

# Ceffort, arousal, and efficiency: Revisiting cognitive–energetical models in modern psychology.

Emily Roseland\*

Centre for Health Research & School of Psychology and Wellbeing University of Southern ,Australia

## Introduction

In psychology, understanding how individuals allocate mental resources when faced with cognitive demands has remained a crucial area of inquiry. The cognitive–energetical model, developed by researchers like Daniel Kahneman and further expanded by others such as Sanders and Hockey, provides a framework to explain how effort and arousal impact cognitive performance. This model is particularly relevant in modern contexts where multitasking, digital distractions, and cognitive overload are routine challenges [1].

Contemporary research builds upon these theories by exploring how individual differences (e.g., personality, motivation, mental fatigue) affect effort investment. The concept of “motivational intensity” developed by Brehm and Self (1989) aligns with cognitive–energetical theories, suggesting that individuals exert only as much effort as necessary to achieve a goal unless constraints or rewards modify that decision [2].

Furthermore, the use of psychophysiological measures like pupil dilation, heart rate variability, and EEG has provided empirical support for these theoretical constructs, confirming that arousal and effort levels are measurable and impactful [3].

Efficiency, as defined in these models, involves achieving high performance with minimal mental resource expenditure. This concept is especially relevant in an era of cognitive automation and information overload. Today, researchers explore cognitive efficiency in digital learning environments, adaptive interfaces, and AI-assisted work systems [4].

Cognitive–energetical models suggest that as tasks become automated or practiced, less effort is required, increasing efficiency. This principle is evident in cognitive training, where individuals improve working memory or attention through repeated, adaptive exercises [5].

Understanding effort and arousal helps design better learning strategies. For instance, spaced repetition, active recall, and gamified learning can balance effort with engagement, promoting higher cognitive efficiency [6].

With the rise of remote work and digital fatigue, managing mental effort and arousal is critical. Employers use cognitive workload assessments to avoid burnout and optimize productivity [7].

Interfaces designed with user cognitive load in mind (e.g., minimalism, task chunking) enhance efficiency and reduce mental effort, aligning with cognitive–energetical principles. In conditions like ADHD, depression, and anxiety, the mismanagement of cognitive resources is common. Cognitive–energetical frameworks help inform interventions like cognitive-behavioral therapy and neurofeedback [8].

The integration of wearable technology and real-time biofeedback tools opens new possibilities for applying cognitive–energetical theories. For example, adaptive learning systems that respond to real-time arousal signals could personalize content delivery to match student effort and engagement levels [9].

Artificial intelligence and machine learning can also model and predict cognitive load, offering insights into human-computer collaboration. In the near future, dynamic systems that optimize arousal and effort allocation could become standard in educational software, work platforms, and healthcare [10].

## Conclusion

Revisiting cognitive–energetical models in modern psychology is more relevant than ever. As humans navigate increasingly complex mental environments, understanding the dynamics between effort, arousal, and efficiency becomes critical. These models not only provide theoretical insights but also practical applications in enhancing performance, well-being, and adaptability in a cognitively demanding world.

## References

1. Cooper PS, Baillet S. Over the rainbow: Guidelines for meaningful use of colour maps in neurophysiology. *NeuroImage*. 2021;245:118628.
2. Ichimiya Y, Mizuguchi S, Motomura Y, et al. Acute-phase electroencephalography for an infantile atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumor. *Clinical Neurol Neurosurgery*. 2021;209:106922.
3. Saunders B, Inzlicht M. Pooling resources to enhance rigour in psychophysiological research: Insights from open science approaches to meta-analysis. *International J Psychophysiol*. 2021;162:112-20.
4. Mendizabal A, Fan JH. Feasibility and effectiveness appraisal of a neurology residency health equities curriculum. *J Neurological Sci*. 2021;431:120040.

\*Correspondence to: Emily Roseland, Centre for Health Research & School of Psychology and Wellbeing University of Southern ,Australia. E-mail: emily.roseland@gmail.com

Received: 03-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166674; Editor assigned: 04-Mar-2025, PreQC No. AAJPC-25-166674 (PQ); Reviewed: 18-Mar-2025, QC No. AAJPC-25-166674; Revised: 24-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. AAJPC-25-166674 (R); Published: 31-Mar-2025, DOI: 10.35841/aaipc-10.2.289

5. Cooper PS, Baillet S. Over the rainbow: Guidelines for meaningful use of colour maps in neurophysiology. *NeuroImage*. 2021;245:118628.
6. Ichimiya Y, Mizuguchi S, Motomura Y, et al. Acute-phase electroencephalography for an infantile atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumor. *Clinical Neurol Neurosurgery*. 2021;209:106922.
7. Saunders B, Inzlicht M. Pooling resources to enhance rigour in psychophysiological research: Insights from open science approaches to meta-analysis. *International J Psychophysiol*. 2021;162:112-20.
8. Lee JLC. An update on memory reconsolidation updating. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2017; 21(7):531-45.
9. McCormick C. Different neural routes to autobiographical memory recall in healthy people and individuals with left medial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychol*. 2018;110:26-36
10. Barrett HC, Kurzban R. Modularity in cognition: Framing the debate. *Psychological Review*. 2006;113(3):628.