OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

International Journal of School and Cognitive Psychology

Short Communication

Task Interference and Cognitive Load Effects in Complex Learning Activities

Aisha Benkhaled*

Department of Cognitive Psychology, University of Algiers II, Algiers, Algeria

DESCRIPTION

Human cognition operates within limited processing capacity, which becomes especially evident when individuals attempt to handle multiple tasks at the same time. In learning environments, students are often required to switch between activities such as listening, note-taking, reading, and problem-solving. The way cognitive resources are distributed across these demands influences accuracy, speed, and overall comprehension. Multi-tasking, although frequently perceived as efficient, often leads to reduced performance when cognitive load exceeds manageable limits [1].

Cognitive load refers to the amount of mental effort required to process information. When multiple tasks compete for the same cognitive resources, performance can decline due to overload. Working memory, which temporarily holds and manipulates information, plays a central role in this process. Since its capacity is limited, simultaneous demands can lead to incomplete processing or loss of information. This is particularly evident when tasks require similar types of processing, such as reading while listening to spoken instructions [2].

Task switching is a common form of multi-tasking that involves shifting attention from one activity to another. Each switch requires mental adjustment, including disengaging from one task and reorienting to another. These transitions consume cognitive resources, resulting in what is often described as switching cost. Frequent switching can reduce efficiency, as the mind must repeatedly re-establish context and retrieve relevant information [3].

The complexity of tasks significantly affects how cognitive load is distributed. Simple, well-practiced activities require fewer resources and can sometimes be performed simultaneously with minimal interference. However, complex tasks that demand reasoning, analysis, or problem-solving compete more strongly for cognitive capacity. When such tasks are combined, performance typically declines due to insufficient resources available for deep processing [4].

Attention control is a key factor in managing cognitive load. The ability to selectively focus on relevant information while ignoring distractions determines how effectively multiple inputs are handled. Individuals with stronger attentional control are better able to prioritize tasks and reduce interference. However, even with strong attention skills, there are limits to how much simultaneous processing can be sustained without degradation in performance [5].

Environmental conditions contribute significantly to cognitive load distribution. Noisy or visually cluttered settings increase the amount of irrelevant information that must be filtered out. This additional processing burden reduces available capacity for primary tasks. Conversely, structured and simplified environments allow more efficient allocation of cognitive resources, supporting better performance during complex activities [6].

Digital environments introduce new challenges related to multi-tasking. Devices often encourage simultaneous engagement with multiple streams of information, such as messaging, browsing, and content consumption. While this may create the perception of productivity, it frequently results in fragmented attention. Rapid switching between digital inputs can weaken comprehension and reduce retention of information [7].

Individual differences influence how cognitive load is managed. Some individuals are more capable of handling divided attention due to higher working memory capacity or better attentional control. Others may experience rapid overload when multiple tasks are introduced. These differences can affect learning outcomes and performance consistency across different settings [8].

Practice and familiarity can reduce cognitive load associated with certain tasks. When activities become automated through repetition, they require fewer conscious resources. This allows more capacity to be allocated to additional tasks. However, true multi-tasking remains limited, as highly demanding cognitive processes still compete for shared resources even when partial automation is achieved [9].

Instructional design can help manage cognitive load by structuring tasks in a way that reduces unnecessary complexity. Breaking information into smaller segments, presenting material sequentially, and minimizing irrelevant details can improve processing efficiency. Clear instructions and well-organized materials also reduce the burden on working memory [10].

Correspondence to: Aisha Benkhaled, Department of Cognitive Psychology, University of Algiers II, Algiers, Algeria, E-mail: aisha.benkhaled@ua2-cogdz.dz

Received: 22-Sep-2025, Manuscript No. IJSCP-25-41498; **Editor assigned:** 24-Sep-2025, PreQC No. IJSCP-25-41498 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 08-Oct-2025, QC No. IJSCP-25-41498; **Revised:** 15-Oct-2025, Manuscript No. IJSCP-25-41498 (R); **Published:** 22-Oct-2025, DOI: 10.35248/2469-9837.25.12.486

Citation: Benkhaled A (2025). Task Interference and Cognitive Load Effects in Complex Learning Activities. Int J Sch Cogn Psycho.12:486.

CONCLUSION

Cognitive load distribution plays a critical role in determining the effectiveness of multi-tasking. Because mental resources are limited, simultaneous demands can reduce accuracy and comprehension, especially when tasks are complex. Factors such as attention control, environmental structure, task complexity, and emotional state all influence how effectively cognitive resources are managed. By aligning task design with cognitive capacity, performance can be improved without overloading the system.

REFERENCES

1. Einfeld SL, Ellis LA, Emerson E. Comorbidity of intellectual disability and mental disorder in children and adolescents: A systematic review. J Intellect Dev Disabil. 2011;36(2):137-143.

2. Walter F, Carr MJ, Mok PL, Astrup A, Antonsen S, Pedersen CB, et al. Premature mortality among patients recently discharged from their first inpatient psychiatric treatment. JAMA Psychiatry. 2017;74(5):485-492.

3. Hollan D. Constructivist models of mind, contemporary psychoanalysis, and the development of culture theory. Am Anthropol. 2000;102(3):538-550.

4. Fuchs C. Erich Fromm and the critical theory of communication. Hum Relat. 2020;44(3):298-325.

5. Chowdhuri AR, Singh T, Ghosh SK, Sahu SK. Carbon dots embedded magnetic nanoparticles chitosan metal organic framework as a nanoprobe for pH sensitive targeted anticancer drug delivery. ACS Appl Mater Interfaces. 2016;8(26):16573-16583.

6. MacLean A, Sweeting H, Hunt K. 'Rules' for boys,'guidelines' for girls: Gender differences in symptom reporting during childhood and adolescence. Soc Sci Med. 2010;70(4):597-604.

7. Dey B, Ghosh JR, Bandyopadhyay AR. A study on axial triradius among the Autistic patients of Bengalee Hindu Caste Populations of West Bengal. Int J Biomed Res. 2014;5(11):715-716.

8. Olofinbiyi SA, Mkhize S, Dlamini S, Maluleke W, Olofinbiyi OB. Social dimension of risk behaviours among adolescent prostitutes: Insight from South-Western Nigeria. Cogent Soc Sci. 2019.

9. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior, organızational behavior and human decision processes. 1991;50:179-211.

10. Bluth K, Roberson PN, Gaylord SA, Faurot KR, Grewen KM, Arzon S, et al. Does self-compassion protect adolescents from stress? J Child Fam Stud. 2016;25:1098-1109.