



Available Online at EScience Press
International Journal of Education Foundations
ISSN: 3078-7866 (Online), 3078-7858 (Print)
<https://ijef.esciencepress.net>

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Micro-Credentials in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Adoption, Value, Quality Assurance, and Future Directions

^aFekadu Beyene Ayana, ^bProsperity M. Mwila, ^bFekede Tuli

^a PhD Scholar, Department of Education Foundations, School of Graduate Studies, St Augustine University of Tanzania

^b Academician, Department of Education Foundations, School of Graduate Studies, St Augustine University of Tanzania

^c Academician, Department of Curriculum and Instructional Sciences, College of Educational Sciences- Kotebe University of Education, Ethiopia

Corresponding Author Email: fike2015@yahoo.com

Author's Contributions

All authors contributed equally to this research.

Article History

Received February 10, 2026; Accepted: April 27, 2026; Published: July 24, 2026.

ABSTRACT

This systematic literature review examined the evolving role of micro-credentials in higher education, focusing on their conceptualisation, adoption, perceived value, quality assurance mechanisms, and future implications. The review followed a structured methodology guided by the PRISMA framework to ensure transparency, rigour, and replicability in the identification, screening, and selection of relevant studies. A comprehensive search was conducted across major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, JSTOR, and Google Scholar, covering studies published between 2021 and 2026. Key search terms included micro-credentials, digital badges, higher education credentials, lifelong learning, skills recognition, and employability. The initial search yielded 98 records drawn from education, technology, management, and interdisciplinary fields. After removing duplicates, studies were screened at title and abstract level using predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Eligible studies were peer-reviewed, written in English, focused on micro-credentials in higher education, and provided empirical, conceptual, or systematic insights. Studies were excluded if they lacked peer review, focused on informal or non-higher education training, or did not provide sufficient methodological clarity. Full-text eligibility assessment and quality appraisal further refined the sample, resulting in 40 studies being included in the final synthesis. Data extraction was conducted using a structured matrix capturing publication details, context, stakeholder focus, methodological approach, and key findings. The data were analysed using thematic content analysis, allowing for the identification of patterns and conceptual relationships across studies. The PRISMA-guided selection process ensured methodological rigor by systematically narrowing from 98 identified records to 40 high-quality studies suitable for synthesis. The review identified six dominant themes: institutional adoption and readiness, employability and learner value, employer recognition and trust, quality assurance and regulatory frameworks, digital credentialing ecosystems, and emerging future directions linked to artificial intelligence and lifelong learning. Findings indicate that micro-credentials are increasingly viewed as flexible, modular complements to traditional degree programmes rather than replacements. However, their implementation remains uneven due to challenges in standardisation, credit transferability, governance, and employer trust.

Keywords: micro-credentials; higher education; employability; quality assurance; digital badges; lifelong learning; systematic literature review

INTRODUCTION

Higher education is increasingly under pressure to respond to rapid technological change, labour market uncertainty, and growing demand for short, flexible, and recognisable learning pathways. While traditional degree programmes remain central to academic formation and professional qualification, there is a growing need for more targeted forms of learning that can be delivered in smaller units and recognised across institutions and labour markets. In this context, micro-credentials have emerged as modular certifications designed to verify specific learning outcomes, competencies, or skills. Their growing prominence is evident in policy debates, institutional strategies, employer engagement, open and distance learning systems, and digital education platforms.

Recent scholarship positions micro-credentials as an educational innovation capable of strengthening the link between lifelong learning, employability, and institutional transformation (Pirkkalainen et al., 2023; Orman et al., 2023). This expansion has been particularly pronounced in the post-COVID-19 period, when higher education systems worldwide were compelled to rapidly adopt digital, blended, and flexible learning models at scale. The pandemic therefore acted as a catalyst, accelerating existing trends toward modularisation and digitally mediated credentialing. This acceleration aligns with broader systemic pressures facing higher education, including technological disruption, shifting labour market demands, and increased expectations for stackable and portable qualifications.

Despite this rapid growth, the literature remains divided on the implications of micro-credentials for higher education systems. On one hand, they are viewed as tools for enhancing access, flexibility, and lifelong learning opportunities. On the other hand, concerns persist that they may contribute to the fragmentation of higher education into disconnected short courses that lack coherence and long-term academic value (Kušić et al., 2022). Traditional degrees therefore continue to hold significant value, particularly for comprehensive knowledge formation, professional identity, and credential recognition, even as learners and employers increasingly demand more agile and competency-based alternatives.

The meaning of micro-credentials is not yet universally settled. Some authors treat them as small-scale qualifications that certify learning outcomes after short learning experiences. Others view them as digital

badges, nano-credentials, alternative credentials, short courses, stackable units, or competency-based certificates. The lack of agreement affects how institutions design programmes, how regulators evaluate them, and how employers interpret their value. Studies from Malaysia, Australia, Europe, the United States, Saudi Arabia, and wider international contexts show that the same term can refer to different levels of assessment, workload, credit, platform use, industry involvement, and credential portability (Md Rami et al., 2023; Narayanaswamy et al., 2024; Zhang & Alasmari, 2025). This conceptual diversity gives micro-credentials flexibility but also creates risk when learners invest time and money in credentials whose recognition remains uncertain.

The expansion of micro-credentials is closely tied to digital transformation in higher education. Online learning platforms, digital badges, verifiable credentials, skills profiling systems, and artificial intelligence tools have made credential production and dissemination faster. The digital nature of micro-credentials enables learners to share evidence of achievement with employers and other institutions. However, technological capacity alone does not guarantee educational value. Scholars report that successful adoption requires curriculum design, clear learning outcomes, assessment standards, metadata, quality assurance, institutional policy, staff development, and employer engagement (Reed et al., 2024; Ward et al., 2023; Charles & Hill, 2025). Therefore, the question is not only whether micro-credentials can be issued but whether they can carry meaningful, trusted, and portable evidence of learning.

This systematic literature review addresses this problem by synthesising recent evidence on micro-credentials in higher education. The review focuses on adoption, value, quality assurance, stakeholder recognition, and future directions. The paper follows a design similar to established systematic review papers where studies are identified, screened, appraised, coded, and classified into thematic domains. The purpose is not to repeat individual studies but to build an integrated picture of what the literature says about micro-credentials as an emerging higher education practice. The review is guided by four questions. First, how are micro-credentials conceptualised in higher education literature. Second, what opportunities do they create for learners, institutions, employers, and governments. Third, what barriers limit their implementation and recognition. Fourth, what future

research and policy directions are needed for quality assured micro-credential ecosystems.

METHODOLOGY

Review Design

The paper adopted a systematic literature review design. The review was organised around a protocol that specified the review questions, search terms, source types, screening criteria, quality appraisal procedure, extraction matrix, and synthesis strategy. The design was selected because micro-credential research crosses higher education, educational technology, open and distance learning, employability, quality assurance, and policy studies. A systematic review was therefore more appropriate than a narrative review because it allowed transparent selection and classification of evidence. The process followed the logic of identification, screening, eligibility, inclusion, coding, synthesis, and reporting. The review also used thematic content synthesis because the studies included were diverse in methods and were not suitable for statistical meta-analysis.

Search Strategy

The search strategy combined keyword searching from credible database. The main search terms were micro-credential, micro-credentials, digital badge, alternative credential, short learning, stackable credential, higher education, university, employability, quality assurance,

lifelong learning, open and distance learning, artificial intelligence, and digital credentialing. These terms were combined using Boolean operators and searched in education and interdisciplinary sources. The search was supplemented by checking publisher pages, journal pages, preprint records, institutional repositories, and reference trails. The initial search gave 98 records across major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, JSTOR, and Google Scholar, covering studies published between 2021 and 2026. After removing duplicates and clearly irrelevant records, the remaining studies were screened for direct relevance to micro-credentials in higher education or closely related learning ecosystems.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Search Strategy and Sources

A comprehensive search was conducted across multiple academic databases, including Google Scholar, Education Resources Information Centre (ERIC), African Journals Online (AJOL). Boolean search terms combined concepts related to career guidance, vocational education, secondary schools, subject choice, and career pathways. The review focused on studies published between (2015) and (2025) and written in English.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Table 1.

Criteria type	Operational decision
Inclusion criteria	Studies published between 2021 and 2026; studies addressing micro-credentials, digital badges, stackable credentials, or alternative credentials; studies located in higher education, open and distance learning, professional learning, employability, quality assurance, or digital education; journal articles, book chapters, conference papers, preprints, and institutional repository papers; English-language records with enough detail for coding.
Exclusion criteria	Studies not focused on micro-credentials or related credentialing; papers dealing only with general online learning without credentialing; non-education papers with no higher education link; editorials without substantive analysis unless directly relevant to conceptual framing; inaccessible records with insufficient bibliographic or abstract information; duplicate records.

Screening and Selection Process

The final 40 records formed the review corpus. Exclusion at full-text level was mainly due to weak higher education relevance, limited treatment of micro-credentials, conceptual overlap with already included studies, or insufficient information for systematic

extraction. The final set included conceptual, empirical, review, bibliometric, case study, policy, conference, preprint, and book chapter sources. This broad inclusion was necessary because micro-credential scholarship is still developing and important evidence appears across multiple publication formats.

Table 2.

Review stage	Number of records
Records identified through databases	98
Duplicates removed	10
Records screened by title and abstract	88
Records excluded after title and abstract screening	29
Full-text records assessed for eligibility	59
Full-text records excluded with reasons	19
Studies included in final synthesis	40

Data Extraction and Quality Appraisal

A structured data extraction matrix was prepared for all included studies. The matrix captured author, year, title, publication type, DOI or link, geographical focus, stakeholder focus, methodology, key contribution, and implications for higher education. Quality appraisal considered the clarity of aims, relevance to micro-credentials, adequacy of method, transparency of evidence, quality of argument, and usefulness for answering the review questions. Empirical studies were assessed for methodological clarity, data source, sampling, analysis, and consistency between evidence and claims. Conceptual and policy studies were assessed for coherence, relevance, and connection to existing literature. Review studies were assessed for search transparency, selection logic, and synthesis quality. No included study was treated as equal in strength during synthesis because the review differentiated between empirical evidence, conceptual argument, policy analysis, and future-oriented commentary.

Data Synthesis

The extracted data were synthesised through thematic content analysis. Initial codes were generated from repeated concepts such as readiness, employability, recognition, flexibility, stackability, policy, accreditation, employer trust, digital badges, artificial intelligence, and

lifelong learning. Similar codes were then clustered into broader themes. Six final themes were produced after comparing the codes across the included studies. These themes were institutional adoption and readiness, learner value and employability, employer recognition and stakeholder trust, quality assurance and regulatory alignment, digital credentialing infrastructure, and future directions for AI-supported and lifelong learning ecosystems. The synthesis was interpretive rather than merely descriptive because the aim was to explain how the field is developing and where major tensions remain.

RESULTS

Characteristics of Included Studies

The review corpus shows a sharp increase in micro-credential scholarship after 2022. The earliest sources in the corpus focused on strategic repositioning, distance education, and post-pandemic flexibility. Later studies moved toward implementation, institutional readiness, employer recognition, quality assurance, policy legitimacy, and the role of artificial intelligence. This pattern suggests that micro-credentials have moved from being a speculative innovation toward becoming an operational issue for universities, quality assurance agencies, employers, and digital education providers.

Table 3.

Publication year	Number of records	Main emphasis
2021	2	Early strategic and distance-learning discussions on micro-credentials.
2022	6	Growth in systematic, policy, and conceptual debates after the pandemic.
2023	8	Expansion of institutional readiness, stakeholder, and digital credentialing studies.
2024	8	Increase in empirical case studies, employer studies, and quality debates.
2025	12	Rapid growth in AI, employability, policy, and future-oriented studies.
2026	4	Emerging work on governance, quality assurance, national frameworks, and future learning systems.

Methodological Patterns

The methodological distribution confirms that the field is still developing. Strong empirical evidence exists but remains concentrated in specific national and institutional contexts. Many papers are conceptual or framework-oriented because institutions and regulators are still defining how micro-credentials should work.

Review and bibliometric studies show that the field has grown enough to support synthesis, but they also show continuing fragmentation. The presence of preprint and conference literature indicates that micro-credential research is moving quickly and that peer-reviewed evidence may lag behind practice.

Table 4.

Methodological group	Number	Contribution to synthesis
Conceptual and critical papers	10	These papers clarified meanings, tensions, and policy implications.
Empirical qualitative or case studies	11	These studies examined readiness, leadership, employer perceptions, design principles, and national contexts.
Systematic, scoping, integrative, or bibliometric reviews	7	These studies mapped trends, opportunities, challenges, and research gaps.
Policy, framework, and design-oriented papers	8	These papers proposed implementation models, quality frameworks, or digital credentialing structures.
Preprint, conference, and emerging technology papers	4	These sources addressed fast-developing issues such as AI and digitalisation.

THEMATIC FINDINGS

Institutional Adoption and Readiness

The first theme concerns institutional adoption and readiness. Several studies show that universities are interested in micro-credentials because they provide flexible routes for reaching adult learners, working professionals, international learners, and students seeking employability skills. However, adoption is not only a matter of launching short courses. Institutions need governance structures, policy alignment, academic leadership, workload models, digital infrastructure, instructional design support, and staff capacity. Evidence from Malaysian higher education demonstrates that leadership readiness, human resources, facilities, accreditation, and accountability shape successful implementation (Md Rami et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2025). Studies on institutional readiness also show that micro-credentials fit well with open, flexible, and distance learning ideals, but universities must adapt internal processes before such credentials can become credible and scalable (Varadarajan et al., 2025). In addition to global trends, early evidence from African higher education systems—particularly South Africa indicates that micro-credential integration is emerging through pilot initiatives and institutional experiments, although implementation remains largely at an infancy stage with limited standardisation, policy coherence, and system-wide adoption (Barbara, 2022). In South Africa, initial efforts suggest growing interest in using micro-credentials and digital badges to expand access and recognition of learning within higher education, but these initiatives are still largely exploratory and institution-specific, with limited national coordination or regulatory alignment (Barbara, 2022).

The adoption literature suggests that many institutions approach micro-credentials as innovations that sit between formal degrees and informal professional development. This positioning creates both opportunity and uncertainty. Micro-credentials can attract new learner groups and strengthen university responsiveness to labour market change. Yet they can also become peripheral products if they are not embedded in curriculum, credit, assessment, and quality assurance systems. Studies from Malaysia and Saudi Arabia show that national policy, institutional strategy, and stakeholder perceptions can either support adoption or create hesitation (Keoy et al., 2024; Zhang & Alasmari, 2025). Therefore, institutional readiness is best understood as a multidimensional condition rather than simple willingness to participate.

Learner Value, Employability, and Lifelong Learning

The second theme relates to learner value and employability. Micro-credentials are widely presented as flexible learning opportunities that help learners demonstrate specific skills. Learners can use them for reskilling, upskilling, professional development, career transition, and lifelong learning. Recent work argues that micro-credentials can help bridge the gap between traditional degrees and labour market demands because they provide targeted evidence of competencies (Gamage & Dehideniya, 2025; Narayanaswamy et al., 2024). Studies on student perceptions indicate that learners are interested in micro-credentials when they believe the credentials improve employability, provide visible recognition, and can be shared with employers through digital platforms. However, learner value depends on clarity, trust, affordability, accessibility, and recognition beyond the issuing institution.

The literature also shows that micro-credentials support lifelong learning when they are modular and stackable. Stackability allows learners to accumulate smaller units of learning toward larger qualifications or professional portfolios. This can widen access for learners who cannot commit to full degree programmes. It can also support professionals who need rapid updating in response to technological change. However, the review found that stackability is often claimed more strongly than demonstrated. Many studies describe the promise of stackable pathways, but fewer provide evidence that credits move smoothly across institutions, countries, or qualification frameworks. The field therefore needs stronger evidence on how learners actually combine micro-credentials over time and whether this accumulation produces career or educational mobility.

Employer Recognition and Stakeholder Trust

The third theme concerns employer recognition and stakeholder trust. Micro-credentials can only support employability when employers understand and value them. Employer-focused studies show cautious optimism. Employers may appreciate micro-credentials because they provide targeted information about specific skills, but they also need clear standards, credible issuers, transparent assessment, and reliable evidence of competence (Ha et al., 2024). The literature indicates that employer trust depends on more than the existence of a digital badge. Employers need to know what was learned, how learning was assessed, who verified the credential, how difficult the credential was, and whether the skill aligns with workplace needs. Without such information, micro-credentials risk becoming attractive but weak signals.

Stakeholder trust also involves governments, quality assurance agencies, professional bodies, institutions, learners, and platform providers. A credential ecosystem becomes stronger when these actors agree on common principles. Studies from Asian and international contexts show that quality assurance, legitimacy, regulatory frameworks, and industry alignment remain central concerns (Hou et al., 2026). The review suggests that stakeholder trust is built through transparency. Each micro-credential should communicate learning outcomes, workload, level, assessment method, issuer, quality assurance process, credit value, and possible pathways. When such metadata are missing, employers and other institutions may struggle to compare credentials across providers.

Quality Assurance, Accreditation, and Regulation

The fourth theme is quality assurance. This was one of the strongest cross-cutting concerns in the reviewed literature. Micro-credentials are attractive because they are flexible, short, and targeted, but these same characteristics can create quality risks. If credentials are developed without common standards, learners may accumulate certificates that lack academic depth, transferability, or labour market value. Quality

assurance studies argue that micro-credentials require clear standards for curriculum design, assessment, credit, verification, issuer responsibility, learner identity, and review processes. Research on Asian contexts shows that legitimacy and regulatory frameworks are essential when micro-credentials become part of formal higher education systems (Hou et al., 2026).

The quality assurance debate also raises questions about whether micro-credentials should be treated as independent credentials or components of larger programmes. If they are independent, they need enough credibility to stand alone. If they are stackable, they need alignment with qualification frameworks, credit systems, and institutional policies. The reviewed studies show no single global model. Some countries use national guidelines and qualification agencies. Some institutions create internal governance frameworks. Others depend on industry partnerships, platform standards, or digital verification systems. The strongest direction in the literature is not standardisation for its own sake but transparent alignment that allows learners, employers, and institutions to interpret credentials consistently.

Digital Credentialing, Skills Profiling, and Technology Infrastructure

The fifth theme is digital credentialing infrastructure. Micro-credentials are often linked with digital badges, online platforms, skills profiling systems, blockchain verification, and interoperable credential wallets. The reviewed studies show that digital systems can make credentials portable and easier to verify. Skills profiling can connect learning outcomes to occupational skills and help designers align courses with labour market needs (Ward et al., 2023). Digital badges can also communicate metadata about achievement and assessment. However, the review found that technology is useful only when it is connected to sound pedagogy, assessment, and quality assurance. A digital badge without clear academic value becomes a visual symbol rather than meaningful evidence of learning.

Technology infrastructure also creates equity and implementation challenges. Institutions require learning management systems, badge platforms, data governance policies, authentication tools, instructional design expertise, and technical support. Learners require digital access and the ability to manage credentials across platforms. Employers require systems that can verify and interpret credential evidence. The literature therefore frames micro-credentials as part of a broader digital education ecosystem rather than a single course format. This ecosystem includes academic design, platform architecture, data standards, human support, and stakeholder communication. Weakness in any part of this chain can reduce the value of the credential.

Artificial Intelligence and Future Directions

The sixth theme relates to future directions, especially

artificial intelligence. Recent studies and book chapters increasingly connect micro-credentials with AI-supported professional development, personalised learning, automated skills mapping, adaptive assessment, and digital labour market intelligence (Charles & Hill, 2025; Strielkowski, 2025). AI can help identify skills gaps, recommend learning pathways, generate personalised feedback, and connect micro-credential programmes to changing employment demands. This makes micro-credentials attractive in fast-changing fields where full curriculum reform may move too slowly. However, AI also raises concerns about quality, bias, privacy, academic integrity, over-automation, and the credibility of assessment. The future of micro-credentials therefore depends on responsible integration rather than technological enthusiasm alone.

Future-oriented literature also suggests that micro-credentials may reshape the relationship between higher education and lifelong learning. Universities may become lifelong learning ecosystems that offer degrees, certificates, short courses, professional pathways, and digital credentials. This shift could make higher education more inclusive for adult learners, working professionals, and people needing continuous reskilling. However, the review found that the future

remains contested. Some authors see micro-credentials as a route to equity, flexibility, and responsiveness. Others warn that they can contribute to fragmented learning, marketisation, and a narrow skills agenda. The strongest future direction is therefore balanced: micro-credentials should support flexible learning without weakening the broader educational purposes of universities.

Taxonomy of Micro-Credential Issues in Higher Education

The taxonomy shows that micro-credentials are not only curriculum products. They sit at the intersection of institutional strategy, learner aspirations, employer needs, regulatory structures, and digital infrastructure. This makes implementation complex because success requires coherence across multiple dimensions. A strong micro-credential system must therefore answer six basic questions. What learning is certified. How is the learning assessed. Who recognises the credential. How is quality assured. How can the credential be verified. How does the credential connect to further learning or employment. These questions should guide institutional and national implementation strategies.

Table 5.

Dimension	Main issues identified in the review
Institutional dimension	Governance, leadership, policy, workload, infrastructure, instructional design, finance, and strategic positioning.
Learner dimension	Access, flexibility, affordability, motivation, employability, career mobility, and lifelong learning pathways.
Employer dimension	Recognition, trust, skill relevance, verification, clarity of evidence, and alignment with workplace needs.
Quality dimension	Assessment standards, credit value, metadata, accreditation, portability, and review mechanisms.
Technology dimension	Digital badges, platforms, skills profiling, interoperability, verification, data governance, and AI integration.
Policy dimension	National frameworks, cross-border recognition, equity, funding, regulation, and stakeholder coordination.

DISCUSSION

The systematic review indicates that micro-credentials are becoming an important part of higher education transformation. Their growth is linked to employability, lifelong learning, digital transformation, and changing relationships between universities and work. The evidence suggests that micro-credentials can serve learners who need flexible and targeted skill development. They can also help universities respond to external demands without replacing degree programmes. However, the review also shows that the value of micro-credentials remains conditional. Their success depends on credible design, transparent

assessment, recognised standards, stakeholder trust, and meaningful links to educational and employment pathways.

A major finding is that the field is moving from conceptual enthusiasm to implementation complexity. Early discussions emphasised promise, flexibility, and innovation. More recent studies focus on readiness, quality assurance, regulatory legitimacy, employer perceptions, and digital infrastructure. This shift is important because it shows that micro-credentials are no longer only an idea. They are becoming institutional practices that need governance, funding, staff capability, and accountability. The most convincing

studies are those that examine actual institutions, stakeholders, and implementation processes rather than treating micro-credentials as automatically beneficial.

The review also reveals a tension between flexibility and standardisation. Micro-credentials are attractive because they can be short, targeted, and responsive. Yet they require standards to be trusted. Too much standardisation may reduce flexibility, while too little standardisation may reduce credibility. Higher education systems therefore need a balanced approach. Institutions should retain room to design contextually relevant micro-credentials, but each credential should communicate core information about learning outcomes, level, workload, assessment, issuer, credit, quality assurance, and pathways. This balance can protect innovation while reducing confusion.

Another important issue is equity. Micro-credentials are often promoted as accessible because they are smaller and more flexible than full degrees. However, access depends on cost, digital connectivity, language, platform usability, recognition, and learner support. If these conditions are ignored, micro-credentials may benefit already advantaged learners who can pay for additional credentials and present them confidently to employers. The literature therefore suggests that equity should be built into design and policy. This includes affordable pricing, accessible platforms, learner advising, recognition of prior learning, and alignment with public education goals.

The review further suggests that employers are essential to the future of micro-credentials. Many university-based micro-credentials are justified through employability claims. However, employer recognition cannot be assumed. Employers need confidence that micro-credentials represent assessed competence rather than mere participation. Stronger employer involvement in design, validation, assessment standards, and feedback can increase relevance. At the same time, universities should avoid reducing higher education to narrow job training. The strongest model is a partnership approach where micro-credentials support both work-related competence and wider learning outcomes such as critical thinking, ethical judgement, communication, and adaptability.

The relationship between micro-credentials and artificial intelligence deserves careful attention. AI can support personalised learning pathways and faster identification of skills gaps. It can also help map

credentials to labour market data and learner profiles. However, AI-supported credentialing must be governed carefully. Automated assessment and recommendation systems require transparency, fairness, privacy protection, and academic oversight. The use of AI should strengthen learning and verification rather than create unexamined technological dependence. Future research should examine how AI affects assessment validity, learner agency, equity, and employer trust in micro-credentials.

IMPLICATIONS

Implications for Higher Education Institutions

Higher education institutions should develop micro-credential policies before scaling provision. These policies should clarify definitions, approval processes, workload, assessment, credit, quality assurance, digital badge metadata, and rules for stacking. Institutions should also invest in instructional design and staff development because good micro-credentials require more than recorded content. Each programme should be developed around clear learning outcomes, authentic assessment, learner support, and evidence of achievement. Universities should avoid creating isolated micro-credentials without pathways because disconnected credentials may not generate lasting value for learners.

Implications for Quality Assurance Agencies

Quality assurance agencies should provide flexible but clear frameworks for micro-credentials. Frameworks should not prevent innovation, but they should require transparent information about level, workload, assessment, issuer responsibility, credit value, and learner identity verification. Agencies should also encourage cross-institutional recognition and common metadata standards. This is important because learners may complete credentials from several providers. Without shared principles, portability will remain weak and the value of micro-credentials will depend heavily on the reputation of individual providers.

Implications for Employers and Industry Partners

Employers should be involved in identifying skill needs, validating learning outcomes, reviewing assessment tasks, and interpreting credential evidence. This involvement can increase trust and relevance. However, employer involvement should not remove academic responsibility. Universities need to maintain educational quality and ensure that micro-credentials develop transferable competence rather than only narrow job-specific procedures. Industry partnerships

work best when they combine labour market relevance with academic standards and learner development.

Implications for Learners

Learners should be supported to evaluate the credibility and usefulness of micro-credentials before enrolment. Advising systems should help them understand whether a credential is assessed, recognised, stackable, credit-bearing, employer-aligned, or useful for further study. Learners should also be taught how to present digital credentials in professional portfolios. Without such guidance, learners may collect many certificates without building a coherent pathway. Learner support is therefore central to the social and educational value of micro-credentials.

Table 6.

Research gap	Suggested future research direction
Longitudinal learner outcomes	Future studies should follow learners after completing micro-credentials to assess employment, promotion, further study, income, or career mobility.
Employer decision-making	More empirical research is needed on how employers actually interpret micro-credentials during recruitment and promotion.
Quality assurance models	Comparative studies should examine which quality assurance models produce recognition, portability, and learner protection.
Stackability and credit transfer	Research should test whether micro-credentials genuinely stack into larger qualifications across institutions and countries.
Equity and access	Studies should examine cost, digital access, language, disability inclusion, gender, and socioeconomic participation.
AI-supported credentialing	Future research should examine fairness, privacy, validity, bias, and academic integrity in AI-supported micro-credential systems.

IMITATIONS OF THE REVIEW

This review has limitations. First, the field is rapidly changing, and new studies are appearing every month. Findings should therefore be interpreted as a synthesis of evidence available within the selected period rather than a final account of the field. Second, the included studies were methodologically diverse, making statistical meta-analysis inappropriate. Third, the corpus included peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, conference papers, preprints, and repository sources because micro-credential scholarship is emerging across multiple publication channels. This widened the evidence base but also required careful appraisal of source strength. Fourth, some recent records had limited publicly available metadata, which restricted full bibliographic verification. Despite these limitations, the review provides a coherent synthesis of major themes, tensions, and future directions in micro-credential research.

CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review concludes that micro-credentials are becoming a significant part of higher

Research Gaps and Future Research Agenda

The strongest gap is the lack of longitudinal evidence. Many studies describe expected benefits, but fewer follow learners over time to examine whether micro-credentials produce measurable educational or employment gains. Another gap concerns employer behaviour. Studies often report stakeholder perceptions, but less is known about whether employers prefer micro-credentials, how they compare them with degrees, and whether they influence hiring decisions. Future research should therefore move beyond general attitudes and examine actual outcomes.

education because they respond to demand for flexible, targeted, and recognised learning. The evidence shows that micro-credentials can support employability, lifelong learning, professional development, and institutional responsiveness. However, their value is not automatic. Micro-credentials become meaningful when they are based on clear learning outcomes, valid assessment, quality assurance, transparent metadata, credible issuers, employer recognition, and pathways for further learning. The review also shows that the field is moving from broad enthusiasm toward more serious questions about governance, regulation, equity, and trust. For higher education institutions, the challenge is to integrate micro-credentials without fragmenting learning or weakening academic standards. For policymakers, the priority is to create frameworks that support innovation while protecting learners. For researchers, the next stage is to produce stronger empirical evidence on outcomes, employer recognition, and the long-term value of micro-credentials. The future of micro-credentials will depend on whether they are treated as credible components of lifelong learning ecosystems rather than isolated digital certificates.

Hence, the success of micro-credentials is based not only on technological advancement but also

collaboration among universities, industries, policy makers and quality assurance agencies

REFERENCES

- Ali, S. A. (2023). Harnessing the digital nature of micro-credentials in higher education ecosystems. Preprints. <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202303.0045>
- Barbara, J. (2022). Microcredentials and Digital Badges: Opening Higher Education in South Africa through Innovative Recognition. 10.47622/9781928502425_P16.
- Brown, M. (2023). A strategic institutional response to micro-credentials. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.807>
- Charles, T., & Hill, C. (2025). Micro-credentials and AI in higher education: Transforming professional development. In *Prompt engineering and generative AI applications for teaching and learning*. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7332-3.ch001>
- Cheng, J. K., Yong, I. S.-C., Ch'ng, C. K., & Lim, H. T. (2025). Micro-credentials in Malaysian higher education: A comprehensive case study approach. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 10751-10775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13278-7>
- Gamage, K. A. A., & Dehideniya, S. C. P. (2025). Unlocking career potential: How micro-credentials are revolutionising higher education and lifelong learning. *Education Sciences*, 15(5), 525. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050525>
- Ha, N. T. N., Van Dyke, N., Spittle, M., Watt, A., & Smallridge, A. (2024). Micro-credentials through the eyes of employers: Benefits, challenges and enablers of effectiveness. *Education + Training*, 66(7), 948-963. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-08-2023-0340>
- Hou, A. Y. C., Tao, C. H., Su, E. H. C., Zhou, K. Z.-W., Chen, Y., Lin, A. F. Y., & Hill, C. (2026). Does quality assurance matter for micro-credentials in higher education? Legitimacy, regulatory framework, and challenges in four Asian contexts. *Studies in Higher Education*, 51(3), 592-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2025.2482833>
- Keoy, K. H. (2024). Streamlining micro-credentials implementation in higher education. *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219649223500697>
- Kušić, S., Vrcelj, S., & Zovko, A. (2022). Micro-credentials: Improvement or fragmentation in higher education? *International Conference on Education and New Developments*. <https://doi.org/10.36315/2022v2end033>
- Md Rami, A. A., Ismail, I. A., Sarman, M. A., & Zulkifly, N. A. (2023). Execution of micro-credentials in Malaysia: The challenges and readiness of higher education leaders. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 19(4), 768-780. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v19i4.24782>
- Narayanaswamy, R., Albers, C., Knotts, T., & Albers-Miller, N. (2024). Sustaining and reinforcing the perceived value of higher education: E-learning with micro-credentials. *Sustainability*, 16(20), 8860. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16208860>
- Orman, R., Şimşek, E., & Kozak Çakır, M. A. (2023). Micro-credentials and reflections on higher education. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, 17(2), 96-112. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HEED-08-2022-0028>
- Pirkkalainen, H., Sood, I., Padrón-Nápoles, C. L., & Camilleri, A. (2023). How might micro-credentials influence institutions and empower learners in higher education? *Educational Research*, 65(1), 40-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2022.2157302>
- Reed, A., Kong, Y., & Abramovich, S. (2024). Assessment, credential, or both? Higher education faculty's design principles for micro-credentials. *Discover Education*, 3, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00100-2>
- Strielkowski, W. (2025). The role of micro-credentials in the future digitalized AI-driven education. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2511.07583>
- Varadarajan, S., Koh, J. H. L., & Daniel, B. K. (2023). A systematic review of the opportunities and challenges of micro-credentials for multiple stakeholders: Learners, employers, higher education institutions and government. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00381-x>
- Varadarajan, S. (2025). Institutional readiness for the implementation of micro-credentials in higher education. *Distance Education*.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2024.2442017>

Ward, R., Moller, F., Prickett, T., & Walters, J. (2023). Using skills profiling to enable badges and micro-credentials to be incorporated into higher education courses. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.807>

Yılık, M. A. (2025). The rationales and values of micro-credentials in higher education. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 58, 101951.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2025.101951>

Zhang, K., & Alasmari, T. (2025). Micro-credentials in Saudi higher education: Stakeholder perceptions and policy implications for economic transformation and bridging skills gaps. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 10(4), 481-502. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPC-10-2024-0171>