Cognitive Load in AI-Augmented SaaS Dashboards: Design Patterns for Decision Fatigue Reduction

Rohan Rajendra Girase[1], Dr. Sukhada Khandge[2]
[1,2]*Department of Film and Media, Ajeenkya D Y Patil University*

***Abstract*—The integration of artificial intelligence into enterprise Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) dashboards has transformed how business users interact with data. While AI-augmented dashboards promise efficiency and deeper insight, they simultaneously introduce a layer of cognitive complexity that existing design literature has not adequately addressed. This paper investigates how AI-generated information density contributes to cognitive load and decision fatigue in enterprise SaaS dashboard environments, and identifies interface design patterns that can reduce this burden. Drawing on secondary research that synthesises peer-reviewed literature from cognitive psychology, human-computer interaction, and enterprise UX design, this study maps how excessive AI-generated content overloads users' working memory and degrades decision quality. The paper proposes four evidence-based design patterns consolidated into the PACE Framework: Progressive AI Disclosure, Adaptive Information Hierarchy, Contextual Priority Surfacing, and Embedded Cognitive Rest. The findings indicate that cognitive overload in AI-augmented dashboards is not merely a function of data volume but is critically shaped by how AI-generated content is presented, prioritised, and paced. This paper contributes an actionable, theoretically grounded framework for UX practitioners and product designers working on enterprise SaaS products.**

***Index Terms*—cognitive load, AI-augmented interfaces, SaaS dashboard design, decision fatigue, information overload, enterprise UX, design patterns, human-computer interaction**

I. INTRODUCTION

Every working day, millions of enterprise professionals open dashboards that are no longer simply charts and tables. Powered by machine learning, predictive analytics, and natural language generation, SaaS dashboards such as Salesforce Einstein, Microsoft Power BI Copilot, and HubSpot AI surface AI-generated recommendations, anomaly alerts, trend forecasts, and automated summaries alongside traditional metrics. The premise of these systems is to give users more intelligence, faster. The reality is frequently the opposite: more information does not always produce better decisions. In many enterprise environments, the volume and velocity of AI-generated content overwhelm users rather than empowering them. Cognitive psychology has long established that human working memory operates within strict capacity limits. When information presented to a user exceeds those limits through visual complexity, conflicting data, or an excess of simultaneous AI-generated signals, cognitive overload occurs. The consequences range from slower task completion and higher error rates to decision fatigue: the progressive deterioration in the quality of decisions made after sustained cognitive effort. What has not been sufficiently examined is the specific way AI augmentation alters the cognitive landscape of enterprise dashboards in ways traditional design frameworks were never designed to address.

The academic literature on dashboard design established foundational principles of visual hierarchy, data density, and usability in the pre-AI era. Cognitive load theory has primarily been developed in educational and instructional contexts. Research on information overload has addressed organisational and managerial information environments. However, the specific intersection of AI-generated content, cognitive load, and enterprise dashboard UX design represents a gap that has grown increasingly significant as AI becomes standard in SaaS products. Recent systematic reviews confirm this domain is nascent, with relevant academic publications peaking only in 2023 and 2024.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To examine how AI-generated content density in SaaS dashboards contributes to cognitive load and decision fatigue through existing cognitive and HCI literature.

- To identify evidence-based UX design patterns that reduce cognitive overload in enterprise dashboard contexts.
- To synthesise these patterns into a coherent, practitioner-oriented design framework applicable to AI-augmented SaaS interfaces.
- To identify directions for future primary research in this underexplored domain.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Enterprise SaaS is a market valued at over USD 195 billion globally as of 2023, with AI integration accelerating across virtually every major platform. UX designers and product managers responsible for these systems must decide daily what to show, how much to show, and how to surface AI-generated insight without undermining the user's capacity to act on it. At present, these decisions are made largely on product intuition or competitive benchmarking rather than on an evidence-based understanding of cognitive consequences. This paper seeks to provide that foundation.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews key bodies of literature that form the theoretical foundation for this study. Four interrelated domains are examined: cognitive load theory, decision fatigue and information overload, dashboard design principles, and AI augmentation in enterprise SaaS interfaces.

A. Cognitive Load Theory

The theoretical anchor of this study is Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), which proposes that human working memory is limited in both capacity and duration [2]. Sweller argued that effective interface design must account for these limitations by structuring information in ways that minimise unnecessary cognitive demand. The theory distinguishes three types of cognitive load: intrinsic, extraneous, and germane.

Intrinsic load refers to the complexity inherent in the task itself, determined by the number and interactivity of elements that must be processed simultaneously. Extraneous load is the cognitive burden imposed not by the content but by the way it is presented. Poor visual design, cluttered layouts, and redundant information increase extraneous load without advancing understanding. Germane load refers to the productive cognitive effort devoted to forming and consolidating new mental schemas.

Miller's foundational research established that humans can hold approximately seven items (plus or minus two) in working memory at any given time [1]. In the context of AI-augmented dashboards, where the number of simultaneously presented elements routinely exceeds this threshold, the implications are significant. Kalyuga et al. demonstrated that extraneous load is particularly damaging in complex, multi-element tasks, precisely the type of task that characterises enterprise SaaS dashboard use [10]. Van Merriënboer and Sweller further extended CLT to technology-mediated environments, observing that interfaces providing redundant information across multiple channels simultaneously increase cognitive load rather than reducing it [6].

B. Decision Fatigue and Information Overload

Decision fatigue describes the progressive deterioration in decision quality after sustained periods of decision-making activity. The concept draws on ego depletion theory introduced by Baumeister et al., which posits that self-regulation draws on a limited cognitive resource that becomes depleted with use [3]. As this resource diminishes, individuals adopt decision-making shortcuts, become more susceptible to default options, or disengage from deliberate evaluation altogether. In enterprise software contexts, the relevance of decision fatigue is acute. Business users of SaaS dashboards continuously interpret data, evaluate AI-generated recommendations, prioritise competing alerts, and select courses of action, often across multiple dashboards within a single working session. Hagger et al. confirmed in a major multi-laboratory replication study that sustained effortful cognitive activity leads to measurable decrements in subsequent task performance [11].

Eppler and Mengis provide the most comprehensive academic treatment of information overload, drawing on thirty years of literature across organisation science, marketing, management information systems, and related disciplines [7]. Their framework establishes that information overload occurs when the volume, complexity, or novelty of information presented to an individual exceeds their cognitive processing capacity. Effects include degraded decision quality, increased stress, loss of sense of control, and arbitrary information processing. Critically, the relationship between information quantity and decision quality follows an inverted-U pattern: up to a point, more information improves decisions, but beyond that threshold additional information actively degrades performance.

C. Dashboard Design and Usability

Few defined a dashboard as a visual display of the most important information needed to achieve one or more objectives, consolidated on a single screen so information can be monitored at a glance [4]. This definition emphasises selectivity: a good dashboard shows the most important information, not all available information. This principle of purposeful reduction stands in tension with the logic of AI augmentation, which tends toward the comprehensive surfacing of all potentially relevant data and insights.

Tufte's concept of the data-ink ratio holds that every element of a visual display should carry genuine informational weight, and that redundant or decorative elements should be eliminated [5]. When applied to AI-generated dashboard content, this principle implies that AI-generated annotations, recommendations, and summaries must each carry genuine informational value that the user cannot derive from the underlying data alone. Norman's theory of human-centred design contributes the concept of feedback loops: users need clear signals about what an interface element does and what effect their interactions have [13]. In AI-augmented dashboards where the system continuously adapts its outputs, this feedback loop becomes uncertain, itself constituting a source of cognitive load.

D. AI Augmentation in Enterprise SaaS Interfaces

Adewusi et al. provide a survey of advances in AI-augmented UX design for enterprise platforms, documenting how machine learning, natural language processing, and behavioural analytics are deployed to create adaptive, personalised interfaces [9]. Their findings emphasise both the potential of AI-augmented design to improve usability and the significant unresolved challenges of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and user trust.

Stige et al. conducted a systematic literature review on AI for UX design, identifying five key areas of application: understanding context of use, eliciting user requirements, generating design solutions, evaluating designs, and supporting development [14]. The review observes that existing literature has focused predominantly on theoretical approaches, neglecting the practical implications for end-user experience, particularly how AI-generated outputs within a live product affect the cognitive experience of the business user.

Liu et al., in a systematic review of AI in automated and remote UX evaluation covering fifty-five studies published between 2014 and 2024, confirm that academic interest in this domain is accelerating, with publication counts peaking in 2023 and 2024 [8]. However, the review identifies that dataset bias and limited generalisability were the most frequently cited challenges, and that only 7.3% of studies explicitly addressed the need for standardised evaluation frameworks. This finding underscores the immaturity of the field and the genuine need for framework-building contributions of the type this paper seeks to provide.

E. Summary and Research Gap

The reviewed literature establishes a well-evidenced foundation: human working memory is limited; information overload degrades decision quality; good dashboard design requires selective, purposeful presentation of information; and AI augmentation in enterprise software is introducing new forms of information density that existing design frameworks were not built to address. The intersection of these four bodies of knowledge defines the research space this paper occupies. No prior study has synthesised these domains to produce a framework specifically addressing cognitive load reduction in the context of AI-augmented SaaS dashboards. This study does so.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study adopts a secondary research design involving the systematic collection, analysis, and synthesis of existing published knowledge rather than the generation of new primary data [15]. This approach is appropriate for studies whose objective is to synthesise a fragmented body of knowledge into a coherent framework. The decision to adopt secondary research is justified on three grounds. First, the domain is sufficiently nascent that a synthesis of existing knowledge is a necessary precursor to empirical primary research. Second, the breadth of relevant literature spanning cognitive psychology, HCI, dashboard design, and AI-augmented UX necessitates an integrative approach. Third, secondary research enables rigorous scholarship within the constraints appropriate to an undergraduate research context.

B. Source Selection and Inclusion Criteria

Sources were identified through systematic searches of Google Scholar, ResearchGate, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, and PubMed. Search terms included combinations of: cognitive load theory, information overload, dashboard design, UX design patterns, AI-augmented interfaces, enterprise SaaS usability, decision fatigue, working memory limitations, and human-computer interaction. Searches were conducted between January and April 2026. Inclusion criteria required sources to be peer-reviewed academic publications directly relevant to one or more of the four thematic domains. Seminal works published before the digital era were included on the basis of their foundational theoretical importance. Sources were excluded if they were not directly relevant to the research objectives or could not be verified as peer-reviewed.

C. Analytical Approach

The analytical approach employed is thematic synthesis as described by Thomas and Harden [16]. Thematic synthesis involves three stages: coding of findings from individual studies, organisation of codes into descriptive themes, and development of analytical themes that generate new interpretive frameworks. In this study, findings were coded according to: (a) mechanisms of cognitive load and overload, (b) documented consequences for user decision-making and performance, (c) design principles or patterns associated with load reduction, and (d) the specific context of AI-generated content in enterprise interfaces. These codes were then synthesised into the four-component PACE Framework presented in Section VII.

D. Limitations

The secondary research design carries inherent limitations. Findings and the framework presented are grounded in existing literature rather than empirical primary data; they therefore constitute a theoretical contribution rather than an experimentally validated one. The generalisability of the framework will require testing through primary research in real enterprise SaaS environments. Additionally, the rapidly evolving nature of AI technology means that specific AI features referenced may have changed significantly between publication dates of sources and the present day.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The thematic synthesis of the reviewed literature yielded four primary findings that directly address the research objectives of this study.

A. Finding 1: AI Augmentation Creates a Distinct Form of Extraneous Cognitive Load

The cognitive load literature establishes clearly that extraneous load is the primary target of effective interface design. In traditional dashboard contexts, extraneous load is generated by poor visual hierarchy, cluttered layouts, or irrelevant data display. In AI-augmented dashboards, an additional source of extraneous load emerges: the simultaneous presentation of multiple AI-generated outputs including recommendations, anomaly alerts, natural language summaries, and predictive forecasts, each of which demands active cognitive evaluation independently of the underlying data.

This is a qualitatively different form of extraneous load from that addressed in classical CLT for two reasons. First, AI-generated content carries an implicit claim to authority: it has been computed and users must decide whether to trust, question, or act on it, a metacognitive demand absent from traditional data display. Second, AI-generated content is dynamic, changing as new data arrives or the AI model updates. The cognitive effort required to continuously re-evaluate shifting AI outputs constitutes a form of sustained extraneous load that has not previously been characterised in the HCI or cognitive load literature.

B. Finding 2: Information Overload in AI Dashboards Follows a Predictable Failure Pattern

Drawing on Eppler and Mengis's framework of information overload causes and consequences, the review identified a predictable three-stage failure pattern in AI-augmented dashboard design. In the first stage, AI augmentation is introduced to reduce cognitive effort: the system is intended to do the analytical work so the user does not have to. In the second stage, AI-generated outputs proliferate across the dashboard as the AI model identifies more patterns, correlations, and potential actions. In the third stage, the cumulative volume of AI-generated content crosses the user's cognitive threshold, producing the classical symptoms of information overload: degraded decision quality, selective attention, loss of trust, and disengagement.

This failure pattern is corroborated by practitioner evidence. Eleken identified data overload as the most common failure mode of AI-powered dashboards, noting that these tools frequently result in analysis paralysis and that dashboards that look impressive in demos end up ignored in practice [17]. The User Interviews AI in UX Research Report similarly noted that AI tools lack nuance and context, compounding the cognitive trust-evaluation burden on users [18].

C. Finding 3: Existing Dashboard Design Principles Are Insufficient for AI-Augmented Contexts

Established design principles, including Few's selectivity, Tufte's data-ink ratio, and Norman's feedback loop principles, remain valid in the AI-augmented context but are insufficient. Few's principle that a dashboard should show the most important information presupposes the designer knows in advance what that information is. In AI-augmented environments, this selection problem is dynamically transferred to the user. Tufte's data-ink ratio addresses unnecessary visual complexity but not the cognitive cost of trust-evaluation that AI-generated content uniquely imposes. Norman's feedback loop principles address the clarity of individual interactions but not the systemic cognitive burden of sustained AI-recommendation evaluation across an entire working session. This finding establishes that design principles required for AI-augmented dashboards must extend beyond the existing literature. They must specifically address the prioritisation of AI-generated outputs, the management of user trust in AI recommendations, the pacing of cognitive demand across a user session, and the provision of structural relief from continuous AI-driven decision pressure. These are the design challenges the PACE Framework is constructed to address.

D. Finding 4: Progressive Disclosure, Prioritisation, and Structural Rest Are the Most Evidence-Supported Strategies

Across the reviewed literature, three categories of design strategy emerged as most consistently associated with cognitive load reduction in complex, information-rich digital environments. Progressive disclosure, the practice of revealing information in stages with higher levels of detail available on demand, has been validated in HCI research as an effective mechanism for managing extraneous cognitive load. Applied to AI-generated content, this implies the system should surface a single prioritised recommendation by default, with further recommendations accessible through deliberate user action.

Information prioritisation, the explicit ranking of displayed content according to urgency, relevance, or actionability, reduces the cognitive work required to determine where attention should be directed. Research on real-time dashboard design in operational contexts supports the use of visual priority hierarchies and alert taxonomies as mechanisms for reducing cognitive overload under time pressure [19]. Structural rest, the intentional incorporation of white space and information-free zones within dashboard layouts, is supported by evidence from both cognitive load theory and visual design research, as working memory requires attentional space to consolidate information.

VII. THE PACE FRAMEWORK

Drawing from the four findings presented in Section VI, this paper proposes the PACE Framework for Cognitive-First Dashboard Design. PACE represents four interrelated design principles: Progressive AI Disclosure, Adaptive Information Hierarchy, Contextual Priority Surfacing, and Embedded Cognitive Rest. Together, these four principles constitute a coherent, theoretically grounded approach to designing AI-augmented SaaS dashboards that empower rather than overwhelm their users.

A. P: Progressive AI Disclosure

Grounded in van Merriënboer and Sweller's CLT-derived guidance on multimedia learning environments and established HCI practice around progressive disclosure [20], this principle holds that AI-generated content should be revealed in deliberate stages rather than surfaced simultaneously in its entirety. A dashboard should surface only a single primary AI-generated recommendation as its default state, with additional recommendations accessible through explicit user action. This design pattern shifts cognitive control from the system to the user, directly addressing the extraneous load problem identified in Finding 1. When users encounter a single primary AI recommendation rather than a cascade of simultaneous outputs, the cognitive task of evaluating its validity and actionability becomes tractable.

B. A: Adaptive Information Hierarchy

This principle extends the established dashboard design concept of visual hierarchy into the AI-augmented context by making the hierarchy itself responsive to user context, role, and real-time data state. Traditional visual hierarchy is static: the designer determines which elements occupy primary, secondary, and tertiary positions, and those positions remain fixed. In AI-augmented dashboards, the relative importance of different data points varies dynamically as underlying data changes. Adaptive Information Hierarchy proposes that the AI system should not merely generate insights but also restructure the visual hierarchy of the dashboard in response to those insights, bringing the most critical information to the most prominent position. Importantly, this adaptation must be bounded within a stable visual grammar to prevent the layout changes themselves from becoming a source of cognitive load.

C. C: Contextual Priority Surfacing

This principle addresses the problem identified in Finding 2 by proposing that AI system output should be filtered and prioritised according to the specific role, task, and temporal context of the individual user. Current enterprise AI dashboard implementations frequently surface the same AI outputs to all users regardless of their current task or decision context. Drawing on Eppler and Mengis's identification of task and process characteristics as a primary cause of information overload, Contextual Priority Surfacing proposes that AI recommendation engines should incorporate task context as a primary filtering variable. This could be operationalised through explicit user-declared context, implicit context inference from learned behaviour patterns, or role-based filtering.

D. E: Embedded Cognitive Rest

Grounded in the cognitive load and decision fatigue literature, this principle proposes that AI-augmented dashboards should be explicitly designed to incorporate structural relief from continuous cognitive demand. Embedded Cognitive Rest extends the concept of visual white space in three directions. First, temporal cognitive rest: rather than surfacing AI-generated alerts continuously and in real time, the dashboard should batch non-urgent AI insights and surface them at designated moments rather than interrupting the user's cognitive flow with a continuous stream. Second, attentional anchors: stable, non-AI-generated reference points within the dashboard that provide predictable cognitive footholds amid the dynamic AI content. Third, completion signals: clear visual indicators that the AI system has finished its current output cycle, providing users with a cognitive signal that it is safe to shift from monitoring mode to action mode.

E. Framework Summary

The four principles of the PACE Framework are not independent guidelines but interrelated design commitments. Progressive AI Disclosure controls the volume of simultaneous AI output. Adaptive Information Hierarchy ensures what is shown is structured to match real-time informational importance. Contextual Priority Surfacing filters AI outputs to match the user's current task and role. Embedded Cognitive Rest ensures the temporal and structural rhythm of the dashboard preserves working memory capacity rather than exhausting it. Together, they constitute a framework for designing AI-augmented SaaS dashboards that respect the cognitive realities of their users.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusion

This paper has examined the relationship between AI augmentation in enterprise SaaS dashboards and the cognitive burden placed on business users, with a focus on identifying design patterns that can reduce decision fatigue and cognitive overload. Beginning from the established theoretical foundations of cognitive load theory, working memory research, information overload, and decision fatigue, and extending into the emerging literature on AI-augmented UX design, this study has identified a significant gap between the cognitive demands imposed by contemporary AI-augmented dashboards and the design frameworks available to address them. In response to this gap, this paper proposed the PACE Framework: a four-principal design framework comprising Progressive AI Disclosure, Adaptive Information Hierarchy, Contextual Priority Surfacing, and Embedded Cognitive Rest. Each principle is grounded in the reviewed literature, addresses a specific mechanism of cognitive overload in the AI-augmented dashboard context, and offers actionable guidance for UX designers and product teams. Together, the four principles constitute a philosophy of cognitive-first AI dashboard design that treats the user's working memory as the primary design constraint and the quality of user decision-making as the primary success metric.

B. Recommendations

Based on the findings and framework, the following recommendations are offered to UX designers, product managers, and enterprise SaaS development teams.

- Apply the PACE Framework as a design audit tool for existing AI-augmented dashboards. Evaluate each dashboard against the four principles and identify which types of cognitive load are currently being generated unnecessarily.
- Reframe AI feature success metrics. Move away from engagement metrics such as click-through rates on AI recommendations, and toward cognitive effort metrics: time-to-decision, self-reported confidence, and error frequency.
- Conduct primary usability research. The PACE Framework provides a theoretical foundation; its principles should be tested through controlled usability studies using validated cognitive load measurement instruments such as the NASA Task Load Index.
- Pursue cross-disciplinary collaboration. Effective AI dashboard design requires input from cognitive psychologists, data scientists, and enterprise UX designers working together. The silos between these disciplines are a structural barrier to solving the cognitive overload problem.

REFERENCES

[1] G. A. Miller, "The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information," Psychological Review, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 81–97, 1956.

[2] J. Sweller, "Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning," Cognitive Science, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 257–285, 1988.

[3] R. F. Baumeister, E. Bratslavsky, M. Muraven, and D. M. Tice, "Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 1252–1265, 1998.

[4] S. Few, Information Dashboard Design: The Effective Visual Communication of Data. Sebastopol, CA, USA: O'Reilly Media, 2006.

[5] E. R. Tufte, The Visual Display of Quantitative Information, 2nd ed. Cheshire, CT, USA: Graphics Press, 2001.

[6] J. J. G. van Merriënboer and J. Sweller, "Cognitive load theory and complex learning: Recent developments and future directions," Educational Psychology Review, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 147–177, 2005.

[7] M. J. Eppler and J. Mengis, "The concept of information overload: A review of literature from organization science, accounting, marketing, MIS, and related disciplines," The Information Society, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 325–344, 2004.

[8] Y. Liu, W. Zhang, and H. Chen, "AI in automated and remote UX evaluation: A systematic review (2014–2024)," Advances in Human-Computer Interaction, vol. 2025, Art. no. 7442179, 2025.

[9] B. A. Adewusi, B. I. Adekunle, S. D. Mustapha, and A. C. Uzoka, "Advances in AI-augmented user experience design for personalized public and enterprise digital services," International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 1910–1929, 2023.

[10] S. Kalyuga, P. Ayres, P. Chandler, and J. Sweller, "The expertise reversal effect," Educational Psychologist, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 23–31, 2003.

[11] M. S. Hagger et al., "A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect," Perspectives on Psychological Science, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 546–573, 2016.

[12] "Dealing with information overload: A comprehensive review," Frontiers in Psychology, vol. 14, Art. no. 1122200, 2023.
[13] D. A. Norman, The Design of Everyday Things, rev. ed. New York, NY, USA: Basic Books, 2013.
[14] S. H. Stige, J. H. Rosenvinge, and B. Traeen, "Artificial intelligence for user experience design: A systematic literature review and future research agenda," ResearchGate, 2023.
[15] A. Bryman, Social Research Methods, 5th ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2016.
[16] J. Thomas and A. Harden, "Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews," BMC Medical Research Methodology, vol. 8, Art. no. 45, 2008.
[17] Eleken, "AI dashboard design: A guide for SaaS teams and data professionals," eleken.co, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.eleken.co/blog-posts/ai-dashboard-design
[18] User Interviews, "AI in UX research report 2024," userinterviews.com, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.userinterviews.com/ai-in-ux-research-report
[19] Smashing Magazine, "From data to decisions: UX strategies for real-time dashboards," smashingmagazine.com, Sep. 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.smashingmagazine.com/2025/09/ux-strategies-real-time-dashboards/
[20] J. Nielsen, "Progressive disclosure," Nielsen Norman Group, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://www.nngroup.com/articles/progressive-disclosure/
[21] J. Sweller, "Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design," Learning and Instruction, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 295–312, 1994.
[22] J. Sweller, J. J. G. van Merriënboer, and F. G. Paas, "Cognitive architecture and instructional design," Educational Psychology Review, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 251–296, 1998.