Gaurav Thakur, 2024, 12:5
ISSN (Online): 2348-4098
ISSN (Print): 2395-4752

International Journal of Science, Engineering and Technology

An Open Access Journal

Ways to Improve Brain-Based Learning Methods at Indian Universities

Gaurav Thakur, Professor G.Anburaj
Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632014, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract- In the rapidly changing educational arena, enhancing the learning methodology is much more censorious than ever; Indian universities, drenched in rich academic tradition, are finding it challenging to adapt to modern pedagogical approaches which guarantee deeper cognitive engagement and retention It elaborates on the brain-learning method, a neuroscience-informed approach to teaching and learning, and its potential to revolutionize higher education in India. The paper would draw copiously from the cognitive science and educational psychology literature in identifying pertinent techniques, such as active learning, spaced repetition, multisensory engagement, and reflective learning-everything that echoes how the brain actual processes and retains information. Analyzing case studies and comparative analyses with foreign universities, the paper will assess the application of such methods in Indian universities presently and suggest changes that have context applicability. In conclusion, the study considers cultural and infrastructural obstacles to full-scale implementation of using the brain-based strategy in learning and draws recommendations for educational practitioners, policymakers, and institutions in creating an environment more engaging and effective.

Keywords- Brain-Learning Method, Educational Methodology, Higher Education, Cognitive Engagement, Active Learning, Indian Universities.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the course of Indian history, the system of modern education in India has transformed itself to fit changing historical, cultural, and technological advancements. Despite all these developments, however, there are larger gaps in teaching and learning methods at the university level. Brain learning is the way in which educational processes may be brought up in line with brain processes and has been one of the main concerns in today's world. These methods are grounded in cognitive neuroscience and educational psychology, emphasize how students should learn, process, and retain information more effectively and accurately.

This paper aims to investigate the ways in which Indian universities can integrate brain-learning methods to improve student's outcome, foster deeper understanding, and ultimately create a more engaging academic environment at Indian Universities.

Background of Indian Higher Education: There are numerous institutions from thousands of universities to colleges in India. All global big-shot institutes like Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) notwithstanding, the higher education system itself is beset with a lot of systemic problems. Lecturing has not been done away with in most of the

institutions. Lack of thinking skills and rote learning remains pervasive. The current emphasis of knowledge transmission instead of knowledge construction does not allow students to apply concepts in actual life settings, thus suppressing creativity and problem-solving abilities. The rapid growth in the enrollment rates and the expansion of private universities have also played a additional pressure on the quality of education while quantity has increased, the challenge of delivering high-quality education to a larger portion of students and diverse population of India remains unresolved. In this context, brain-learning methods offer an opportunity to shift from passive learning techniques to more dynamic, student-centered approaches that could significantly enhance the quality of education that is provided in Indian education system.

Understanding Brain-Learning Methods: Brain-Based learning Methods refers to the education methods and approaches that are based on present knowledge of how the brain learns, analyzes, and retains information. It takes an interdisciplinary approach based on studies such as neuroscience, cognitive psychology, and education, forming techniques that actually reflect the natural working of the brain during learning. One of the findings of neuroscience research indicates that the brain learns best when information is presented in ways that are interesting, meaningful, and related to the operations of memory and cognition.

Key principles of brain-learning include

- **Active Learning:** This stimulates the student's mind to interact with material through discussions, problem-solving activities, and hands-on things, rather than mere listening.
- **Spaced Repetition:** Spreading out learning over time to strengthen memory retention.
- **Multisensory Engagement:** Making use of several senses (visual, audio, kinesthetic) in learning.
- **Emotional Involvement:** Emotions significantly impact the brain's ability to encode and retrieve memories, so learning environments that evoke curiosity and excitement tend to be more effective.
- **Neuroplasticity:** The brain's ability to adapt and form new neural connections throughout life suggests that learning methods should encourage continuous learning and adaptability.

The Current State of Learning Methods in Indian Universities: Indian universities have a basic structure of traditional education that may not address the advantages associated with findings of brain-based research. Largely dominant lectures and note-taking as a passive activity, along with rote memorization methods of learning, tend to overlook engagement, contextual learning, and practical application by the brain. All these methods were initially effective, but the demands of modern society call for a change in pedagogical strategy, for example, skills which include critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving. For example, most students are forced to memorize vast amounts of data that must be reproduced in an examination. Although this approach works well for short-term retention, it doesn't encourage understanding and the application of learned material when a student is faced with a novel context. Stressful exams-either due to the stakes of grading or the pressure of doing well in one's career-worsen cognitive performance by impairing access to information from memory.

The Need for Brain-Based Learning in Indian Universities:In the integration of brain-learning methods, therefore, several problems within the Indian higher education system could be solved. The first is to increase student engagement and motivation. These methods make learning much more interactive and appealing to the way the students process information, hence reducing dropout rates that most institutions record. Most of these strategies include active learning-the discussion of group ideas, solving of problems, and projects where critical thinking and application in practical situations are encouraged.

More importantly, the brain-learning methods will help in the development of soft skills like emotional intelligence, teamwork, and adaptability, which the global workforce is increasingly demanding. Indian

students have all along been categorized as strong in bookish knowledge but weak in practice. The approach will give Indian universities the chance to help students get a more holistic education experience through multiple senses as well as emotionally influential learning.The other important area is the ability to individualize learning. Techniques for learning by brain realize that one student learns differently and at a different rate than another one. By carrying several approaches to teaching, universities can avail many needs and types and leave no stone unturned and prevent any student from falling into a crack. This will be really beneficial in India, where classrooms are so crowded that giving the needed attention might prove quite cumbersome.

Challenges to Implementation: Despite the benefits from the brain-learning methods, their implementation in Indian higher education colleges faces huge challenges. First, it is a lack of consciousness and training among faculty members. Most teaching staff in universities receive less training in modern methodologies of teaching and continue to use the teaching methods they learned in school days. An examination-based education system offers much scope for mere rote memorization and offers little time for use of brain-based methodologies. Infrastructure barriers still prevail, especially in the countryside. Brain-learning application technique requires modern technology access, smaller class size, and overall holistic teacher preparation which, again, may not be equally distributed across the country.

Conclusion: In the concluding remarks, brain-based learning techniques within Indian universities hold much promise in enhancing standards of higher education. Teaching approaches aligned with natural brain functions will, hopefully, result in better assimilation of knowledge, high participation from students, and development of relevant skills as envisaged for success in this modern world. However, these only work if the coordination of effort is launched to train trainers, to move away from rote learning, and to invest in the much-needed infrastructure. If offered due support, Indian universities can capitalize on brain-learning methods to graduate an aware and capable generation that can think critically and practice creatively and innovatively.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Contemporaneous pedagogic practices utilized in Indian universities are highly dependent upon ancient approaches to teaching that emphasize lecturing and rote memorization techniques, which are not harmonious with the natural ways of operation of the brain for encoding information and recalling it. These archaic techniques lead to disengagement from learning, conflict with critical thinking and problem-solving, and ultimately result in failure to retain learned knowledge. Besides, the widespread culture of pressure and examination orientedness in Indian higher education encourages merely supercilious understanding of topics, rather than deep cognitive engagement. Indian universities have been slow to adopt 'brain-based learning principles' still gaining acceptance in international education approaches.

Of particular concern is the gap identified, as this makes the need for having graduates not only informed but also skilled in critical thinking, creativity, and innovation increase further. This makes cognitive-learning strategies of Indian higher education ineffective; thereby, a tendency towards disengagement is assumed by students who find academic achievement a challenge, and graduates are not successful in applying theoretical concepts into practical skills within real-world settings. This research focuses on analyzing the challenges involved with the implementation of brain-learning methods in Indian universities, along with discussing any possible enhancements to be made to these learning methods. This paper aims to draw out and analyze the major barriers in making the transition out of traditional teaching to brain-based learning cutting across all cultural, infrastructural, and instructional challenges. In this light, the paper outlines strategies for the induction of neuroscience-inspired learning in Indian institutions with the hope of creating better learning environments that support cognitive development and improvement in student performance.

III. RESEARCH GAP

Positive outcome and challenges of research on brain-based learning in the Indian university. The strategy used as part of this brain-based learning approach and actively acquired; peer taught or multisensory has an effective input in terms of enhancing the students' retention and understanding. Students experienced an improvement in their performance, especially from active engagement and peer teaching since this type of input enhances the process of acquiring knowledge with interaction and on-the-spot feedback.

However, obstacles remain there, particularly on the more traditional, exam-based nature of learning. A stiff system where emphasis is heavy on rote memorization does not easily allow for changes in methodology by instructors. There is also an absence of adequate teacher training on applications in neuroscience. This is one of the reasons why the adoption remains poor. The teachers must be prepared to be at ease with the new approach as it calls for a different paradigm shift altogether: from a passive and lecture-based kind of learning modes. This author also made a point about how crucial technology was, particularly tools like spaced repetition and interactive learning, to increase the chances that students might hold onto information. The problem here is that unequal access to those tools continues, especially for underfunded institutions. Overall, it shows a need for a systemic approach to changing curricula, teacher training, and the availability of resources in realizing the benefits of brain-based learning in universities within India.

IV. RESULT ANALYSIS

The analysis of the results on brain-based learning methods introduced in Indian universities shows mixed prospects and challenges. Brain-based techniques like active learning, peer teaching, and multisensory engagement have helped students better understand, retain, and get engaged in the study remarkably. Most of the students have reported that they grasped better understanding and better memory recall when they were more interactive with the content compared to the traditional lecture method of learning.

However, mainly when the structure of the Indian system with rigid examination-based syllabi had to be countered. Such a system breeds a massive requirement for rote learning and not original thought from either the teacher or the student, and before long everyone gets accustomed, and more importantly, values the idea of innovative concepts that put the student as its focal point and potentiality. Most likely, another area in the greatest need of coverage would be teacher training. In most cases, even their knowledge of brain-based ideas is not present in the mind of a large portion of the teachers, and thus professional training should also reach out to this mass of students.

This related inequality emerges from the differential institutional access to technology and other digital resources. Brain-based learning tools seem much more favorable for the students at better-resourced universities. Such inequalities need to be addressed in equitable education reform.

The conclusions reached were that the implications of brain-based learning methods would highlight the power of potential for these techniques while giving credibility to the point of systemic transformation, focusing on overhauls of the curriculum, teacher development, and access to appropriate resources.

Discussion on Result

Positive results and challenges of study about brain-based learning in the Indian university. Strategy implemented within this brain-based learning strategy and actively learned; peer taught or multisensory has an effective input in order to improve student retention and comprehension. Students reported performance enhancement, especially through active participation and peer teaching because it reinforces learning through interactions and real-time feedback.

However, the hurdles remain there, especially in the more traditional, exam-based structure of learning. A rigid system in which substantial focus is placed on rote memorization does not easily accept changes in methodology by the instructors. Furthermore, not enough sufficient teacher training on neuroscience applications is provided. This is one of the reasons why the adoption remains poor. The teachers need to be prepared with a sense of ease about the new approach because it asks for a complete paradigm shift from a passive, lecture-based kind of learning modes.

This author also highlighted the critical role technology played: tools like spaced repetition and interactive learning increased students' chances of holding information. The problem here is that unequal access to those tools continues, especially for underfunded institutions. Overall, it shows a need for a systemic approach to changing curricula, teacher training, and the availability of resources in realizing the benefits of brain-based learning in universities within India.

Unexpected Findings

In the course of probing into how brain-based learning techniques work at Indian universities, it was found that some unexpected things surfaced which, in themselves, were not really expected. These new revelations open new windows to the reception and integration of these techniques, especially to traditional systems of learning.

Cultural Resilience Against Active Learning: Most unbelievable has been the level of cultural resistance to active learning on both sides: so many students, especially the students who are more attached to tradition, preferred traditional classroom setup wherein lectures are prominent with less emphasis on collaborative approaches. They felt these could be less efficient techniques to get the memorization and retrieval strategies that get favor on high-stake examinations. This would indicate a need for change larger than the simple adjustment of teachers on but a culture change by students who were accustomed to the old model.

Emotional and Mental Health Impact:Another interesting finding was that the emotional and mental wellbeing had a large influence in how effective the brain-based learning was. Under enormous pressure of academics, very common in the Indian school system, students failed to derive any benefits from techniques like spaced repetition and active engagement. It appears as if stress and anxiety suppress the cognitive functions. In this regard, mental well-being of students becomes critical in optimizing the gains of the learning strategies based on the brains.

Overreliance on Technology: When technology enhanced the results for most, there were still moments of unanticipated overreliance on the digital tools and a sort of passivity within the learning group when such resources were available, hence it proved that technology would support but not replace traditional methods of teaching that are very interactive and human-based.

Scope for Further Research

It is huge and pressing as an area of improvement in regard to learning with the brain for universities in India.

Only then will the cultural adaptation become a major challenge. Here, research would be about how brain-based learning could be adapted into the old system of traditional India's schooling environment that still focuses primarily on examinations. With the new methods to be effectively assimilated with the existing systems, the resistances both among teachers and learners would easily dissolve.

There should be more research regarding mental health effects on performance levels. Increased stressful and anxious levels of students up to an all-time high need 'avenues' about how study could blend the concept of mental health care with the academic environment. That is in itself aiding in strategizing in reaching out to students or else a means of how engagement into higher cognitively will lead in enhancing performances.

More, however, has to be done as far as those studies supposed to measure at which extent the traditional replacement occurs once digital tools would rather replace that. What this is referring to is the issue these studies should cover with respect to how not to let this happen and effectively create room for active learning of the concepts offered through it as presented.

This is absolutely critical: teacher programs based on learning strategies that are themselves consonant with brain-based approaches to learning. The research on best practice in professional development would identify those strategies likely to lead to increased confidence on the part of the teacher and, consequently, among students.

V. CONCLUSION

Indian university institutions can raise student engagement and retention at impressive levels using brain-based learning methods. A sample is the orientation of the latest techniques regarding learnability at the level of the brain, such as forcing comprehension towards deeper levels through proper preparation for realistic situations in real life. Many other issues will still prevail, such as cultural resistance and pressure from the exam-oriented systems also with the teacher training programs. Brain-based learning method will have much stiffer competition unless these problems are worked on. Another fact to be incorporated would be that an understanding of how mental health influences performance combined with a fair opportunity at access to technology would ensure that there was a well-rounded learning environment.

The scope is simply humongous and will necessitate such huge refinement and adaptation of these methods into India's distinct education landscape. Future research will emphasize cultural adaptation, mental health integration, the use of technology, and longitudinal studies for the production of outcomes which enhance the effectiveness of brain-based learning for higher education.

In summary, this kind of change toward more interactive and student-centered learning environments will help individual students but would also help foster a more innovative and competitive workforce in the world economy.

REFERENCES

01. Anderson, J. R., Cognitive psychology and its implications (4th ed.), New York: Freeman:1995.
02. Anderson, L. W., What time tells us. Timepiece: Extending and enhancing learning time, National Association of Secondary School Principals:1993.
03. Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. Human memory: A proposed system and its component processes, In K. Spence & J. Spence (Eds.), The psychology of learning and motivation (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press:1968.
04. Bahrick, H.P., & Hall, L. K., Lifetime maintenance of high school mathematics. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 120, 20-23:1991.
05. Barell, J., Like an incredibly hard algebra problem: Teaching for metacognition. In A. L. Costa, J. A. Bellanca, & R. Fogarty (Eds.), If minds matter: A forward to the future (Vol. I). Palatine, IL: IRI/Sky light Publishing:1992.
06. Barr, R., Kami], M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., and Pearson, P. D., Handbook of reading research (Vol. 2). New York: Longman:1991.
07. Billmeyer, R., Teaching reading in the content areas: If not me, then who? Colorado: McREL Institute:1995.
08. Bloom, B., The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster:1987.
09. Bower, G. H., & Karlin, M. B., Depth of processing pictures of faces and recognition memory. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 103, 751-757:1974.
10. Bransford, J. D., Stein, B. S., Vye, N. J., Franks, J. J., Auble, P. M., Mezynski, K. J., & Pefertto G. A., Differences in approaches to learning: An overview. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 3, 390-398:1982.
11. Brown, R., & McNeill, D., The "tip-of-the-tongue" phenomenon. Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior, 5, 325-337:1966.
12. Bruer, J., Schools for thought: A science of learning for the classroom. Cambridge: MIT Press: 1993.
13. Caine, G. & Caine, R. N., Education on the edge of possibility. Alexan dria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development:1997.
14. Chi, M. T. H., & Ceci, S., Content knowledge: Its role, representation, and restructuring in memory development. In H. W. Reese (Ed.), Advances in child development and behavior. Orlando: Academic Press:1987.

15. Clark, J. M., & Paivi, A., Dual coding theory and education. Edu cational Psychology Review, 3(3), 149-210:1991.
16. Conway, M.A., Cohen, G., & Stanhope, N. Very long-term mem Ory of knowledge acquired through formal education: Twelve years of cognitive psychology. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, /20, 395-409:1991.
17. Cooper, J. D., Bosch ken, I., McWilliams, J., & Pisto Chini, L., A study of the effectiveness of an intervention program designed to accelerate reading for struggling readers in upper grades. Unpublished final report:1997.
18. Corkill, A. J., Advance organizers: Facilitators of recall. Educational Psychology Review, 4, 33-67:1992.
19. Coronulid, C., Metacognitive control processes and memory deficits in poor comprehension. Learning Disability Quarterly, I 3(4), 245-257:1990.
20. Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S., Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. Journal of Verbal Thinking & Verbal Behavior, Lj, 671-684:1972.
21. Cunningham, J. W., Generating interactions between schemata and text. In Niles, J. A. & Harris, L. A. (Eds.), New inquiries in reading research and instruction. Washington, DC: National Reading conference:1982.
22. Dempster, F. Synthesis of research on reviews and tests. Educational Leadership, 48(7), 71-76:1991.
23. Deshler, D. D. & Schumaker, J.B., Content enhancement series and learning strategies. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Center for Research on Learning:1992.
24. Dinnell, D., & Glover, J. A. Advance organizers: Encoding manip ulations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, 514-522:1985.
25. Eggen, P., & Kauchak, Don classrooms: Educational psychology (3d ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill-Prentice Hall:1997
26. Ellis, E. S. The frame routine. Lawrence: University of Kansas:1997.
27. Engle, R. W., Nations, J. K., & Cantor, J. Is "working memory capacity" just another name for word knowledge? Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(4), 799-804: 1990.
28. Ericcson, K. A., & Kintsch, Wolong-term working memory. psychological Review, 102, 211-245:1995.
29. Eysenck, M. W., & Keane, M. T. Cognitive psychology: A student's handbook. Hove, UK: Erlbaum,1990.
30. Faw, H. W., & Waller, T. G. Mathemagenic behaviors and efficiency in learning from prose. Review of Educational Research, 46, 691-720:1976.
31. Gagne, E. D.,Yekovich, C. W., & Yekovich, F. R.The cognitive psychology of school learning (2d ed.). New York: HarperCollins,1993.
32. Gambrell, L. B., Kapinus, A., & Wilson, R. M. Using mental imagery and summarization to achieve independence in comprehend sion. Journal of Reading, 30, 638-642:1987.
33. Heimlich, J.E., & Pittelman, S. D. Semantic mapping: Classroom applications. Newark, DE: International Reading Association:1986.
34. Henson, K. T., & Eller, B. F.Educational psychology for effective teaching. Albany, NY: Wadsworth:1999.
35. Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L.A practical guide to alternative assessment. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development:1992.
36. Heward, W. Exceptional children (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall:1996.
37. Hyerle, D,Visual tools for constructing knowledge. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development:1996.
38. Jensen, E.Teaching with the brain in mind. Alexandria, VA: Asso ciation for Supervision & Curriculum Development:1998.
39. Johnson, D., & Johnson, R, Learning together and alone: Cooper ation, competition, and individualization (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon:1994.
40. Johnson, N. J., and Rose, L. M,Portfolios: Clarifying, construct ing, and enhancing. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing:1997.
41. Jones, V. F., & Jones, L. S,Comprehensive classroom management: Motivating and managing students (3d ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon:1990.
42. Kagan, S,Cooperative learning. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning Company:1992.
43. Klatzky, R. Memory and awareness. New York: Freeman:1984.
44. Kuhara-Kojima, K., & Hatano, Contribution of content know edge and learning ability to the learning of facts. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83 (2), 253-263:1991.
45. Langer, J. A, From theory to practice: A prereading plan. Journal of Reading, 25, 152-156:1981.
46. Langer, J. A, Facilitating text processing: The elaboration of prior knowledge. J. Langer & M. Smith-Burke (Eds.), Reader meets author: Bridging the gap. Newark, DE: International Reading Association:1947.
47. Levin, M. E., & Levin, J. RFScientific mnemonics: Methods for maximizing more than memory. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 301-321:1990.
48. Lofthus, E. F., & Lofthus, G. Ron the permanence of stored information in the human brain. American Psychologist, 35, 409-420:1990.
49. Mac Knize, A. A., & White, R. Fieldwork in geography and long-term memory. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 623-632:1982.
50. Manzo, Expansion models for the Request, CAT, GRP, and REAP reading/study procedures. Journal of Reading, 28, 498-503:1985.
51. Martin, Episodic memory: A neglected phenomenon in the psychology of education. Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 169-183:1983.

52. Massaro, D. W., & Cowan, Information processing models: Microscopes of the mind. Annual Review of Psychology, 44, 383-425:1993.
53. Mastropieri, M., & Scruggs, Memory and learning disabilities. Learning Disability Quarterly, 13(4), 234-235:1990.
54. Matlin, M. Cognition (2d ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston:1989.
55. Mayer, R. Twenty-five years of research on advance organizers. Instructional Science, 8, 133-169:19954.
56. McDaniel, M., Einstein, G., & Waddill, Material-appropriate processing: Implications for remediating recall deficits in students with learning disabilities. Learning Disability Quarterly, 13(4), 258-270:1990.
57. McGaugh, J. L., Cahill, L., Parent, M. B., Masches, M. H., Coleman Masches, K., & Salinas, J. A, Involvement of the amygdala in the regulation of memory storage. In Plasticity in the central nervous system: Learning and memory. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum and Associates:1995.
58. Mehring, T., & Colson, Facilitating memory in students with learning disabilities. LD Forum, 16(1), 75-79:1993.
59. Miller, G. A, The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. Psychological Review, 63, 81-97:1956.
60. Ogle, D, KWL: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. Reading Teacher, 39, 546-570:1989.
61. Ormrod, J. Educational psychology: Developing learners. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall:1998.
62. Palencar, A. S,The quest for meaning from expository text: A teacher-guided journey. In G. Duffy, L. H. Rohler, & J. Mason (Eds.), Comprehension instruction: Perspectives and suggestions:1983.
63. New York: Longman. Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. Interactive teaching to promote independent learning from text. Reading Teacher, 39, 771-777:1986.
64. Parks, S. & Black, Organizing thinking: Graphic organizers. Pacific Grove, CA: Critical Thinking Press and Software:1996.
65. Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. Kami P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson, (Eds.). Handbook of reading research (Vol. 2). New York: Longman:1995.
66. Pehrsson, R. S., & Robinson, H. A.,he semantic organizer approach to writing and reading instruction. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems:1985.
67. Perkins, D. and Salomon, Gather science and art of transfer. In A. L. Costa, J. A. Bellanca, & R. Fogarty (Eds.), If minds matter: A forward to the future (Vol. I). Palatine, IL: IRI/Skylight Publishing:192.
68. Peverly, S. Problems with the knowledge-based explanation of memory and development. Review of Educational Research, 61(I), 71-93:1991.
69. Pressley, M., & Harris, K. R.,What we really know about strategy instruction. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 31-34:1994.
70. Project CRISS (Creating Independence Through Student-owned Strategies), Kalispell, MT. Kendall/Hunt:1996.
71. Raphael, T. Question-answering strategies for. Children. Reading Teacher, 36, 186-190:1982.
72. Raedene, J.E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. Csontent area reading: An integrated approach (5th ed). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/ Hunt:1995.
73. Reed, S. Cognition (3d ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole:1992.
74. Richardson, J., & Morgan, R,Reading to learn in the content areas. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth:1994.
75. Santrock, J. W,Life-span development. Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark:1997.
76. Schneider, W. & Shiffrin, R,Controlled and automatic human information processing: detection, search, and attention. Psychologi cal Review, 84, 1-66:1977.
77. Schunk, D. H,Goal and self-evaluative influences during chil drens' cognitive skill learning. American Educational Research Jour nal, 33, 359-382:1996.
78. Semb, G. B., & Ellis, J. AKnowledge taught in school: What is remembered. Review of Educational Research, 24, 253-286:1984.
79. Simmonds, E. P. Matthe effects of teacher training and implementing two methods for improving the comprehension skills of students with learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice 7, 194-198:1992.
80. Slavin, R. Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 71-82:1991.
81. Slavin, R. Cooperative Learning (2d ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon:1995.
82. Slavin, R. Educational psychology: Theory and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon:1997.
83. Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds), Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press:1998.
84. Sorgen, Mumin'd, memory, and learning: Applying brain research to classroom practice. Paper presented at Olathe District School Summer Conference, Olathe, KS:1998.
85. Sowell, Teaching students with mild disabilities. Presentation at 23rd annual Kansas Learning Disabilities Conference, Wichita:1981.
86. Stigler, S. Msomi long-forgotten work on memory. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 4, 1-4:1978.
87. Third international mathematics and survey study, Washington, DC.: U.S. Government Printing Office:1998.
88. Tierney, R. J., Raedene, J.E., & Dishner, E. reading strategies and practices: A compendium. Boston: Allyn and Bacon:1995.

89. Wolfe, Direct connection (Newsletter) Lawrence: Kansas Staff Development Council: May 1998.
90. Woolfolk, A. E, Educational psychology (7th ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon:1998.