

# The Effect of a Brain-based Learning Strategy on Developing The Reading Comprehension Skills of Faculty of Specific Education Prospective Teachers

Hoda Waheed Metwaly Farag

Prof.Dr. Muhammad Hassan Ibrahim  
*Professor of Curriculum and Instruction  
(TEFL), Faculty of Education, Zagazig  
University*

Dr.Nadia Lotfy Abdelhalim Mohamed  
*Lecturer of Curriculum and Instruction  
(TEFL), Faculty of Specific Education,  
Zagazig University*



المجلة العلمية المحكمة لدراسات وبحوث التربية النوعية

المجلد العاشر - العدد الثالث - مسلسل العدد (٢٥) - يوليو ٢٠٢٤م

رقم الإيداع بدار الكتب ٢٤٢٧٤ لسنة ٢٠١٦

ISSN-Print: 2356-8690 ISSN-Online: 2974-4423

موقع المجلة عبر بنك المعرفة المصري <https://jsezu.journals.ekb.eg>

[JSROSE@foe.zu.edu.eg](mailto:JSROSE@foe.zu.edu.eg)

البريد الإلكتروني للمجلة E-mail

## The Effect of a Brain-based Learning Strategy on Developing The Reading Comprehension Skills of Faculty of Specific Education Prospective Teachers

**Prof.Dr. Muhammad Hassan  
Ibrahim**

*Professor of Curriculum and  
Instruction (TEFL), Faculty of  
Education, Zagazig University*

**Dr.Nadia Lotfy Abdelhalim  
Mohamed**

*Lecturer of Curriculum and  
Instruction (TEFL), Faculty of  
Specific Education, Zagazig  
University*

**Hoda Waheed Metwaly Farag**

تاريخ المراجعة ٢٠٢٤-٦-٦م

تاريخ النشر ٢٠٢٤-٧-٧م

تاريخ الرفع ٢٠٢٤-٥-٢٥م

تاريخ التحكيم ٢٠٢٤-٦-٤م

### **Abstract:**

The current study was carried out to investigate the effect of a Brain-based Learning Strategy on Developing The Reading Comprehension Skills of Faculty of Specific Education Prospective Teachers . The study adopted the two groups design, in which 60 students participated from the fourth year, Instructional technology department at the Faculty of Specific Education, Zagazig University during the academic year 2023/2024. They were instructed by applying the brain-based learning strategy. To obtain data, one instrument was used: a pre-post reading comprehension skills test.

Findings showed that the brain-based learning strategy improved students' reading comprehension skills. Thus, it is recommended to utilize brain-based learning as a new strategy in developing EFL students' reading comprehension skills.

**Key words:** Brain-based learning strategy- Reading comprehension skills.

أثر إستراتيجية قائمة على التعلم المستند للدماغ فى تنمية مهارات الفهم القرائى لدى الطلاب  
المعلمين بكلية التربية النوعية

### **المخلص:**

أجريت الدراسة الحالية لمعرفة أثر استراتيجية التعلم المبني على الدماغ فى تنمية مهارات الفهم القرائى لدى المعلمين المحتملين بكلية التربية النوعية، واعتمدت الدراسة على تصميم المجموعتين، حيث شارك فيهما ٦٠ طالباً من الفرقة الرابعة قسم تكنولوجيا التعليم بكلية التربية النوعية جامعة الزقازيق خلال العام الدراسي ٢٠٢٣/٢٠٢٤، تم تعليمهم من خلال تطبيق استراتيجية التعلم المبني على الدماغ، للحصول على البيانات تم استخدام أداة واحدة: اختبار مهارات الفهم القرائى القبلي والبعدي، وأظهرت النتائج أن استراتيجية التعلم المبني على الدماغ

حسنت قراءة الطلاب مهارات الفهم، وبالتالي يوصى باستخدام التعلم المبني على الدماغ كإستراتيجية جديدة في تطوير القراءة لدى طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية مهارات الفهم.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** إستراتيجية التعلم المستند علي الدماغ - مهارات الفهم القرائي

## Introduction

During last decade, new brain imaging techniques have allowed scientists to observe the brain while it is learning. The field of neuroscience has produced a body of empirical data that provides a new understanding of how the brain functions when it is learning, by exploring the neuroanatomical of cognitive functions (Craig, 2007). The brain was referred to in terms of a "triune brain," or a brain in three parts: the lower, middle, and upper sections. The lower brain is responsible for survival learning, while the middle and upper brain are responsible for higher-level thinking. Presently, brain theory focuses more on a holistic view of the brain. The theory emphasizes a more systems based approach wherein the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (Bonomo Ed, 2017).

To understand brain based, a study of brain cells is needed. The brain consists of many cells; one type, which is basic to learning, is the neuron. Learning tasks place when two neurons communicate. When the neuron gathers information, it grows appendages called dendrites Stevens & Goldberg (2001, cited in Clemons 2005) Following are some of the findings from brain research:

- Brains are specialized and are not equally good at everything.
- Brains are designed for fluctuations rather than constant attention.
- Emotions are critical to successful learning.
- Brains are poorly designed for rote learning.
- Multi\_sensory input is desired by our brains.
- Learning involves the whole body.
- Each brain is unique.
- Threat, high anxiety, and a sense of helplessness impairs learning.
- Brain process both parts and wholes simultaneously.
- Brains are considered "plastic" and continue to develop throughout our lives.

According to (William, 1999) The principals of brain\_based learning are:

1. The brain is a parallel processor. It can perform many functions simultaneously (Omstein& Thompson, 1984).
2. Learning engages the entire physiology. Anything that effects our physiological functioning affects our capacity to learn. Both externally and internally generated stimuli promote brain activity, resulting in increased neuronal connections or synapses.

3. The more extensive the web of these connections, the greater the brain's capacity in the future to take in information and skills, as well as integrate them and apply them appropriately to life's daily challenges (Diamond, 1996).
4. The search for meaning is innate. The brain needs and automatically registers the familiar while simultaneously searching for and responding to novel stimuli (O'Keefe & Nadel, 1978).
5. The search for meaning occurs through "patterning". The brain functions as a pattern maker, pattern follower, and pattern sensor. From early childhood, the brain establishes patterns based on both verbal and nonverbal messages that come to us from parents and other authority figures.
6. Emotions are critical to patterning. The learner's feelings and attitudes will be involved in learning and will determine future learning.
7. Every brain simultaneously perceives and creates parts and wholes. In a healthy person, the two hemispheres are inextricably interactive, irrespective of whether a person is dealing with words, mathematics, music or art (Hart, 1984).
8. Learning involves both focused attention and peripheral perception. The brain recognizes stimuli from both its focused and its peripheral fields (Buzan, 1989).
9. Learning always involves conscious and unconscious processes. We remember our experiences, not just what we are told.
10. Each brain is unique. Because learning actually changes the structure of the brain, the more we learn, the more unique we become. The ultimate capacity of the brain for learning cannot be measured and will never be known, as that capacity increases with use (Caine & Caine, 1990).

Brain-based or brain compatible instruction requires instructors to understand how the brain works and thus, design instruction with that information in mind (Stevens & Goldberg, 2001). Teachers have been encouraged to combine knowledge about their profession with findings from brain research to create learner centered environments whether online or in physical classrooms. Applying brain research to instructional design can result in the practice of brain-compatible instruction instead of brain antagonistic instruction (Stevens & Goldberg, 2001).

Reading comprehension is a complex process that requires the coordination of bottom-up word level skills and top-down meaning processing skills. Much research over the past several decades has focused on the decoding component of this equation, demonstrating strong correlations between low-level decoding skills and reading comprehension (e.g., Shankweiler, 1989). More recent research has

examined the unique contribution of higher-level skills to reading comprehension (e.g., Landi & Perfetti, 2007; Nation & Snowling, 1998; Yuill & Oakhill, 1991). The bulk of the research exploring both lower-level and higher-level contributions has been done with school age children, leaving the population of adults relatively ignored.

Literal comprehension, or reading on the lines, engages a student in the process of extracting information explicitly stated in a passage (Carnine et al.2010). This level of understanding depends upon learners' word level processing capacity, or their ability to exactly identify individual words and apprehend the meaning created by the combination of words into longer strings including propositions and sentences (Perfetti et al.2010). In line with this, Goff (2010) proposed that the components of literal comprehension include context, facts and sequence.

Inference making, the ability to infer information that is not explicitly stated in the text, is a crucial component of reading comprehension as reflected in several models of reading such as the Direct and Inferential Mediation (DIME) model (Cromley & Azevedo, 2007; Cromley et al., 2010), Structure Building Framework (Gernsbacher, 1991), Reading Systems framework (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014), and the Landscape Model (van den Broek et al., 1999).

### **Statement of the problem**

The study problem could be stated as thus: The prospective teachers at the technological education department at faculty of Specific Education show poor mastery of the Reading Comprehension skills. Therefore, the current study attempted to develop those using a strategy based on Brain-Based Learning. This problem could be translated into the following general question:

What is the effect of a brain\_ based strategy on developing literal and Inferential reading comprehension skills of the prospective teachers at Faculty of Specific Education, Zagazig University?

This main question could be divided into the following sub questions:

1. What are the reading comprehension skills literal and inferential reading comprehension skills needed for prospective teachers at the faculty of Specific Education Zagazig University?
2. What is the effect of utilizing a brain-based strategy on developing literal reading comprehension skills for prospective teachers?
3. What is the effect of utilizing a brain-based strategy on developing inferential reading comprehension skills for prospective teachers?
4. What are the features of a brain-based learning strategy to develop reading comprehension skills for the prospective teachers?

### Significance of the Study

This study was supposed to be beneficial for both:

1. EFL learners: as it could help them to improve their reading comprehension skills.
2. EFL teachers: as it provides them with a brain-based strategy to develop their reading comprehension skills.
3. Researcher: This study may clear the way for other researchers to conduct further studies on developing other English Skills (Listening, Writing, and Speaking) through using a brain-based learning strategy.

### 5. Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to:

1. A group of EFL prospective teachers (instructional technology) at the faculty of Specific Education, Zagazig University.
2. Reading comprehension skills (literal and inferential levels).
3. The brain-based learning strategy to develop EFL reading comprehension skills for prospective teachers.

**Table 1. The List of EFL Reading Comprehension Skills Judged valid by the Jury.**

| NO | Sub Skills   | Degree of Importance |            |                 |
|----|--|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
|    | The prospective teachers at the Instructional Technology Department are supposed to: | Very Importance      | Importance | Less Importance |
| 1  | identify the main idea in a text.  |                      |            |                 |
| 2  | recognize the sequence of events.  |                      |            |                 |
| 3  | determine major reading details.   |                      |            |                 |
| 4  | guess the meaning of unfamiliar words.   |                      |            |                 |
| 5  | recognize referents of words and pronouns.   |                      |            |                 |
| 6  | identify cause and effect relationships.   |                      |            |                 |
| 7  | make comparisons between different ideas.  |                      |            |                 |
| 8  | distinguish between the main idea and the supporting ideas.                          |                      |            |                 |
| 9  | identify the author's purpose.   |                      |            |                 |
| 10 | underline main points.   |                      |            |                 |



|    |                         |  |  |  |
|----|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| 11 | identify-author's tone. |  |  |  |
|----|-------------------------|--|--|--|

### Hypotheses of the Study

The study hypotheses was as follow:

The current hypotheses of the study principally aim to explore the effect of comparing the mean scores of the students of the experimental group from the department of the instructional technology.

The study could be presented as follow:

1. There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post-test of overall reading comprehension skills, favoring the experimental group.
2. There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group on the pre\_post test of reading comprehension skills, favoring the post-test.
3. The brain-based learning strategy is effective in developing some reading comprehension skills (literal and inferential levels).

### Method

#### Design of the Study

The study adopted the quasi-experimental design using two groups. The groups were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group prospective teachers were taught using brain-based learning strategy, while the control group prospective teachers received no other treatment except for the regular way of learning. Both groups were exposed to the pre- post reading test.

#### Participants and Settings of the Study

The participants of this study were intact classes selected from level four students, Faculty of Specific Education, Zagazig University. This was in the first term of the 2023-2024 academic year. The participants were divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group, 30 students (prospective teacher) each.

**Instruments of the study:** The study employed the following instrument

1. A pre/post reading comprehension test (Appendix C) **Description of the Instruments**

- **Test purpose**

The test was designed to evaluate the prospective teachers at Faculty of Specific Education reading comprehension skills.

- **Sections of the Test**

The test consisted mainly of four sections, all of them measure prospective teachers' reading comprehension skills. The test is divided into eleven subskills; identifying the main idea in a text, recognizing the sequence of events, determining major reading details, guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words, recognizing referents of words and

pronouns, identifying cause and effect relationships, making comparisons between different ideas, distinguishing between the main idea and the supporting ideas, identifying the author's purpose, underlining main points, and identifying author's tone.

### Procedures

The experimental participants of the study as mentioned earlier were 30 students from the Faculty of Specific Education, Zagazig University. The reason for choosing Level four students was that those students need an adequate level of reading comprehension. Thus, it was believed that developing their reading comprehension thinking skills would benefit them in studying their core courses as well as in their future career.

### Results of the Study

It was hypothesized that: "There would be a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and that of the control group with the two-levels of Reading Comprehension Skills for both groups in their performance on the Reading Comprehension post test as a whole and its dimensions in favor of the experimental group". A t-test for independent samples was used as shown in Table 2. Table 2. Differences between experimental and control groups in the reading comprehension skills post-test

| skills                                    | Group        | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | t     | df | Sig.           |
|---|--------------|----|-------|----------------|-------|----|----------------|
| Identify the main idea in a text          | Experimental | 30 | 1.933 | 1.461          | 0.88  | 58 | 0.930 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.967 | 1.473          |       |    |                |
| Recognize the sequence of events          | Experimental | 30 | 1.633 | 1.425          | 0.182 | 58 | 0.857 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.700 | 4.419          |       |    |                |
| Determine major reading details           | Experimental | 30 | 1.600 | 1.354          | 0.387 | 58 | 0.700 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.733 | 1.311          |       |    |                |
| Guess the meaning of unfamiliar words     | Experimental | 30 | 1.967 | 1.425          | 0.186 | 58 | 0.853 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 2.033 | 1.351          |       |    |                |
| Recognize referents of words and pronouns | Experimental | 30 | 1.867 | 1.358          | 0.195 | 58 | 0.846 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.933 | 1.284          |       |    |                |
| Identify cause and effect relationships   | Experimental | 30 | 1.533 | 1.358          | 0.291 | 58 | 0.772 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.633 | 1.299          |       |    |                |
| Make comparisons                          | Experimental | 30 | 1.867 | 1.431          | 0.091 | 58 | 0.928 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.900 | 1.398          |       |    |                |



|   |              |    |        |       |       |    |                |
|---|--------------|----|--------|-------|-------|----|----------------|
| between different ideas   |              |    |        |       |       |    |                |
| <b>Distinguish between the main idea and the supporting ideas</b> | Experimental | 30 | 1.500  | 1.456 | 0.89  | 58 | 0.929 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.533  | 1.431 |       |    |                |
| <b>Identify the author's purpose</b>                              | Experimental | 30 | 1.433  | 1.381 | 0.094 | 58 | 0.925 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.467  | 1.357 |       |    |                |
| <b>Underline main points</b>                                      | Experimental | 30 | 1.633  | 1.586 | 0.249 | 58 | 0.805 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.733  | 1.529 |       |    |                |
| <b>Identify-author's tone</b>                                     | Experimental | 30 | 1.667  | 1.347 | 0.196 | 58 | 0.845 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 1.733  | 1.285 |       |    |                |
| <b>Total</b>  | Experimental | 30 | 18.633 | 5.041 | 0.598 | 58 | 0.552 not sig. |
|   | Control      | 30 | 19.367 | 4.437 |       |    |                |

Table (2) indicates that *t*-values are not statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This means that there are not statistically differences between the mean scores of both experimental and control groups in the pre- reading comprehension test and its sub skills before conducting the experiment. Therefore, any differences on post administration of the reading test will be attributed to the experimental treatment.

**Table (3): T-test results of the experimental and control groups on the post reading test**

| Skills   |              | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | T       | df | Sig. |
|--|--------------|----|-------|----------------|---------|----|------|
| <b>identify the main idea in a text</b>          | control      | 30 | 2.033 | 0.889          | -11.481 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 4.367 | 0.669          |         |    |      |
| <b>recognize the sequence of events</b>          | control      | 30 | 2.043 | 1.033          | -9.740  | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 4.367 | 0.808          |         |    |      |
| <b>determine major reading details</b>           | control      | 30 | 1.633 | 0.718          | -11.271 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 4.100 | 0.959          |         |    |      |
| <b>guess the meaning of unfamiliar words</b>     | control      | 30 | 1.433 | 0.897          | -12.940 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 4.233 | 0.774          |         |    |      |
| <b>recognize referents of words and pronouns</b> | control      | 30 | 1.500 | 0.820          | -9.798  | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 3.900 | 1.061          |         |    |      |
| <b>identify cause and effect</b>                 | control      | 30 | 1.467 | 0.819          | -8.999  | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimental | 30 | 3.767 | 1.135          |         |    |      |

| relationships  | 1                |    |        |       |         |    |      |
|--|------------------|----|--------|-------|---------|----|------|
| make comparisons between different ideas                   | control          | 30 | 1.533  | 0.776 | -13.437 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 4.200  | 0.761 |         |    |      |
| distinguish between the main idea and the supporting ideas | control          | 30 | 1.532  | 0.819 | -14.403 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 4.267  | 0.639 |         |    |      |
| identify the author's purpose                              | control          | 30 | 1.667  | 0.711 | -14.432 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 4.300  | 0.702 |         |    |      |
| underline main points                                      | control          | 30 | 1.933  | 1.142 | -9.128  | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 4.233  | 0.774 |         |    |      |
| identify-author's tone                                     | control          | 30 | 1.533  | 0.776 | -12.661 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 4.167  | 0.834 |         |    |      |
| Total  | control          | 30 | 18.233 | 3.136 | -37.117 | 58 | 0.01 |
|  | experimenta<br>1 | 30 | 45.767 | 2.582 |         |    |      |

It's clear from table (3) that there is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group at (0.01) level in favor of experimental group. This means that brain-based strategy was effective in enhancing students' reading skills. Thus, the first hypothesis can be confirmed. The researcher attributes these differences to the proposed strategy.

**Table (4) t-test results of the experimental group in reading skills on the pre/post reading test**

| Skills                                    | Group | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | T       | df | Sig. |
|---|-------|----|-------|----------------|---------|----|------|
| identify the main idea in a text          | pre   | 30 | 1.933 | 1.461          | - 9.016 | 29 | 0.01 |
|   | post  | 30 | 4.367 | 0.669          |         |    |      |
| recognize the sequence of events          | pre   | 30 | 1.633 | 1.425          | - 9.645 | 29 | 0.01 |
|   | post  | 30 | 4.367 | 0.808          |         |    |      |
| determine major reading details           | pre   | 30 | 1.600 | 1.354          | - 9.724 | 29 | 0.01 |
|   | post  | 30 | 4.100 | 0.959          |         |    |      |
| guess the meaning of unfamiliar words     | pre   | 30 | 1.967 | 1.425          | - 8.641 | 29 | 0.01 |
|   | post  | 30 | 4.233 | 0.774          |         |    |      |
| recognize referents of words and pronouns | pre   | 30 | 1.867 | 1.358          | - 7.441 | 29 | 0.01 |
|   | post  | 30 | 3.900 | 1.061          |         |    |      |
| identify cause and                        | pre   | 30 | 1.533 | 1.358          | - 6.817 | 29 | 0.01 |

|  |      |    |        |       |          |    |      |
|--|------|----|--------|-------|----------|----|------|
| effect relationships                                       | post | 30 | 3.767  | 1.135 |          |    |      |
| make comparisons between different ideas                   | pre  | 30 | 1.867  | 1.431 | - 8.836  | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 4.200  | 0.761 |          |    |      |
| distinguish between the main idea and the supporting ideas | pre  | 30 | 1.500  | 1.456 | - 9.942  | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 4.267  | 0.639 |          |    |      |
| identify the author's purpose                              | pre  | 30 | 1.433  | 1.381 | -11.564  | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 4.300  | 0.702 |          |    |      |
| underline main points                                      | pre  | 30 | 1.633  | 1.586 | - 9.089  | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 4.233  | 0.774 |          |    |      |
| identify-author's tone                                     | pre  | 30 | 1.667  | 1.347 | - 9.724  | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 4.167  | 0.834 |          |    |      |
| Total  | pre  | 30 | 18.633 | 5.041 | - 26.279 | 29 | 0.01 |
|  | post | 30 | 45.767 | 2.582 |          |    |      |

Table (4) indicates that there is a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level between the mean scores of the experimental group the pre and the post administration of the reading test regarding each sub-skill of reading comprehension skills. Therefore, the second hypothesis can be confirmed. The following figure shows the difference between the experimental group pre-post-performance in the reading test .

Table (5) Effect size of the brain based strategy in developing reading skills

| Skills   | $\eta^2$     | Effect size   |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| identify the main idea in a text                           | <b>0.737</b> | <b>High</b>   |
| recognize the sequence of events                           | <b>0.762</b> | <b>High</b>   |
| determine major reading details                            | <b>0.765</b> | <b>High</b>   |
| guess the meaning of unfamiliar words                      | 0.720        | <b>High</b>   |
| recognize referents of words and pronouns                  | 0.656        | <b>High</b>   |
| identify cause and effect relationships                    | 0.615        | <b>Middle</b> |
| make comparisons between different ideas                   | 0.729        | <b>High</b>   |
| distinguish between the main idea and the supporting ideas | 0.773        | <b>High</b>   |
| identify the author's purpose                              | 0.822        | <b>High</b>   |
| underline main points                                      | 0.740        | <b>High</b>   |
| identify-author's tone                                     | 0.765        | <b>High</b>   |
| Total  | 0.959        | <b>High</b>   |

Table (5) shows the effect size of the proposed strategy on the overall score for testing reading comprehension skills, where the values of ( $\eta^2$ ) in each skill and the total score of the test ranged between (0.615, and 0.822).

## Discussion

the proposed program has had appositve effect on developing reading comprehension skills of the experimental participants. This was an indication to the effect of the proposed strategy on developing the experimental participants' targeted skills. In addition, the experimental participants' overall development was satisfactory as no one failed. For this reason, the study joins and adds to the other studies that have investigated similar approaches for developing various aspects of reading comprehension skills. The obtained results of this study revealed that they are in line with those of many related studies and supported by a certain theoretical background that places more emphasis on the necessity of acquiring reading skills in a motivating environment.

## References

- Bonomo Ed, V. (2017). *Brain-Based Learning Theory*. Journal of Education and Human Development.
- Buzan, (1989). *Biochemical Education*. BBC Books, London. 1989 (New Revised Edition). £6.99 (paperback) ISBN 0-563-20811-2
- Craig, D. I. (2007). *Applying Brain\_based Learning Principles to Athletic Training Education* Athletic Training Education Journal.
- Caine, R. N., &Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*.
- Clemons, S. A. (2005). *Brain-based learning: Possible implications for online instruction*. International Journal of Instructional Technology and distance learning, 2(9), 25-34.
- Kilpatrick, (2019). *Reading Development and Difficulties*. Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice. Springer
- O'Keefe, J. and L. Nadel (1978). *The Hippocampus as a Cognitive Map*. Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Ornstein, R., and R Thompson (1984). *The Amazing Brain Boston Houghton Mifflin Company*
- Thompson, J. B. (1984). *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stevens & Goldberg, (2001). For the Learners' Sake: *Brain-Based Instruction for the 21st Century*. Paperback
- <https://www.amazon.co.uk/Learners-Sake-Brain-Based-Instruction-Century/dp/1569761213>
- Williams, M. H. (1999). *The Effects of a Brain-based Learning Strategy, Mind Mapping, on Achievement of Adults in a training environment with consideration to learning styles and brain Hemisphericity*. University of North Texas in Partial.