

## **The Cambridge Handbook of Cognition and Education**

This handbook reviews a wealth of research in cognitive and educational psychology that investigates how to enhance learning and instruction to aid students struggling to learn and to advise teachers on how best to support student learning. The handbook includes features that inform readers about how to improve instruction and student achievement based on scientific evidence across different domains, including science, mathematics, reading, and writing. Each chapter supplies a description of the learning goal, a balanced presentation of the current evidence about the efficacy of various approaches to obtaining that learning goal, and a discussion of important future directions for research in this area. It is the ideal resource for researchers continuing their study of this field or for those only now beginning to explore how to improve student achievement.

JOHN DUNLOSKY is a professor of psychology in the Department of Psychological Sciences and Director of the Science of Learning and Education Center at Kent State University, USA. He received the Distinguished Scholar Award in 2010 from Kent State University and is a founder of the International Association for Metacognition.

KATHERINE A. RAWSON is a professor of psychology in the Department of Psychological Sciences at Kent State University, USA. She has received numerous awards for her research, including the US Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, the Outstanding Research and Scholarship Award from Kent State University, and the Outstanding Early Career Award from the Psychonomic Society.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-41601-6 — The Cambridge Handbook of Cognition and Education  
Edited by John Dunlosky, Katherine A. Rawson  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

# The Cambridge Handbook of Cognition and Education

Edited by

**John Dunlosky**  
*Kent State University*

**Katherine A. Rawson**  
*Kent State University*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

## CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,  
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781108416016](http://www.cambridge.org/9781108416016)

DOI: 10.1017/9781108235631

© Cambridge University Press 2019

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2019

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd. Padstow Cornwall

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Dunlosky, John, editor.

Title: The Cambridge handbook of cognition and education / edited by John Dunlosky, Kent State University, Katherine A. Rawson, Kent State University.

Description: New York : Cambridge University Press, 2019. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018033895 | ISBN 9781108416016 (alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Cognitive learning – Handbooks, manuals, etc. | Cognition – Handbooks, manuals, etc.

Classification: LCC LB1062 .C36 2019 | DDC 371.39–dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2018033895>

ISBN 978-1-108-41601-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-40130-2 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xv
How Cognitive Psychology Can Inform Evidence-Based Education Reform: An Overview of <i>The Cambridge Handbook of Cognition and Education</i>	1
JOHN DUNLOSKY AND KATHERINE A. RAWSON	
<b>Part I Foundations</b>	15
1 How the Learning Sciences Can Inform Cognitive Psychology	17
KEITH SAWYER AND JOHN DUNLOSKY	
2 Quackery in Educational Research	35
DANIEL H. ROBINSON AND JOEL R. LEVIN	
<b>Part II Science and Math</b>	49
3 Teaching Critical Thinking as if Our Future Depends on It, Because It Does	51
DIANE F. HALPERN AND HEATHER A. BUTLER	
4 Improving Students' Scientific Thinking	67
DAVID KLAHR, CORINNE ZIMMERMAN, AND BRYAN J. MATLEN	
5 Spatial Skills, Reasoning, and Mathematics	100
NORA S. NEWCOMBE, JULIE L. BOOTH, AND ELIZABETH A. GUNDERSON	
6 Iterative Development of Conceptual and Procedural Knowledge in Mathematics Learning and Instruction	124
BETHANY RITTLE-JOHNSON	
7 Development of Fraction Understanding	148
POOJA G. SIDNEY, CLARISSA A. THOMPSON, AND JOHN E. OPFER	

vi	Contents	
	<b>8 Learning How to Solve Problems by Studying Examples</b>	183
	TAMARA VAN GOG, NIKOL RUMMEL, AND ALEXANDER RENKL	
	<b>9 Harnessing Our Hands to Teach Mathematics: How Gesture Can Be Used as a Teaching Tool in the Classroom</b>	209
	ELIZABETH M. WAKEFIELD AND SUSAN GOLDIN-MEADOW	
	<b>Part III Reading and Writing</b>	235
	<b>10 Fundamental Components of Reading Comprehension</b>	237
	ANNE E. COOK AND EDWARD J. O'BRIEN	
	<b>11 Writing as a Learning Activity</b>	266
	PERRY D. KLEIN AND AARTJE VAN DIJK	
	<b>12 Bilingualism and Education: Bridging Cognitive Science Research to Language Learning</b>	292
	GIGI LUK AND JUDITH F. KROLL	
	<b>13 Note-Taking</b>	320
	STEPHEN T. PEVERLY AND AMIE D. WOLF	
	<b>14 Multiple-Text Comprehension</b>	356
	JEAN-FRANÇOIS ROUET, M. ANNE BRITT, AND ANNA POTOCKI	
	<b>15 Interventions to Promote Reading for Understanding: Current Evidence and Future Directions</b>	381
	ELIZABETH A. STEVENS AND SHARON VAUGHN	
	<b>Part IV General Learning Strategies</b>	409
	<b>16 When Does Interleaving Practice Improve Learning?</b>	411
	PAULO F. CARVALHO AND ROBERT L. GOLDSTONE	
	<b>17 Correcting Student Errors and Misconceptions</b>	437
	ELIZABETH J. MARSH AND EMMALINE DREW ELISEEV	
	<b>18 How Multimedia Can Improve Learning and Instruction</b>	460
	RICHARD E. MAYER	
	<b>19 Multiple-Choice and Short-Answer Quizzing on Equal Footing in the Classroom: Potential Indirect Effects of Testing</b>	480
	MARK A. MCDANIEL AND JERI L. LITTLE	
	<b>20 Collaborative Learning: The Benefits and Costs</b>	500
	TIMOTHY J. NOKES-MALACH, CRISTINA D. ZEPEDA, J. ELIZABETH RICHEY, AND SONIYA GADGIL	
	<b>21 Self-Explaining: Learning About Principles and Their Application</b>	528
	ALEXANDER RENKL AND ALEXANDER EITEL	

22	Enhancing the Quality of Student Learning Using Distributed Practice	
	MELODY WISEHEART, CAROLINA E. KÜPPER-TETZEL, TINA WESTON, ALICE S. N. KIM, IRINA V. KAPLER, AND VANESSA FOOT-SEYMOUR	550
	<b>Part V Metacognition</b>	585
23	Self-Regulation in Computer-Assisted Learning Systems	
	ROGER AZEVEDO, NICHOLAS V. MUDRICK, MICHELLE TAUB, AND AMANDA E. BRADBURY	587
24	Improving Students' Metacomprehension Accuracy	619
	THOMAS D. GRIFFIN, MARTA K. MIELICKI, AND JENNIFER WILEY	
25	Calibration and Self-Regulated Learning: Making the Connections	647
	DOUGLAS J. HACKER AND LINDA BOL	
26	Teachers' Judgments of Student Learning of Mathematics	
	KEITH W. THIEDE, STEVEN OSWALT, JONATHAN L. BRENDENFUR, MICHELE B. CARNEY, AND RICHARD D. OSGUTHORPE	678
27	Learning Strategies and Self-Regulated Learning	696
	PHILIP H. WINNE AND ZAHIA MARZOUK	
	<i>Index</i>	716

## Figures

4.1	Visual representation of the “Earth is like a peach” analogy (after Matlen et al., 2011)	<i>page 77</i>
4.2	The control panel and two sample programs for discovering how the “mystery key” (labeled “RPT”) works on a simulated robot (shown in its “home” position in the center of the screenshot) (after Klahr, Fay, & Dunbar, 1993)	82
4.3	A typical item from a “high-stakes” state assessment of domain-general experimentation skills and knowledge	84
4.4	Typical computer-interface item for assessing children’s ability to design unconfounded experiments as part of their CVS training	85
5.1	(a) Illustration of the type of items used on the Thurstone mental rotation task; (b) A sample item from the Children’s Mental Transformation Task (from Gunderson, et al., 2012, p. 1233. Reprinted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	104
5.2	Proportional reasoning measure	105
5.3	Examples of core vs. culturally mediated principles of geometry (from Giofrè, et al., 2013, p. 117. Copyright 2013 by Elsevier. Reprinted with permission)	110
5.4	Classifications of spatial abilities (from Christou, 2010, p. 209. Copyright 2010 by Springer Science+Business Media B.V. Reprinted with permission)	112
6.1	Schematic of four theoretical viewpoints on the causal relations between conceptual and procedural knowledge	127
6.2	Regression paths of the best-fitting structural equation model of the relations among conceptual and procedural knowledge in Study 1 (from Schneider, Rittle-Johnson, and Star, 2011. Reprinted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	133
6.3	Experiment 1 gain scores by condition for each item type (from Rittle-Johnson & Koedinger, 2009, p. 491. Copyright 2009 by the British Psychological Society. Reprinted with permission)	138
7.1	An illustration of children’s intuitions about mathematical patterns vs. difficulty reasoning about the formal symbolic fractional notation used to represent those magnitudes	149
7.2	Tasks for assessing knowledge of natural, whole number magnitudes	152



7.3	Example stimuli for tasks assessing infants', children's, and adults' ability to represent and compare nonsymbolic ratios and proportions	156
7.4	Illustration of a task in which participants draw a diagram to represent a fraction division problem	165
7.5	Fractions can be represented using area models (Panel A) and number lines (Panel B)	169
8.1	Worked example of an electrical circuits troubleshooting task (after Van Gog, Kester, & Paas, 2011; Van Gog et al., 2015)	185
8.2	Screenshot of a video modeling example (used in Hoogerheide, Van Wermeskerken et al., 2016) in which it is demonstrated and explained how to solve an electrical circuits troubleshooting task (the steps of the procedure are presented on the slides)	186
8.3	Example of a self-explanation prompt (see bottom-left) and illustration of the difference between a molar (left) and modular (right) example (from Hilbert et al., 2008, reprinted with permission)	192
9.1	Example of teacher highlighting two sides of an equation through gesture	215
9.2	Example of teacher demonstrating slope changes using iconic gesture (from Alibali & Nathan, 2012, with permission from Taylor & Francis)	215
9.3	Examples of gesture strategies produced by children	218
9.4	Examples of the gesture strategies children were taught to produce in Goldin-Meadow, Cook, and Mitchell (2009)	224
10.1	The RI-Val model of comprehension (from O'Brien & Cook, 2016)	247
10.2	Reading times in milliseconds for nonanomalous and anomalous target and spillover sentences as a function of context conditions – (a) shared vs. (b) distinguishing features (from Williams, Cook, & O'Brien, 2018)	251
10.3	Reading times in milliseconds for target and spillover sentences as a function of consistency and passage position (early vs. late) – (a) nonfantasy-related inconsistencies, (b) fantasy-related inconsistencies (from Walsh, Cook, & O'Brien, 2018)	254
12.1	English language arts (ELA) performance for Grade 3 students with diverse language backgrounds	309
12.2	Mathematics performance for Grade 3 students with diverse language backgrounds	310
13.1	Hypothesized relationships among cognitive processes, notes, and test performance (reprinted from Peverly et al., 2012, with permission from John Wiley and Sons)	329
14.1	References to documents in undergraduate students' short essays about historical controversies as observed in the study by Rouet et al. (1996, adapted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	362
14.2	Mean number of idea units in students' essays as a function writing task and type of idea unit category in the study by Le Bigot and Rouet (2007)	368

14.3	Model linking individual characteristics to multiple-text comprehension (Bråten et al., 2014)	371
15.1	Themes identified from Scammacca et al. (2016)	391
15.2	Graphic organizer demonstrating multiple strategies for word learning	397
15.3	Get the Gist graphic organizer	399
16.1	Examples of paintings and artists used by Kornell and colleagues (Kornell & Bjork, 2008; Kornell et al., 2010)	415
16.2	Average posttest score by concept repetition rate for the (a) self-regulated and (b) yoked groups in Carvalho and colleagues (2016; reprinted with permission)	420
16.3	Schematic representation of the mechanism proposed in Sequential Attention Theory (SAT) for how each sequence leads to attending to different properties of the studied materials (from Carvalho & Goldstone, 2017b. Reprinted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	422
17.1	Proportion of errors corrected on the final test based on feedback condition (no feedback, correct/incorrect, answer feedback) and the number of multiple-choice alternative answer choices (two, three, four) on an initial multiple-choice test (after Marsh et al., 2012)	440
17.2	The effect of feedback type (no feedback, correct answer feedback, explanation feedback) on repeated questions compared with transfer questions (from Butler, Godbole, & Marsh, 2013, p. 292. Adapted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	444
17.3	The ball and string problem, which tests a person's understanding of curvilinear motion (after Kaiser, Jonides, & Alexander, 1986)	446
18.1	Frames from narrated animation on how a bicycle tire pump works	463
18.2	Cognitive theory of multimedia learning	464
18.3	Do people learn better when we add interesting but extraneous text?	467
18.4	Which instructional method leads to better learning about braking systems?	468
18.5	Which instructional method leads to better learning from an online slideshow?	469
18.6	Do people learn better when a CONTINUE button is added after each segment?	470
18.7	Do people learn better when they receive pretraining in the names and characteristics of the key elements?	471
18.8	Which instructional method leads to better learning from an online slideshow?	472
18.9	Do people learn better when an onscreen agent uses humanlike gestures or stands still?	474

19.1	Correct performance on a final free-recall test (Experiment 4a), a final cued-recall test (Experiment 4b), and a final recognition test (Experiment 4c) as a function of initial test type (from Glover, 1989. Adapted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	482
19.2	Enhancement of subsequent retrieval (recall) following initial recall vs. initial recognition of an item (from McDaniel & Masson, 1985. Reprinted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	482
19.3	Exam performance for identical and related questions as a function of initial quiz format (from Experiment 1 of McDaniel et al., 2012. Adapted with permission)	483
19.4	Exam performances from Experiments 1b and 4 of McDermott et al. (2014) as a function of quiz format and exam format (adapted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	485
19.5	Gamma correlations representing, for each participant in the reread and quiz conditions, respectively, the relationship between estimates of fact recall and actual recall for each section (after Little & McDaniel, 2015. Adapted with permission)	491
20.1	Illustration of the three common collaborative scenarios	503
20.2	Illustration of two levels of analysis within scenario 1	505
20.3	Illustration of Rajaram and Pereira-Pasarin's (2010) theoretical framework of the cognitive mechanisms underlying effects of collaboration on memory (after Rajaram & Pereira-Pasarin, 2010, p. 651. Copyright 2010. Reprinted with permission from SAGE Publications)	516
21.1	Example of a self-explanation prompt (Hilbert et al., 2008. Reprinted with permission)	529
21.2	Interconnected representation of a principle and multiple example cases (after Renkl, 2017b. Reprinted with permission from Springer Nature)	533
21.3	Two routes of transfer based on an interconnected representation of a principle and multiple cases (after Renkl, 2017b. Reprinted with permission from Springer Nature)	534
21.4	Example of assisted prompting by using fill-in-the-blanks self-explanations (from Berthold & Renkl, 2009. Reprinted with permission from the American Psychological Association)	536
22.1	A basic distributed practice research design	551
22.2	A complex distributed practice research design where three different learning schedules are compared against each other	555
23.1	Screenshot of MetaTutor	591
23.2	Examples of specific uses of multimodal multichannel data to investigate CAM processes with different CALSs	607
24.1	Overview of the standard metacomprehension paradigm (minus the shaded box)	620

---

24.2	A process model of metacognition during learning	622
24.3	An illustration of how test difficulty impacts absolute but not relative accuracy	625
25.1	Phases and subprocesses of self-regulation (Zimmerman, 2008, p. 178. Reprinted with permission from SAGE Publications)	648
26.1	Monitoring and control for students and teachers	682
26.2	Link between teacher judgment accuracy and student achievement	683
27.1	Example of standards and a motivational factor weighed when judging utility	702

## Tables

3.1	A sample of critical thinking skills	<i>page 55</i>
3.2	A sample item from the Halpern Critical Thinking Assessment (HCTA)	60
4.1	A taxonomy for categorizing psychological investigations of aspects of science education, with representative examples of each type	69
6.1	Range of tasks used to assess conceptual knowledge	131
6.2	Limited empirical evidence relevant for identifying optimal ordering of instruction on concepts and procedures	136
6.3	Design of intervention conditions in Rittle-Johnson and Koedinger (2009)	138
7.1	Experimental design and findings from McCrink and Wynn (2007)	158
7.2	Common strategies for comparing fraction magnitudes among adults	161
11.1	Text genres in the writing to learn literature	271
11.2	Summary of review of empirical research	282
12.1	Sociodemographic information of Grade 3 general education children attending public schools in Massachusetts during the 2012/13 academic year	308
13.1	Selected questions from an unpublished note-taking questionnaire administered to college students ( $N = 435$ )	330
14.1	Two texts that form part of a 6th grade geography reading assignment. The texts are featured on two pages of an electronic textbook. The title <i>Getting housing in Mumbai</i> is displayed at the top of each page (our adaptation from French)	358
18.1	Evidence-based principles for the design of multimedia instruction	466
18.2	Portions of nonpersonalized and personalized text from a narrated animation on how the human respiratory system works	473
19.1	Indirect benefits of testing	488
20.1	Summary of three common approaches to examining collaborative learning	507
20.2	Mean proportion of segments recalled by experts, novices, and nonpilots as a function of individual or collaborative recall (after Meade, Nokes, & Morrow, 2009, p. 43. Copyright 2009 Psychology Press, an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group. Reprinted by permission of the publisher)	511
22.1	Distributed practice studies of verbal learning	558

---

22.2	Distributed practice studies of motor skills	560
22.3	Distributed practice studies of intellectual skills	563
22.4	Distributed practice studies of social and emotional skills	565
22.5	Suggestions for implementing distributed practice into classroom instruction	571
23.1	Sample questions and data sources based on conceptual dichotomies about cognitive, affective, and metacognitive (CAM) self-regulated learning processes	598
25.1	Studies on factors that may contribute to calibration	652
25.2	Studies on improving calibration accuracy	658
25.3	Studies showing positive effects on accuracy and performance	662
25.4	Studies showing positive effects on accuracy but not performance	663
26.1	Illustrations of the relation between absolute and relative accuracy	680
26.2	Descriptive statistics of formative assessment scales and correlations with measures of judgment accuracy ( $N = 16$ )	688
27.1	COPES features of a task	699

## Contributors

ROGER AZEVEDO, Department of Learning Sciences and Educational Research,  
University of Central Florida, USA

LINDA BOL, Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University,  
USA

JULIE L. BOOTH, College of Education, Temple University, USA

AMANDA E. BRADBURY, Department of Psychology, North Carolina State University,  
USA

JONATHAN L. BRENDEFUR, Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Foundational  
Studies, Boise State University, USA

M. ANNE BRITT, Department of Psychology, Northern Illinois University, USA

HEATHER A. BUTLER, Department of Psychology, California State University,  
Dominguez Hills, USA

MICHELE B. CARNEY, Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Foundational  
Studies, Boise State University, USA

PAULO F. CARVALHO, Human-Computer Interaction Institute, Carnegie Mellon  
University, USA

ANNE E. COOK, Educational Psychology Department, University of Utah, USA

EMMALINE DREW ELISEEV, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke  
University, USA

JOHN DUNLOSKY, Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University,  
USA

ALEXANDER EITEL, University of Freiburg, Germany

VANESSA FOOT-SEYMOUR, Department of Psychology, LaMarsh Centre for Child and  
Youth Research, York University, Canada

SONIYA GADGIL, The Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence and Educational  
Innovation, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

SUSAN GOLDIN-MEADOW, Department of Psychology and Department of Comparative Human Development, University of Chicago, USA

ROBERT L. GOLDSTONE, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences and Program in Cognitive Science, Indiana University, USA

THOMAS D. GRIFFIN, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA

ELIZABETH A. GUNDERSON, Department of Psychology, Temple University, USA

DOUGLAS J. HACKER, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Utah, USA

DIANE F. HALPERN, Claremont McKenna College and Minerva Schools at KGI, USA

IRINA V. KAPLER, Department of Psychology, LaMarsh Centre for Child and Youth Research, York University, Canada

ALICE S. N. KIM, Department of Psychology, York University, Canada; Rotman Research Institute of Baycrest, Canada

DAVID KLAHR, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

PERRY D. KLEIN, The Faculty of Education, Western University, Canada

JUDITH F. KROLL, Department of Psychology, University of California, Riverside, USA

CAROLINA E. KÜPPER-TETZEL, School of Social Sciences, Psychology, University of Dundee, Scotland

JOEL R. LEVIN, University of Arizona, USA

JERI L. LITTLE, Department of Psychology, Hillsdale College, USA; now at Department of Psychology, California State University, East Bay, USA

GIGI LUK, Harvard Graduate School of Education, USA

ELIZABETH J. MARSH, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Duke University, USA

ZAHIA MARZOUK, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada

BRYAN J. MATLEN, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

RICHARD E. MAYER, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA

MARK A. MCDANIEL, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, USA

MARTA K. MIELICKI, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA



---

NICHOLAS V. MUDRICK, Department of Psychology, North Carolina State University, USA

NORA S. NEWCOMBE, Department of Psychology, Temple University, USA

TIMOTHY J. NOKES-MALACH, Department of Psychology and Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, USA

EDWARD J. O'BRIEN, Psychology Department, University of New Hampshire, USA

JOHN E. OPFER, Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, USA

RICHARD D. OSGUTHORPE, College of Education, Boise State University, USA

STEVEN OSWALT, College of Education, Boise State University, USA

STEPHEN T. PEVERLY, Teachers College, Columbia University, USA

ANNA POTOCKI, Department of Psychology, Université de Poitiers, France

KATHERINE A. RAWSON, Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University, USA

ALEXANDER RENKL, Department of Psychology, University of Freiburg, Germany

J. ELIZABETH RICHEY, Human-Computer Interaction Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, USA

BETHANY RITTLE-JOHNSON, Department of Psychology and Human Development, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, USA

DANIEL H. ROBINSON, University of Texas at Arlington, USA

JEAN-FRANÇOIS ROUET, Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), Poitiers, France

NIKOL RUMMEL, Institute of Educational Research, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

KEITH SAWYER, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA

POOJA G. SIDNEY, Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University, USA

ELIZABETH A. STEVENS, Department of Special Education and The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, The University of Texas at Austin, USA

MICHELLE TAUB, Department of Learning Sciences and Educational Research, University of Central Florida, USA

KEITH W. THIEDE, College of Education, Boise State University, USA

CLARISSA A. THOMPSON, Department of Psychological Sciences, Kent State University, USA

AARTJE VAN DIJK, Department of Teacher Training, Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands

TAMARA VAN GOG, Department of Education, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

SHARON VAUGHN, Department of Special Education and The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, The University of Texas at Austin, USA

ELIZABETH M. WAKEFIELD, Department of Psychology, Loyola University Chicago, USA

TINA WESTON, Department of Psychology, LaMarsh Centre for Child and Youth Research, Centre for Aging Research and Education, York University, Canada

JENNIFER WILEY, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA

PHILIP H. WINNE, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Canada

MELODY WISEHEART, Department of Psychology, LaMarsh Centre for Child and Youth Research, Centre for Aging Research and Education, York University, Canada

AMIE D. WOLF, Teachers College, Columbia University, USA

CRISTINA D. ZEPEDA, Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, USA

CORINNE ZIMMERMAN, Department of Psychology, Illinois State University, USA