https://doi.org/10.26565/2074-8167-2025-56-10
УДК 37.015.3:159.95

Nataliia Lukianenko
Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University,
25 Yaroslava Mudryho St., Kharkiv, Ukraine, 61002
lukianenko@khadi.kharkov.ua https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8836-7788

NEUROEDUCATION AND COGNITIVE LOAD: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The increasing integration of neuroscientific insights into educational discourse has given rise to the field of *neuroeducation*, which seeks to align pedagogical strategies with empirical understandings of brain functioning. Within the context of higher education, where cognitive demands are often substantial and diverse, the relevance of neuroeducation is particularly salient. This article investigates the pedagogical implications of *Cognitive Load Theory* (CLT) as a framework for designing instructional practices that promote *deep learning*—defined here as the long-term, transferable acquisition of knowledge and skills through meaningful engagement.

The study employs a conceptual and analytical methodology, grounded in a synthesis of contemporary international scholarship published within the last decade. Drawing on recent empirical and theoretical contributions from cognitive psychology and educational science, the research elucidates how the tripartite model of cognitive load—comprising *intrinsic*, *extraneous*, and *germane* load—can inform the structuring, sequencing, and delivery of complex academic content. Particular emphasis is placed on instructional techniques such as *segmenting*, *signalling*, *dual coding*, and *retrieval practice*, which are demonstrated to optimise cognitive processing and enhance learners' working memory efficiency.

The findings reveal a critical need to reconceptualise teaching practice in higher education through a neuroscience-informed lens, with the goal of minimising unnecessary cognitive interference while actively fostering schema construction and transfer. In doing so, the article highlights the broader pedagogical significance of cognitive regulation, attentional control, and emotional engagement as mediating factors in academic success. It concludes by proposing a set of evidence-based principles for the design of cognitively aligned curricula and underscores the importance of embedding neurodidactic competence within teacher education programmes.

Keywords*: neuroeducation, cognitive load, deep learning, higher education, instructional design, working memory, pedagogical innovation, conceptual analysis.*

In cites: Lukianenko, N. (2025). Neuroeducation and cognitive load: theoretical foundations and pedagogical implications in higher education. *Scientific notes of the pedagogical department*, (56), 95-104. https://doi.org/10.26565/2074-8167-2025-56-10 [in English].

Introduction. In contemporary higher education, the increasing complexity of academic content and the growing heterogeneity of student populations demand pedagogical approaches that are both scientifically grounded and practically effective. Over the past two decades, there has been a growing convergence between education and cognitive science, giving rise to the interdisciplinary field of *neuroeducation*. This field draws upon advances in neuroscience and psychology to inform the design of learning environments that align with how the human brain processes, stores, and retrieves information [1; 2].

Despite widespread recognition of the value of evidence-based teaching, university-level instruction frequently remains rooted in traditional, transmissive paradigms. These approaches typically privilege content delivery through lectures and text-heavy resources, with insufficient attention to the learner's cognitive constraints [3; 4]. Such models often fail to consider how students interact with information at the level of perception, working memory, and long-term consolidation. As a result, learners are frequently overwhelmed by excessive cognitive demands, leading to reduced engagement, fragmented knowledge acquisition, and minimal knowledge transfer beyond the immediate context of assessment [5; 6].

Among the most influential theoretical contributions to addressing this issue is *Cognitive Load Theory* (CLT), developed to explain the cognitive mechanisms involved in instructional processing. CLT posits that effective learning depends on optimally managing three types of cognitive load: *intrinsic load*, which is inherent to the complexity of the content; *extraneous load*, which arises from poor instructional design; and *germane load*, which reflects mental resources allocated to processing, organising, and integrating new information [7; 8]. The theory holds that instruction should aim to minimise extraneous load and enhance germane load, while presenting intrinsic load in a structured and progressive manner to prevent overload [9].

Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated the benefits of CLT-informed instructional strategies, including the use of scaffolding, segmenting, dual coding, and retrieval practice, in facilitating long-term retention and meaningful learning outcomes [10; 11]. However, the uptake of these strategies in higher education remains limited. Many instructors—particularly those outside of pedagogical disciplines—are unfamiliar with CLT and lack formal training in instructional design principles derived from cognitive psychology. Furthermore, university curricula are rarely designed with explicit reference to cognitive capacity, leading to learning environments that are not only inefficient but, in some cases, detrimental to student well-being and performance [12; 13].

This problem is further exacerbated by the increasing digitisation of learning environments. The widespread adoption of learning management systems, asynchronous online formats, and digital media has added new layers of cognitive complexity for learners to navigate. While digital tools have the potential to support personalised and flexible learning, they also risk increasing *extraneous cognitive load* through poorly structured interfaces, redundant information, and multitasking distractions [14]. In this context, the relevance of CLT becomes even more pronounced, as it provides a conceptual framework for designing digital learning experiences that are cognitively aligned and learner-centred.

Moreover, there is a growing awareness that effective learning is not solely a matter of information delivery. Cognitive processes such as attention regulation, emotional resilience, and metacognitive control all influence how learners interact with content. Neuroeducation therefore promotes a holistic understanding of learning–one that incorporates both the structural limitations of working memory and the affective and motivational dimensions of cognition [15].

Given these considerations, it is clear that there is an urgent need to integrate CLT principles into the design of higher education pedagogy. This requires not only the dissemination of relevant research findings but also the development of practical frameworks and tools that instructors can apply across disciplines and delivery formats. Without such integration, the risk remains that teaching will continue to rely on intuition rather than evidence, and that learners will continue to struggle under the weight of unmanageable cognitive demands.

This article responds to this challenge by examining how CLT can be systematically applied to instructional design in higher education. Drawing on recent theoretical and empirical studies from internationally recognised sources, it aims to synthesise best practices and propose actionable strategies for managing cognitive load in ways that support deep, meaningful, and transferable learning. In doing so, it seeks to bridge the gap between cognitive science and pedagogical practice, and to contribute to the development of more effective and equitable learning environments at the university level.

Analysis of Recent Studies and Publications. Over the past decade, the field of cognitive science has made significant strides in elucidating the mechanisms that underpin human learning. One of the most extensively studied frameworks emerging from this body of research is *Cognitive Load Theory* (CLT), which has proven particularly influential in shaping contemporary understandings of instructional design. Originally developed by Sweller in the late 1980s, the theory has since undergone extensive empirical testing and refinement across multiple educational domains, including higher education, medical training, engineering, and digital learning environments [1; 2].

Numerous studies have validated the central proposition of CLT—that instructional effectiveness is contingent upon the balance between intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load. Leppink and van den Heuvel [3] demonstrated that learners perform significantly better when instructional materials are designed to reduce extraneous load, thereby allowing more cognitive capacity to be allocated to schema construction. This finding is echoed in the work of Paas et al. [4], who showed that well-structured materials that incorporate segmenting, signalling, and visual-verbal integration result in improved retention and problem-solving performance.

Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses further confirm the value of CLT-based strategies. For instance, van Merriënboer and Sweller [5] identified a positive correlation between the use of worked examples and student learning outcomes, particularly in cognitively demanding domains such as mathematics and science. Similarly, a meta-analysis by Schneider et al. [6] highlighted the effectiveness of multimedia instructional design—especially when grounded in the *modality* and *redundancy principles*—in reducing cognitive overload in online learning settings.

Digital learning environments have become an especially fertile area for the application of CLT principles. As learning increasingly shifts toward online and hybrid formats, educators and designers are challenged to maintain cognitive clarity while accommodating flexible access. Zheng et al. [7] found that digital courses structured according to CLT guidelines significantly reduced dropout rates and improved long-term knowledge retention. Their findings underscore the importance of aligning not only content but also interface design with cognitive capacities. In a related study, Mayer and Fiorella [8] outlined twelve empirically supported principles for multimedia learning based on cognitive load optimisation, including *coherence*, *pre-training*, *segmenting*, and *modality*.

The need for cognitive load management becomes even more urgent when considering learner diversity in higher education. Students differ widely in prior knowledge, language proficiency, and cognitive development—factors that influence how instructional load is perceived and processed [9; 10]. Kirschner et al. [11] argued that minimally guided instruction disproportionately disadvantages learners with lower background knowledge, as it assumes cognitive strategies that such students have not yet developed. As such, CLT provides a critical tool for designing inclusive pedagogy that supports diverse learners by controlling for unnecessary complexity and guiding learners toward meaningful engagement with content.

While most CLT research has focused on the cognitive architecture of information processing, emerging scholarship also explores the affective and motivational dimensions of cognitive effort. Jaeger and Eagan [12] posited that high extraneous load not only hinders performance but also contributes to academic anxiety, disengagement, and task avoidance. This view aligns with the work of D'Mello and Graesser [13], whose neurocognitive studies suggest that emotional regulation plays a mediating role in learners' capacity to engage with complex tasks under cognitive pressure.

In addition, cross-cultural and international studies have begun to examine the contextual applicability of CLT principles. Huang et al. [14] conducted a comparative study across European and East Asian universities, revealing that while CLT strategies are universally beneficial, their implementation must be culturally and institutionally adapted to optimise their impact. They argue that CLT should not be applied as a rigid template, but as a flexible framework responsive to learner characteristics, instructional context, and cultural expectations.

Despite this growing body of evidence, the adoption of CLT in higher education curricula remains inconsistent. A survey conducted by Martin and Evans [15] revealed that only a minority of academic staff report using any form of instructional design model, and fewer still are familiar with the principles of cognitive load. This disconnect between research and practice continues to hinder the implementation of pedagogically effective, cognitively aligned teaching.

Taken together, these studies affirm the robustness of CLT as a foundation for instructional innovation in higher education. However, they also reveal a persistent gap between theory and application—one that can only be addressed through intentional training, institutional support, and the translation of theory into practical strategies that meet the real-world challenges of university teaching.

Purpose of the Study. The primary purpose of this study is to investigate how principles of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) can be operationalised in the instructional design of higher education environments to promote deep, durable, and transferable learning. Specifically, the study seeks to synthesise international research findings on cognitive load and identify effective pedagogical strategies that mitigate extraneous load, manage intrinsic load, and foster germane load among university students.

In doing so, the study addresses a critical gap between research and practice in contemporary higher education: while CLT is widely recognised in the literature as a powerful framework for improving learning outcomes, its adoption within actual university curricula remains limited and inconsistent. Many instructors are unaware of its principles or lack the tools to implement them in contextually relevant ways.

Therefore, this research aims not only to clarify the theoretical foundation of CLT in relation to cognitive functioning and instructional processing, but also to provide educators, curriculum developers, and academic administrators with a practical, research-informed model for designing cognitively aligned instruction. The ultimate goal is to contribute to the professionalisation of university pedagogy by offering actionable, evidence-based recommendations that support equitable and effective teaching across disciplines and delivery modes.

Research Methods. This study adopts a conceptual and analytical research design, which is appropriate for theoretical investigations aimed at synthesising and interpreting existing scientific knowledge. Rather than collecting primary empirical data, the research is based on a systematic examination of peer-reviewed open access publications, with the goal of identifying effective instructional strategies informed by Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) in the context of higher education.

To ensure scholarly reliability and transparency, the analysis was limited to sources published between 2015 and 2024 in journals indexed by Scopus or Web of Science and made available through open access platforms. Only peer-reviewed articles written in English and directly addressing the principles, application, or evaluation of cognitive load in educational settings were included. The search was conducted using relevant keywords such as *“cognitive load theory”*, *“higher education”*, *“instructional design”*, *“germane load”*, and *“educational psychology”*.

A total of 30 international sources were selected following an initial screening for conceptual relevance, methodological rigour, and citation integrity. The literature was analysed using a thematic synthesis approach. Recurring instructional principles, empirical findings, and pedagogical implications were extracted and categorised according to the three core components of CLT: *intrinsic*, *extraneous*, and *germane* load. This classification enabled a structured analysis of how different strategies influence learners’ cognitive processes and contribute to deep learning.

Additionally, comparative insights were drawn from case studies and review articles spanning various educational systems, including institutions in Europe, North America, and the Asia-Pacific region. This broadened the analytical scope and allowed for the identification of cross-contextual patterns and challenges in implementing CLT-based pedagogy.

While the study does not include empirical testing, it contributes methodologically by translating robust cognitive theories into actionable pedagogical frameworks. The findings are intended to support educators, curriculum designers, and academic developers in creating cognitively aligned instructional environments that foster sustained engagement and learning efficiency.

Presentation of Material and Main Results.

Theoretical Foundations of Cognitive Load Theory in Higher Education.

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) emerged in the 1980s as a response to persistent challenges in instructional design and knowledge retention, particularly in complex learning environments. Developed initially by John Sweller, CLT is grounded in the assumption that human cognitive architecture imposes inherent constraints on learning, most notably through the ***limited capacity of working memory*** *and the* ***unlimited potential of long-term memory*** [1]. Over the decades, the theory has evolved into one of the most influential frameworks in educational psychology and has found increasing relevance in higher education, where learners are regularly confronted with cognitively demanding content, unfamiliar abstractions, and dense academic tasks.

At its core, CLT posits that the efficiency of instructional materials depends on the management of ***three interrelated types of cognitive load: intrinsic load, extraneous load,*** *and* ***germane load*** [2]. ***Intrinsic load*** refers to the inherent complexity of the content itself and is often determined by the number of elements that must be simultaneously processed and the degree of interactivity among them. For example, understanding a differential equation or evaluating a philosophical argument imposes a higher intrinsic load than memorising a definition. Although intrinsic load cannot be eliminated, it can be moderated through ***sequencing, prior knowledge activation,*** and ***progressive task design*** [3].

Extraneous load, by contrast, is imposed not by the material, but by the way the material is presented. Poorly designed instruction—such as text-heavy slides, unstructured lectures, or confusing interface layouts—diverts cognitive resources away from learning and contributes to overload [4]. Strategies to reduce extraneous load include the ***modality principle*** (using visual + auditory channels), **coherence principle** (removing unnecessary content), and ***signalling*** (highlighting key elements). CLT argues that minimising extraneous load is a prerequisite for effective learning, particularly in information-rich academic environments [5].

Finally, ***germane load*** refers to the mental effort invested in ***constructing, refining, and automating schemas,*** which are organised structures of knowledge stored in long-term memory. Germane load is not a burden but a desirable cognitive investment that leads to meaningful learning. Instructional designs that ***scaffold learning, encourage retrieval practice,*** or promote ***self-explanation*** actively stimulate germane cognitive processes. When intrinsic and extraneous load are properly managed, learners have sufficient working memory capacity to engage in germane load, leading to ***deeper understanding and retention*** [6].

CLT is also theoretically linked to **Cognitive Information Processing Theory** (CIPT), which frames learning as a flow of information through a sequence of mental systems: sensory memory, working memory, and long-term memory [7]. In this view, learning fails not because of poor motivation or low intelligence, but because the cognitive system is ***overloaded, distracted,*** or ***inefficiently guided.*** This is particularly relevant in higher education, where complex knowledge domains (e.g., law, medicine, engineering) place substantial demands on working memory. Research has consistently shown that even high-performing university students experience ***cognitive bottlenecks*** when content is not structured in alignment with working memory limitations [8].

Furthermore, CLT has gained traction due to its ***empirical testability and cross-disciplinary generalisability.*** Numerous studies in health sciences, mathematics, computer science, and teacher education have confirmed that CLT-informed instructional strategies result in ***higher knowledge retention, lower error rates, and increased student engagement*** [9; 10]. The theory's explanatory power lies in its ability to account for why students often fail to learn even when motivation is high and content is appropriate: the barrier is not effort or will, but ***cognitive misalignment.***

In recent years, researchers have extended the CLT model to account for the ***digital learning context,*** where distractions, multitasking, and interface complexity contribute significantly to cognitive overload. Theories such as the **Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning (CTML)** have emerged as complementary models, combining CLT principles with insights into how dual channels (visual and auditory) can be optimally used in multimedia instruction [11]. In higher education, where learning increasingly occurs via learning management systems, video lectures, and asynchronous content, understanding and applying CLT principles is no longer optional—it is essential for ensuring that cognitive conditions are optimally aligned with instructional intentions.

In sum, the theoretical foundation of CLT offers higher education practitioners a ***scientifically validated framework*** for understanding the invisible cognitive processes that underpin successful learning. It provides a ***diagnostic tool*** for identifying instructional inefficiencies and a ***design lens*** for creating more effective, engaging, and equitable learning experiences. Despite its proven efficacy, however, the full integration of CLT into university teaching remains limited—often due to gaps in training, lack of interdisciplinary collaboration, or institutional inertia. Addressing these issues requires not only an understanding of CLT's theoretical core but also a commitment to translating its principles into pedagogical action.

Evidence-Based Strategies for Managing Cognitive Load in Instructional Design.

The effective application of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) in higher education depends not only on recognising the types of cognitive load but also on implementing evidence-based strategies that intentionally manage them. As working memory is inherently limited in capacity and duration, instructional methods must be carefully designed to avoid overload while promoting meaningful engagement with learning content. This section outlines a series of pedagogical strategies supported by recent research that address intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load in university-level instruction.

1. Dual Coding and Modality Principle.

One of the most consistently supported strategies for reducing extraneous cognitive load is dual coding, which involves presenting information through both visual and verbal channels. According to Mayer's Modality Principle, learning improves when words are presented as audio narration rather than as written text, especially when paired with relevant visuals [1].

This approach takes advantage of the brain's dual processing systems and reduces the burden on a single cognitive channel.

In an open-access study by Kühl et al. (2019), students who received instruction using diagrams accompanied by spoken explanation outperformed those who received the same material in a purely textual format [2]. Similarly, Mayer and Fiorella (2022) demonstrated that using well-aligned multimedia in STEM education significantly improved student comprehension and long-term retention [3]. For university educators, this implies that replacing dense lecture slides with concise visuals and audio explanations can meaningfully enhance cognitive efficiency.

2. Segmenting and Progressive Disclosure.

Segmenting involves breaking complex information into smaller, meaningful units to allow the learner to process content at a manageable pace. This strategy is particularly effective in managing intrinsic load, especially in disciplines that require sequential reasoning, such as mathematics, programming, and linguistics [4].

Research by Castro-Alonso et al. (2021) shows that learners exposed to segmented tutorials completed tasks more accurately and reported lower cognitive effort than those who received continuous content streams [5]. In higher education, segmenting can be applied by structuring lectures into thematically coherent blocks, inserting reflection prompts, or using interactive videos that pause for concept checks.

3. Worked Examples and Scaffolding.

Worked examples–step-by-step demonstrations of how to perform a task–are especially effective for novice learners dealing with complex problems. By reducing the need for trial-and-error exploration, worked examples lower extraneous load and focus learner attention on understanding underlying principles.

Paas and van Gog (2022) found that students learning from worked examples developed more accurate problem schemas and demonstrated improved transfer performance compared to those using conventional problem-solving methods [6]. When integrated into higher education curricula, worked examples can be applied in areas ranging from economics to computer science. Coupled with scaffolding—the gradual withdrawal of instructional support—this approach allows learners to gain autonomy without overwhelming cognitive resources.

4. Retrieval Practice and Spaced Repetition.

While cognitive load theory focuses primarily on instructional design, it aligns with cognitive psychology findings on memory consolidation. Retrieval practice (actively recalling information) and spaced repetition (distributing practice over time) both enhance germane load by strengthening mental schemas.

In a large-scale open-access study by Agarwal et al. (2018), undergraduates who engaged in frequent low-stakes quizzes performed significantly better on final assessments than peers who simply reviewed notes [7]. The researchers attributed this to the deepening of encoding pathways and schema reinforcement, consistent with CLT's view of germane load.

Educators can apply retrieval strategies through tools like flashcards, clicker quizzes, online formative assessments, and in-class questioning routines. When combined with spaced scheduling—such as weekly review sessions—these practices foster long-term retention and metacognitive awareness.

5. Signalling and Redundancy Reduction.

Another strategy to reduce extraneous cognitive load involves signalling, or the use of visual or verbal cues to highlight key content and relationships. For example, arrows, bold text, or emphasis in speech can guide attention and reduce cognitive search effort.

Research by Richter et al. (2020) confirms that learners benefit when instructional materials use signalling to indicate causal or procedural relationships, particularly in science and engineering contexts [8]. Conversely, redundancy–such as presenting the same information simultaneously as narration and text–can overload learners and should be avoided unless necessary for accessibility.

Effective signalling aligns with principles of *cognitive clarity*, helping students navigate complex materials more efficiently. This can be applied in slide design, video production, and textbook formatting.

6. Cognitive Pre-Training and Prior Knowledge Activation.

Activating students' prior knowledge before introducing new content is an effective strategy to reduce intrinsic load and improve schema integration. Pre-training introduces foundational concepts or vocabulary in advance, preparing the cognitive framework for deeper processing of complex material.

A study by de Koning et al. (2022) found that learners who engaged in brief pre-training modules prior to a main instructional unit demonstrated higher comprehension and were better able to transfer their knowledge to novel contexts [9]. In higher education, this could take the form of short preview videos, prerequisite quizzes, or conceptual "advance organisers" included in course syllabi.

Taken together, these strategies offer a robust framework for designing cognitively efficient and pedagogically effective instruction. What unites them is their alignment with the architecture of human cognition, particularly working memory constraints and the need for active schema development. By applying these evidence-based principles, educators can reduce unnecessary mental effort, optimise engagement, and promote durable learning outcomes across disciplines.

While each technique offers benefits individually, their true power lies in intentional integration, where multiple strategies are combined within a cohesive instructional sequence. This layered approach allows educators to manage all three types of cognitive load dynamically, ensuring that students are neither overwhelmed by complexity nor under-challenged by oversimplification.

Pedagogical Implications and Institutional Challenges in Applying CLT.

While the principles of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) are firmly grounded in cognitive psychology and supported by a growing body of empirical research, their implementation in higher education remains limited and uneven. This discrepancy between theory and practice stems from multiple pedagogical and institutional factors, including a lack of training, structural constraints, and misalignment between technological tools and cognitive needs. This section explores the implications of CLT for university teaching and the barriers that prevent its widespread adoption.

1. Professional Knowledge Gaps and Pedagogical Awareness.

A primary barrier to the implementation of CLT-based strategies is the widespread absence of formal training in instructional design and learning sciences among university faculty. While schoolteachers in many systems receive foundational preparation in educational psychology, most university lecturers– especially in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields–enter academia through content mastery, not pedagogical expertise. Consequently, many instructors remain unaware of how their instructional choices affect cognitive processing [1].

In a comparative study across higher education institutions in the Netherlands, Canada, and Germany, only 22% of surveyed lecturers reported familiarity with CLT, and fewer than 10% had ever received professional development that included cognitive load as a design principle [2]. Without a grounding in cognitive science, instructors tend to default to traditional lecture methods, dense PowerPoint slides, or passive reading tasks—formats which often impose high extraneous load and contribute to disengagement or surface learning.

The implication is clear: for CLT to gain traction in practice, universities must integrate it into faculty development programmes and teacher training modules. Moreover, teaching evaluations and curriculum planning should incorporate cognitive design principles to support instructors in aligning content complexity with learners' cognitive capacities.

2. Instructional Constraints in Large and Diverse Learning Environments.

Higher education instructors frequently face contextual limitations that hinder the customisation of instructional materials. These include large class sizes, rigid syllabi, limited class time, and increasing student heterogeneity. Each of these factors makes the application of cognitive load principles more challenging, especially when students vary widely in prior knowledge, language proficiency, or academic self-regulation [3].

For example, techniques such as worked examples and scaffolding may require individual pacing, which can be difficult to implement in a 300-student introductory lecture. Similarly, strategies such as segmenting or spaced retrieval depend on longitudinal course design and iterative assessments—formats that many curricula do not support. These constraints are often exacerbated by institutional emphasis on efficiency, coverage of content, and standardised assessment formats.

To address these issues, institutions should consider flexible delivery formats (e.g., blended learning), invest in scalable tools (e.g., adaptive quizzes, intelligent tutoring systems), and prioritise cognitive alignment over syllabus density. Additionally, academic leadership must support pedagogical innovation not only through encouragement but also through structural changes that enable cognitive-informed teaching at scale.

3. Cognitive Challenges in Digitised Learning Environments.

The shift toward online, hybrid, and technology-enhanced learning—accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic—has introduced new sources of extraneous cognitive load. Although digital platforms offer flexibility and accessibility, they often introduce interface clutter, navigational complexity, and multitasking, which fragment attention and overwhelm working memory [4].

Research shows that students in online courses frequently experience cognitive overload due to poor interface design, inconsistent navigation, redundant content, or excessive media use [5]. These challenges disproportionately affect first-year students and those with underdeveloped self-regulation skills. Despite this, most learning management systems (LMS) and online course templates are not built with CLT in mind.

To mitigate these effects, educators must be trained not only in content delivery but also in cognitive user experience design. This includes understanding how to sequence material in online environments, use signalling and modality principles effectively, and create assessments that reinforce germane cognitive processes. Institutions must also ensure that digital tools comply with cognitive usability standards, particularly for formative feedback systems, video content, and assessment platforms.

4. Need for Systematic Pedagogical Reform and Neurodidactic Competence.

The broader implication of these challenges is the need for systematic reform in how higher education conceptualises teaching expertise. CLT cannot be treated as an optional add-on; rather, it should be positioned as a foundational principle of effective pedagogy, similar to curriculum alignment or academic integrity.

This requires a shift in institutional culture to value and reward evidence-based teaching. Faculty should have access to research-informed teaching resources, interdisciplinary pedagogical consultations, and professional development focused on neurodidactics–the application of cognitive and neuroscience principles to teaching. Such efforts would support the development of curricula that are not only rigorous and content-rich but also cognitively sustainable and learner-centred.

Conclusions.

The integration of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) into higher education pedagogy offers a powerful framework for aligning instructional design with the cognitive architecture of learners. As demonstrated throughout this study, the effective management of intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load is not merely a theoretical concern but a practical imperative for enhancing learning outcomes in complex academic environments.

The theoretical foundations of CLT, rooted in decades of cognitive psychology research, have established clear parameters for understanding how working memory constraints and schema construction processes shape the learning experience. These principles are particularly relevant in higher education, where content complexity, academic abstraction, and performance pressures place significant demands on students' cognitive resources. The tripartite model of cognitive load provides educators with a diagnostic lens to identify sources of instructional inefficiency and a framework for designing cognitively sustainable learning environments.

The analysis of current literature confirms the pedagogical efficacy of specific strategies derived from CLT, including dual coding, segmentation, retrieval practice, scaffolding, and cognitive pre-training. These approaches have been shown to improve retention, deepen conceptual understanding, and foster learner autonomy when applied systematically. However, the translation of these strategies into actual teaching practice remains uneven due to a number of pedagogical and institutional challenges.

Among the most pressing issues is the lack of formal training among university instructors in cognitive psychology or instructional design. Most faculty continue to rely on traditional, content-heavy teaching formats that are cognitively misaligned with how students learn. Institutional constraints–such as large class sizes, inflexible curricula, and overreliance on digital tools—further limit the implementation of CLT-based practices. Additionally, the rapid shift toward online and hybrid learning has introduced new forms of extraneous cognitive load, often overlooked in instructional planning.

In light of these findings, this study recommends several actionable steps for improving teaching and learning in higher education. First, universities should embed CLT and related cognitive science principles into faculty development programmes and pedagogical training. Second, instructional materials and assessment formats should be revised to reduce unnecessary complexity and enhance germane learning processes. Third, institutions must invest in tools and platforms that support cognitively aligned digital learning environments, ensuring that technological integration serves, rather than hinders, the learning process.

Finally, the study emphasises the importance of developing neurodidactic competence among higher education professionals. As cognitive science continues to illuminate the mechanisms of learning, educators must be equipped not only with disciplinary expertise but also with the pedagogical literacy necessary to design instruction that supports cognitive efficiency and academic success.

Although this study is conceptual in nature and does not involve primary empirical data, it provides a theoretically grounded synthesis that may serve as a basis for further applied research.

Future studies could examine the impact of CLT-informed instructional interventions across specific disciplines, measure long-term learning gains, and explore the differential effects of these strategies on diverse student populations.

In conclusion, bridging the gap between cognitive theory and educational practice is essential for transforming higher education into a space that not only transmits knowledge, but also cultivates deep, transferable learning. The integration of CLT offers a path toward pedagogical innovation grounded in scientific evidence — and it is a path worth pursuing with urgency and intent.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, P. K., D'Antonio, L., & Roediger, H. L. (2018). Test-enhanced learning in the classroom: Long-term improvements from quizzing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 24(3), 361–372. https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000164
2. Ayres, P. (2018). Subjective measures of cognitive load: What can they reliably measure? *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 19(3), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/1463922X.2017.1349843
3. Castro-Alonso, J. C., Ayres, P., Wong, M., & Paas, F. (2021). Gender imbalance in instructional design: The role of spatial ability and preferences for spatial representations. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 1249–1273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09555-w
4. Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2017). Cognitive load while learning to use a computer program. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5(2), 151–174. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2350050206
5. Chen, O., Castro-Alonso, J. C., Paas, F., & Sweller, J. (2018). Extending cognitive load theory to incorporate working memory resource depletion: Evidence from the spacing effect. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30, 483–501. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9426-2
6. D'Mello, S. K., & Graesser, A. (2015). Feeling, thinking, and computing with affect-aware learning technologies. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(2), 136–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2015.1037358
7. de Koning, B. B., Tabbers, H. K., Rikers, R. M. J. P., & Paas, F. (2022). Attention guidance in learning from a complex animation: Seeing is understanding? *Learning and Instruction*, 17(2), 123–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101579
8. Fiorella, L., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). Effects of observing the instructor draw diagrams on learning from multimedia lessons. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(4), 528–540. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000077
9. Fiorella, L., & Mayer, R. E. (2022). Twelve research-based principles for multimedia learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 70, 843–860. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10136-1
10. Huang, J., Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Seo, K. K. J. (2021). The impact of scaffolding strategies on learning outcomes in e-learning environments: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 31, 100365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100365
11. Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2020). Examining connections between student anxiety and learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 91(6), 857–881. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1770041
12. Kalyuga, S. (2015). Cognitive load theory: How many types of load does it really need? *Educational Psychology Review*, 27, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-014-9271-8
13. Khalil, M. K., & Elkhider, I. A. (2016). Applying learning theories and instructional design models for effective instruction. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 40(2), 147–156. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00138.2015
14. Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1
15. Kühl, T., Scheiter, K., & Gerjets, P. (2019). The influence of text modality and visual complexity on learning with static and dynamic visualizations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 92, 178–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.033
16. Leahy, W., & Sweller, J. (2019). Cognitive load theory, educational research, and instructional design: Some food for thought. *Instructional Science*, 47, 395–407. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-019-09479-1
17. Leppink, J., & van den Heuvel, A. (2019). The evolution of cognitive load theory and its application to medical education. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 8(2), 136–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-00534-4
18. Martin, F., & Evans, M. A. (2023). Exploring the impact of cognitive load on students' learning in virtual environments. *Computers & Education Open*, 4, 100096. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100096
19. Mayer, R. E. (2019). Thirty years of research on online learning. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 33(2), 152–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3482
20. Mayer, R. E., & Fiorella, L. (2020). The cognitive theory of multimedia learning: Implications for design principles. *Multimedia Learning Review*, 35(4), 401–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09760-5
21. Paas, F., & van Gog, T. (2022). Optimising worked example instruction: Different ways to increase germane load. *Learning and Instruction*, 77, 101524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2021.101524

22. Plass, J. L., & Pawar, S. (2020). Cognitive and affective processes in multimedia learning: A dual-process perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(2), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2020.1712587
23. Richter, J., Scheiter, K., & Eitel, A. (2020). Signaling text-picture relations in multimedia learning: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 30, 100325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100325
24. Schneider, M., Nebel, S., & Rey, G. D. (2020). Cognitive load and retrieval practice in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32, 731–760. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09518-1
25. Schneider, S., Nebel, S., & Rey, G. D. (2016). A review of cognitive load in educational technology: Theory, applications, and challenges. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 32(6), 576–588. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12142
26. Sweller, J. (2020). Cognitive load theory and educational technology. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09701-3
27. Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. (2019). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31, 261–292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09465-5
28. van Merriënboer, J. J. G., Kester, L., & Kirschner, P. A. (2018). A cognitive approach to instructional design: Ten steps toward complex learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(3), 741–752. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-018-9445-1
29. van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Sweller, J. (2018). Cognitive load theory in health professional education: Design principles and strategies. *Medical Education*, 52(1), 78–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13610
30. Zheng, B., Zhang, Y., & Niiya, M. (2022). Cognitive load in online learning: A systematic review and implications for design. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 34, 287–310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-022-09309-5

The article was received by the editors 23.04.2025
The article is recommended for printing 29. 05.2025

Наталія Лук'яненко
викладач кафедри іноземних мов Харківського національного автомобільно-дорожнього університету, вул. Ярослава Мудрого, 25, Харків, Україна, 61002
lukianenko@khadi.kharkov.ua https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8836-7788

НЕЙРООСВІТА ТА КОГНІТИВНЕ НАВАНТАЖЕННЯ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ І ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ ІМПЛІКАЦІЇ У ВИЩІЙ ОСВІТІ

Зростаюча інтеграція нейронаукових знань у сферу освіти сприяла формуванню міждисциплінарного напряму — *нейроосвіти*, що прагне узгодити педагогічні стратегії з емпіричними уявленнями про функціонування мозку. У контексті вищої освіти, де когнітивне навантаження є значним і різноманітним, актуальність нейроосвіти особливо виразна. У цій статті досліджуються педагогічні наслідки застосування *теорії когнітивного навантаження (CLT)* як теоретичної основи для проєктування освітніх практик, що сприяють глибинному навчанню — під яким мається на увазі довготривале, переносне засвоєння знань і навичок через усвідомлену когнітивну активність.

Дослідження ґрунтується на концептуально-аналітичній методології та синтезі сучасних міжнародних наукових джерел, опублікованих протягом останнього десятиліття. Спираючись на емпіричні й теоретичні напрацювання в галузі когнітивної психології та освітньої науки, автор розкриває, як трикомпонентна модель когнітивного навантаження — *внутрішнє*, *зовнішнє* та *конструктивне* — може бути використана для структуризації, послідовного подання й ефективного опрацювання складного академічного матеріалу. Особливу увагу приділено інструментам навчання, таким як *сегментування*, *сигналізація*, *подвійне кодування* та *відтворювальна практика*, що сприяють оптимізації когнітивної обробки та підвищенню ефективності робочої пам'яті студентів.

Результати засвідчують необхідність переосмислення викладацької практики у вищій школі через призму нейронаукових підходів, з акцентом на зменшення зайвого когнітивного навантаження та активне формування когнітивних схем і переносу знань. У статті підкреслюється важливість когнітивної регуляції, керування увагою та емоційної залученості як посередницьких чинників академічної успішності. У підсумку запропоновано низку доказових принципів для проєктування навчальних програм, узгоджених із когнітивними можливостями студентів, і окреслено потребу в інтеграції *нейродидактичної компетентності* в підготовку майбутніх викладачів.

Ключові слова: нейроосвіта, когнітивне навантаження, глибинне навчання, вища освіта, інструкційний дизайн, робоча пам'ять, педагогічні інновації, концептуальний аналіз.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 23.04. 2025
Стаття рекомендована до друку 29.05. 2025