element Interactivity Management:** Content simplification refers to managing element interactivity rather than reducing academic rigor. High element interactivity increases intrinsic cognitive load and

can overwhelm working memory (Sweller, 1994). The isolated-interacting elements strategy addresses this by presenting complex information in stages (Pollock *et al.*, 2002).

ii. Sequencing and the Expertise Reversal Effect: Effective sequencing aligns instruction with learners' evolving expertise. The expertise reversal effect shows that instructional methods beneficial for novices may become redundant or counterproductive for advanced learners (Kalyuga *et al.*, 2003). Cognitively optimized sequencing begins with high instructional support and gradually reduces guidance.

iii. Chunking: Micro-Level Schema Construction: Chunking addresses the limited capacity of working memory (Miller, 1956; Cowan, 2001) by organizing multiple elements into meaningful units. Within CLT, chunking supports schema construction by combining elements into single cognitive units (Sweller *et al.*, 2011).

Instructional and Curriculum-Level Application

At the instructional level, chunking involves breaking content into smaller segments. At the curriculum level, it involves grouping related concepts into thematic clusters, enabling learners to process information as integrated schemas (Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020).

Cognitive Implications

Effective chunking reduces intrinsic cognitive load, promotes integrated understanding, and supports schema automation, allowing learners to achieve deeper learning.

The Worked Example Effect and Step-by-Step Fading

The worked example effect demonstrates that learners achieve better outcomes when studying fully solved problems rather than engaging in unguided problem-solving initially (Sweller & Cooper, 1985). To support the transition from novice to expert, support should be gradually reduced through faded examples (Renkl *et al.*, 2004).

Redundancy Reduction and the Split-Attention Principle

Extraneous cognitive load often results from poorly designed materials. The split-attention effect occurs when learners must divide attention between multiple related sources, increasing cognitive burden (Ayres & Sweller, 2014). Integrating related text and visuals reduces this load (Mayer, 2021).

Curriculum Design Models Through a Cognitive Lens

The ADDIE Model: A Cognitively Informed Systems Approach

The ADDIE framework provides a systematic approach to instructional design. When aligned with CLT, each phase supports cognitive load management:

- i. **Analysis:** Assesses learners' prior knowledge, as intrinsic load depends on existing schemas.
- ii. **Design:** Structures content to optimize processing by sequencing and applying multimedia principles.
- iii. **Development:** Translates design into materials by ensuring spatial contiguity and reducing redundancy.
- iv. **Implementation:** Delivers instruction adaptively, with teachers scaffolding to prevent overload.
- v. **Evaluation:** Measures instructional efficiency, balancing high performance with appropriate mental effort.

The ADDIE model is directly relevant because it provides a practical, step-by-step mechanism for educators to systematically implement cognitive load optimization strategies from initial planning through to evaluation.

The Spiral Curriculum: Iterative Schema Reinforcement

The spiral curriculum (Bruner, 1960) aligns with CLT by managing intrinsic cognitive load through progressive learning:

- i. **Mechanics of the Spiral:** Learners are first introduced to simplified concepts.
- ii. **Schema Automation:** Through repetition, schemas become automated.
- iii. **Progressive Increase in Complexity:** Learners handle more complex material as prior schemas free up mental resources.

This model represents the structural embodiment of managing intrinsic cognitive load over time, naturally supporting schema automation and preventing novices from being overwhelmed.

Constructive Alignment: Systemic Reduction of Extraneous Load

Constructive alignment (Biggs, 1996) ensures coherence between learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment. From a CLT perspective, misalignment creates unnecessary cognitive load by forcing learners to reconcile inconsistencies. When alignment is achieved, extraneous load is minimized, and germane load is maximized. This model is relevant to this write up because it highlights that curriculum optimization is not just about content delivery; it proves that misaligned testing and teaching methods actively generate extraneous cognitive load that hinders student success.

Instructional Strategies for Reducing Cognitive Load

Content Organization and Schema Priming

When information is presented linearly without highlighting relationships, cognitive burden increases. Incorporating schema priming techniques, such as advance organizers (Ausubel, 1960), allows learners to activate prior knowledge before detailed instruction.

Guided Instruction vs. Discovery Learning

Cognitive Load Theory strongly supports explicit, guided instruction for novice learners. Minimally guided instruction forces novices to rely on means-ends analysis, a cognitively exhausting strategy (Kirschner *et al.*, 2006). Explicit instruction provides structured explanations and worked examples.

Instructional Media Design: Managing the Transient Information Effect

Instructional media, particularly video and audio, can increase cognitive load when not carefully designed. The transient information effect occurs when information is presented briefly and disappears before learners can fully process it, thereby placing additional demands on working memory (Mayer, 2009). This limits learners' ability to integrate and retain information effectively.

Segmenting and Learner-Controlled Pacing: The segmenting principle allows learners to control the pace of instruction, reducing cognitive overload and improving comprehension (Mayer, 2009). Strategies such as breaking content into shorter segments and allowing replay support effective processing. Empirical evidence shows that well-designed multimedia reduces extraneous cognitive load and enhances learning (Castro-Alonso *et al.*, 2021).

Assessment Design: Formative Evaluation as Cognitive Load Management

Assessment plays a key role in managing cognitive load, not just measuring outcomes.

- i. **Formative Assessment and Cognitive Efficiency:** Frequent low-stakes assessments support learning through retrieval practice and continuous feedback. The testing effect and spacing effect improve long-term retention and schema development (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006).
- ii. **Assessment as Diagnostic Feedback:** Formative assessments help identify areas of cognitive difficulty, allowing instructors to adjust instruction through scaffolding and simplification. This ensures that cognitive load remains within manageable limits and prevents cumulative learning.

The Role of Technology in Cognitive Load Optimization

Technology can either enhance or hinder learning, depending on design.

- i. **Technology as a Cognitive Load Optimizer:** When grounded in sound instructional design, technology reduces extraneous load. Adaptive learning systems regulate intrinsic load by adjusting content difficulty to learners' prior knowledge (Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020).
- ii. **Multimedia Learning Environments:** Multimedia tools enhance learning when designed according to principles such as coherence, signaling, modality, and redundancy (Mayer, 2009).

- iii. **Microlearning and Cognitive Efficiency:** Microlearning reduces cognitive load by presenting information in small, manageable units, supporting efficient processing.
- iv. **Online Learning and Cognitive Load:** Online learning may introduce extraneous load through complex interfaces and distractions, fragmenting attention (Skulmowski & Xu, 2022). Effective design requires simple interfaces.
- v. **Split-Attention and Interface Design:** Integrating related text and visuals reduces the split-attention burden and improves comprehension in digital platforms (Mayer, 2009).

Technology in the Nigerian Context

In Nigeria, infrastructural challenges such as limited electricity and internet access can increase cognitive load. However, accessible tools such as mobile learning and low-bandwidth platforms offer practical solutions.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Future Directions

AI can enhance learning by personalizing instruction and providing real-time feedback, aligning with learners' cognitive needs, provided it is implemented within sound pedagogical frameworks.

Critical Perspective: The Limits of Technology: Technology is not inherently beneficial; its value depends on alignment with cognitive principles, not complexity (Sweller *et al.*, 2011).

Implications for Educational Practice: Applying Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) shifts the educational focus from mere content transmission to actively managing working memory limitations across several key domains:

- i. **Capacity-Driven Curriculum Design:** Curricula must prioritize cognitive efficiency over content volume. Because subject experts often underestimate task complexity due to their own automated schemas, they must collaborate closely with instructional designers to align content demands with learners' actual expertise (Sweller *et al.*, 2011).
- ii. **Teachers as Cognitive Load Managers:** Educators must transition from knowledge transmitters to cognitive regulators. This requires continuously diagnosing whether learning barriers stem from intrinsic, extraneous, or germane load, and making real-time instructional adjustments such as simplifying tasks or providing worked examples (Sweller *et al.*, 2011; Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020).
- iii. **Redefining Active Learning:** Active learning should be understood as active *cognitive* processing rather than mere physical or behavioral engagement. Because novices lack existing schemas, they require explicit guidance and structured

problem-solving instead of cognitively exhausting, unguided discovery (Kirschner *et al.*, 2006).

- iv. **Strategic Technology Integration:** Technology must function as a cognitive tool governed by the less is more principle. Educational institutions should train staff to prioritize simple, evidence-based tools over complex systems that introduce extraneous split-attention effects, a practice especially critical in resource-constrained contexts (Mayer, 2009; Castro-Alonso *et al.*, 2021).

Implications for Curriculum Development: Because subject experts often underestimate task complexity, they must collaborate with instructional designers to ensure content perfectly aligns with learners' cognitive capacities (Sweller *et al.*, 2011).

Challenges in Developing Contexts: The Nigerian Experience

- i. **Curriculum Overload and the NERDC Syllabus:** Curriculum overload remains a major challenge in Nigeria, particularly within the NERDC syllabus, which emphasizes broad content coverage. This results in excessive learning demands, increasing intrinsic cognitive load and overwhelming working memory (Olugbenga *et al.*, 2023).
- ii. **Inadequate teacher training in cognitive science:** Teacher education programs often neglect how learners process information. Practices such as simultaneous dictation and rapid content delivery create split-attention effects, impairing comprehension (Agwu & Arokoyu, 2025; Castro-Alonso *et al.*, 2021).
- iii. **Large Class Sizes and Constraints on Scaffolding:** Large class sizes restrict the use of adaptive instruction. Teachers often adopt uniform approaches, leading to intrinsic overload for novices and redundancy effects for advanced learners (Kalyuga *et al.*, 2003).
- iv. **Infrastructural Deficits and the Digital Divide:** Limited access to reliable electricity and internet connectivity constrains the effective use of technology, which can increase extraneous cognitive load through interruptions and divided attention (Skulmowski & Xu, 2022).

Systemic Implications

These interconnected challenges create systemic cognitive overload. Addressing these issues requires coordinated reforms that integrate cognitive principles into curriculum design, teacher education, and policy.

Conclusion

Effective curriculum design must shift from content-driven approaches to frameworks aligned with human cognitive architecture. By applying Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), educators can manage working memory limitations through strategies like chunking,

scaffolding, and worked examples, utilizing structural models such as ADDIE and the spiral curriculum. While educational technology holds great potential, it must be carefully integrated to avoid exacerbating cognitive load, particularly in developing contexts like Nigeria where curriculum overload and large class sizes already strain learners' cognitive resources. Ultimately, transforming education from mere content transmission into a process of cognitive optimization requires context-sensitive reforms, including curriculum restructuring, targeted teacher training in cognitive science, and strategic technological integration.

Suggestions for Policy and Practice

Addressing cognitive constraints in resource-constrained contexts like Nigeria requires coordinated, system-wide reforms grounded in Cognitive Load Theory. To effectively align educational practices with human cognitive architecture, the following strategies are suggested:

- i. **Policy-Level Curriculum Restructuring:** Shift from content-heavy syllabi to competency-based frameworks to reduce content volume, eliminate redundancies, and support deeper schema construction.
- ii. **Re-Engineering Teacher Education:** Integrate cognitive science into continuous professional development, equipping educators with practical strategies to manage cognitive load and adapt instruction to learner expertise (Sweller *et al.*, 2011).
- iii. **Scalable Scaffolding for Large Classrooms:** Implement structured supports, such as worked examples and peer-assisted learning, to distribute instructional support and effectively manage cognitive demands in overcrowded classes.
- iv. **Strategic Technology Integration:** Prioritize simple, context-sensitive, and low-bandwidth digital tools (e.g., microlearning and offline solutions) over complex systems that introduce extraneous cognitive load.
- v. **System-Level Alignment:** Ensure absolute coherence across curriculum design, teaching practices, assessments, and technology to consistently maintain cognitive efficiency and sustainability.

References

- Agwu, C. O., & Arokoyu, A. A. (2025). Cognitive load theory and the teaching of complex concepts in senior secondary school chemistry curriculum: The place of element interactivity. *Faculty of Natural and Applied Sciences Journal of Mathematics, and Science Education*, 6(2), 137–143.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1960). The use of advance organizers in the learning and retention of meaningful verbal material. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51(5), 267–272.

- Ayres, P., & Sweller, J. (2014). The split-attention principle in multimedia learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning* (2nd ed., pp. 206–226). Cambridge University Press.
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32(3), 347–364
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Castro-Alonso, J. C., de Koning, B. B., Fiorella, L., & Paas, F. (2021). Five strategies to optimize cognitive load in instructional videos. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 15(3), 263-269.
- Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24(1), 87-114.
- Jiang, D., & Kalyuga, S. (2020). Confirmatory factor analysis of cognitive load ratings in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychology*, 40(6), 732-751.
- Kalyuga, S. (2007). Expertise reversal effect and its implications for learner-tailored instruction. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(4), 509–539.
- Kalyuga, S., Ayres, P., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2003). The expertise reversal effect. *Educational Psychologist*, 38(1), 23–31.
- Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86.
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R. E. (2021). Evidence-based principles for how to design effective instructional videos. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 10(2), 229-240.
- Mayer, R. E., & Fiorella, L. (2014). Principles for reducing extraneous processing in multimedia learning: Coherence, signaling, redundancy, spatial contiguity, and temporal contiguity principles. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning* (2nd ed., pp. 279–315). Cambridge University Press.

- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81–97
- Müller, M., & Goldenberg, G. (2021). Curriculum coherence and student learning outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100402.
- Olugbenga, M., Yakubu, N. T., & Ali, M. M. (2023). Curriculum overload in Nigerian junior secondary schools: Constraints to quality teaching and learning process. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 1(3), 341–348.
- Paas, F., & van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2020). Cognitive-load theory: Methods to manage working memory load in the learning of complex tasks. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(4), 394–398.
- Pollock, E., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2002). Assimilating complex information. *Learning and Instruction*, 12(1), 61–86.
- Renkl, A., Atkinson, R. K., Maier, U. H., & Staley, R. (2004). From problem solving to problem formulation: Fostering transfer with worked-out examples. *Instructional Science*, 32(1-2), 59–82.
- Roediger, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological Science*, 17(3), 249–255.
- Skulmowski, A., & Xu, K. M. (2022). Understanding cognitive load in digital and online learning: A new perspective on extraneous cognitive load. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 171–196.
- 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., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.
- Sweller, J., & Cooper, G. A. (1985). The use of worked examples as a substitute for problem solving in learning algebra. *Cognition and Instruction*, 2(1), 59–89.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.