

# Human Memory and the Limits of Technology in Education

Puddifoot, Katherine; O'Donnell, Cian

*License:*

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Puddifoot, K & O'Donnell, C 2018, 'Human Memory and the Limits of Technology in Education', *Educational Theory*.

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Katherine Puddifoot, Cian O'Donnell, Human Memory and the Limits of Technology in Education, *Educational Theory*, [add vol./issue/date/page or article number], which has been published in final form at [Link to final article using the DOI]. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Checked 21/06/2018.

**General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Human Memory and the Limits of Technology in Education**

2

3 **Abstract** Human memory systems perform various functions beyond simple storage and  
4 retrieval of information. They link together information about events, build abstractions, and  
5 perform memory updating. In contrast, typical information storage and access technologies,  
6 such as note-taking applications and Wikipedia, tend to store information verbatim. In this  
7 article, we use results from cognitive psychology, neuroscience and machine learning to argue  
8 that the increased dependence on such technologies in education may come at a price: the  
9 missed opportunity for memory systems of student learners to form abstractions and insights  
10 from newly learned information. This conclusion has important implications for how  
11 technologies should be adopted in education.

12

13 **1. Introduction**

14 Numerous technologies are now used within educational settings, with the aim of improving  
15 the learning experience and student outcomes. Examples include: distance/online/virtual  
16 learning; the use of analytics to gather and utilise data about student learning habits;  
17 interactive learning applications/tools; audio-visual teaching aids; and information storage  
18 and access technologies.<sup>1</sup> The increasing use of technologies within educational settings raises  
19 important questions about the extent to which traditional methods of teaching and learning  
20 should be supplanted by new methods involving the use of technology. In this paper, we  
21 highlight a potential danger to supplanting some teaching methods with alternatives that  
22 involve using technologies.

23 We focus on the use of what we call *information storage and access technologies*.  
24 These technologies store information that can easily and rapidly be accessed by anyone with  
25 an understanding of how to use them. They can be contrasted to technologies that directly act  
26 as a means of support to learning activities rather than providing access to information  
27 (Tondeur, van Braak and Valcke 2007). Included in the relevant category are: (i) personal  
28 devices such as flash drives, cloud storage, and note-taking applications, in which students

1 can store information that they have been taught; (ii) open access resources such as Wikipedia  
2 or Google that contain information that other people have made available; (iii) restricted  
3 access resources such as digital textbooks or the online learning environments for specific  
4 courses of study, which include course-related documents and resources; and (iv) social  
5 media resources, in which information shared by other people can be accessed and used by a  
6 student in their studies. For some purposes, people may distinguish between devices that store  
7 self-generated information (e.g. note-taking applications) and devices that store other-  
8 generated information (e.g. Wikipedia), but for our purposes we treat both equally.

9         We recognise that these technologies perform numerous important roles within  
10 contemporary education settings, ameliorating the student experience and student outcomes in  
11 a variety of important ways. However, we highlight a danger associated with the adoption of  
12 these technologies within an educational setting. Because of the benefits of the technologies,  
13 some people have argued that educational methods should be overhauled, so that significantly  
14 less emphasis is placed on students engaging in learning that involves storing information to  
15 memory systems in the human brain. We argue that there are important functions performed  
16 by human memory systems— the linking together of information found in different sources,  
17 the production of abstract representations, and the updating of learnt information over time—  
18 which are unlikely to be performed if educational methods are overhauled in thus way. We  
19 argue that these functions are essential to the achievement of one of the central goals of  
20 education, i.e.: the transference of learning. Consequently, a move away from storing  
21 information internally in our brains has the potential to have a detrimental effect on  
22 educational outcomes because it can prevent students from achieving transference. Our  
23 argument draws on findings from cognitive psychology, neuroscience and machine learning.

24         The structure of our argument is as follows. In section 2, we show why information  
25 storage and access technologies are attractive to those working within an educational setting.  
26 In section 3, we highlight the functions performed by internal memory that will be the focus  
27 of discussion. In section 4, we show how these functions are important and valuable within an  
28 educational setting, improving the student experience and learning outcomes by facilitating

1 transference of learning—a central goal of education. Then, in section 5, we show that these  
2 functions might not be performed, and transference not achieved, if there is an increased  
3 focus within education on using information storage and access technologies.

4

5 **2. The appeal of technology in education**

6 Information storage and access technologies have several features that make them attractive  
7 for use in education. Contemporary digital technologies have large storage capacities.  
8 Information stored to these devices is easily compressed and therefore a large amount can be  
9 stored on small physical devices (Selwyn 2016). The technologies are highly reliable at  
10 storing accurate, verbatim representations of information that are then available for retrieval.  
11 The information stored in these technologies can be easily edited (ibid.), searched through,  
12 copied, and shared. In contrast, human memory systems have only limited storage capacities  
13 (see, e.g. Cherniak 1983, Brady et al., 2011). There is a huge psychological literature  
14 suggesting that people are not only susceptible to forgetting, we are also susceptible to  
15 *misremembering* (Robins 2016), recalling details of an event inaccurately (e.g. Loftus and  
16 Palmer 1974; Roediger and McDermott 1995; Schacter and Addis 2007). Human memory  
17 systems are therefore fallible with respect to the goal of storing accurate verbatim  
18 representations of information. Finally, human memory systems are largely private. If a  
19 person wishes to access information stored in another person’s internal memory systems, their  
20 success depends on the ability to identify and communicate their need, and on the other  
21 person’s willingness, as well as their ability, to access and to provide this information.  
22 Meanwhile, technologies such as Wikipedia, Google and social media provide easy, public  
23 access to information.

24 On a view according to which memory works as a storehouse (Sutton 1998), only  
25 functioning to store and provide access to information, the types of technologies that we are  
26 discussing would seem to overwhelmingly, if not only, bring benefits, inside and outside of  
27 education. They provide better storage capacities, more accurate records of information, and  
28 more ready access to a wider set of information than internal memory systems. However, the

1 memory-as-storehouse picture has been widely rejected within philosophy of memory (see  
2 e.g. De Brigarde 2014; Sutton 2009, 2010; Michaelian 2011; Robins 2016) and cognitive  
3 psychology (see, e.g. Schachter and Addis 2007; Schachter 2011) and is increasingly being  
4 criticised in neuroscience (see, e.g. Stickgold and Walker, 2013; Eichenbaum and Cohen,  
5 2014; Richards and Franklin 2017). It is now widely accepted that memory systems perform  
6 numerous important functions other than storage and retrieval. Our claim is that these  
7 functions are both important to education and unlikely to be performed if students reduce the  
8 extent to which they internalise information to memory because of the adoption of  
9 information storage and access technologies.

10 We therefore highlight how discussions within the cognitive sciences put pressure on  
11 positions like that of connectivism within educational theory, according to which it is not the  
12 learning that occurs within a person that is important but instead the networks that they form,  
13 with computer networks, social networks, etc. as it is through these that people can acquire  
14 accurate, up-to-date information (Siemens 2005, Thota 2015). We argue that the learning that  
15 occurs within the person, in their internal memory systems, can be vital to supporting  
16 important functions of learning. Our view also highlights shortcomings of some educational  
17 practices that involve the use of information storage and access technologies to perform  
18 functions traditionally performed by internal human memory systems, e.g. allowing students  
19 to use information storage and access technologies inside the examination room (see, e.g.  
20 Wheeler 2011). We show that there are important functions of human memory systems that  
21 are less likely to be performed if such practices are adopted.

22 To be clear, our aim is not to advocate the use of technology-free examinations or any  
23 other specific traditional methods of teaching and learning. It is consistent with the claims  
24 made in the current paper that, for example, the *constructivist* view of education is correct.  
25 According to constructivism, students should be active learners, using existing knowledge to  
26 engage in activities that lead to the acquisition of further knowledge (Bruner 1996). Adaptive  
27 learning technologies may help accelerate this process by, for example, tailoring feedback or  
28 lines of instruction to suit each particular student (Desmarais and Baker, 2012). It is also

1 consistent with the view defended in this paper that both informal and formal methods of  
2 learning are valuable. Informal methods of learning tend to take place outside of a structured  
3 learning environment and do not tend to involve rigorous testing (Marswick and Watkins  
4 1990). One can learn informally outside the classroom in everyday life (Mills and Kraftl  
5 2014). It is consistent with our view that active and informal learning are highly valuable.  
6 What our argument emphasises that if learning, either utilising these methods or not, does not  
7 involve the internalisation of information, student learning can be negatively affected.

8

### 9 **3. Human Memory and Its Functions**

10 The aim of this section is to spell out in more detail the functions other than those suggested  
11 by the memory-as-storehouse view that are performed by human memory systems. It outlines  
12 results from the fields of neuroscience, cognitive psychology and machine learning that show  
13 how the brain mechanisms underlying memory are responsible for: (i) linking together  
14 information about different events, (ii) building abstract representations, (iii) updating  
15 memories in light of most recent information.

16 Let us begin with considering how biological memory systems link together  
17 information about different events. In a learning setting, this will usually involve linking the  
18 newly learned information with existing, older memories for other events and concepts. In  
19 neuroscience, this linking is generally thought to occur slowly over days and nights as part of  
20 a larger process termed *systems consolidation*. Consolidation here is defined as a process that  
21 crystallises new memories so that they become less malleable and more locked-in over time  
22 (McGaugh, 2000). Neuroscientists believe that systems consolidation involves a two-stage  
23 process: first, new memories are encoded in the hippocampus directly following the  
24 experience. Second, over the following days and weeks the newly learned information is  
25 transferred from the hippocampus to the neocortex where it is linked to existing memories and  
26 stored long-term (Alvarez and Squire, 1994; Buszaki 1989; Marr 1971). Mechanistically, the  
27 basic transfer of information from hippocampus to neocortex is believed to happen via  
28 repeated *replay* of episodic memories by the hippocampus during sleep (Buszaki 1989;

1 Wilson and McNaughton 1994, O’Neill et al., 2010). The idea is that memory replay by  
2 hippocampus during sleep drives neocortical brain networks, activating both some  
3 representation of the new memory, plus related older memories. This co-activation triggers  
4 strengthening of interconnections between the sets of active neocortical neurons, and so links  
5 the new memory with existing knowledge.

6         Of the three memory processes we describe, this standard account of systems  
7 consolidation model accounts only for the first (linking together of information). Importantly  
8 however, this consolidation process also seems to parallel the abstraction and generalisation  
9 of memories into simpler representations (Winocur et al. 2007; Stickgold & Walker, 2013).  
10 This is a process that is taken by cognitive psychologists to explain a large range of  
11 memories, as it is thought that representations of the gist of events remain as verbatim details  
12 fade (Brainerd & Reyna 2002). Although it is not known how memory generalisation works  
13 at the neural level, two recent theoretical models have been put forward. Lewis and Durant  
14 (2011) suggest that if multiple memories were to be replayed concurrently by the brain, then  
15 “the overlapping replay of related memories selectively strengthens shared elements”. As the  
16 non-overlapping elements of these memories will not be reinforced, they are more likely to be  
17 forgotten. This model fits with the common-sense view that an abstraction should be built out  
18 of the common elements of different items, while the ignoring their differentiating details.  
19 O’Donnell and Sejnowski (2014) propose a different model for memory generalisation, where  
20 memory replay during non-REM sleep results in a biochemical template being laid down in  
21 the neocortical neurons that were activated by the replayed memory. This template is then  
22 used during the subsequent REM phase of the sleep cycle (when most vivid dreams occur) to  
23 selectively strengthen connections from neurons outside the template to those neurons inside  
24 the template. This should have the effect of broadening the original memory representation to  
25 incorporate a wider set of neurons. In contrast to the Lewis and Durant model, the O’Donnell  
26 and Sejnowski model proposes that generalisations are not formed by finding commonalities  
27 between pairs of memory items, but by taking a single memory and meshing it with existing  
28 prior knowledge about the world, so generalising its contents.

1           A related insight into how human memory generalisation might work comes from the  
2 field of machine learning. Machine learning researchers seek to build computer programs that  
3 learn how to perform a task by encountering example ‘training’ data points and updating their  
4 algorithms accordingly, mimicking how humans learn cumulatively. In this field, it is well  
5 appreciated that the ability of a computer program to generalise from specific training  
6 examples to perform well on a broader set of tasks can be impaired by *overfitting*. Overfitting  
7 happens when a statistical model learns to capture too well every detail of the specific  
8 examples that it happened to see during training. If these details are irrelevant for the broader  
9 problem, then they may impair generalisation on future tasks. Machine learning researchers  
10 have discovered several methods for reducing the effects of overfitting. One powerful  
11 solution is to build in prior knowledge that the computer programmer may have of the  
12 structure of the problem. Ideally this prior structural information will bias the computer  
13 program towards solutions that lead to better performance on data or related tasks. For  
14 example, a program that is pre-programmed to know that everyday objects, like bicycles, tend  
15 to consist of multiple parts can learn to understand new object categories from as few as one  
16 or two examples, to the same level of performance as humans (Lake et al., 2015). In contrast,  
17 otherwise identical programs that do not understand that objects can be decomposed into parts  
18 tend to generalise poorly. Hence, prior knowledge is essential for robust generalisation.

19           The third type of memory processing performed by the brain, memory updating, is  
20 thought to be mediated by the mechanism of *reconsolidation*. In something of a surprise to  
21 the neuroscience field, it was shown that previously consolidated memories could be made re-  
22 labile simply by appropriately cueing their recall (Nader et al, 2000). This finding implies that  
23 each recall of a memory opens a temporal window of opportunity for the brain to alter it, and  
24 potentially incorporate new information into it. Memory updating can explain findings from  
25 cognitive psychology showing that memories of specific events can be updated to reflect  
26 information, including false information, encountered after the event, in what has become  
27 known as the *misinformation effect* (e.g. Loftus and Palmer 1974). Findings from  
28 neuroscience suggest that the incorporation of information provided after the event is possible

1 during the window of opportunity that occurs at each recall of the memory. For our purposes,  
2 the key lesson is that that new learned information is not simply linked an original memory,  
3 but in fact the original memory itself is altered. This may result in aspects of the old memory  
4 potentially being lost in the process. In this sense, the brain performs a true updating, not  
5 simply an accumulation of information.

6

#### 7 **4. Limited functioning of information storage and access technologies**

8 In this section we show that the functions of memory outlined in section 3 facilitate the  
9 achievement of one of the most important goals of education: the transference of learning.

10 The transference of learning involves information being used outside of the context in  
11 which it was initially learnt (Thorndike and Woodward 1901). It is widely accepted among  
12 educators that transference is a crucial component of education (Bransford and Schwartz  
13 1999; Perkins and Salomon 1992).<sup>ii</sup> Educators aim for the information that they convey to  
14 their students to be utilised under a variety of different conditions, inside and outside of the  
15 classroom (Bransford and Schwartz 1999) rather than the benefits of their learning to be  
16 confined to the context of learning. For example, a student might study population growth in  
17 ecology, learn that exponential growth of groups occurs when there are no barriers to slow  
18 growth, then transfer this learning to the consideration of infectious disease in epidemiology,  
19 concluding that diseases will spread exponentially if barriers are not in place (Kaminski et al  
20 2013). In this case, what is learnt about one case could be applied in another educational  
21 context (in another class) or outside of the classroom. Another example would be a student of  
22 history who learns about the dangers of populism by learning about one case in history and  
23 applies their learning to other historical cases, and then compares each of these cases to what  
24 is currently occurring within her home country. In the final case, the student could develop a  
25 general picture of the dangers of populism on the basis of considering two or more historical  
26 cases, and the general picture could then be used to understand current events.

27 What is most important for our purposes is that all cases of transfer of learning are  
28 highly dependent on the functions of human memory outlined in section 3. This point can be

1 understood by considering the various stages of information processing involved in the  
2 transference of learning.

3         For transference to occur, information about different cases must *be linked together*,  
4 e.g. information about two cases of populism. If information about case of populism A is  
5 never connected to case of populism B then learning about case A will not be transferred to  
6 case B. In order to ensure that the information is linked where appropriate, an *abstract*  
7 *representation* must be formed that reflects the commonalities between the cases, e.g. the  
8 feature of the cases that are due to populism rather than something else. This requires  
9 abstracting away from the details that differ between the cases and detecting a common core  
10 (Kaminski et al 2009). Where people fail to engage in transfer of learning this can be because  
11 they attend too heavily to details of a specific case, failing to see the commonalities between  
12 cases (ibid.). Once an abstract representation has been formed, there is the potential to  
13 identify numerous different learning contexts in which previously learned knowledge could  
14 be applied. By applying learning across new contexts it will be possible to refine the abstract  
15 representation to reflect the new information that becomes linked together through the process  
16 of transfer. It will also be possible to change one's view of the information learnt in the initial  
17 stages of learning. If one's initial learning about populism is challenged by comparing it to  
18 other cases of populism, through the process of transfer of learning, the earlier *learning can*  
19 *be updated.*<sup>iii</sup>

20         We have seen that each of these processes—linking together of information,  
21 formation of abstract representation, and updating of learned information—are facilitated by  
22 the nature of human memory systems. It therefore follows that the functions of human  
23 memory systems, other than the storage and retrieval of information—facilitate the core goal  
24 of education that is transference of learning.

25         It is worth noting that not all types of learning can be transferred. For some  
26 information, there is no way to find commonalities between examples to build an abstraction.  
27 For example, there is no way of predicting someone's phone number from their name. This  
28 means that it would be impossible to study a list of name/phone number pairings to discover

1 some underlying structure with which to build an abstract model, that could later help you to  
2 predict a new person's phone number based on name alone. In situations like these it makes  
3 sense to offload the information to external devices, both because they are good at storing a  
4 large amount of information, and because the student will not miss out on any abstractions by  
5 doing so. This observation is consistent with the claims made in the current discussion,  
6 however, because our aim is to show that there is a *significant subset* of information that can  
7 usefully be transferred by forming abstractions, and that this transference is likely to be  
8 missed with increased dependence on information storage and access technologies. Our claim  
9 is *not* that *all* information can usefully be transferred in this way.

10

## 11 **5. Educational Technologies and a Failure of Functioning**

12 So far we have argued that human memory systems function in ways other than simply  
13 storing and retrieving information, and that these functions are important to the achievement  
14 of transference of learning—a central goal of education. This section shows that the same  
15 functions are unlikely to be performed as students increasingly depend on information storage  
16 and access technologies.

17         The argument outlined so far provides good *prima facie* reasons for accepting this  
18 conclusion. It has identified advantages for learning which are the result of the systems  
19 operating in ways that differ from how information storage and access technologies operate,  
20 i.e. solely providing a facility for storage and retrieval of information. This suggests that if  
21 people who increase their usage of information storage and access technologies also reduce  
22 the extent to which they internalise information to memory, they will miss out on advantages  
23 for learning.

24         It is, of course, important for us to show that these phenomena—i.e. (i) the increase in  
25 use of information storage and access technologies and (ii) the reduction of internalisation of  
26 information to memory—reliably co-occur. Why should we think this? First of all, there may  
27 be cases where the co-occurrence would be intentional. For example, teachers who adopt the  
28 connectivist viewpoint might decide that it is no longer important to teach students

1 information for storing in their internal memories, due to the existence of new technologies.  
2 This might be reflected in their teaching practice. Alternatively, widespread use of  
3 information storage and access technologies might lead to an unintentional reduction in  
4 learners' internally stored information. For example, it has been found that people tend to  
5 forget information that they think will be stored externally (Sparrow et al 2011). If the process  
6 of using these external technologies is not sufficient to trigger the brain functions that  
7 facilitate transfer of learning, transference may become less likely.

8         To see why it is that the use of technologies does not involve the performance of  
9 these functions it is first important to note that there is more than one way that information  
10 storage and access technologies could be adopted, depending on (a) the specific technologies  
11 and (b) the aims of those adopting them. In some cases, students might go through an initial  
12 learning experience in which they cognitively process information before storing it to one of  
13 the technologies. Students using note-taking applications could fit this description. In other  
14 cases, students might never go through an initial learning experience in which they  
15 cognitively process information. They might instead be merely instructed upon how to access  
16 information from the technologies, for example by searching Wikipedia. In both types of  
17 cases students are susceptible to missing the benefits of transference of learning.

18         Let us begin by focusing on the second case, those students who do not cognitively  
19 process the information. As they have not processed the information, they cannot have built  
20 abstract representations of the information. Without building these abstractions, the students  
21 will not be able to identify new cases in which previous learning is relevant.

22         It might be thought, however, that students could simply search for information when  
23 they encounter a task or problem for which information stored in these technologies could  
24 usefully be applied. For example, a person interested in understanding how diseases spread  
25 could search information storage and access technologies, such as Google or Wikipedia, to  
26 find an abundance of information relating to the topic. There are a number of problems with  
27 this response.

1 First of all, searches of this type will likely be too narrow to facilitate the type of  
2 transfer possible through the use of internal memory systems. This is because those engaging  
3 in the searches will not be aware of what information could usefully transfer and therefore  
4 would not search effectively for information. For instance, a search for information about  
5 how diseases spread that uses disease-specific keywords is unlikely to reveal information  
6 about the growth of populations in ecology. Although a description of the commonalities  
7 between these two processes may exist somewhere in the external storage system, successful  
8 discovery of this information would require that the person engaging in the search used the  
9 right search terms, i.e. terms that reflected the connection between the two types of  
10 information. However, students are unlikely to search in this way if they are unaware of the  
11 connection between the types of information because they have not formed an abstract  
12 representation reflecting the common core of the two types of information. And they will not  
13 have formed an abstract representation of this type if they have never internalised the  
14 information.

15 One way to understand this point is by considering Donald Rumsfeld's infamous  
16 distinction between *known unknowns* and *unknown unknowns*. One natural interpretation of  
17 this distinction is that known unknowns are things that we know we do not know. On the  
18 other hand, unknown unknowns are the things that we don't know that we don't know.<sup>iv</sup> A  
19 learner who sought and found information about the growth of populations in order to gain  
20 insights about the spread of disease would have to know that there was a connection between  
21 these cases that they did not know enough about. However, if they have not formed an  
22 abstract representation of the common core of the two cases then they will not be aware of the  
23 connection. The information about the connection between the cases will be an unknown  
24 unknown. Consequently, the student is unlikely to find the information through a search of  
25 information storage and access technologies.

26 Second, even if students were reliably able to access the information they needed by  
27 searching information storage and access technologies to identify information that would be  
28 relevant to their learning, the process may be impractically time-consuming, or might

1 interfere with other cognitive tasks. Insights that we have gained from previous learning  
2 experiences are constantly informing new experiences that we have, inside and outside of the  
3 classroom. This can be achieved automatically or offline by the brain, therefore quickly and  
4 efficiently, without producing significant interference with other cognitive tasks. A switch to  
5 increased use of searching technologies may lead to these features being lost.

6           What about students who do engage in some cognitive processing before offloading  
7 information to information storage and access technologies? Will they too miss out on the  
8 benefits of transference of learning? Discussions from the neuroscience of memory suggest  
9 that they will.

10           The main difference between students who engage in some cognitive processing of  
11 information before offloading it and those that do not is that the former will temporarily  
12 engage with the information. Lessons from neuroscience suggest that this temporary access to  
13 information will not suffice to produce the abstract representations that are necessary for  
14 transference of learning. The research suggests that the process of memory abstraction is tied  
15 to the slow neocortical learning system so it takes time: minimally one night's sleep, but  
16 perhaps several months (Rasch and Born, 2013). This implies that if students only briefly  
17 process the information and then it is actively forgotten, as it is likely to be when a student is  
18 aware that the information will be stored and accessible in an external device (Sparrow et al  
19 2011), the information is likely not to be stored for long enough to allow full abstraction to  
20 occur.

21           In sum, then, students who offload information to information storage and access  
22 devices, and depend on their ability to later access information from the devices rather than  
23 retrieve it from memory, are highly susceptible to missing out on the advantages of  
24 transference of learning that internal memory systems supply.

25

## 26 **Conclusion**

27 Human memory systems do not function like a storehouse. They perform functions other than  
28 storing and providing access to information, including linking together information about

1 different events, forming abstract representations, and facilitating the updating of information  
2 stored to memory. Each of these functions supports the transference of learning, which is a  
3 core goal of education. These functions may be impaired if future students become  
4 increasingly dependent on technologies that function more like a storehouse, i.e. information  
5 storage and access technologies. If so, the increased use of information storage and access  
6 technologies could undermine one of the main goals of education. We suggest that future  
7 educationalists should design teaching plans that deliver the types of information that would  
8 most help student build links and abstractions across material, while simultaneously  
9 encouraging students to offload non-structured or detailed information to external storage  
10 technologies, as appropriate. Such a balanced approach could maximise the benefits of both  
11 minds and machines.

## 1   **References**

- 2   Alvarez, P, and L R Squire. 1994. "Memory Consolidation and the Medial Temporal Lobe: a  
3   Simple Network Model.." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*  
4   *States of America* 91 (15): 7041–45.
- 5   Bortolotti, Lisa. "Epistemic benefits of elaborated and systematized delusions in  
6   schizophrenia." *The British journal for the philosophy of science* 67, no. 3 (2015): 879-900.
- 7   Brady, T F, T Konkle, and G A Alvarez. 2011. "A Review of Visual Memory Capacity:  
8   Beyond Individual Items and Toward Structured Representations" *Journal of Vision* 11 (4):  
9   1–34.
- 10   Brainerd, C. J., & Reyna, V. F. (2002). Fuzzy-trace theory and false memory. *Current*  
11   *Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 5: 164-169.
- 12   Bransford, John D., and Daniel L. Schwartz. "Chapter 3: Rethinking transfer: A simple  
13   proposal with multiple implications." *Review of research in education* 24, no. 1 (1999): 61-  
14   100.
- 15   Bruner, Jerome. *The Culture of Education*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1996.
- 16   Buzsáki, G. 1989. "Two-Stage Model of Memory Trace Formation: a Role for 'Noisy' Brain  
17   States.." *Neuroscience* 31 (3): 551–70.
- 18   Cherniak, Christopher. "Rationality and the structure of human memory." *Synthese* 57, no. 2  
19   (1983): 163-186.
- 20   Collins, Rupert A., and Robert H. Cruickshank. "Known knowns, known unknowns, unknown  
21   unknowns and unknown knowns in DNA barcoding: a comment on Downton et al." *Systematic*  
22   *biology* 63, no. 6 (2014): 1005-1009.
- 23   De Brigard, Felipe. "Is memory for remembering? Recollection as a form of episodic  
24   hypothetical thinking." *Synthese* 191, no. 2 (2014): 155-185.
- 25   Desmarais, Michel C, and Ryan S Baker. 2012. "A Review of Recent Advances in Learner and  
26   Skill Modeling in Intelligent Learning Environments." *User Modeling and User-Adapted*  
27   *Interaction* 22 (1-2). Kluwer Academic Publishers: 9–38.

1 Eichenbaum, H, and Cohen, NJ. 2014. "Can We Reconcile the Declarative Memory and Spatial  
2 Navigation Views on Hippocampal Function?." *Neuron* 83 (4): 764–70.

3 Kaminski, Jennifer A., Vladimir M. Sloutsky, and Andrew F. Heckler. "The cost of  
4 concreteness: the effect of nonessential information on analogical transfer." *Journal of*  
5 *Experimental Psychology: Applied* 19, no. 1 (2013): 14.

6 Kaminski, Jennifer A., Vladimir M. Sloutsky, and Andrew Heckler. "Transfer of mathematical  
7 knowledge: The portability of generic instantiations." *Child Development Perspectives* 3, no.  
8 3 (2009): 151-155.

9 Lake, Brenden M, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. 2015. "Human-Level  
10 Concept Learning Through Probabilistic Program Induction.." *Science* 350 (6266): 1332–38.

11 Lewis, Penelope A, and Simon J Durrant. 2011. "Overlapping Memory Replay During Sleep  
12 Builds Cognitive Schemata.." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 15 (8): 343–51.

13 Loftus, E.F. and Palmer, J.C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of  
14 the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal*  
15 *Behaviour*, 13, 5: 585-589.

16 Marr, D. 1971. "Simple Memory: a Theory for Archicortex." *Philosophical Transactions of the*  
17 *Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* 262 (841): 23–81.

18 Marsick, Victoria J., and Karen Watkins. *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace*,  
19 London, Routledge, 1990

20 Michaelian, Kourken. "Generative memory." *Philosophical psychology* 24, no. 3 (2011): 323-  
21 342.

22 Mills, Sarah, and Peter Kraftl, eds. *Informal education, childhood and youth: Geographies,*  
23 *histories, practices.* Springer, 2014.

24 Nader, K, G E Schafe, and J E Le Doux. 2000. "Fear Memories Require Protein Synthesis in  
25 the Amygdala for Reconsolidation After Retrieval.." *Nature* 406 (6797): 722–26.

26 Norris, Christopher. *Epistemology: Key concepts in philosophy.* A&C Black, 2005.

27 O'Donnell, Cian, and Terrence J Sejnowski. 2014. "Selective Memory Generalization by  
28 Spatial Patterning of Protein Synthesis.." *Neuron* 82 (2): 398–412.

1 O'Neill, Joseph, Barty Pleydell-Bouverie, David Dupret, and Jozsef Csicsvari. 2010. "Play It  
2 Again: Reactivation of Waking Experience and Memory.." *Trends in Neurosciences* 33 (5):  
3 220–29.

4 Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. "Transfer of learning." *International encyclopedia of*  
5 *education* 2 (1992): 6452-6457.

6 Puddifoot, Katherine. "Dissolving the epistemic/ethical dilemma over implicit bias."  
7 *Philosophical Explorations* 20, no. sup1 (2017): 73-93.

8 Rasch, Björn, and Jan Born. 2013. "About Sleep's Role in Memory.." *Physiol Rev* 93 (2): 681–  
9 766.

10 Richards, Blake A, and Paul W Frankland. 2017. "The Persistence and Transience of  
11 Memory.." *Neuron* 94 (6): 1071–84.

12 Robins, Sarah K. "Misremembering." *Philosophical Psychology* 29, no. 3 (2016): 432-447.

13 Roediger, H. L., & McDermott, K. B. (1995). Creating false memories: Remembering words  
14 not presented in lists. *Journal of experimental psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*,  
15 21, 4, 803-814.

16 Schacter, Daniel L., Donna Rose Addis, and Randy L. Buckner. "Remembering the past to  
17 imagine the future: the prospective brain." *Nature reviews. Neuroscience* 8, no. 9 (2007): 657.

18 Schacter, Daniel L., Scott A. Guerin, and Peggy L. St Jacques. "Memory distortion: an adaptive  
19 perspective." *Trends in cognitive sciences* 15, no. 10 (2011): 467-474.

20 Scoville, W B, and B Milner. 1957. "Loss of Recent Memory After Bilateral Hippocampal  
21 Lesions.." *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry* 20 (1): 11–21.

22 Selwyn, Neil. *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing,  
23 2016.

24 Siemens, George. "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age". *International*  
25 *Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDL)* (2005). URL:  
26 <http://er.dut.ac.za/handle/123456789/69> (accessed July 31st 2017).

1 Sparrow, Betsy, Jenny Liu, and Daniel M. Wegner. "Google effects on memory: Cognitive  
2 consequences of having information at our fingertips." *science* 333, no. 6043 (2011): 776-  
3 778.

4 Stickgold, E, and Walker MP. 2013. "Sleep-Dependent Memory Triage: Evolving  
5 Generalization Through Selective Processing.." *Nature Neuroscience* 16 (2): 139–45.

6 Sutton, John. "Adaptive misbeliefs and false memories" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(6)  
7 (2009): 535–536.

8 Sutton, John. "Observer perspective and acentered memory: Some puzzles about point of view  
9 in personal memory." *Philosophical Studies*, 148 (2010): 27–37.

10 Sutton, John. *Philosophy and memory traces: Descartes to connectionism*. Cambridge  
11 University Press, 1998.

12 Thota, Neena. "Connectivism and the use of technology/media in collaborative teaching and  
13 learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 2015, no. 142 (2015): 81-96.

14 Tondeur, Jo, Johan Van Braak, and Martin Valcke. "Towards a typology of computer use in  
15 primary education." *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 23, no. 3 (2007): 197-206.

16 Wilson, M A, and B L McNaughton. 1994. "Reactivation of Hippocampal Ensemble Memories  
17 During Sleep.." *Science* 265 (5172): 676–79.

18 Winocur, Gordon, Morris Moscovitch, and Melanie Sekeres. 2007. "Memory Consolidation or  
19 Transformation: Context Manipulation and Hippocampal Representations of Memory.." *Nature Neuroscience* 10 (5): 555–57.

20

21 Woodworth, Robert S., and E. L. Thorndike. "The influence of improvement in one mental  
22 function upon the efficiency of other functions.(I)." *Psychological review* 8, no. 3 (1901):  
23 247.

24

---

<sup>i</sup> It might be useful to note that one technology can fall under various categories, e.g. a tablet.

<sup>ii</sup> There has been some skepticism about whether transference of learning actually occurs. See, e.g., Thorndike and Woodward's (1901) seminal paper. However, we are construing transference very broadly, to reflect the full range of activities accepted as such in the literature, and find it highly implausible that none of the examples discussed are genuine cases in which people could transfer learning.

---

<sup>iii</sup> It might be objected that updating memories about a past learning experience is costly, leading to an inaccurate representation of the initial learning experience and a lack of self-knowledge about what has been learnt. These are real costs, undermining the student's ability to represent the past accurately. However, with respect to the goal of storing learnt information so that it can later be accessed and used, for example, in further transference of learning, the updating of the memory can be highly beneficial. It enables the information learnt through the process of transference to be stored without using extra storage space, which is limited (see, e.g. Cherniak 1983). Under such circumstances, the costs of memory updating might be viewed as the lesser of two epistemic evils (Bortolotti 2015; Puddifoot 2017), where the alternative is failing to achieve the goal of engaging in successful learning.

<sup>iv</sup> For an alternative philosophical interpretation of Rumsfeld's meaning see Norris 2005. Rumsfeld was heavily criticised for making this distinction but he is far from alone, for example, the distinction is used in biology (see, e.g. Collins and Cruikshank 2014).