Nidhi SACHDEVA

Microlearning as a Vehicle for Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction

Bridging Cognitive Science and Instructional Practice

Introduction

Microlearning – delivering instruction in small, focused segments – has gained traction as a modern, digitized strategy in both corporate training and formal education (De Gagne et al., 2019; Giurgiu, 2017). In parallel, Barak Rosenshine's *Principles of Instruction* have become a widely respected guide for effective teaching, grounded in cognitive science, classroom observations of expert teachers, and decades of empirical research (Rosenshine, 2012; Archer & Hughes, 2011). But it is rare that these two developments – microlearning as a delivery model and Rosenshine's framework as a pedagogical guide – are considered together. While Rosenshine's principles provide evidence-informed direction for teaching and learning, and microlearning offers a flexible, accessible and scalable format for instruction, the potential synergy between them remains largely unexplored.

This paper argues that microlearning when designed intentionally and grounded in cognitive principles can serve as a powerful vehicle for operationalizing Rosenshine's ten principles of instruction in both K–12 and higher education contexts. Rosenshine's principles encompass powerful research-backed instructional practices such as reviewing prior learning, presenting new material in small steps, checking for understanding, providing models and scaffolds, guiding practice, and ensuring opportunities for independent application.

Here I theorize that *microlessons* (bite-sized, structured learning units) are particularly well suited to instantiate these principles in diverse subject areas such as mathematics, science, and language instruction. While current research frequently claims that microlearning improves knowledge retention, lowers cognitive load, and boosts engagement (Mohammed et al., 2018; Nikou & Economides, 2018), many such claims are under-theorized or lack integration with robust learning science. Rather than accepting microlearning as inherently effective, this paper takes a different stance: microlearning can become effective when designed with the pedagogical precision that Rosenshine's principles demand. Conversely, microlearning also offers a powerful delivery mechanism for operationalizing those very principles creating a mutually reinforcing relationship between format and pedagogy.

Rosenshine's ten principles align closely with evidence-informed strategies from cognitive science such as retrieval practice, worked examples, scaffolding, and spaced repetition (Dunlosky et al., 2013; Pashler et al., 2007). Synthesizing insights from educational psychology, cognitive science, and instructional design, I discuss how *evidence-informed microlessons* offer a highly practical format to enact Rosenshine's framework in both online and face-to-face learning environments.

To my knowledge, no prior work has systematically mapped microlearning design to Rosenshine's ten principles in the context of formal education. This paper aims to contribute a conceptual model and practical rationale for using microlearning not just as a delivery tool, but as a structured method to implement Rosenshine's empirically derived principles. It is intended for researchers, instructional designers, and educators seeking to ground their design and practice in both cognitive science and pedagogical clarity. The sections that follow provide:

- an overview of microlearning, its definitions, scope and the need for deliberate design
- a review of Rosenshine's framework, its cognitive foundations, and a principle-by-principle mapping onto microlearning strategies,
- a discussion on research supports and insights for aligning microlearning with Rosenshine's work, and
- a discussion of implications, gaps, and opportunities for future research and instructional design.

Microlearning: Definitions, Scope, and the Need for Deliberate Design

Microlearning is generally defined as an instructional approach that delivers content in short, focused segments, typically designed to address a single learning objective or skill. While there is no universally agreed maximum length, microlearning units often range from a few seconds up to 10 – 15 minutes (Hug, 2005; Leong et al., 2021; Sachdeva, 2023a). These brief, self-contained lessons – often called "microlessons" – might include videos, quizzes, interactive simulations, or concise readings that learners can easily consume and revisit. Importantly, microlearning emphasizes scope and focus over strict duration: each unit targets a single concept or skill, in contrast to traditional lessons that cover multiple points simultaneously (Buchem & Hamelmann, 2010; Dingler et al., 2017).

Interest in microlearning has grown sharply over the past two decades, supported by technological advances that enable learning to occur "anytime, anywhere" via digital platforms, mobile apps, and online learning management systems (De Gagne et al., 2019; Giurgiu, 2017, Sachdeva, 2023a). Bibliometric analyses show a marked increase in publications on microlearning since the late 2010s, with much of this scholarship clustering around themes such as design, implementation, evaluation, and mobile delivery (Sankaranarayanan et al., 2022). However, many studies equated "effectiveness" with usability or learner perception, not actual learning gains. Some studies cited debunked theories; for instance, Aldosemani (2019) linked microlearning to learning styles, a theory widely refuted by cognitive scientists, including Pashler et al. (2008). Such examples reflect a broader issue: many claims about microlearning lack firm theoretical or empirical grounding (Khong & Kabilan, 2020).

While early applications of microlearning were particularly prominent in corporate training and professional development (Dolasinki & Reynolds, 2020) – valued for cost-effectiveness, just-in-time delivery, and accessibility – it has increasingly been adopted in higher education contexts, including healthcare education, teacher preparation programs, and undergraduate coursework (De Gagne et al., 2019; Javorcik et al., 2023).

Despite this growing interest, the research base on microlearning reveals persistent conceptual and empirical challenges. A major critique is that microlearning remains inconsistently defined, with varied and sometimes contradictory conceptualizations across contexts and disciplines (Khong & Kabilan, 2020). As a result, the term "microlearning" risks functioning as a buzzword – applied broadly to any short-form content without clear pedagogical coherence. Indeed, many implementations simply segment longer content into smaller pieces without fundamentally redesigning instructional goals, sequencing, or assessment practices (Sachdeva, 2023a). Such ad hoc approaches risk creating fragmented learning experiences that sacrifice depth and conceptual integration.

Empirical studies have similarly produced mixed evidence. Much of the existing literature focuses on learner satisfaction, usability, or engagement metrics rather than robust measures of learning gains or knowledge transfer (De Gagne et al., 2019; Sankaranarayanan et al., 2022). For example, scoping reviews in health professions education have found that while microlearning interventions were well-received by learners, they rarely demonstrated improvements in performance outcomes or long-term retention (De Gagne et al., 2019). Similarly, while claims such as microlearning improves motivation, reduces cognitive load, and enhances retention, these benefits are often under-theorized and insufficiently tied to established principles of learning science (Giurgiu, 2017; Sachdeva, 2023a; Taylor & Hung, 2022).

Proponents argue that microlearning can reduce cognitive load by segmenting content into manageable units, facilitate retrieval practice through frequent short assessments, and promote distributed practice with spaced delivery (Giurgiu, 2017). Indeed, some empirical studies have reported benefits such as improved retention, reduced perceived cognitive load, and increased learner motivation (Nikou & Economides, 2018; Mohammed et al., 2018). However, critics caution that microlearning is not inherently effective simply by virtue of being "short" (Neelen & Kirschner, 2017; Sachdeva, 2023a). Another notable concern is that microlearning's promise of flexibility and accessibility may inadvertently encourage shallow or incidental design.

Without explicit instructional goals, opportunities for retrieval practice, scaffolded support, or structured feedback, microlearning risks becoming a series of disconnected "information snacks" rather than coherent learning experiences that build meaningful understanding. As Sachdeva (2023a) argues, simply shortening content does not inherently improve learning – what matters is how those short units are structured, sequenced, and connected to sound pedagogical principles from cognitive science.

These critiques underscore the need for **intentional, theory-informed design of microlearning experiences**. While microlearning's structural features – brevity, focus, digital accessibility – offer real advantages, they do not guarantee learning outcomes on their own (Sachdeva, 2023a). As Sachdeva has often said, "Just because it is *micro* doesn't automatically make it *effective* too." To move beyond superficial implementations, scholars and practitioners have called for microlearning to be embedded within robust instructional frameworks that emphasize clear learning objectives, meaningful sequencing, opportunities for practice and feedback, and strategies for knowledge transfer (Khong & Kabilan, 2020; Leong et al., 2021; Sachdeva, 2023a; Sachdeva, 2023b).

Recently, Sachdeva (2023c) has proposed coining a new term – MicroLearning (capital M, capital L) – to emphasize the need for pedagogically designed, cognitively aligned microlearning that goes beyond simply making content "short" and instead ensures meaningful, theory-informed learning outcomes. As Sachdeva (2023c) explains:

In this new term, I capitalize "Learning" to emphasize that the lesson is designed with certain evidence-based principles in mind. And I capitalize "Micro", not to refer to time length (although MicroLearning lessons do tend to be short), but rather to refer to the mental complexity of the material taught.

Keeping these varying perspectives in mind, this paper argues that Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction provide a powerful framework for implementing microlearning in learning design. Derived from decades of empirical research, cognitive science, and classroom observations of expert teaching practice, Rosenshine's principles emphasize structured review, presenting new material in small steps with practice, questioning, modeling, guided and independent practice, scaffolding, and planned cumulative review (Rosenshine, 2012). These principles align closely with evidence-based learning strategies such as retrieval practice, cognitive load management through segmentation, and spaced repetition (Dunlosky et al., 2013; Sweller et al., 2019).

By aligning microlearning design with Rosenshine's empirically supported principles, educators and instructional designers can transform microlessons from mere content fragments into structured, pedagogically coherent learning experiences. This approach ensures that the strengths of microlearning – its flexibility, focus, and accessibility – are harnessed in ways that genuinely promote durable learning and knowledge transfer.

In the following sections, this paper systematically maps Rosenshine's principles onto specific microlearning design strategies, offering a conceptual model for integrating these evidence-informed practices into both K–12 and higher education contexts.

Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction and Cognitive Foundations

Rosenshine's principles of instruction distill key strategies observed in effective teaching and supported by research (Rosenshine 2010, 2012). Prior to developing the famous ten principles of instruction, back in 1980s Barak Rosenshine and Robert Stevens[1] had synthesized decades worth of research on explicit teaching and laid out six instructional functions (1986). These functions were determined from prior research of successful teacher training and student achievement programs. They filtered all their obser-

[1] It's striking that this synthesis was published forty years ago, yet its guidance remains so relevant that anyone interested in effective instruction should make sure to read it.

vations down to the following six functions which even four decades later read as the gold standard for instructional practice.

- Review, checking previous day's work (and reteaching if necessary)
- Presenting new content/skills
- Initial student practice (and checking for understanding)
- Feedback and correctives (and re-teaching if necessary)
- Student independent practice
- Weekly and monthly reviews

Rosenshine later developed a set of instructional principles through his synthesis of research derived from three converging sources: (a) cognitive science research on how the brain learns (e.g. working memory limits and the benefits of practice), (b) studies of classroom practices used by highly successful/master teachers, and (c) research on instructional supports (like modeling and scaffolding) that help students master complex tasks. The fact that these independent research strands agree gives confidence in the validity of Rosenshine's guidelines. Rosenshine (2012) reported, "Even though these are three very different bodies of research, there is no conflict at all between the instructional suggestions that come from each of these three sources. In other words, these three sources supplement and complement each other" (pp. 12). While Rosenshine originally articulated 17 instructional procedures**,** the 10 principles presented in his 2012 *American Educator* article have gained wider traction in teacher education, policy, and professional development contexts. These ten offer a concise synthesis of his broader framework, making them well-suited for analysis and application. Accordingly, this paper focuses on the 10 key principles – without dismissing the broader context of the original 17 – as it examines how microlearning, and microlessons in particular, can instantiate and extend Rosenshine's evidence-informed vision of effective teaching. Here are Rosenshine's ten principles and a brief discussion on how each of these can be integrated into microlearning design:

Begin each lesson with a short review of previous learning

Daily review helps strengthen connections to prior material, promoting more fluent and automatic recall of essential facts and skills. By actively retrieving previously learned information, students activate relevant schemas in long-term memory, which frees up limited working memory resources for new learning. This process of retrieval practice – well documented in cognitive science as the "testing effect" – consistently outperforms passive review strategies like re-reading for long-term retention (Roediger & Butler, 2011; Dunlosky et al., 2013). Rosenshine (2012) emphasized that developing expertise requires extensive, repeated practice, and daily review provides a structured opportunity to build this practice into everyday instruction. When integrated into microlearning design, daily review can take the form of short, targeted microlessons or quizzes that reinforce key concepts and skills over time, supporting durable learning while reducing cognitive load.

Present new material using small steps, with student practice after each step

Because working memory has a limited capacity, instruction is most effective when new content is broken down into manageable, well-sequenced chunks. Presenting too much information at once can overwhelm learners and create high cognitive load, which impedes understanding and retention (Sweller, 1988; Sweller et al., 2019). To mitigate this, effective teachers present new material in small, coherent steps and check for understanding frequently, ensuring that students can process and integrate each segment before moving on. This practice is directly aligned with cognitive load theory, which emphasizes reducing extraneous cognitive demands and optimizing germane load for learning. In microlearning design, this principle is naturally operationalized through short, focused microlessons that deliver one concept or skill at a time, making it easier for learners to absorb, process, and retain new information without overload.

Ask a large number of questions and check the responses of all students

Questioning is a powerful instructional strategy for engaging learners and monitoring their understanding in real time. Frequent, well-designed questions prompt students to actively retrieve and apply recently learned material, strengthening neural connections through retrieval practice (Roediger & Butler, 2011). Effective questioning strategies – such as cold-calling, all-student response systems, or think-pair-share – ensure broad participation, uncover misconceptions, and foster active cognitive processing (Wiliam, 2014). Moreover, expert teachers often go beyond asking for correct answers, prompting students to explain their reasoning and the steps they used to arrive at a solution, also known as process questions. This emphasis on process supports metacognition and deeper understanding. In microlearning design, this principle can be embedded through short interactive quizzes, reflection prompts, or branching scenarios within microlessons, offering immediate feedback while ensuring that learners engage actively with the content rather than passively consuming it.

Provide models and worked examples

Explicit modeling – demonstrating how to solve a problem step-by-step – offers students a cognitive roadmap for their own practice. Worked examples and instructor think-alouds serve as powerful forms of scaffolding, reducing cognitive load by guiding learners through complex tasks in manageable steps (Sweller et al., 2011). By showing both the *how* and the *why* behind procedures, modeling supports schema construction and makes expert reasoning visible. Research on cognitive apprenticeship and observational learning further emphasizes that seeing an expert perform a task while articulating their thought process enhances learners' understanding, confidence, and ability to transfer knowledge to new contexts (Collins et al., 1989; Bandura, 1977). In microlearning design, this principle can be operationalized through short video demonstrations, annotated worked examples, or interactive tutorials that allow learners to pause, replay, and reflect – making expert strategies accessible anytime, anywhere while supporting mastery through repeated exposure.

Guide student practice

As Rosenshine (2010) notes, "It is not enough simply to present students with new material, because the material will be forgotten until there is sufficient rehearsal" (p. 16). After initial modeling, effective instruction requires leading students through guided practice with close teacher support. Rather than immediately leaving learners to work independently, instructors scaffold learning by solving problems together, often using structures such as the "I do, We do, You do" gradual release model (Fisher & Frey, 2021). During guided practice, teachers provide timely hints, feedback, and clarifications to help students achieve a high success rate before moving to independent work. In microlearning design, guided practice can be implemented through interactive microlessons that include step-by-step problem solving, embedded prompts for reflection, or adaptive feedback, enabling learners to rehearse and apply new concepts in a supported environment.

Check for student understanding

Continual formative assessment is essential to ensure that students are accurately grasping new material as it is introduced. Effective teachers regularly check for understanding using strategies such as asking students to summarize key ideas, solving sample problems together, or administering quick, low-stakes quizzes (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Cognitive science research shows that misconceptions, if left unaddressed, can become entrenched and impede further learning (Chi, 2005). Rosenshine (2012) emphasized that confirming understanding at frequent intervals enables teachers to provide immediate clarification or reteaching, closing knowledge gaps before they widen. In microlearning design, this principle can be realized through embedded formative assessments – such as short quizzes, reflective prompts, or interactive questions within microlessons – that offer learners and instructors timely feedback on comprehension while supporting active engagement and retrieval practice.

Obtain a high success rate
Rosenshine emphasized that during guided practice, teachers should aim for students to achieve approximately 80% success before moving on to new material. Maintaining a high success rate ensures that learners are sufficiently mastering the content, which builds their confidence, supports motivation, and reduces the likelihood of reinforcing errors (Rosenshine, 2012). This approach is closely related to mastery learning models, where instruction is organized into short, focused units and students are required to demonstrate a predefined level of performance – often around 80% accuracy – before advancing (Bloom, 1976). Research has shown that achieving high success rates not only strengthens self-efficacy but also helps narrow achievement gaps between faster and slower learners. In microlearning design, this principle can be implemented through brief, focused microlessons paired with low-stakes quizzes or formative assessments that allow learners to confirm mastery of each concept before progressing, thus supporting differentiated pacing and personalized learning.

Provide scaffolds for difficult tasks
Scaffolding involves providing temporary, targeted supports that enable learners to successfully engage with tasks that would otherwise be beyond their current level of independent ability. Examples of scaffolds include hints, cues, step-by-step checklists, visual organizers, and partially completed worked examples (Rosenshine, 2012). As learners gain proficiency, these supports are gradually reduced or removed – a process often likened to removing training wheels. This approach is grounded in cognitive theories of managing intrinsic load (i.e., the inherent complexity of the new material being learned), which emphasize breaking down complex tasks into simpler, more manageable components and supporting learners as they integrate these components into cohesive schemas[2] (Sweller et al., 2011). Effective scaffolding is a hallmark of explicit instruction, ensuring that students can practice challenging skills with appropriate guidance before moving to independent application. In microlearning design, scaffolding can be embedded through features such as interactive hints, layered content reveal, step-by-step demonstrations, and adaptive feedback within microlessons, enabling learners to progress confidently while managing cognitive demands.

Require and monitor independent practice
After guided practice and scaffolding, students need opportunities to practice independently to consolidate skills and knowledge, moving learning into long-term memory through repetition and application. Rosenshine (2012) emphasized that independent practice should focus on the same material that was initially taught and practiced with teacher support, thereby avoiding cognitive overload. Asking students to leap prematurely to entirely new or more complex tasks without support risks confusion and errors. Effective teachers carefully monitor independent practice – through strategies such as homework checks, in-class work review, or learning portfolios – to ensure learners remain on track and receive timely feedback. This approach aligns with well-established research showing that overlearning and repeated practice foster fluency, automaticity, and durable recall (Cepeda et al., 2006). In microlearning design, independent practice can be supported through follow-up microlessons, practice quizzes, and self-paced exercises that reinforce prior learning while allowing learners to apply concepts with increasing independence.

Engage students in weekly and monthly review
Beyond the daily review emphasized in Principle 1, Rosenshine highlighted the importance of planned, longer-term review to support durable learning. Weekly and monthly reviews help students retain information over the long term by integrating older material with new learning, reinforcing connections across topics (Rosenshine, 2012). This approach leverages the well-established cognitive phenomenon known as the *spacing effect*: distributing study and practice over time yields superior retention

[2] Organized structures of prior knowledge that help individuals interpret new information, recognize patterns, and make sense of complex tasks more efficiently. For example, all that one knows about dogs is part of their dog schema – including that dogs bark, have four legs, can be pets, and come in many breeds.

compared to massed practice or cramming (Cepeda et al., 2006; Dunlosky & Rawson, 2015). Regular cumulative review – through quizzes, practice sets, or revisiting key concepts – also serves as retrieval practice, strengthening memory by requiring students to actively recall prior learning. As Rosenshine (2012) noted, "the more one rehearses and reviews information, the stronger the interconnections between the material become" (pp.19), reflecting decades of memory research demonstrating that repeated, spaced retrieval enhances the consolidation and organization of knowledge in long-term memory. In microlearning design, this principle can be implemented through carefully sequenced microlessons that revisit essential content over time, cumulative low-stakes quizzes, or spaced push notifications that prompt learners to review and reinforce key ideas across weeks or months.

Together, these ten principles offer a research-informed blueprint for designing microlearning experiences that are not merely short, but instructionally rich and pedagogically sound. By aligning microlesson design with Rosenshine's framework, educators and instructional designers can ensure that each brief learning unit contributes meaningfully to long-term understanding, skill development, and knowledge transfer. Rather than treating microlearning as an incidental or convenience-driven strategy, this approach grounds it in robust cognitive science and proven instructional practices. The result is a model of microlearning that is purposeful, structured, and capable of supporting both novice and advanced learners in K–12 and higher education contexts. Figure of Table 1 shows how each of Rosenshine's ten Principles of Instruction can be intentionally operationalized through evidence-informed microlesson design. Rather than treating microlearning as simply "short content," these strategies aim to align with cognitive science principles to promote meaningful, durable learning. This mapping demonstrates that microlessons can be deliberately designed to embody Rosenshine's principles, transforming microlearning from disconnected "information snacks" into coherent, evidence-informed instructional experiences that support durable learning and transfer.

It is important to note that a single microlesson need not incorporate all ten of Rosenshine's principles simultaneously; rather, effective design can target one or more principles depending on the lesson's purpose and its role within the broader instructional sequence.

Figure 1 — Mapping Rosenshine's Principles to Intentional Microlesson Design

Rosenshine's Principle of Instruction	Intentional Microlesson Design Goal	Example Strategies
1. Begin each lesson with review	Activate prior knowledge; retrieval practice; reduce forgetting	Short review videos; daily/weekly micro-quizzes; spaced flashcard decks; recap microlessons revisiting key concepts
2. Present new material in small steps	Reduce cognitive load; manage intrinsic complexity	Single-concept microlessons; step-by-step video explanations; sequenced short modules; interactive slide decks focusing on one skill at a time
3. Ask a large number of questions and check responses	Promote active processing; surface misconceptions	Embedded formative questions; interactive branching scenarios; short-response prompts; in-video quizzes with feedback
4. Provide models and worked examples	Support schema-building; reduce cognitive load via scaffolding	Demonstration videos; narrated worked examples; think-aloud recordings; annotated problem-solving steps
5. Guide student practice	Provide supported rehearsal; ensure early success	Interactive problem-solving microlessons; adaptive feedback prompts; "I do, We do, You do" micro-activities; guided worksheets with hints
6. Check for student understanding	Identify misconceptions; enable timely feedback	Embedded short quizzes; reflective prompts; auto-graded questions; end-of-lesson checks for understanding
7. Obtain a high success rate (~80%)	Build confidence and mastery before moving on	Low-stakes practice quizzes with mastery criteria; repeatable exercises; feedback loops that promote achieving success thresholds
8. Provide scaffolds for difficult tasks	Support learners through complex skills; manage intrinsic load	Interactive hints; layered content reveal; partially worked examples; visual organizers; downloadable checklists
9. Require and monitor independent practice	Reinforce learning through retrieval and application	Self-paced follow-up microlessons; practice problem sets; cumulative review quizzes; learner portfolios for submission and feedback
10. Engage students in weekly and monthly review	Combat forgetting via spacing effect; strengthen retention	Sequenced spaced-review microlessons; scheduled push notifications; cumulative quizzes revisiting prior topics; reflective journaling prompts

Note. This table illustrates how microlearning design can deliberately operationalize Rosenshine's ten principles of instruction.

In conclusion of this section, microlearning can be seen as a delivery mechanism that, if used thoughtfully, encapsulates proven instructional strategies. I claim here that each Rosenshine principle finds a natural implementation in the microlearning model. This synergy suggests that an instructional design framework marrying the two could be highly beneficial for learners and learning designers. Educators could use Rosenshine's principles as guidelines when creating microlessons. The next sections discuss research and theoretical support for this synthesis, as well as any gaps or counterpoints we should be aware of.

Research Support and Insights For Aligning Microlearning with Rosenshine's Principles

The conceptual alignment between microlearning and Rosenshine's principles is not only intuitive but also well-supported by research in cognitive science and other fields.

Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller et al., 2019) directly supports the microlearning strategy of breaking content into small steps (Rosenshine's Principle 2). Human working memory is limited – typically processing only 4–7 items at once (Miller, 1956) – making segmented, bite-sized lessons cognitively efficient. Studies applying Cognitive Load Theory in higher education have shown that short modules can reduce perceived cognitive load and improve test performance compared to traditional lectures (De Gagne et al., 2019; Leong et al., 2020; van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2018). By reducing extraneous load[3] and segmenting content, microlearning operationalizes Rosenshine's advice to present new material in small, manageable steps.

Retrieval Practice and Spaced Repetition emphasized in Rosenshine's Principles 1 and 10, are also central to effective microlearning design. Decades of research show that actively recalling information improves long-term retention far more than passive review (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006), and that spacing study sessions prevents forgetting (Carpenter et al., 2022; Cepeda et al., 2006). Microlearning systems often build in these effects by design – for example, with daily quizzes, spaced notifications, or adaptive review schedules. Studies have shown that spaced learning significantly reduced knowledge decay among medical residents, illustrating that frequent, low-stakes retrieval supports durable learning (Kerfoot, 2007; Matos et al., 2017).

Feedback and Mastery Learning are similarly well-supported. Rosenshine's principles highlight the importance of checking for understanding, providing scaffolds, and ensuring high success rates (~80% accuracy). Microlearning modules often feature immediate feedback and multiple attempts, allowing learners to identify misconceptions and improve iteratively. Studies have found that microlearning tools can promote self-regulation as students use feedback to target weaknesses strategically (Hosseini et al., 2020; Shamir-Inbal & Blau, 2022). Such design supports metacognition, learner confidence, and mastery – all goals central to Rosenshine's framework.

Empirical Evidence in Education also reinforces this connection between microlearning and Rosenshine's principles. Research on microlearning-enhanced flipped classrooms (Fidan, 2023) found improved performance and satisfaction among pre-service teachers when microlearning videos were added. Systematic reviews in K–12 contexts report improved test scores in subjects like math and vocabulary when daily micro-quizzes or short modules are integrated effectively (Magbago et al., 2025; Sabilla & Daulay, 2025). In higher education, studies (Gohar, 2023) have linked microlearning to improved vocabulary acquisition and lower cognitive load in foreign language courses.

Neuroscience Perspectives further support this synergy. Retrieval practice strengthens neural connections by repeatedly activating memory-related brain regions, including the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex, helping consolidate and integrate new information (van den Broek et al., 2014). Spacing promotes long-term memory consolidation by allowing synaptic changes to stabilize between learning sessions, consistent with evidence from neuroimaging and animal studies showing enhanced hippocampal encoding during distributed practice (Fields, 2005; Smolen et al., 2016). Short, focused

[3] Mental effort imposed by poorly designed materials that doesn't help learning, such as confusing layouts, poorly designed slides, unnecessary GIFs, background music or redundant on-screen text that distracts a learner and does not contribute to learning.

lessons also help manage attention: research suggests sustained attention during lectures often declines after approximately 10–15 minutes, indicating the need to reset attention periodically through brief, varied activities (Wilson & Korn, 2007). Microlearning aligns with this by offering multimodal, concise segments that can re-engage learners' focus. Finally, immediate feedback in microlearning can engage reward-related circuits in the brain, such as the striatum, reinforcing learning behaviors and supporting motivation through dopaminergic pathways (Schultz, 2016; Ripollés et al., 2016). This is an evolving field, and more research is needed to connect microlearning interventions directly with neural measures of learning – such as long-term changes in hippocampal structure, functional connectivity, or neuroplasticity markers. Future studies that link behavioral gains from microlearning to observable neural adaptations will be critical in fully validating its neuroscientific foundations.

In summary, the convergence of evidence from cognitive psychology, educational research, and neuroscience gives strong support to aligning microlearning design with Rosenshine's principles. By grounding microlessons in evidence-based strategies such as segmentation, retrieval practice, feedback, and spacing, educators and instructional designers can transform microlearning from fragmented "information snacks" into structured, effective learning experiences that truly promote durable understanding and knowledge transfer.

Gaps and Opportunities in the Literature

Despite their strong conceptual alignment, there remains a clear gap in the scholarly literature explicitly connecting microlearning with Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction. Most research treats microlearning as a standalone innovation or explores Rosenshine's principles in traditional teaching contexts, but few have formally integrated the two.

Existing connections are mostly informal or practitioner-focused. For example, Sachdeva (2023c) proposed the term *MicroLearning* to emphasize evidence-based, cognitively aligned design, specifically citing Rosenshine and Cognitive Load Theory in blog posts and sample microlesson designs. However, a search of academic databases reveals no comprehensive studies or frameworks explicitly combining microlearning and Rosenshine's principles in formal education settings.

Moreover, microlearning researchers themselves highlight related gaps. Silva et al. (2023) note the limited research on microlearning in primary education, calling for adaptations suited to diverse learners and contexts – a space where, I strongly view, Rosenshine's K–12-oriented principles could offer valuable guidance. Monib et al. (2025) suggest general design principles for microlearning (e.g., bite-sized objectives, engagement, personalization) can help improve learning outcomes. While these principles overlap with Rosenshine's ideas, but were developed independently and need further validation.

This gap represents a clear opportunity. This paper explicitly synthesizing Rosenshine's principles with microlearning aims to offer a unified, evidence-informed framework for educators and instructional designers. Such a framework would answer the question: *How can we ensure microlearning is truly effective form of learning?* – by anchoring its design in Rosenshine's proven principles.

By making this link explicit, microlearning can move beyond ad hoc or fragmented implementations or being simply "information snacks" toward coherent, pedagogically sound practice. It would also help counter skepticism that microlearning is merely corporate or informal training, showing instead how it can be rigorously applied in K–12 and higher education. In short, there is both a clear gap and a strong rationale for bridging these two domains, and this synthesis has the potential to advance research, instructional design, and teaching practice meaningfully.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that microlearning and Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction – often treated as separate threads in educational discourse – are in fact highly complementary. Microlessons, when thoughtfully designed, can serve as practical embodiments of Rosenshine's ten principles, enabling educators to implement evidence-based teaching strategies in both classroom and online environments. From daily review and small-step instruction to questioning, guided practice, scaffolding, and cumulative review, each principle can be deliberately incorporated into microlearning design.

Research evidence and cognitive theory reinforce this synergy. Microlearning's segmentation aligns with Cognitive Load Theory by breaking complex content into manageable chunks. Its use of frequent, low-stakes quizzes supports retrieval practice and spaced repetition, core to Rosenshine's emphasis on review. Rapid feedback loops and opportunities for repeated success build learner confidence and self-regulation, fulfilling Rosenshine's call for high success rates and careful checking for understanding. Moreover, microlearning's flexibility – delivered via mobile, asynchronous, and on-demand formats – extends these effective practices beyond traditional classroom seat time, offering scalable options for homework, revision, and even teacher professional development.

At the same time, this synthesis remains underexplored in the academic literature. While both microlearning and Rosenshine's principles have strong independent research traditions, few studies have explicitly connected them into a unified instructional framework. This gap represents a clear opportunity for scholarship and practice. This paper aims to address that need by articulating such a framework – grounded in cognitive science and enriched with practical design examples – to help educators move beyond viewing microlearning as a buzzword and instead see it as a rigorous, evidence-informed approach.

Such an integration also directly addresses common criticisms of microlearning as superficial or fragmented. When each microlesson is intentionally crafted with Rosenshine's principles in mind – linking to prior knowledge, including practice and feedback, building in review – it becomes part of a coherent instructional sequence that supports durable learning. Rather than replacing traditional instruction, microlearning can enrich it. Instructors might blend direct teaching with microlessons for reinforcement and practice, or flip classroom models using microlessons for pre-class preparation followed by in-class guided practice.

From a cognitive science perspective, this alignment rests on solid foundations. It leverages spacing, retrieval, and chunking to match how human memory and attention work. By embedding effective learning strategies into daily, bite-sized experiences, microlearning can help ensure that principles long known to work in education are actually implemented at scale, with technology as an enabler rather than a distraction.

Ultimately, bridging microlearning with Rosenshine's empirically derived principles offers a promising path for instructional innovation that remains true to "what works" in education. This paper aims to fill this gap in the literature and practice by offering a synthesis that can benefit researchers (through a clear agenda and testable framework), educators (by providing concrete design strategies), instructional designers (by guiding the creation of effective microlearning content), and most importantly, learners (by ensuring that short, flexible learning experiences are pedagogically sound and genuinely effective). By doing so, it seeks to help move microlearning from hype to a mature, evidence-informed learning phase or pedagogical sequence that maximizes learning outcomes across K–12 and higher education contexts.

References

- Aldosemani, T. I. (2019). Microlearning for macro-outcomes: Students' perceptions of telegram as a microlearning tool. In T. Väljataga & M. Laanpere (Eds.), *Digital Turn in Schools – Research, Policy, Practice* (pp. 189–201). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7361-9_13
- Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. Guilford Press.

- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 141-154). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102
- Bloom, B. S. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. McGraw-Hill.
- Buchem, I., & Hamelmann, H. (2010). Microlearning: A strategy for ongoing professional development. *eLearning Papers*, 21, 1–15.
- Carpenter, S. K., Pan, S. C., & Butler, A. C. (2022). The science of effective learning with spacing and retrieval practice. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(8), 496–511. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00089-1
- Cepeda, N. J., Pashler, H., Vul, E., Wixted, J. T., & Rohrer, D. (2006). Distributed practice in verbal recall tasks: A review and quantitative synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(3), 354–380. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.3.354
- Chi, M. T. H. (2005). Commonsense conceptions of emergent processes: Why some misconceptions are robust. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 14(2), 161–199. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1402_1
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (2018). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In *Knowing, learning, and instruction* (pp. 453-494). Routledge.
- De Gagne, J. C., Park, H. K., Hall, K., Woodward, A., Yamane, S., & Kim, S. S. (2019). Microlearning in health professions education: Scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(8), e13997. https://doi.org/10.2196/13997
- Dingler, T., Weber, D., Pielot, M., Cooper, J., Chang, C.-C., & Henze, N. (2017). Language learning on-the-go: Opportune moments and design of mobile microlearning sessions. *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services, 1– 12*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3098279.3098565
- Dolasinski, M. J., & Reynolds, J. (2020). Microlearning: A New Learning Model. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 44(3), 551–561. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348020901579
- Dunlosky, J., & Rawson, K. A. (2015). Practice tests, spaced practice, and successive relearning: Tips for classroom use and for guiding students' learning. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(1), 72–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000024
- Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2013). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques: Promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 14(1), 4–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612453266
- Fidan, M. (2023). The effects of microlearning-supported flipped classroom on pre-service teachers' learning performance, motivation and engagement. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(10), 12687-12714.
- Fields, R. D. (2005). Making memories stick. *Scientific American*, 292(2), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0205-74
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2021). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility*. ASCD.
- Giurgiu, L. (2017). Microlearning an evolving e-learning trend. *Bulletin of the "Transilvania" University of Braşov. Series VII: Social Sciences and Law*, 10(2), 37–42.

- Gohar, R. H. A. (2023). A Microlearning ESP Program to Develop University Students' Vocabulary and Reduce their Cognitive Load. *CDELT Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, *83*(1), 453-476.
- Hosseini, H. M., Ejtehadi, A., & Hosseini, M. M. (2020). Flipping Microlearning-Based EFL Classroom to Enhance Learners' Self-Regulation. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *20*, 43-59.
- Hug, T. (2005). Micro learning and narration. Exploring possibilities of utilization of narrations and storytelling for the designing of "micro units" and didactical micro-learning arrangements. *Proceedings of the Fourth Media in Transition Conference*, *MIT*. May 6 – 8, 2005.
- Javorcik, T., Kostolanyova, K., & Havlaskova, T. (2023). Microlearning in the education of future teachers: Monitoring and evaluating students' activity in a microlearning course. *Electronic Journal of E-learning*, *21*(1), 13-25.
- Kerfoot, B. P., DeWolf, W. C., Masser, B. A., Church, P. A., & Federman, D. D. (2007). Spaced education improves the retention of clinical knowledge by medical students: a randomised controlled trial. *Medical Education*, *41*(1), 23-31.
- Khong, H. K., & Kabilan, M. K. (2020). A theoretical model of micro-learning for second language instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(7), 1483–1506. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1818786
- Leong, K., Sung, A., Au, D., & Blanchard, C. (2020). A review of the trend of microlearning. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*, *13*(1), 88-102.
- Matos, J., Petri, C. R., Mukamal, K. J., & Vanka, A. (2017). Spaced education in medical residents: an electronic intervention to improve competency and retention of medical knowledge. *PLoS One*, *12*(7), e0181418.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81–97. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043158
- Mohammed, G.S., Wakil, K., & Nawroly, S. (2018). The effectiveness of microlearning to improve students' learning ability. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 3(4), 124–127. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.415824
- Monib, W. K., Qazi, A., & Apong, R. A. (2025). Learning beyond boundaries: A Systematic review and a novel framework for improving learning outcomes. *Heliyon*. 11(2), e41413.
- Neelen, M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2017, June 13). Microlearning – A New Old Concept to Put Out to Pasture. *3-Star Learning Experiences*.
- Microlearning – A New Old Concept to Put Out to Pasture
- Nikou, S. A., & Economides, A. A. (2018). Mobile-based micro-learning and assessment: Impact on learning performance and motivation of high school students. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 34(3), 269–278. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12240
- Pashler, H., Bain, P. M., Bottge, B. A., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., & Metcalfe, J. (2007). Organizing instruction and study to improve student learning: IES practice guide. *National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.*
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 9(3), 105–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6053.2009.01038.x

- Ripollés, P., Ferreri, L., Mas-Herrero, E., Alicart, H., Gómez-Andrés, A., Alicart, H., … & Rodríguez-Fornells, A. (2016). Intrinsically regulated learning is modulated by synaptic dopamine signaling. *eLife*, 5, e17441. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.17441
- Roediger, H. L., & Butler, A. C. (2011). The critical role of retrieval practice in long-term retention. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 15(1), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.09.003
- Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. *American Educator*, 36(1), 12–19.
- Rosenshine, B. (2010). *Principles of instruction*. Brussels: International Academy of Education.
- Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, *3*, 376-391.
- Sabilla, S., & Daulay, S. H. (2025). Effectiveness of using drops application in English vocabulary on students' learning outcomes. *Journal of English Language, Literature and Teaching*, 10 (1). https://doi.org/10.32528/ellite.v10i1.3152
- Sachdeva, N. (2023a). *Designing Evidence-Informed Microlearning for Graduate-Level Online Courses* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Sachdeva, N. (2023b). How 7taps aligns with the science of learning – Part 1: Rosenshine's principles of instruction. *7taps Website*. https://www.7taps.com/research
- Sachdeva, N. (2023c). Let's focus on "Learning" in MicroLearning. *The Learning Scientists Blog*. https://www.learningscientists.org/blog/2023/8/10
- Sankaranarayanan, R., Leung, J., Abramenka-Lachheb, V., Seo, G., & Lachheb, A. (2022). Microlearning in Diverse Contexts: A Bibliometric Analysis. TechTrends. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00794-x
- Schultz, W. (2016). Reward functions of the basal ganglia. *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 123(7), 679–693. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-016-1510-0
- Shamir-Inbal, T., & Blau, I. (2022). Micro-learning in designing professional development for ICT teacher leaders: The role of self-regulation and perceived learning. *Professional Development in Education*, *48*(5), 734-750.
- Silva, E. S., Costa, W. P. D., Lima, J. C. D., & Ferreira, J. C. (2025). Contribution of microlearning in basic education: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, *15*(3), 302.
- Smolen, P., Zhang, Y., & Byrne, J. H. (2016). The right time to learn: Mechanisms and optimization of spaced learning. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 17(2), 77–88. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2015.18
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive Load During Problem Solving: Effects on Learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4
- Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). Measuring Cognitive Load. In J. Sweller, P. Ayres, & S. Kalyuga (Eds.), Cognitive Load Theory (pp. 71–85). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8126- 4_6
- Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. (2019). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 31, 261–292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09465-5
- Taylor, A., & Hung, W. (2022). The Effects of microlearning: A scoping review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 70(2), 363–395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10084-1
- van den Broek, G. S., Segers, E., Takashima, A., & Verhoeven, L. (2014). Do testing effects change over time? Insights from immediate and delayed retrieval speed. *Memory*, *22*(7), 803-812.

- van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Kirschner, P. A. (2018). *Ten steps to complex learning* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Wiliam, D. (2014, April). Formative assessment and contingency in the regulation of learning processes. In *Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, PA*.
- Wilson, K., & Korn, J. H. (2007). Attention during lectures: Beyond ten minutes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34(2), 85–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280701291291.