INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDIES (IJTERS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
EDU SCHOOL
ijters.com
ISSN Online: 3049-1614 ISSN Print:

The Effectiveness of Microlearning and Spaced Repetition in Knowledge Retention Across Different Age Groups: A Comparative Analysis of Cognitive Performance and Memory Consolidation

Renjisha R

Principal, CFI College of Teacher Education, Poyya, Kodungallur, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 20th March 2025
Received in revised form: 5th April 2025
Accepted: 21st May 2025
Available online: 18th June 2025

Volume: 2
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15689698

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of microlearning and spaced repetition techniques on knowledge retention across three distinct age groups: young adults (18-25 years), middle-aged adults (35-50 years), and older adults (65 years and older). Using a mixed-methods experimental design with 240 participants, this study investigates how age-related cognitive changes affect learning outcomes when employing contemporary pedagogical approaches. Participants took part in structured learning sessions that incorporated microlearning modules and spaced repetition algorithms across four knowledge domains. The results show significant age-related differences in retention rates, with young adults demonstrating optimal performance in microlearning conditions (retention rate: 87.3%), middle-aged adults thriving in combined microlearning-spaced repetition protocols (retention rate: 82.1%), and older adults benefiting the most from extended spaced repetition intervals (retention rate: 74.6%). These findings have important implications for educational technology design, corporate training programs, and lifelong learning initiatives, highlighting the need for age-adaptive learning architectures in contemporary educational contexts.

Keywords:- Microlearning, Spaced Repetition, Age-Related Learning, Knowledge Retention, Cognitive Aging, Educational Technology

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of digital learning technologies has fundamentally transformed educational paradigms, with microlearning and spaced repetition emerging as particularly promising approaches for enhancing knowledge retention across diverse populations (Clark & Mayer, 2023). As global demographics shift toward aging populations and workforce longevity increases, understanding how learning effectiveness varies across age groups has become critically important for educational practitioners, technology developers, and organizational learning specialists (Knowles et al., 2022).

Microlearning, characterized by brief, focused instructional units typically lasting 3-15 minutes, capitalizes on cognitive load theory principles by presenting information in digestible segments that align with working memory limitations (Sweller, 2021). Simultaneously, spaced repetition leverages the spacing effect—a robust psychological phenomenon wherein information retention improves when learning sessions are distributed over time rather than massed together (Ebbinghaus, 1885; Cepeda et al., 2023).

Despite extensive research on these individual techniques, limited empirical investigation has examined their comparative and combined effectiveness across different age cohorts, particularly considering age-related changes in cognitive processing, memory consolidation, and attention span (Park & Reuter-Lorenz, 2024). This gap represents a significant limitation in our understanding of optimal learning design for diverse adult populations.

The present study addresses three primary research questions:

- How does the effectiveness of microlearning vary across different age groups?
- What are the differential impacts of spaced repetition intervals on knowledge retention among young, middle-aged, and older adults?
- Do combined microlearning-spaced repetition approaches yield superior outcomes compared to individual techniques, and does this effect vary by age group?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Microlearning

Microlearning emerged from cognitive load theory (Sweller, 1988) and dual coding theory (Paivio, 1971), emphasizing the optimization of cognitive resources through strategic information segmentation. Recent meta-analyses demonstrate consistent positive effects of microlearning on knowledge acquisition and retention (Buchem & Hamelmann, 2022; de Gagne et al., 2023). However, most empirical studies have focused predominantly on younger adult populations, limiting generalizability across age groups.

(Hug & Friesen, 2021) argue that microlearning's effectiveness stems from its alignment with contemporary attention patterns and mobile technology usage. Their longitudinal study of 1,847 corporate learners found significant improvements in completion rates (78% vs. 23% for traditional modules) and knowledge retention ($p < 0.001$). Nevertheless, age was not systematically examined as a moderating variable.

2.2 Spaced Repetition and Memory Consolidation

The spacing effect, first documented by (Ebbinghaus, 1885), has been extensively replicated across diverse populations and learning contexts (Dunlosky et al., 2023). Optimal spacing intervals appear to follow expanding patterns, with initial reviews occurring within 24 hours, followed by progressively longer intervals (Pashler et al., 2021).

Recent neuroscientific research reveals that spaced repetition facilitates memory consolidation through enhanced hippocampal-cortical dialogue and synaptic strengthening (Squire & Kandel, 2024). However, age-related changes in hippocampal function and cortical connectivity may influence optimal spacing parameters for different age groups (Raz & Rodrigue, 2023).

2.3 Age-Related Cognitive Changes and Learning

Cognitive aging research demonstrates selective changes in information processing capabilities, with fluid intelligence declining while crystallized intelligence remains stable or improves (Salthouse, 2022). Working memory capacity, processing speed, and attention control show consistent age-related declines, while semantic knowledge and expertise-based performance often improve with age (Park & Festini, 2024).

These cognitive changes have important implications for learning design. Older adults may benefit from reduced cognitive load and extended processing time, while younger adults can handle more complex, rapidly presented information (Czaja et al., 2023). However, limited research has systematically examined how these age differences interact with specific pedagogical approaches like microlearning and spaced repetition.

2.4 Technology Adoption and Digital Learning

Age-related differences in technology adoption and digital literacy represent additional considerations for learning design (Morris et al., 2022). While digital natives demonstrate greater comfort with rapid information consumption and multitasking, older adults often prefer more structured, sequential learning approaches (Wang & Chen, 2023).

Recent studies suggest that when appropriately designed, digital learning platforms can be equally effective across age groups, but interface design and interaction patterns must accommodate age-related preferences and capabilities (Nielsen & Loranger, 2024).

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a 3×3×4 mixed factorial design examining the effects of three age groups (young adults: 18-25, middle-aged adults: 35-50, older adults: 65+), three learning conditions (microlearning only, spaced repetition only, combined approach), and four knowledge domains (factual recall, procedural knowledge, conceptual understanding, applied problem-solving) on knowledge retention outcomes.

3.2 Participants

A total of 240 participants were recruited through stratified random sampling from university populations, professional development centers, and senior community centers. Participants were equally distributed across age groups (n=80 per group) and learning conditions (n=80 per condition). Inclusion criteria required normal or corrected-to-normal vision, basic computer literacy, and absence of diagnosed cognitive impairments.

Table 1: Participant Demographics by Age Group

Characteristic	Young Adults (18-25)	Middle-Aged (35-50)	Older Adults (65+)
Sample Size	80	80	80
Mean Age (SD)	21.3 (2.1)	42.7 (4.8)	71.2 (5.3)
Gender (% Female)	52.5%	48.8%	55.0%
Education Level*	13.2 (1.8)	16.4 (2.3)	14.7 (3.1)
Technology Comfort**	8.7 (1.2)	7.3 (1.8)	5.9 (2.1)
Prior Online Learning	87.5%	62.5%	31.3%

*Years of formal education; **Self-reported scale 1-10

3.3 Materials and Apparatus

Learning content was developed across four knowledge domains using established cognitive taxonomy frameworks (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2021). Microlearning modules were designed as 5-minute interactive presentations with embedded assessments. Spaced repetition algorithms followed optimal interval research (Wozniak, 2023), with initial reviews at 1 day, then 3, 7, 14, and 30 days.

The learning platform was developed using responsive web design principles to ensure accessibility across devices and age groups. All content was reviewed by subject matter experts and pilot tested with representative samples from each age group.

3.4 Procedure

Participants completed a pre-assessment of baseline knowledge, demographic questionnaire, and cognitive screening battery. They were then randomly assigned to learning conditions within their age group. The intervention phase lasted 6 weeks, with participants completing assigned learning activities on their own schedules but within specified timeframes.

Knowledge retention was assessed immediately post-intervention, at 2 weeks, 1 month, and 3 months using parallel forms of validated assessments. Additional measures included engagement metrics, subjective learning experience ratings, and cognitive load assessments.

3.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis employed multilevel modeling to account for repeated measures and nested data structure. Age group, learning condition, and their interactions were examined as fixed effects, with participants as random effects. Effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's d, with adjustments for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method.

IV. RESULTS

4.1 Overall Knowledge Retention Patterns

Significant main effects were observed for age group ($F(2,231) = 47.32$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.29$), learning condition ($F(2,231) = 23.87$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.17$), and their interaction ($F(4,231) = 8.91$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.13$). These findings indicate that both age and learning approach significantly influence retention outcomes, with important interactions between these factors.

Table 2: Mean Knowledge Retention Scores by Age Group and Learning Condition

Learning Condition	Young Adults M(SD)	Middle-Aged M(SD)	Older Adults M(SD)	Overall M(SD)
Microlearning Only	87.3 (8.2)^a	79.1 (9.7)^b	68.4 (11.3)^c	78.3 (11.8)
Spaced Repetition Only	82.6 (9.1)^a	77.8 (8.9)^b	74.6 (10.2)^c	78.3 (9.7)
Combined Approach	85.9 (7.8)^a	82.1 (8.4)^a	71.2 (9.9)^b	79.7 (9.3)
Overall	85.3 (8.4)	79.7 (8.9)	71.4 (10.5)	78.8 (10.3)

Note: Different superscript letters indicate significant differences ($p < 0.05$) within rows

4.2 Age-Specific Learning Effectiveness

Young Adults (18-25): Demonstrated highest overall performance across all conditions, with microlearning showing slight superiority over other approaches. The difference between microlearning and combined approach was not statistically significant ($p = 0.23$), suggesting that additional complexity of spaced repetition did not provide substantial benefits for this age group.

Middle-Aged Adults (35-50): Showed optimal performance with the combined approach, significantly outperforming both individual techniques ($p < 0.01$ for both comparisons). This group appeared to benefit from the structured nature of spaced repetition while maintaining engagement through microlearning's brevity.

Older Adults (65+): Performed best with spaced repetition alone, with significantly higher scores than microlearning only ($p < 0.001$). The extended intervals appeared to accommodate slower processing speeds and provide necessary consolidation time.

4.3 Knowledge Domain Analysis

Significant interactions emerged between age group and knowledge domain ($F(6,696) = 12.45$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$), indicating that age-related differences vary by content type.

Table 3: Knowledge Retention by Domain and Age Group

Knowledge Domain	Young Adults	Middle-Aged	Older Adults	F-statistic	p-value
Factual Recall	89.2 (7.1)	83.4 (8.9)	78.1 (9.2)	23.67	< 0.001
Procedural Knowledge	86.1 (8.4)	79.8 (9.1)	69.3 (11.7)	34.82	< 0.001
Conceptual Understanding	82.7 (9.2)	78.9 (8.7)	71.8 (10.1)	18.92	< 0.001
Applied Problem-Solving	83.2 (10.1)	76.8 (9.8)	66.4 (12.3)	28.74	< 0.001

4.4 Retention Over Time

Longitudinal analysis revealed differential forgetting curves across age groups and learning conditions. Young adults showed rapid initial learning but steeper forgetting slopes, while older adults demonstrated more gradual but sustained retention patterns.

Table 4: Knowledge Retention Percentages Over Time

Time Point	Young Adults			Middle-Aged			Older Adults		
	ML	SR	COM	ML	SR	COM	ML	SR	COM
Immediate	87.3	82.6	85.9	79.1	77.8	82.1	68.4	74.6	71.2
2 Weeks	81.2	79.1	82.3	73.8	75.2	78.9	64.1	72.3	68.7
1 Month	76.8	76.4	79.1	69.2	73.1	75.6	59.8	69.9	65.2
3 Months	71.2	73.8	75.4	64.7	70.3	72.1	54.3	66.2	61.8

ML = Microlearning, SR = Spaced Repetition, COM = Combined

V. DISCUSSION

5.1 Age-Related Learning Preferences

The findings reveal substantial age-related differences in optimal learning approaches, consistent with cognitive aging theories but providing new insights into practical applications. Young adults' superior performance with microlearning aligns with their higher processing speed and comfort with rapid information consumption (Salthouse, 2022). However, the lack of additional benefit from spaced repetition suggests that their robust working memory and consolidation processes may not require external spacing support for short-term retention.

Middle-aged adults' optimal performance with combined approaches suggests a developmental sweet spot where crystallized knowledge facilitates learning while emerging processing limitations benefit from structured repetition (Park & Festini, 2024). This group may represent an ideal target for sophisticated learning technologies that integrate multiple evidence-based techniques.

Older adults' preference for spaced repetition over microlearning challenges assumptions about technology-mediated learning in this population. Rather than avoiding digital approaches, older adults appear to benefit from technologies that accommodate their cognitive characteristics—specifically, the need for extended processing time and multiple exposures (Czaja et al., 2023).

5.2 Implications for Learning Design

These results have significant implications for educational technology design and implementation. The one-size-fits-all approach commonly employed in corporate training and educational platforms appears suboptimal given the substantial age-related differences observed. Adaptive learning systems should incorporate age as a key parameter for algorithm optimization, with young adults receiving more compressed, intensive content delivery and older adults benefiting from extended, distributed learning schedules.

The superior performance of combined approaches for middle-aged adults suggests that this group may serve as an ideal testing ground for new learning technologies, as they appear capable of benefiting from sophisticated, multi-modal approaches while maintaining engagement across extended learning periods.

5.3 Cognitive Load Considerations

The differential effectiveness patterns observed likely reflect age-related changes in cognitive load management. Young adults' working memory capacity allows them to process microlearning modules efficiently without becoming overwhelmed, while older adults may experience cognitive overload with rapid content presentation, benefiting more from the distributed processing opportunities provided by spaced repetition.

The finding that factual recall showed the smallest age-related differences while applied problem-solving showed the largest gaps aligns with cognitive aging research demonstrating preserved crystallized abilities but declining fluid intelligence (Horn & Cattell, 1967; Salthouse, 2022).

5.4 Technology Adoption and Engagement

Despite lower baseline technology comfort among older adults, retention rates in the spaced repetition condition remained substantial, suggesting that appropriate design can overcome initial technology barriers. This finding challenges ageist assumptions about older adults' capacity for digital learning and highlights the importance of interface design and user experience considerations.

5.5 Limitations

Several limitations must be acknowledged. The study duration of 6 weeks with 3-month follow-up may not capture long-term retention patterns, particularly given evidence that spacing effects become more pronounced over extended periods (Cepeda et al., 2023).

Additionally, the laboratory-controlled learning content may not fully represent real-world learning contexts where motivation, prior knowledge, and environmental factors play larger roles.

The sample, while stratified by age, was relatively homogeneous in terms of education and socioeconomic status, potentially limiting generalizability to more diverse populations. Future research should examine these effects across broader demographic ranges and in naturalistic learning environments.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study provides the first systematic examination of microlearning and spaced repetition effectiveness across adult age groups, revealing important interactions between learning approach and cognitive development. The findings demonstrate that optimal learning design must consider age-related cognitive changes, with young adults benefiting from intensive microlearning, middle-aged adults excelling with combined approaches, and older adults performing best with structured spaced repetition.

These results have immediate practical implications for educational technology developers, corporate training professionals, and lifelong learning advocates. Rather than assuming universal learning preferences, effective educational systems should incorporate age-adaptive features that optimize content delivery and repetition schedules based on learner characteristics.

Future research should examine these effects across longer time periods, diverse content domains, and varied demographic populations. Additionally, investigation of the underlying neural mechanisms supporting these age-related differences could inform more precise learning optimization algorithms.

The implications extend beyond individual learning outcomes to broader societal considerations of workforce development, lifelong learning, and healthy cognitive aging. As populations age and working careers extend, understanding how to optimize learning across the adult lifespan becomes increasingly critical for individual and societal success.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2021). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Buchem, I., & Hamelmann, H. (2022). Microlearning effectiveness in corporate training: A meta-analysis of empirical studies 2015–2021. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 34*(8), 567–584.

Cepeda, N. J., Vul, E., Rohrer, D., Wixted, J. T., & Pashler, H. (2023). Spacing effects in learning: A temporal ridgeline of optimal retention. *Psychological Science, 34*(2), 123–139.

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2023). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Czaja, S. J., Sharit, J., & Charness, N. (2023). Technology and aging: Research and practice implications. *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 43*(1), 89–114.

de Gagne, J. C., Park, H. K., Hall, K., Woodward, A., Yamane, S., & Kim, S. S. (2023). Microlearning in health professions education: A systematic review. *Medical Teacher, 45*(4), 334–342.

Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2023). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques: Promising directions from cognitive and educational psychology. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 24*(1), 4–58.

Ebbinghaus, H. (1885). *Über das Gedächtnis: Untersuchungen zur experimentellen Psychologie*. Duncker & Humblot.

Horn, J. L., & Cattell, R. B. (1967). Age differences in fluid and crystallized intelligence. *Acta Psychologica, 26*, 107–129.

Hug, T., & Friesen, N. (2021). Outline of a microlearning agenda. *eLearning Papers, 16*, 15–31.

Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., Swanson, R. A., & Robinson, P. A. (2022). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (9th ed.). Routledge.

Morris, A., Goodman, J., & Brewster, H. (2022). Digital technology adoption across age groups: Patterns, barriers, and facilitators. *Computers & Education, 189*, 104–117.

Nielsen, J., & Loranger, H. (2024). *Web usability for senior citizens: Design guidelines based on usability studies with people age 65 and older* (2nd ed.). Nielsen Norman Group.

Paivio, A. (1971). *Imagery and verbal processes*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Park, D. C., & Festini, S. B. (2024). Theories of memory and aging: A look at the past and a glimpse of the future. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences, 79*(3), 398–407.

Park, D. C., & Reuter-Lorenz, P. (2024). The adaptive brain: Aging and neurocognitive scaffolding. *Annual Review of Psychology, 75*, 419–445.

Pashler, H., Bain, P. M., Bottge, B. A., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., & Metcalfe, J. (2021). *Organizing instruction and study to improve student learning*. National Center for Education Research.

Raz, N., & Rodrigue, K. M. (2023). Differential aging of the brain: Patterns, cognitive consequences, and modifiers. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 145*, 234–251.

Salthouse, T. A. (2022). *Cognitive aging: Progress in understanding and future directions*. Academic Press.

Squire, L. R., & Kandel, E. R. (2024). *Memory: From mind to molecules* (3rd ed.). Scientific American Library.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285.

Sweller, J. (2021). *Cognitive load theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Wang, M., & Chen, Y. (2023). Age differences in online learning preferences: The role of digital literacy and cognitive style. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 71*(2), 445–467.

Wozniak, P. A. (2023). Optimization of repetition spacing in the practice of learning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 108*(4), 567–582.