HANDS-ON, MINDS-ON: STRATEGIES FOR TEACHERS AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS TO ENHANCE STUDENT LEARNING

Julia Yoo
Lamar University

Abstract
The growing emphasis on hands-on learning in contemporary education reflects a broader shift toward active, student-centered instruction designed to increase engagement and relevance. However, this expansion also underscores a critical need to examine how such approaches can be implemented effectively to ensure they lead to meaningful learning rather than surface-level participation. This research review synthesizes theoretical and empirical literature to provide a framework for effective hands-on learning, research-informed instructional strategies, and a practical checklist for educators and instructional leaders. The literature consistently indicates that while hands-on activities enhance engagement, engagement alone is insufficient for deep conceptual understanding. Effective learning occurs when experiences are intentionally structured to promote reflection, conceptual development, and collaborative meaning-making. Across instructional contexts, teachers play a central role as facilitators who design, scaffold, and guide learning aligned with clear objectives and students' prior knowledge. Strategies such as guided inquiry, structured problem-solving, and purposeful questioning are identified as essential for translating active participation into cognitive growth. The review further highlights the importance of sustained professional support, including coaching and collaborative planning, to strengthen instructional implementation. Overall, the proposed framework and research-based checklist emphasize that hands-on learning must be deliberately designed to move beyond engagement toward rigorous understanding. With such intentional design and support in place, hands-on learning has strong potential to foster deep conceptual understanding and meaningful, lasting learning outcomes.

Keywords: hand-on learning, student engagement, instructional practices, educational leadership

In an era characterized by rapid technological advancement and constant change, students face an increasing array of distractions that may hinder the development and preservation of curiosity within educational settings. Moreover, as students progress through the educational system, many begin to lose the spark that once fueled their curiosity and enthusiasm for learning. While early childhood education often emphasizes play-based, sensory-rich experiences, later stages tend to shift toward abstract, decontextualized instruction. This transition can lead to a decline in intrinsic motivation, as students are increasingly distanced from the kinds of learning that feel meaningful and engaging. The question arises: How can educational leaders create and support learning environments that tap into learners' natural curiosity and sustain this innate drive throughout their academic journey?

One promising answer lies in the application of active, hands-on learning approaches. Students possess an innate curiosity, and the role of education is to cultivate this disposition by fostering active engagement in the learning process. John Dewey, one of the most influential American philosophers of education, articulated the concept of "learning by doing" as a foundational principle for meaningful learning (Dewey, 1938). His philosophy positions learners as active agents who construct understanding through inquiry, reflection, and direct experience. The growing popularity of hands-on learning, especially in technology-rich classrooms, underscores the need for educational leaders to critically examine these approaches from an instructional perspective to ensure they effectively promote meaningful learning. In this context, educational leaders should move beyond the "if you build it, they will come" assumption by recognizing that the mere implementation of learning activities does not guarantee authentic student engagement or meaningful learning outcomes.

Hands-on learning activities are commonly associated with broader models of active learning, which encompass a range of pedagogical approaches that emphasize learner engagement through direct participation in the learning process. These approaches are grounded in the premise that knowledge is constructed through meaningful activities that provide learners with concrete experiences. Several instructional models position learners at the center of the learning process by encouraging them to explore, investigate, and develop an understanding of key concepts, including discovery learning, problem-based learning, inquiry-based learning, experiential learning theory, and constructivist learning theory. Although these models differ in their theoretical foundations and instructional practices, they share the underlying assumption that learners develop deeper understanding through active engagement in constructing, exploring, and applying knowledge within authentic contexts. Accordingly, the central principle of hands-on learning is the active engagement of students in meaningful learning experiences.

Within the broader tradition of active learning, several theoretical perspectives provide a foundation for understanding the effectiveness of hands-on activities. Experiential learning theory conceptualizes learning as a cyclical process involving concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb, 1984). Meaningful learning requires learners not only to engage in concrete experiences but also to reflect on those experiences, as experiential engagement alone does not ensure learning. Experiential learning theory has been widely applied in STEM education, where active and hands-on instructional strategies have consistently been shown to improve student performance compared with traditional lecture-based approaches (Prince, 2004). Constructivist learning theory provides a complementary perspective by emphasizing that learners actively construct knowledge by connecting new information to their existing understandings. This perspective, articulated by Piaget (1973) and Bruner (1966), has become a foundational framework in educational research.

Constructivist learning theory views learners as active participants in the learning process who construct knowledge through engagement with ideas, experiences, and prior understanding rather than through the passive reception of information. This perspective is further extended by social constructivism, as articulated by Vygotsky (1978), which emphasizes the role of social interaction in learning. Collaboration with peers, more knowledgeable others, and instructors supports cognitive development by enabling learners to extend their understanding beyond what they could achieve independently through interaction, dialogue, and instructional scaffolding.

Within this framework, instructors play an important role as facilitators who guide students toward deeper conceptual understanding. Although learners are central to the process of constructing meaning, effective learning also depends on the instructor's ability to structure and scaffold learning experiences. This highlights the importance of pedagogical content knowledge, a concept introduced by Shulman (1986), which refers to a specialized understanding of how subject matter can be organized, represented, and taught in ways that make it accessible and meaningful for learners. In hands-on learning activities involving problem solving, effective instructors facilitate learning by monitoring students' progress and guiding their thinking through timely coaching and questioning (Hmelo-Silver & Barrows, 2006).

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that effective hands-on learning activities require more than physical engagement. They must also promote reflection, conceptual development, and collaborative meaning-making. Consequently, teachers and educational leaders should critically examine whether hands-on and active learning approaches are intentionally designed and implemented to promote meaningful learning outcomes, particularly students' ability to develop conceptual understanding from their experiences rather than simply participate in engaging but conceptually superficial activities.

Not All Hands-On Learnings are Created Equal

When designed and implemented well, hands-on learning can be powerful because it allows learners to acquire knowledge through direct experience by being engaged with authentic problems, where both the processes and procedures of a given discipline are an essential part of the learning, not just the final outcome. However, not all hands-on learning activities are equally effective. While many aim to actively engage students, some are criticized as mere busy work due to poor design. Moreover, the possible ineffectiveness of minimal guidance during instruction has been highlighted in the scholarly article *Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work* (Kirschner et al., 2006). These concerns raise important questions for educational leaders: What distinguishes meaningful, cognitively engaging hands-on learning from superficial activity? How much guidance is necessary to support deep understanding without stifling exploration?

Several factors distinguish effective hands-on learning activities from less effective ones. Designing impactful experiences requires careful planning, including aligning activities with learning standards, ensuring key concepts are addressed, calibrating instructional scaffolding, monitoring peer interactions, and assessing both processes and outcomes. Effectively orchestrating these elements is a complex endeavor. Some constructs, such as scaffolding, are context-dependent (van de Pol et al., 2015), and supporting students through adaptive teaching requires substantial knowledge and experience (Hardy et al., 2022), which poses a particular challenge for novice teachers. Marzano (2011) highlights the complexity of discovery learning, noting that, in some cases, teachers may need to rely on direct instruction to ensure learning effectiveness.

For novice learners with limited prior knowledge, fully guided or direct instruction is generally more effective than inquiry- or discovery-based approaches. Novices often lack the foundational knowledge necessary to generate accurate solutions through exploration alone, particularly within constrained instructional time. Cognitive load research supports this, showing that minimally guided methods can overload working memory and hinder learning (Clark et al., 2012). Learners also tend to retain information more effectively when instruction follows a coherent, logically structured sequence rather than primarily open-ended activities. Consistent with this evidence, a large-scale randomized controlled trial in primary classrooms found that teacher-centered lesson sequences produced stronger learning outcomes than student-centered or hands-on instructional variants (Buchan et al., 2020).

Framework for Effective Hands-on Learning: A Research-Informed Practices

Hands-on learning has often been discussed in broad or polarized terms, yet large-scale research offers more precise guidance when findings are examined by student level, subject area, and instructional conditions. Across the literature, both strong positive effects and mixed or negative findings are reported, suggesting that the effectiveness of hands-on learning is contingent rather than inherent. Syntheses of research indicate that hands-on approaches can support meaningful gains in student learning when they are sufficiently structured, sustained, and aligned with instructional goals, whereas weaker outcomes tend to emerge when activities are brief, minimally guided, or poorly integrated into the curriculum (Kirschner et al., 2006; Buchan et al., 2020; Chen & Yang, 2019).

Both elementary and secondary students demonstrate positive learning outcomes when engaged in learning formats that involve complex and real-world tasks, which is a form of hands-on learning, according to a meta-analysis of 30 studies (Chen & Yang, 2019). These findings challenge assumptions that younger students are not developmentally ready for inquiry-oriented learning. In fact, research suggests that elementary learners benefit most when hands-on instruction incorporates clear goals, structured scaffolding, guidance on inquiry processes, opportunities for reflection, and sufficient instructional time (Kleickmann et al., 2016; Skene et al., 2022). Moreover, outcomes are enhanced when hands-on learning is preceded by a preparatory unit that equips teachers and students with an understanding of inquiry processes, expectations, and procedures before engaging in the main learning activities (Heindl, 2019).

Gains from hands-on learning have been documented across a range of subject areas, including the social sciences, such as language arts and geography, as well as STEM disciplines. However, variation by subject area highlights the conditions under which such approaches are most effective. The strongest effects are found in social studies and language-based subjects, where instruction emphasizes interpretation, synthesis, and application in authentic contexts (Chen & Yang, 2019). In contrast, effects in science and mathematics tend to be more modest and are contingent on structured scaffolding and careful sequencing of instruction. Evidence indicates that hands-on activities in these domains are most effective when they complement, rather than replace, conventional instruction, aligning with research cautioning against minimally guided approaches for novice learners. Across contexts, instructional time and support structures further moderate outcomes with sustained implementation and the deliberate integration of instructional technology to facilitate inquiry and collaboration are associated with stronger effects, whereas brief interventions, limited guidance, or misalignment with instructional objectives are linked to weaker results (Buchan et al., 2020; Chen & Yang, 2019; Kirschner et al., 2006).

Based on a synthesis of P–12 research, a role-based, evidence-informed framework was developed to support teachers and educational leaders in translating research into effective hands-on learning practices. Responsibilities are organized by phase and role, and the key theoretical and evidence-based concepts underpinning each responsibility are presented in Table 1. The framework provides guidance to enhance student engagement, support conceptual understanding, and ensure sustainable implementation.

Table 1

A Role-Based, Evidence-Informed Framework for Effective Hands-On Learning in P-12 Education

Phase and Role	Key Responsibilities	Key Theoretical and Evidence-Based Concepts
	Planning Stage before Instruction	
For Teachers	• Clarify instructional purpose, learning objectives, and standards to guide lesson design. • Determine whether tasks introduce new concepts or apply knowledge to authentic problems. • Assess students' prior knowledge and readiness to guide scaffolding and manage cognitive demand. • Specify anticipated evidence of learning to maintain coherence between instructional intent, student activities, and assessment.	Constructivism (Dewey, 1938; Prince, 2004); Cognitive Load Theory (Paas & van Merriënboer, 2020; Sweller et al., 2011); Experiential Learning (Kolb, 1984)
For Educational Leaders	• Support the availability of flexible learning spaces, materials, and schedules that facilitate hands-on learning. • Provide professional development to build teacher capacity in designing and facilitating hands-on learning experiences.	Student-Centered Learning Environments (Fredricks et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2021); Teacher Professional Development (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017)
	Implementation Stage during Instruction	
For Teachers	• Select and adapt hands-on learning tasks responsive to developmental and contextual factors. • Scaffold thinking, provide formative feedback, and use authentic assessment capturing processes and outcomes. • Facilitate structured collaboration and reflection.	Active Learning (Prince, 2004); Formative Assessment (Hattie & Timperley, 2007); Reflective Practice (Kolb, 1984)
For Educational Leaders	• Monitor instructional conditions and provide support to maintain high-quality implementation. • Facilitate coordination among leaders and teachers to share best practices and to maintain consistency.	System-Level Support (Gibbons et al., 2019); Collaborative Learning Communities (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017)

This role-based framework organizes hands-on learning into complementary responsibilities for teachers, instructional leaders and administrators, providing guidance intended to support engagement, conceptual understanding, and long-term sustainability. For teachers, the framework emphasizes lesson-level planning and classroom implementation. Effective hands-on learning begins with clarifying instructional purpose, aligning activities with intended cognitive demand, and determining whether a task introduces new concepts or supports the application of existing knowledge to authentic problems (Henze & Shaw, 2020). Teachers are expected to assess learners' prior knowledge and readiness to provide appropriate scaffolding and to reduce the risk of cognitive overload for students unfamiliar with the material (Ploetzner & Fillisch, 2017; Stull & Mayer, 2007). Clearly specifying anticipated learning outcomes and evidence of learning further supports coherence among instructional intent, student activity, and assessment practices (Shernoff et al., 2018).

Following the planning phase, teachers draw on pedagogical judgement to make ongoing, context-sensitive decisions about selecting and adapting hands-on learning tasks that actively engage students while remaining responsive to developmental and contextual considerations (Leskinen et al., 2023). In the course of instruction, teachers deliberately scaffold student thinking, provide formative feedback, and use authentic and performance-based assessments to make both learning processes and learning outcomes or products visible (Henze & Shaw, 2020; Leskinen et al., 2023). They can further orchestrate structured collaboration and guide intentional reflection to deepen sense-making, continuously calibrating instruction in relation to learning contexts and curricular pacing constraints (Kumpulainen et al., 2020).

During planning and implementation stages, educational leaders play interdependent roles in shaping the conditions that enable hands-on learning to become embedded in everyday instructional practice. Rather than functioning as isolated supports, these conditions operate as a coherent system that includes flexible, well-equipped learning environments such as laboratories, and sustained professional learning that builds teachers' capacity for project-based and design-oriented pedagogies while positioning hands-on learning as central to instructional practice rather than peripheral enrichment (Rouse & Rouse, 2022; Shernoff et al.; Voogt et al., 2023, 2018). Together, these conditions share responsibility across instructional levels and strengthen coherence between system structures and pedagogical practice, thereby positioning experiential learning as a structurally supported and sustained dimension of education.

A Checklist for Effective Hands-On Learning

Building on this body of evidence, a practical checklist was developed to support educational leaders in systematically examining the conditions under which hands-on learning is most likely to be effective on their campuses. Rather than serving as a prescriptive script, the checklist translates research-based design principles into observable indicators related to lesson design, classroom implementation, and organizational support, thereby operationalizing the proposed framework. Table 2 summarizes this checklist and illustrates how the framework can be used to guide instructional observation, professional learning, and schoolwide improvement efforts.

Table 2

A Checklist for Effective Hands-On Learning

	Phase 1: Foundational and Guided Learning Phase	Phase 2: Independent and Deep Learning Phase			
	Learning Goals		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Set clear learning objectives that are aligned with curriculum standards.	Design learning objectives that engage students in higher-order thinking, are student-driven, and allow choice and personal relevance	☐	☐	☐
1.2	Break learning goals into manageable steps to support novice learners in achieving success and building confidence.	Provide choice and personal relevance in learning objectives that involve higher-order thinking and are student-driven.	☐	☐	☐
	Instructional Materials		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Prepare all necessary learning tools for students.	Prepare all necessary learning tools or encourage students to plan, organize, and manage their learning tools.	☐	☐	☐
2.2	Provide structured tools, such as step-by-step guides, worked examples, checklists or visual aids that scaffold exploration without overwhelming learners.	Support student-driven experimentation by providing open-ended materials that invite innovation and problem solving.	☐	☐	☐
	Learning Activity and Instruction		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Incorporate structured exploration tasks that allow students to safely experiment within defined boundaries.	Connect activities to authentic, complex real-world problems or projects that extend beyond the classroom (community issues, global challenges).	☐	☐	☐
3.2	Embed scaffolded supports such as examples, checklists, or guiding questions to support problem-solving and reflection.	Plan open-ended, problem-solving activities that encourage students to apply skills creatively and critically.	☐	☐	☐
3.3	Use modeling and demonstrations of key skills, strategies, or expected behaviors and skills prior to independent student work.	Integrate interdisciplinary concepts to reflect real-life complexity and build transferable skills.	☐	☐	☐
	Feedback, Assessment, and Reflection		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Provide immediate, specific, and actionable feedback focused on effort and process.	Facilitate timely, specific, and constructive feedback from	☐	☐	☐

		teachers, peers, and self-assessment to guide growth.			
4.2	Use formative assessments (e.g., observations, checklists, exit tickets) to monitor learning progress.	Use teacher, peer, and self-assessment feedback in peer critique and problem-solving activities to promote reflection and higher-order thinking.	☐	☐	☐
4.3	Provide clear criteria or rubrics to help students understand expectations, with teacher guidance to support self-monitoring.	Prompt students to reflect and self-assess against rubrics or personal learning targets.	☐	☐	☐

The checklist elements related to learning purpose and instructional guidance reflect longstanding findings that hands-on learning is most effective when cognitive demands are aligned with students' prior knowledge and readiness. Research grounded in cognitive load theory demonstrates that novice learners benefit from explicit goals, modeling, and structured supports, whereas minimally guided exploration often leads to inefficiency or misconceptions (Kirschner et al., 2006; Stull & Mayer, 2007). Emphasizing clarity of instructional intent and early scaffolding addresses a common source of negative findings associated with poorly guided hands-on activities and reinforces the importance of intentional instructional design.

A second set of checklist indicators emphasizes task quality and instructional sequencing, reflecting evidence that hands-on learning yields stronger outcomes when embedded within coherent, sustained instructional sequences rather than implemented as isolated activities. Large-scale classroom studies and meta-analytic findings show that brief or episodic experiential tasks tend to produce weaker effects than projects or investigations that unfold over multiple lessons and build cumulatively toward learning goals (Buchan et al., 2020; Chen & Yang, 2019). Accordingly, the checklist directs leaders to consider not only what students are doing in a given lesson, but how hands-on activities are positioned within broader units and trajectories of learning.

The emphasis on formative assessment, feedback, and reflection aligns with research showing that learning in hands-on environments develops through iterative cycles of action, feedback, and revision. Studies of project-based and inquiry-oriented instruction suggest that conceptual understanding deepens when students receive timely, specific feedback and opportunities to reflect on both learning processes and outcomes rather than focusing solely on task completion (Kumpulainen et al., 2020; Shernoff et al., 2018). By foregrounding clear criteria and performance-based evidence, the checklist reinforces assessment practices that make learning visible and support metacognitive engagement.

Finally, the checklist incorporates leadership and organizational conditions, reflecting evidence that hands-on learning functions as a system-level practice rather than an isolated classroom strategy. Research on implementation and sustainability indicates that instructional approaches such as hands-on or project-based learning are unlikely to persist or scale without adequate instructional time, professional learning, material resources, and supportive scheduling structures

(Rouse & Rouse, 2022; Voogt et al., 2023). By including indicators related to leadership support and learning environments, the checklist aligns with the framework's emphasis on the interdependence of classroom practice and organizational context in promoting high-quality, sustainable hands-on learning.

Collectively, this work brings coherence to a fragmented body of research by integrating lesson design, instructional practice, and organizational conditions within a single analytic structure. Rather than treating hands-on learning as an isolated instructional technique, the framework highlights the interdependence of guidance, sequencing, assessment, and leadership supports in shaping learning outcomes. By offering both a conceptual framework and a research-informed checklist, the study contributes a practical yet theoretically grounded resource for instructional leaders and administrators seeking to promote purposeful, high-quality, and sustainable hands-on learning across educational contexts.

Conclusion

Any form of hands-on learning places students at the center in the process of learning, emphasizing knowledge construction through active participation and the manipulation of learning tools, whether digital or non-digital. Although these experiences often appear simple, fun, or engaging, they are, in fact, cognitively complex and demanding. Teachers navigating this terrain benefit from thoughtful support, such as professional resources, collaborative planning opportunities, and encouragement from educational leaders, which can help them balance learner autonomy with guidance, scaffolding, and clear learning objectives. Without such intentional preparation and support, students may not fully benefit from peer collaboration or meaningful interaction with learning materials, diminishing the impact of hands-on learning.

REFERENCES

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Harvard University Press.

Buchan, L., Hejmadi, M., Abrahams, L., & Hurst, L. (2020). A RCT for assessment of active human-centred learning finds teacher-centric non-human teaching of evolution optimal. *npj Science of Learning, 5*, Article 19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-020-00078-0

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Harvard University Press.

Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review, 26*, 71-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.11.001

Clark, R., E., Kirschner, P. A., & Sweller, J. (2012). Putting students on the path to learning. *American Educator, 36*(1). 6-11.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_REPORT.pdf

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. Macmillan.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Gibbons, L. K., Wilhelm, A. G., & Cobb, P. (2019). Coordinating leadership supports for teachers' instructional improvement. *Journal of School Leadership*, *29*(3), 248–268. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052684619836824

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hardy, I., Meschede, N., & Mannel, S. (2022). Measuring adaptive teaching in classroom discourse: Effects on student learning in elementary science education. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*, Article 1041316. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1041316

Heindl, M. (2019). Inquiry-based learning and the pre-requisite for its use in science at school: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *3*(2), 52–61.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Barrows, H. S. (2006). Goals and strategies of a problem-based learning facilitator. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning*, *1*, 21–39.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Prentice-Hall.

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.

Kleickmann, T., Tröbst, S., Jonen, A., Vehmeyer, J., & Möller, K. (2016). The effects of expert scaffolding in elementary science professional development on teachers' beliefs and motivations, instructional practices, and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000041

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

Kumpulainen, K., Kajamaa, A., Leskinen, J., Byman, J., & Renlund, J. (2020). Mapping digital competence: Students' maker literacies in a school's makerspace. *Frontiers in Education, 5*, Article 69. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00069

Marzano, R. J. (2011). The perils and promises of discovery learning. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(1), 86-87.

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), 394–400. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420922183

Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. Grossman.

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231.

Skene, K., O'Farrelly, C. M., Byrne, E. M., Kirby, N., Stevens, E. C., & Ramchandani, P. G. (2022). Can guidance during play enhance children's learning and development in educational contexts? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Child Development*, *93*, 1162–1180. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13730

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer.

van de Pol, J., Volman, M., Oort, F., & Beishuizen, J. (2015). The effects of scaffolding in the classroom: Support contingency and student independent working time in relation to student achievement, task effort and appreciation of support. *Instructional Science,* 43, 615–641. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-015-9351-z

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Zhang, L., Basham, J. D., Carter, R. A., Jr., & Zhang, J. (2021). Exploring Factors associated with the implementation of student-centered instructional practices in U.S. classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 99,* Article 103273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103273