Balancing mental load: Insights from cognitive–energetical theory in task performance.

Grace Lannister*

Child & Adolescent Neuropsychiatry Unit, Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital, Italy

Introduction

In a fast-paced world filled with constant stimuli and multitasking demands, understanding the mechanisms behind mental effort and task performance is more crucial than ever. From students juggling assignments to professionals managing multiple projects, cognitive load affects our ability to function effectively. The **Cognitive–Energetical Theory (CET)** offers a conceptual model that explains how mental effort is managed and what factors influence performance under various conditions. By focusing on how energy resources are regulated in the brain, CET helps explain why individuals perform well in some situations and poorly in others—even when their skills remain the same [1].

Kahneman initially introduced the idea in his 1973 book *Attention and Effort*, and later scholars, notably Robert Hockey, integrated motivation and emotional control into the theory. CET essentially treats mental performance as a balancing act between cognitive demand and available energetic resources [2].

Mental load refers to the amount of cognitive effort being used at a given time. CET suggests that performance degrades when task demands exceed available resources. For instance, trying to study for an exam while responding to work emails divides attention and depletes energy reserves [3].

According to CET, **arousal** (a general state of alertness or wakefulness) and **effort** (the mental resources voluntarily applied to a task) interact to affect performance. Too low arousal results in underperformance (boredom, lack of focus), while too high arousal (anxiety, pressure) may also impair function by overwhelming cognitive resources. Hence, maintaining an optimal level of arousal is critical [4].

CET asserts that effort is a modifiable, limited resource. When multiple tasks are being performed, individuals can consciously or unconsciously shift effort toward more critical or engaging tasks. This flexibility helps explain why multitasking is often inefficient—each task competes for the same cognitive pool [5].

The theory highlights that performance is not just about raw cognitive power but also motivation. A boring task might receive less effort unless it is tied to a meaningful reward. Therefore, increasing motivation—through goals, feedback, or incentives—can help individuals better allocate their resources and manage cognitive load more effectively [6].

When mental resources are depleted through sustained effort, performance declines—a phenomenon known as **cognitive fatigue**. CET helps differentiate between passive fatigue (decline due to prolonged effort) and active disengagement (when an individual chooses to withdraw effort). Recognizing these mechanisms can help individuals take proactive steps like breaks or task rotation [7].

Environmental distractions or emotional stressors influence arousal levels, which in turn affect the ability to manage mental load. CET provides a theoretical explanation for why emotional regulation and a structured workspace are critical in high-performance settings [8].

In academic contexts, understanding CET can improve learning outcomes by structuring study sessions that balance effort and arousal. For example, the Pomodoro technique—studying in short bursts with breaks—aligns well with CET by preventing fatigue and maintaining optimal arousal. In professional environments, CET can guide better task management and scheduling. Assigning high-effort tasks during peak alertness periods (e.g., morning) and lower-effort tasks later in the day can improve overall productivity [9].

CET is also applied in fields like aviation, emergency medicine, and user interface design, where mental load must be carefully balanced. For instance, cockpit designs that reduce unnecessary complexity help pilots conserve cognitive resources for decision-making under stress [10].

Conclusion

The Cognitive–Energetical Theory provides a powerful lens for understanding how humans allocate mental resources during tasks. By recognizing the roles of arousal, effort, and motivation, we gain insight into how to balance mental load more effectively. Whether in academic, professional, or high-stakes environments, CET offers actionable principles to enhance performance and reduce the mental strain that undermines productivity. In a world that often demands more than our brains can comfortably handle, applying CET can be a step toward sustainable mental well-being and better outcomes.

References

1. Jimenez-sanchez M, licitra F, underwood BR, et al. Huntington's disease: Mechanisms of pathogenesis and

***Correspondence to:** Grace Lannister, Child & Adolescent Neuropsychiatry Unit, Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital,Italy. E-mail: grace.lan08@gmail.com

***Received:** 03-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166668; **Editor assigned:** 04-Mar-2025, PreQC No. AAJPC-25-166668 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Mar-2025, QC No. AAJPC-25-166668; **Revised:** 23-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166668 (R); **Published:** 30-Mar-2025, DOI: 10.35841/aajpc-10.2.287*

***Citation:** Lannister G. Balancing mental load: Insights from cognitive–energetical theory in task performance. J Psychol Cognition .2025;10(2):287*

therapeutic strategies. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med. 2017;7(7):a024240.

2. Stoker TB, mason SL, greenland JC, et al. Huntington's disease: Diagnosis and management. Pract Neurol. 2022;22(1):32-41.
3. Snowden JS. The neuropsychology of Huntington's disease. Arch Clin Neuropsychol. 2017;32(7):876-87.
4. Tabrizi SJ, Ghosh R, Leavitt BR. Huntingtin lowering strategies for disease modification in Huntington's disease. Neuron. 2019;101(5):801-19.
5. Pan L, Feigin A. Huntington's disease: New frontiers in therapeutics. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep. 2021;21:1-9.
6. Tolosa E, Garrido A, Scholz SW, et al. Challenges in the diagnosis of Parkinson's disease. Lancet Neurol. 2021;20(5):385-97.
7. Lotankar S, Prabhavalkar KS, Bhatt LK. Biomarkers for Parkinson's disease: Recent advancement. Neurosci. Bull. 2017;33:585-97.
8. Cabreira V, Massano J. Parkinson's disease: Clinical review and update. Acta Med Port. 2019 ;32(10):661-70.
9. Cerri S, Mus L, Blandini F. Parkinson's disease in women and men: What's the difference?. J Parkinsons Dis. 2019;9(3):501-15.
10. Opara JA, Małecki A, Małecka E, et al. Motor assessment in Parkinsons disease. Ann Agric Environ Med. 2017;24(3).