



METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING STUDENTS'
DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY COMPETENCE

Raymova Marfuga Umirzakovna

ARTICLE INFO:

Received:23.10.2026

Revised: 24.10.2026

Accepted:25.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

digital competence;
higher education; digital
literacy; instructional
methodology; DigComp;
project-based learning;
formative assessment;
digital citizenship.

ABSTRACT

This article presents a structured methodology for developing students' digital technology competence in higher education. Drawing on competency-based education, constructivist learning and the European Digital Competence Framework (DigComp 2.2), it proposes a five-stage instructional cycle: diagnosis, goal setting, guided practice, authentic application and reflective assessment. The approach combines problem-based learning, collaborative digital projects, information literacy, responsible artificial intelligence use and formative feedback. A multidimensional assessment rubric is suggested to evaluate technical proficiency, critical judgement, communication, content creation and digital safety. The article is conceptual rather than experimental; therefore, the proposed model is intended for contextual adaptation and subsequent empirical validation.

1. Introduction

Digital transformation has changed how universities generate, distribute and evaluate knowledge. Students increasingly use learning management systems, cloud services, digital libraries, collaborative platforms, data-analysis tools and artificial intelligence applications. However, frequent exposure to technology does not necessarily imply the ability to use it critically, ethically or effectively. Students may be proficient in everyday communication applications while lacking skills in source verification, cybersecurity, data interpretation or the production of accessible digital content.



Consequently, universities need to move beyond teaching isolated software functions toward developing transferable digital competence. Digital competence encompasses knowledge, practical skills, attitudes and responsible judgement required to use technologies to learn, work and participate in society. The DigComp 2.2 framework identifies five interrelated areas: information and data literacy; communication and collaboration; digital content creation; safety; and problem solving (Vuorikari et al., 2022). These areas provide a useful reference for defining learning outcomes and designing assessment activities.

The purpose of this article is to develop an adaptable methodology that integrates these dimensions into university instruction. The objectives are to identify pedagogical foundations, specify instructional stages, recommend teaching activities and propose measurable indicators of student progress. The central proposition is that competence develops more effectively through repeated authentic tasks and guided reflection than through lectures about digital tools alone.

2. Theoretical Foundations and Literature Review

A competency-based approach defines learning in terms of observable performance rather than exposure to content. It requires explicit learning outcomes, opportunities to practise and evidence-based assessment. Constructivist theory further suggests that learners build understanding through active engagement with problems and social interaction. In digital education, this implies designing tasks in which students search for evidence, evaluate alternatives, create artefacts and explain their decisions.

The DigComp framework provides a common language for describing digital competence, while the UNESCO ICT Competency Framework for Teachers highlights the importance of pedagogical integration and institutional support (UNESCO, 2018). Although the latter focuses on educators, it reinforces an important principle: technology improves learning only when teaching strategies and professional capabilities support its use. The OECD (2023) similarly emphasises that successful digital education requires attention to educational goals, access, governance and human capacity, not merely the acquisition of devices.

Self-regulated learning is another important foundation. Students should learn to plan their digital work, monitor reliability and security, seek feedback and revise outcomes. Collaborative learning adds communication, negotiation and shared responsibility. Project-based learning can connect these elements by asking students to produce meaningful outputs for an identifiable audience, such as a research poster, interactive presentation, dataset dashboard or accessible instructional resource.

3. Research Approach and Methodological Design

This study uses a conceptual design and synthesis of established educational frameworks. It does not report a survey, controlled experiment or measured intervention outcomes. The proposed model is derived from the alignment of DigComp competence areas with instructional



design principles and performance-based assessment. Its suitability should be tested in future institutional studies using baseline and post-intervention assessments.

The methodology rests on four principles. First, learning outcomes must be transparent and assessable. Second, activities should be authentic and discipline-relevant. Third, scaffolding should be gradually reduced as learners become independent. Fourth, assessment should address not only the final digital product but also the process, including information selection, ethical decisions, collaboration and reflection.

The design also incorporates an iterative improvement cycle: diagnose needs, teach and scaffold, observe performance, provide actionable feedback, and redesign the next learning task. This cycle helps prevent a common implementation error—equating frequent technology use with demonstrable competence. Evidence should come from what learners can independently produce, justify, and improve.

4. A Five-Stage Methodology for Competence Development

Stage 1: Diagnostic assessment. At the start of a course, instructors identify students' access to technology, prior experience and specific skill gaps. Short practical tasks are preferable to self-ratings alone: learners may be asked to verify a website, organise a shared document, create a chart from a small dataset and identify a suspicious message. The results establish an initial profile and help instructors differentiate support.

Stage 2: Competence-based goal setting. Teachers translate broad framework categories into specific outcomes. For example, by the end of a module, a student should be able to compare three digital sources using explicit credibility criteria, collaborate in a version-controlled document, produce a properly attributed multimedia resource and explain privacy risks associated with data sharing. Outcomes should be aligned with course content rather than treated as unrelated technical exercises.

Stage 3: Guided skill development. Instructors demonstrate essential procedures and reasoning through short demonstrations, worked examples and supervised workshops. Students practise advanced search strategies, citation management, spreadsheet formulas, data visualisation, accessible document design and account security. Instruction includes the limitations of generative AI, including fabricated references, bias, confidentiality risks and the need to verify outputs independently.

Stage 4: Authentic collaborative application. Small groups undertake a discipline-specific digital project. Engineering students might collect and visualise energy-consumption data; education students might design accessible learning materials; economics students might analyse an open dataset. Groups document their sources, assign roles, maintain a revision history and present findings. The instructor provides checkpoints, peer-review opportunities and targeted feedback without taking over the project.



Illustrative engineering assignment: student teams analyse an anonymised electricity-consumption dataset, document data-cleaning decisions, create a reproducible spreadsheet or Python visualisation, and prepare a two-page recommendation for reducing peak demand. Each team must verify source provenance, disclose any generative-AI assistance, protect sensitive data, and defend the limitations of its conclusions. This example is a proposed classroom activity, not an implemented experiment.

Stage 5: Reflection and performance assessment. Students submit both a final artefact and a short process portfolio explaining source choices, corrections, security measures and individual contributions. They compare their performance with baseline tasks, identify remaining weaknesses and establish a personal improvement plan. Reflection converts a one-off activity into transferable learning.

5. Instructional Tools and Learning Activities

Digital competence development should involve a balanced range of tools, selected according to accessibility, privacy and disciplinary relevance. Learning management systems can distribute resources and track submissions; collaborative documents enable shared editing and feedback; spreadsheets and visualisation applications support data reasoning; reference managers strengthen academic integrity; and multimedia editors enable creative communication. No single platform is essential to the methodology: equivalent tools can be substituted where licensing, connectivity or disability-access requirements differ.

One illustrative six-week implementation begins with baseline diagnostics and information evaluation in week one. Week two addresses collaboration and netiquette; week three focuses on digital content creation and attribution; week four covers safety, privacy and responsible AI; week five is devoted to group projects; and week six combines presentations, peer review and post-assessment. Weekly micro-tasks provide immediate practice, while the final project integrates skills across the five competence areas.

For inclusive delivery, teachers should provide low-bandwidth alternatives, mobile-compatible resources, captions, readable document formats and accessible assessment options. Students with unequal access to equipment should have opportunities to use institutional facilities. Differentiated tasks can challenge advanced learners while supporting beginners through templates and additional guidance.

6. Assessment Framework and Indicators

Assessment should combine diagnostic, formative and summative evidence. A practical rubric may use four performance levels: emerging (1), developing (2), proficient (3) and advanced (4). The following dimensions can be scored separately and discussed through feedback rather than reduced to a single uninformative grade.

To improve scoring consistency, assessors should apply behavioural anchors: level 1 completes tasks only with substantial guidance; level 2 completes routine tasks with occasional



assistance; level 3 independently selects suitable tools and justifies choices; level 4 adapts methods to unfamiliar problems, documents decisions, and supports peers. Two assessors may independently score a sample of portfolios and reconcile discrepancies before wider use. The resulting index should be reported alongside dimension-level scores rather than treated as a validated psychometric scale.

Dimension	Observable evidence
Information literacy	Verifies sources, searches strategically and cites evidence accurately
Communication	Collaborates respectfully and manages shared digital workflows
Content creation	Produces functional, accessible and properly attributed digital artefacts
Safety and ethics	Protects data, identifies risks and discloses responsible AI use
Problem solving	Selects tools appropriately, troubleshoots and justifies decisions

A possible competence index is calculated as $C = (I + M + D + S + P) / 5$, where each component represents a rubric score from 1 to 4. This arithmetic mean is illustrative, not a validated psychometric scale. Institutions should examine inter-rater agreement, criterion validity and whether equal weighting is appropriate before using it for high-stakes decisions. To estimate improvement, compare matched baseline and final performance tasks and report both mean changes and the distribution of achievement levels.

7. Discussion and Implementation Considerations

The model's principal strength is its integration of technical performance with critical, social and ethical dimensions. A student who can generate a polished presentation but cannot check its sources or protect confidential information should not be classified as fully digitally competent. Authentic projects expose such gaps because students must apply several skills simultaneously and explain their choices.

Responsible generative-AI use warrants explicit instruction. Students should distinguish assistance from authorship, check fabricated citations and numerical outputs, avoid uploading personal or confidential information, and explain how AI-supported work was verified. Instructors can evaluate this through a short disclosure statement and an oral defence of the student's own reasoning.

Implementation nevertheless presents challenges. Unequal connectivity and device access may amplify existing educational inequalities. Instructors may require professional development to design meaningful tasks and apply rubrics consistently. Digital tools also evolve quickly, so curricula should emphasise adaptable principles—verification, interoperability, privacy,



accessibility and problem-solving—alongside specific software skills. AI-supported work requires transparent rules about permitted assistance, attribution and independent student contribution.

Future research should examine the methodology through a quasi-experimental or mixed-methods design. A feasible study would compare baseline and final authentic tasks, collect student reflections, conduct teacher interviews and monitor retention after several months. Analyses should consider prior experience, disciplinary background and access to devices as potential confounders. Such evidence would allow the proposed sequence and rubric to be refined.

A subsequent evaluation could use a pre-specified rubric with baseline and post-intervention tasks, record access-related confounders, and analyse changes by competence dimension. Interviews and portfolio reviews could explain why scores change. Without an empirical sample, causal effectiveness, statistical significance and generalisability cannot be claimed.

8. Conclusion

Developing students' digital technology competence requires a coherent pedagogical system rather than sporadic exposure to digital applications. The proposed five-stage methodology combines diagnostic assessment, measurable goals, guided practice, authentic collaboration and reflective evaluation. Its multidimensional rubric links learning outcomes to observable evidence across information literacy, communication, content creation, safety and problem solving. Universities can adapt the approach to different disciplines and resource conditions. Empirical validation remains necessary to establish its effectiveness and determine the most appropriate assessment weights and implementation duration.

References

1. OECD. (2023). OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en>
2. UNESCO. (2018). UNESCO ICT Competency Framework for Teachers (Version 3). UNESCO.
3. Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens—With New Examples of Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/115376>