The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
International Journal of Pedagogics

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue03 2026
PAGE NO. 302-306
DOI 10.37547/ijp/Volume06Issue03-61

Advantages of Using The "Dhoch3" Digital Education Platform in Improving Pedagogical Skills

Khudanova Shakhnoza
Doctoral student of Uzbekistan state world languages university, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 February 2026; **Accepted:** 08 March 2026; **Published:** 30 March 2026

Abstract: The rapid digitalization of higher education systems worldwide has placed increasing pressure on institutions to adopt technology-enhanced learning environments. In Uzbekistan, the government-mandated Dhoch3 platform has emerged as a pivotal tool in reforming how pedagogical competencies are assessed, developed, and monitored among higher education faculty. This article examines the advantages of applying the Dhoch3 digital education platform in enhancing the pedagogical skills of university teachers in Uzbekistan, analyzing its impact on professional development, instructional design, and student engagement outcomes.

Keywords: Dhoch3 platform, pedagogical skills, digital education, higher education, teacher professional development, Uzbekistan, e-learning, instructional technology.

Introduction: The twenty-first century has ushered in a profound transformation of educational paradigms globally. The convergence of information and communication technology (ICT) with pedagogical theory has redefined what it means to teach effectively in a university setting (Mishra, Koehler, 2006). Digital learning platforms have transcended their initial role as content repositories to become comprehensive ecosystems that support curriculum design, formative assessment, learner analytics, and teacher professional development (Selwyn, 2019). Governments and institutions alike have recognized that teacher quality is the single most influential school-based factor affecting student achievement, making the enhancement of pedagogical competencies a policy priority of the highest order (Hattie, 2009).

In Uzbekistan, educational reform has accelerated dramatically since the adoption of the Presidential Decree on Education Development Strategy (2017–2021) and the subsequent National Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan (2022–2026). A key initiative within this reform trajectory was the introduction of Dhoch3 — an integrated digital platform developed specifically for higher education institutions — mandated by the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Dhoch3 functions as a multifaceted academic information system, enabling universities to manage faculty attestation, course delivery, research documentation, and professional development records within a unified digital infrastructure (Ministry of Higher Education, Uzbekistan, 2021).

Despite its official adoption across institutions, the pedagogical implications of Dhoch3 remain underexplored in the academic literature. Most discourse surrounding the platform is policy-oriented rather than empirically grounded, leaving a critical gap between implementation mandates and evidence-based understanding of educational outcomes. This article addresses that gap by systematically examining the advantages of Dhoch3 for improving teacher pedagogical skills, drawing on both global digital education research and primary data collected from Uzbek higher education practitioners.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond Uzbekistan's national context. As post-Soviet and

developing nations increasingly adopt homegrown digital platforms rather than importing foreign solutions, understanding the effectiveness and limitations of such platforms informs a broader conversation about educational technology sovereignty, localization, and quality assurance. Furthermore, the pedagogical skill domains affected by Dhoch3 - including reflective practice, learner-centered instruction, and digital pedagogical content knowledge - are universally relevant to teacher education discourse worldwide (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

This article is structured according to the IMRAD format. Following this introduction, the Methods section describes the research design, participants, instruments, and analytical procedures. The Results section presents quantitative findings and thematic qualitative insights. The Discussion section interprets these findings in light of existing theory and evidence. Finally, the Conclusion offers practical recommendations and directions for future research.

METHODS

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative interview responses to achieve a comprehensive understanding of Dhoch3's impact on pedagogical skills (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). The quantitative phase provided measurable outcome data, while the qualitative phase illuminated the contextual and experiential dimensions of platform use.

A stratified random sample of 214 full-time university educators was recruited from five higher education institutions in Uzbekistan: the National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent State Technical University, Samarkand State University, Bukhara State University, and Fergana State University. Institutions were selected to represent diverse disciplinary profiles and geographic regions. Participants ranged in age from 26 to 61 years, with teaching experience ranging from 1 to 35 years. Of the total sample, 58.4% identified as male and 41.6% as female. All participants had been using the Dhoch3 platform for a minimum of one academic year at the time of data collection (2022-2024).

Additionally, 24 purposively selected participants from the survey sample agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews, ensuring maximum variation in institution type, disciplinary background, and years of Dhoch3 experience (Miles et al., 2019).

The Pedagogical Skills Enhancement Questionnaire (PSEQ) was developed by the research team based on the European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators (DigCompEdu; Redecker, 2017) and the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). The PSEQ comprised 42 items across six subscales: Digital Instructional Design, Learner Engagement and Interaction, Assessment and Feedback Practices, Professional Development and Reflection, Collaborative Teaching, and Platform-Specific Usability Satisfaction. Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Internal consistency was acceptable across all subscales.

Semi-structured interview guides consisted of 12 open-ended questions exploring participants' lived experiences with Dhoch3, perceived benefits and barriers, and recommendations for improvement.

Data Collection and Analysis

Surveys were administered electronically via a secure online platform between October 2022 and April 2024. Interviews were conducted via videoconference, audio-recorded with participant consent, and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review boards of each participating university. Participation was entirely voluntary, and data anonymization protocols were strictly maintained throughout the study.

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS v.26. Descriptive statistics characterized participant demographics and scale scores. Independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVAs were used to examine group differences by gender, institution, and experience level. Thematic analysis of interview transcripts followed the six-phase procedure outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), with coding conducted by two independent researchers achieving an inter-rater reliability of 0.84.

RESULTS

The highest mean score was recorded for Learner Engagement and Interaction, reflecting educators' appreciation of Dhoch3's interactive tools. Assessment and Feedback Practices also scored highly, while Platform-Specific Usability Satisfaction recorded the lowest score, indicating partial dissatisfaction with

interface design and technical stability.

Regarding self-reported pedagogical improvements, 78.4% of participants reported measurable enhancement in instructional planning capabilities after sustained Dhoch3 use. Digital competency improvements were acknowledged by 71.2%, while 65.3% indicated that the platform had fostered greater reflective teaching practices. A statistically significant positive correlation was identified between years of Dhoch3 use and Digital Instructional Design scores, suggesting that longitudinal engagement with the platform compounds pedagogical benefits.

ANOVA results revealed significant differences across institutions in Professional Development and Reflection scores, with the National University of Uzbekistan recording significantly higher scores than regional institutions, likely attributable to differences in institutional support infrastructure and trainer availability. Gender differences were non-significant across all subscales.

Thematic analysis of interview transcripts produced four overarching themes: Enhanced Instructional Agency, Real-Time Feedback as a Catalyst for Reflection, Collaborative Professional Communities, and Technical Barriers and Institutional Support Needs.

Theme 1: Enhanced Instructional Agency. Participants consistently described how Dhoch3's structured course planning modules compelled them to articulate learning objectives more explicitly than before. One participant stated: "Before Dhoch3, I taught from habit. The platform made me think about why I was doing each part of my lesson." This aligns with constructivist teacher education theory emphasizing metacognitive awareness as central to professional growth (Mezirow, 1991).

Theme 2: Real-Time Feedback as a Catalyst for Reflection. The platform's automated analytics dashboard, which provides instructors with immediate data on student participation rates, assignment submission patterns, and quiz performance, was frequently cited as transformative. Participants reported using these data to adjust teaching strategies mid-semester, a practice characteristic of formative assessment literacy (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Theme 3: Collaborative Professional Communities. Dhoch3's inter-faculty module facilitated peer observation records, joint curriculum development, and shared resource libraries. Several participants described how access to colleagues' course designs expanded their own pedagogical repertoire: "I looked at how a professor in the chemistry faculty structured problem-based learning online and adapted it for my mathematics class."

Theme 4: Technical Barriers and Institutional Support Needs. Despite overall positive perceptions, participants raised concerns about server downtime, inconsistent mobile functionality, limited multilingual support, and insufficient initial training. These barriers disproportionately affected educators at smaller regional institutions, amplifying existing inequalities in digital pedagogical capacity.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study substantiate the theoretical proposition that purpose-built digital platforms can serve as meaningful catalysts for pedagogical skill enhancement when effectively implemented and institutionally supported (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). The high engagement rates with Dhoch3's instructional planning and assessment features are consistent with research demonstrating that structured digital scaffolding encourages more deliberate and reflective teaching practice (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008).

The strong performance on the Learner Engagement subscale aligns with socio-constructivist learning theory, which holds that interactive, digitally mediated environments can deepen both teacher and learner engagement with course content (Vygotsky, 1978; Jonassen, 1999). Dhoch3's integration of discussion forums, assignment pipelines, and participatory analytics mirrors design principles validated in research on widely used learning management systems (Coates et al., 2005; Nguyen et al., 2021).

The significant correlation between platform experience and instructional design competency is particularly noteworthy. This pattern is consistent with the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and its extensions, which predict that perceived usefulness and ease of use increase with familiarity, leading to deeper integration of the tool into professional practice. Longitudinal professional development programs scaffolded by Dhoch3 would therefore be expected to yield compounding benefits over time (Ertmer &

Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

The institutional disparities revealed by the ANOVA results raise important equity concerns. The concentration of pedagogical benefits among faculty at better-resourced central institutions echoes a broader pattern documented in educational technology research wherein digital divides exacerbate pre-existing structural inequalities (Warschauer, 2004). Addressing this requires not only infrastructure investment but also culturally responsive professional development frameworks that acknowledge the specific challenges faced by educators in under-resourced regional settings (Gay, 2010).

The qualitative themes resonate with Mezirow's (1991) transformative learning theory, which posits that critical reflection on practice is the engine of professional transformation. Dhoch3's data dashboards appear to function as reflective mirrors, making previously tacit aspects of teaching visible and therefore actionable (Schön, 1983). This aligns with calls in teacher education literature for data-informed professional learning that is embedded in everyday practice rather than confined to formal training events (Timperley et al., 2007).

The technical barriers identified - server instability, limited multilingual support, insufficient training - represent endemic challenges in educational technology adoption across developing and transitional economies (Livingstone, 2012). These findings underscore that platform effectiveness is contingent on a complex ecosystem encompassing not only the technology itself but also institutional culture, leadership support, infrastructure quality, and educator beliefs about technology's role in learning (Fullan, 2001).

This study has several limitations. The self-report nature of survey data may introduce social desirability bias. The cross-sectional elements of the design limit causal claims about Dhoch3's direct impact on pedagogical outcomes. The sample is also limited to five institutions and may not fully represent the diversity of Uzbekistan's higher education system. Future research should employ longitudinal designs and comparative analyses across different digital platforms to further validate and extend these findings.

CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical support for the pedagogical value of the Dhoch3 digital education platform in Uzbekistan's higher education sector. The platform demonstrably supports improvements in instructional planning, digital competency, and reflective teaching practice - three dimensions of pedagogical skill that are foundational to effective university teaching. Its real-time analytics, structured course design modules, and collaborative features position it as a promising vehicle for ongoing faculty professional development.

However, the full realization of Dhoch3's pedagogical potential requires concerted action on multiple fronts. Institutional leaders must invest in sustained, differentiated training programs that go beyond initial onboarding to support deep pedagogical integration. Technical teams must prioritize platform stability, mobile optimization, and multilingual accessibility. Policymakers must address the institutional equity gaps that currently limit access to Dhoch3's benefits, ensuring that educators at regional institutions receive support comparable to that available at flagship universities.

For the international academic community, Dhoch3 offers a valuable case study of an indigenously developed educational platform navigating the intersection of national policy mandates, cultural context, and global pedagogical standards. As comparable initiatives emerge across Central Asia and other regions undertaking educational modernization, the lessons drawn from Dhoch3's implementation hold broader relevance for educational technology policy and practice worldwide.

REFERENCES

1. 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
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
3. Coates, H., James, R., & Baldwin, G. (2005). A critical examination of the effects of learning management systems on university teaching and learning. Tertiary Education and Management, 11(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2005.9967137

4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311
6. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008
7. Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 42(3), 255–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782551
8. Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
9. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. Jossey-Bass.
10. Gay, G. (2010). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
11. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
12. Jonassen, D. H. (1999). Designing constructivist learning environments. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory (Vol. 2, pp. 215–239). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
13. Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2014). Technology-enhanced learning and teaching in higher education: What is 'enhanced' and how do we know? A critical literature review. Learning, Media and Technology, 39(1), 6–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2013.770404
14. Livingstone, S. (2012). Critical reflections on the benefits of ICT in education. Oxford Review of Education, 38(1), 9–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2011.577938
15. Mezirow, J. (1991). Transformative dimensions of adult learning. Jossey-Bass.
16. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2019). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
17. Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2021). Regulation on the use of the Dhoch3 digital platform in higher education institutions. Official Government Bulletin of Uzbekistan.
18. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x
19. Nguyen, L., Barton, S. M., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). iPads in higher education: Hype and hope. British Journal of Educational Technology, 46(1), 190–203. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12137
20. Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770
21. Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.
22. Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Polity Press.
23. Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration. New Zealand Ministry of Education.
24. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
25. Warschauer, M. (2004). Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide. MIT Press.