[Introduction]

[Summary]  
In response to Sweden’s education system changes to prioritize traditional teaching methods, Jarden Cooney Horvath, in his article, “The Neuroscience of Learning: Why Traditional Methods Work Best”, published in 2024, argues that traditional teaching methods are more effective than digital teaching methods. Horvath connects Sweden’s neuroscientific research with five main reasons to argue his stance. These reasons include the necessity for empathy to be present for effective learning, the importance of a solid knowledge base to have a creative presence in any task, the consequence of multitasking and the importance of undivided attention, the significance of spatial memory cues triggered by physical books rather than digital mediums of text, and the effectiveness of flashcards to facilitate strong memorization. The article ends with an explanation that digital tools have a place in education, but that the brain has specific processes that only traditional learning methods can effectively work with.

* necessity for empathy to be present for effective learning
* the importance of a solid knowledge base to have a creative presence in any task
* the consequence of multitasking and the importance of undivided attention
* the significance of spatial memory cues triggered by physical books rather than digital mediums of text
* the effectiveness of flashcards to facilitate strong memorization

[Response]

**Reasoning**  
Horvath presents a strong case for why traditional teaching methods are more effective than digital teaching methods by supporting their arguments with neuroscientific evidence.

Horvath starts off talking about the necessity for empathy to be present for effective learning. He lays out a clear discrepancy on the effectiveness of learning between human-to-human interactions and artificial intelligence-to-human interactions that Horvath sufficiently highlights. The main support, being that “it is now clear that oxytocin release can be triggered via purely psychological means” (Horvath, 2024), provides a segway into the specifics. The hormone oxytocin involved in the neural coupling phenomenon creates an impossible retort for the opposing argument as a digital tool will never have the biological requirements to produce the oxytocin. The point ends with the consequences of the lack of empathy in online learning programs causing “85 percent of tuition-free students and over 50 percent of fee-paying students” (Horvath, 2024) to never finish. The impossibility for digital tools to replicate empathy creates an irrefutable point toward the superiority of traditional teaching methods.   
  
Horvath continues with the importance of a solid knowledge base to have a creative presence in any task. He successfully challenges digital tools, such as AI, by explaining the necessity for memorization and learning. While AI can provide information quickly, Horvath explains that “Information is largely unusable until it is deeply encoded and organized within a person’s prior knowledge structures”. (Horvath, 2024) He finishes the point with traditional learning methods being able to encode memories and solidify understanding to creatively solve issues.

The consequence of multitasking and the importance of undivided attention in learning is argued next. Horvath

The arguments Horvath presented were strong but could have been stronger had there been more mention of the opposition. As Horvath argues, he writes about

[Conclusion]
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