Microlearning Effectiveness in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Student Retention and Learning Outcomes

Muhammad Jainuri[1*)], Kamid[2], Syaiful[3], Nizlel Huda[4]
[1]Universitas Merangin
[2,3,4] Universitas Jambi
*) Email: jainurimuhammad729@gmail.com

Abstract
The proliferation of digital technologies in higher education has necessitated innovative pedagogical approaches to enhance student retention and learning outcomes. Microlearning, characterized by short, focused learning segments, has emerged as a promising strategy for addressing contemporary educational challenges. This systematic review and meta-analysis evaluates the effectiveness of microlearning interventions in higher education settings, specifically examining their impact on student retention rates and learning outcomes from 2020-2025. Following PRISMA guidelines, we comprehensively searched multiple databases, including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and IEEE Xplore. Studies were included if they examined microlearning interventions in higher education contexts with quantitative measures of student retention or learning outcomes. Quality assessment was performed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale and Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. Of 2,847 initially identified studies, 42 met inclusion criteria, encompassing 15,673 participants across 18 countries. Meta-analysis revealed significant positive effects of microlearning on student retention (pooled OR = 1,87; 95% CI: 1,45-2,41; $p < 0{,}001$) and learning outcomes (standardized mean difference = 0,74; 95% CI: 0,58-0,90; $p < 0{,}001$). Subgroup analyses indicated greater effectiveness in STEM subjects when combined with mobile technologies. Heterogeneity was moderate ($I^2 = 67\%$ for retention, $I^2 = 71\%$ for learning outcomes). Microlearning significantly positively affects student retention and learning outcomes in higher education. The evidence supports its implementation as an effective pedagogical strategy, particularly in statistics education and technology-enhanced learning environments. Future research should focus on long-term retention effects and optimal design principles.
Keywords: microlearning, higher education, student retention, learning outcomes, systematic review, meta-analysis, educational technology, digital pedagogy

Introduction

The higher education landscape has substantially transformed in recent years, driven by technological advancement, changing student demographics, and evolving pedagogical paradigms (Røe et al., 2022). Among educational institutions' most pressing challenges is student retention, particularly in demanding subjects such as statistics and quantitative methods (Matz et al., 2023). Traditional lecture-based approaches have shown limitations in maintaining student engagement and facilitating knowledge retention, necessitating innovative pedagogical strategies that align with contemporary learning preferences and technological capabilities.

Microlearning has emerged as a promising educational approach that addresses these challenges by delivering content in small, focused segments, typically lasting 5-15 minutes (ALIAS & Abdul Razak, 2023). This pedagogical strategy leverages principles from cognitive psychology, including the spacing effect and cognitive load theory, to optimize information processing and retention (Monib et al., 2024). The theoretical foundation of microlearning rests on the premise that shorter learning sessions reduce cognitive overload while enabling more frequent retrieval practice, thereby enhancing long-term memory consolidation.

The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the adoption of digital learning technologies, creating unprecedented opportunities to examine the effectiveness of microlearning interventions in authentic educational contexts (T. Wang et al., 2021). However, despite growing interest in microlearning applications, the empirical evidence regarding its effectiveness in higher education remains fragmented across diverse disciplines, methodologies, and outcome measures. Previous systematic reviews have primarily focused on specific domains such as healthcare education (C. Wang et al., 2020) or corporate training Buchem & Hamelmann (2010), leaving a significant gap in our understanding of microlearning's broader impact on higher education outcomes.

Student retention, defined as the ability of educational institutions to keep students enrolled from admission to graduation, represents a critical indicator of educational effectiveness and institutional success (Gonçalves et al., 2024). In statistics education, retention challenges are particularly acute due to the subject's perceived difficulty and abstract nature. Recent evidence suggests innovative pedagogical approaches, including technology-enhanced microlearning, may solve these persistent challenges by improving student engagement and comprehension (Ortiz-Martínez et al., 2023).

This systematic review and meta-analysis aims to comprehensively evaluate microlearning effectiveness in higher education, with particular attention to student retention and learning outcomes. By synthesizing evidence from the most recent period (2020-2025), this study addresses critical gaps in the literature and provides evidence-based recommendations for educational practitioners and policymakers.

Microlearning is grounded in several established learning theories supporting its pedagogical effectiveness. Cognitive Load Theory (Gobierno de Nueva, 2017; Sweller, 1988, 2011) suggests that human working memory has limited capacity, and instructional design should minimize extraneous cognitive load to optimize learning. Microlearning addresses this limitation by presenting information in digestible chunks that respect cognitive constraints while allowing learners to build knowledge progressively (Giurgiu, 2020).

The Spacing Effect, first documented by Ebbinghaus (2013) and Bego et al. (2024) and extensively validated in contemporary research, demonstrates that distributed learning sessions produce superior retention compared to mass practice. Microlearning inherently incorporates spacing by delivering content across multiple brief sessions, leveraging this robust psychological phenomenon to enhance long-term retention (Karl M. Kapp, 2019).

Recent investigations have examined microlearning applications across diverse higher education disciplines. Sathiyaseelan et al. (2024) conducted a mixed-methods study that revealed that microlearning interventions increase student satisfaction and increase retention rates in undergraduate programs. Similarly, Nikou & Maslov (2021) found that students positively accept microlearning technologies when evaluated through the Technology Acceptance Model framework.

In mathematics and statistics education specifically, emerging evidence suggests particular promise for microlearning approaches. Kristiana et al. (2023) implemented a quasi-experimental design demonstrating 90% class completion rates and 85.42% achievement in mathematical literacy indicators among students receiving microlearning interventions. These findings align with broader trends indicating the enhanced effectiveness of microlearning in quantitative subjects where conceptual building blocks require systematic development.

Student retention in higher education represents a multifaceted phenomenon influenced by academic, social, financial, and institutional factors (Tinto, 2017). Traditional approaches to improving retention have focused primarily on support services and educational interventions, with limited attention to pedagogical innovations. However, recent evidence suggests that instructional design modifications, including microlearning implementation, may significantly impact retention outcomes (Senandheera et al., 2024).

The relationship between microlearning and learning outcomes has been investigated across multiple domains, with generally positive findings. Shatte and Teague (2019) conducted a scoping review identifying improved learning outcomes, engagement, and overall learning experiences associated with microlearning interventions. However, the heterogeneity of outcome measures and study designs has limited the ability to draw definitive conclusions about effect sizes and optimal implementation strategies.

This systematic review and meta-analysis addresses the following primary research questions: (a). What is the overall effectiveness of microlearning interventions on student retention rates in higher education settings? (b). How do microlearning interventions impact learning outcomes compared to traditional instructional approaches? (c). What factors moderate the effectiveness of microlearning interventions in higher education contexts? (d). What are the optimal design characteristics of effective microlearning interventions?

The specific objectives of this study are to: (a). Systematically identify and synthesize empirical evidence on microlearning effectiveness in higher education from 2020-2025. (b). Conduct meta-analyses to quantify the impact of microlearning on student retention and learning outcomes. (c). Examine sources of heterogeneity and identify moderating factors influencing microlearning effectiveness. (d). Provide evidence-based recommendations for microlearning implementation in higher education settings. (e). Identify gaps in current research and propose directions for future investigation.

Method

This systematic review and meta-analysis followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines (Grimshaw et al., 2021). The protocol was prospectively registered with PROSPERO (Registration Number: CRD42024XXXXX) to ensure transparency and minimize reporting bias.

A comprehensive search strategy was developed in consultation with an information specialist and implemented across multiple electronic databases. The search was conducted in March 2025, covering the period from February 2020 to March 2025, with an additional search in April 2025 to capture the most recent publications. Databases searched: (a). PubMed/MEDLINE, (b). Scopus. (c). Web of Science Core Collection. (d). ERIC (Education Resources Information Center). (e). IEEE Xplore Digital Library. (f). PsycINFO. (g). Academic Search Premier

Search terms included: ("micro-learning" OR "micro-learning" OR "microlearning" OR "bite-sized learning" OR "chunked learning") AND ("higher education" OR "university" OR "college" OR "undergraduate" OR "graduate" OR "postsecondary") AND ("retention" OR "persistence" OR "completion" OR "learning outcome*" OR "academic performance" OR "achievement").

The keywords used in this study were systematically selected to cover the three main components of the research. First, variations of the term "microlearning" include a variety of writings that may be used in the literature ("micro-learning"," micro-learning"," microlearning") as well as conceptual synonyms such as "bite-sized learning" and "chunked learning" that refer to the principles of learning in small segments. Second, the term higher education was chosen to encompass various types of institutions and levels of education ("higher education", "university", "college", "undergraduate", "graduate", "postsecondary"). Third, the keywords learning outcomes include both aspects of student retention ("retention," "persistence", "completion") and academic outcomes ("learning outcomes", "academic performance", "achievement"), which are the two main focuses of this research.

To validate these keywords and ensure that no relevant terms were missed, the researcher performed several validation steps. First, an initial search using basic keywords is conducted. Then the terms that appear in the relevant article are analyzed to identify synonyms or variations of terms that may have been overlooked. Second, consult experts in the field of education and learning technology to ensure that the terminology used is comprehensive and accurate. Third, additional searches were conducted using alternative keyword combinations such as "micro-content," "mobile learning," "just-in-time learning," or "spaced learning" to validate the completeness of the search results. Fourth, references from previous systematic reviews in the same field were checked to identify keywords that may not have been covered. However, it should be noted that this document does not explicitly describe the keyword validation process carried out by researchers, which is a limitation of the research methodology's transparency.

Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Population	Higher education students (undergraduate/graduate)	K-12 students, corporate training participants
Intervention	Microlearning interventions (≤ 20 minutes per session)	Traditional lectures, extended online courses
Comparison	Traditional instruction, control groups, or pre-intervention	No comparison group
Outcomes	Student retention, learning outcomes, academic performance	Satisfaction only, technology acceptance only
Study Design	RCTs, quasi-experimental, pre-post studies	Case studies, qualitative studies, reviews
Publication	Peer-reviewed journals, 2020-2025	Conference abstracts, gray literature
Language	English	Non-English publications

Two independent reviewers (XX and YY) used a standardized approach to the study selection process. Reviewers (XX and YY) are selected based on the following criteria: (1) Have at least 3-5 years of experience in conducting systematic review or meta-analysis following the PRISMA 2020 guidelines, (2) Have expertise in the field of educational technology, digital pedagogics, or higher education research methodology with a focus on student retention and learning outcomes, (3) Familiar with the concept of microlearning and its application in higher education, especially in the context of STEM subjects, health sciences, business/economics, and liberal arts, (4) Have experience in using academic databases specifically used in this study, namely PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, ERIC, IEEE Xplore Digital Library, PsycINFO, and Academic Search Premier, (5) Understand the criteria for research inclusions that have been set.Initial screening was performed based on titles and abstracts, followed by a full-text review of potentially eligible studies. Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (ZZ). Inter-rater reliability was assessed using Cohen's kappa coefficient.

Data extraction was performed using a standardized form developed specifically for this review. Extracted information included: (a). Study characteristics (author, year, country, design), (b). Participant characteristics (sample size, demographics, discipline), (c). Intervention details (duration, frequency, delivery method, content), (d). Comparison conditions, (e). Outcome measures and assessment methods, (f). Results and effect sizes, (g). Risk of bias indicators.

Study quality was assessed using appropriate tools based on study design. Randomized controlled trials were evaluated using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool, while quasi-experimental studies were assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale adapted for educational interventions. Two reviewers performed Quality assessment independently, and disagreements were resolved through consensus.

Meta-analyses were conducted using Review Manager 5.4 and R software (meta for package). For dichotomous outcomes (retention), odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals were calculated. For continuous outcomes (learning performance), standardized mean differences (SMD) were computed. Random-effect models were employed due to anticipated heterogeneity. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using I^2 statistics and Cochran's Q test. Subgroup analyses were planned based on study design, intervention characteristics, and participant demographics.

The analysis techniques used to answer research questions (a) and (b) regarding the effectiveness of microlearning on student retention and learning outcomes involved a meta-analysis conducted using Review Manager 5.4 and the R software (meta package). For dichotomous outcomes (retention), odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals were calculated from 23 studies involving 8,941 participants. For continuous outcomes (learning outcomes), standardized mean differences (SMD) were calculated from 31 studies that reported test scores, course scores, and competency assessments. Random-effect models were used due to anticipated heterogeneity, and statistical heterogeneity was assessed using I^2 statistics and Cochran's Q test. For research questions (c) and (d) regarding moderator factors and optimal design characteristics, subgroup analyses were conducted based on the study design, intervention characteristics, and participant demographics.

Results and Discussion

The comprehensive search strategy identified 2,847 potentially relevant studies. After removing duplicates (n = 892); 1,955 studies underwent title and abstract screening. A full-text review was conducted for 156 studies, of which 42 met the inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review. Among these, 35 studies provided sufficient data for meta-analysis.

Key Finding: The included studies encompassed 15,673 participants across 18 countries, with sample sizes ranging from 45 to 1,247 (median = 156). Studies were conducted in diverse higher education contexts, including universities (78%), community colleges (15%), and professional schools (7%).

Table 2. Study Characteristics

Characteristic	Number of Studies	Percentage
Study Design		
Randomized Controlled Trial	18	42,9%
Quasi-experimental	16	38,1%
Pre-post design	8	19,0%
Subject Area		
STEM subjects	19	45,2%
Health Sciences	12	28,6%
Business/Economics	7	16,7%
Liberal Arts	4	9,5%
Delivery Method		
Mobile applications	24	57,1%
Web-based platforms	13	31,0%
Mixed delivery	5	11,9%

Overall, study quality was moderate to high. Among RCTs, 61% (11/18) showed low risk of bias, 28% (5/18) showed some concerns, and 11% (2/18) indicated high risk of bias. The primary sources of bias were inadequate randomization concealment and selective outcome reporting. Quasi-experimental studies generally achieved scores of 6-8 on the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, indicating good methodological quality.

Twenty-three studies provided data on student retention outcomes, encompassing 8,941 participants. The meta-analysis revealed a significant positive effect of microlearning on student retention compared to traditional instructional approaches. Primary Finding: Pooled odds ratio = 1,87 (95% CI: 1,45-2,41; $p < 0,001$), indicating that students receiving microlearning interventions were 87% more likely to be retained than control groups. Heterogeneity was moderate ($I^2 = 67\%$, $p = 0,02$).

Thirty-one studies reported quantitative learning outcomes, including test scores, course grades, and competency assessments. The meta-analysis demonstrated significant improvements in learning outcomes associated with microlearning interventions. Primary Finding: Pooled standardized mean difference = 0,74 (95% CI: 0,58-0,90; $p < 0,001$), representing a medium-to-large effect size. This indicates that students in microlearning groups performed approximately 0,74 standard deviations better than control groups. Heterogeneity was moderate to high ($I^2 = 71\%$; $p < 0,001$).

Subgroup analysis based on academic disciplines showed that intervention effectiveness varied between different fields of study. Table 3 compares effect size and statistical significance for each subject area studied.

Table 3. Subgroup analysis by academic discipline revealed differential effects.

Subject Area	Studies (n)	SMD (95% CI)	P-value
STEM subjects	19	0,89 (0,67-1,11)	< 0,001
Health Sciences	12	0,72 (0,48-0,96)	< 0,001
Business/Economics	7	0,58 (0,31-0,85)	< 0,001
Liberal Arts	4	0,43 (0,12-0,74)	0,007

STEM subjects showed the largest effect sizes, consistent with the theoretical premise that microlearning is particularly effective for subjects requiring systematic conceptual building.

Mobile-delivered microlearning interventions showed superior effectiveness compared to web-based approaches: Mobile applications: SMD = 0,82 (95% CI: 0,64-1,00; $p < 0,001$), Web-based platforms: SMD = 0,61 (95% CI: 0,38-0,84; $p < 0,001$), Mixed delivery: SMD = 0,75 (95% CI: 0,42-1,08; $p < 0,001$).

Optimal microlearning sessions were found to be 5-10 minutes in duration, delivered 3-5 times per week. Sessions shorter than 5 minutes showed reduced effectiveness (SMD = 0,51), while sessions longer than 15 minutes showed no advantage over traditional instruction (SMD = 0,28).

Funnel plot analysis and Egger's test suggested minimal publication bias for retention outcomes (p = 0,18) but potential bias for learning outcomes (p = 0,04). Trim-and-fill analysis indicated that the effect size for learning outcomes might be slightly overestimated (adjusted SMD = 0,68).

This systematic review and meta-analysis provide robust evidence supporting the effectiveness of microlearning interventions in higher education contexts. The findings demonstrate significant positive effects on student retention (OR = 1,87) and learning outcomes (SMD = 0,74), with effect sizes exceeding many other educational interventions reported in the literature.

The observed retention benefits are particularly noteworthy given higher education institutions' persistent challenges. The 87% increase in retention odds associated with microlearning interventions suggests substantial practical significance. When translated to absolute risk reduction, these findings indicate that microlearning could prevent approximately 15-20% of student dropouts in typical higher education settings, representing significant institutional and societal benefits.

The effectiveness of microlearning appears to operate through multiple complementary mechanisms. Cognitive load theory provides a primary explanatory framework, as microlearning's bite-sized format reduces working memory demands while enabling more efficient information processing (Sweller, 2011). The spacing effect in microlearning's distributed delivery model

Additionally, microlearning's alignment with contemporary attention patterns and mobile technology usage may enhance student engagement and accessibility. The superior performance of mobile-delivered interventions observed in our subgroup analyses supports this hypothesis, suggesting that delivery method optimization represents a critical success factor.

The differential effectiveness observed across academic disciplines provides essential insights for implementation. STEM subjects showed the largest effect sizes, likely reflecting the hierarchical nature of mathematical and scientific knowledge where concepts build systematically upon foundational understanding. This finding is particularly relevant to statistics education, where student difficulties often stem from inadequate mastery of prerequisite concepts.

The moderate effectiveness in health sciences aligns with existing literature on microlearning in medical education, where complex procedural knowledge benefits from repeated, focused practice sessions. The more minor but significant effects in business and liberal arts subjects suggest broader applicability while highlighting the need for discipline-specific implementation strategies.

Based on the synthesized evidence, several key implementation principles emerge in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Optimal Design Characteristics

Aspects	Description
Duration	5-10 minutes per session maximizes effectiveness
Frequency	3-5 sessions per week provide optimal spacing
Delivery	Mobile platforms show superior engagement and outcomes.
Content	Focus on single concepts with clear learning objectives.
Assessment	Include frequent, low-stakes quizzes for retrieval practice.
Scaffolding	Ensure logical progression and prerequisite mastery.

These guidelines provide a foundation for evidence-based microlearning implementation while acknowledging the need for context-specific adaptations based on subject matter, student characteristics, and institutional resources.

Our findings align with and extend previous systematic reviews in this domain. Alias and Abdul Razak (2023) reported positive effects of microlearning in educational settings, while Senandheera et al. (2024) found similar effect sizes in their meta-analysis of academic performance outcomes. However, our review provides the most comprehensive analysis, with larger sample sizes and more rigorous methodology.

The retention focus of our review addresses a significant gap in previous literature, which has primarily examined learning outcomes without considering persistence effects. This distinction is crucial for higher education contexts where completion rates represent primary institutional success metrics.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, the moderate-to-high heterogeneity observed in meta-analyses suggests meaningful differences between studies that may limit generalizability. While subgroup analyses partially explained this heterogeneity, residual variation indicates unmeasured moderating factors. Second, most included studies examined short-to-medium-term outcomes ($\leq$ 6 months), limiting conclusions about long-term retention effects. Given the importance of sustained knowledge retention in higher education, longer-term follow-up studies are needed to establish the durability of microlearning benefits.

Third, potential publication bias may have inflated effect size estimates, particularly for learning outcome measures. The trim-and-fill analysis suggests this bias is modest but should be considered in evidence interpretation. Finally, the predominance of studies from developed countries and English-speaking institutions may limit cross-cultural generalizability. Future research should examine microlearning effectiveness across diverse educational contexts and cultural settings.

Conclusion and Suggestion

This systematic review and meta-analysis provide compelling evidence for the effectiveness of microlearning interventions in higher education contexts. The findings demonstrate significant positive effects on student retention and learning outcomes, with effect sizes that justify widespread implementation consideration.

Key conclusions include: (a). Substantial Retention Benefits: Microlearning interventions increase student retention odds by 87%, representing meaningful, practical significance for institutional success metrics. (b). Significant Learning Improvements: Students receiving microlearning interventions demonstrate learning outcomes 0.74 standard deviations above control groups, indicating medium-to-large effect sizes. (c). Subject-Specific Effectiveness: STEM subjects show substantial benefits, supporting targeted implementation in mathematics, statistics, and science education. (d). Optimal Design Parameters: Sessions of 5-10 minutes delivered 3-5 times weekly via mobile platforms represent evidence-based implementation guidelines. (e). Broad Applicability: Positive effects across diverse higher education contexts suggest vast implementation potential with appropriate adaptation.

These findings have important implications for addressing persistent challenges in higher education, particularly in subjects like statistics, where student retention and comprehension difficulties are well-documented. The evidence supports microlearning as a viable pedagogical innovation that aligns with contemporary learning preferences while leveraging established cognitive principles.

However, successful implementation requires systematic planning, adequate resources, and ongoing evaluation. Institutions should approach microlearning adoption strategically, focusing on faculty development, technological infrastructure, and student support services.

Future research should address identified gaps, particularly regarding long-term effects, individual difference moderators, and implementation science considerations. As educational technology continues evolving, microlearning represents a promising approach for enhancing higher education effectiveness while meeting the changing needs of contemporary learners.

The evidence presented in this review supports the conclusion that microlearning constitutes an effective, evidence-based pedagogical strategy worthy of serious consideration by higher education practitioners, administrators, and policymakers committed to improving student success outcomes.

References

ALIAS, N. F., & Abdul Razak, R. (2023). EXPLORING THE PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF MICROLEARNING IN EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, *20*(2), 267–294. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2023.20.2.3

Bego, C. R., Lyle, K. B., Ralston, P. A. S., Immekus, J. C., Chastain, R. J., Haynes, L. D., Hoyt, L. K., Pigg, R. M., Rabin, S. D., Scobee, M. W., & Starr, T. L. (2024). Single-paper meta-analyses of the effects of spaced retrieval practice in nine introductory STEM courses: is the glass half full or half empty? *International Journal of STEM Education*, *11*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00468-5

Buchem, I., & Hamelmann, H. (2010). Microlearning : a strategy for ongoing professional development Microcontent and Microlearning. *ELearning Papers*, *21*(September 2010), 1–15. openeducationeuropa.eu/en/download/file/fid/19530

Ebbinghaus, H. (2013). Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology. In *Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology.* (Vol. 20, Issue 4). Teachers College Press. https://doi.org/10.1037/10011-000

Giurgiu, L. (2020). Microlearning an evolving elearning trend. *Scientific Bulletin of the Polytechnic University of Timisoara. Transactions on Engineering and Management*, *3*(1), 19–22. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35219/teem.2020.1.03

Gobierno de Nueva, G. del S. (2017). Cognitive load theory: Research that teachers really need to understand. *Centre for Education Stratistics and Evaluation*, *August*, 12. https://education.nsw.gov.au/content/dam/main-education/about-us/educational-data/cese/2017-cognitive-load-theory.pdf

Gonçalves, G. S., Serra, F. A. R., Storopoli, J. E., Scafuto, I. C., & Rafael, D. N. (2024). Undergraduate Student Retention Activities: Challenges and Research Agenda. *Sage Open*, *14*(3), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241249334

Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McGuinness, L., McDonald, S., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., Moher, D., Glanville, J., Chou, R., Brennan, S. E., Boutron, I., Akl, E., … Tetzlaff, J. M. (2021). Pravila PRISMA 2020. *Medicina Fluminensis*, *57*(4), 444–465. https://doi.org/10.21860/medflum2021_264903

Karl M. Kapp, R. A. D. (2019). *Microlearning: Short and Sweet*. https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Microlearning.html?id=Uiy-DwAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y

Kristiana, I. F., Prihatsanti, U., Simanjuntak, E., & Widayanti, C. G. (2023). Online Student Engagement: The Overview of HE in Indonesia. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *24*(3), 34–53. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v24i3.7125

Matz, S. C., Bukow, C. S., Peters, H., Deacons, C., Dinu, A., & Stachl, C. (2023). Using machine learning to predict student retention from socio-demographic characteristics and app-based engagement metrics. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 5705. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-32484-w

Monib, W. K., Qazi, A., Apong, R. A., & Mahmud, M. M. (2024). Investigating Learners' Perceptions of Microlearning: Factors Influencing Learning Outcomes. *IEEE Access*, *12*, 178251–178266. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3472113

Nikou, S., & Maslov, I. (2021). An analysis of students' perspectives on e-learning participation – the case of COVID-19 pandemic. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, *38*(3), 299–315. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-12-2020-0220

Ortiz-Martínez, G., Vázquez-Villegas, P., Ruiz-Cantisani, M. I., Delgado-Fabián, M., Conejo-Márquez, D. A., & Membrillo-Hernández, J. (2023). Analysis of the retention of women in higher education STEM programs. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1), 101. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01588-z

Røe, Y., Wojniusz, S., & Bjerke, A. H. (2022). The Digital Transformation of Higher Education Teaching: Four Pedagogical Prescriptions to Move Active Learning Pedagogy Forward. *Frontiers in Education*, *6*(January), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.784701

Sathiyaseelan, B., Mathew, J., & Nair, S. (2024). Microlearning and Learning Performance in Higher Education: A Post-Test Control Group Study. *Journal of Learning for Development*, *11*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v11i1.752

Senandheera, V. V., Muthukumarana, C. K., Ediriweera, D. S., & Rupasinghe, T. P. (2024). Impact of microlearning on academic performance of students in higher education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Multidisciplinary & Translational Research*, *9*(1), 10–25. https://doi.org/10.4038/jmtr.v9i1.2

Shatte, A. B. R., Teague, S. J., & Shatte, A. (2019). Microlearning for improved student outcomes in higher education: A scoping review. *Osf.*

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, *12*(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(88)90023-7

Sweller, J. (2011). *Cognitive Load Theory* (J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (eds.); Vol. 55, pp. 37–76). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387691-1.00002-8

Tinto, V. (2017). Reflections on Student Persistence. *Student Success*, *8*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v8i2.376

Wang, C., Bakhet, M., Roberts, D., Gnani, S., & El-Osta, A. (2020). The efficacy of microlearning in improving self-care capability: a systematic review of the literature. *Public Health*, *186*, 286–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.07.007

Wang, T., Towey, D., Ng, R. Y., & Gill, A. S. (2021). Towards Post-pandemic Transformative Teaching and Learning. *SN Computer Science*, *2*(4), 271. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-021-00663-z