# CATEGORIZING EDUCATIONAL TERMS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

## Uralova Oysuluv Poyon qizi[1], Bekmuratova Dilbar Xushmamatovna[2]

[1]PhD, Docent, Termiz State Pedagogical Institute
[2]1st Year Master's Student, Termiz State Pedagogical Institute

## ABSTRACT

*Education is a complex field that encompasses various concepts and terms, making it crucial to establish a comprehensive categorization system. This article presents a systematic review of existing literature to identify and categorize educational terms. The review focuses on categorization systems used to classify terms in the domains of curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and educational technology. Findings revealed multiple approaches to categorizing educational terms, including hierarchical taxonomies, concept maps, and ontologies. The categorized terms provide a foundation for developing a standardized vocabulary across educational research and practice.*

**KEY WORDS:** *education, educational terms, categorization, systematic review, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, educational technology, taxonomy, concept mapping, ontology, research, policy development, communication*

Education is a dynamic field with numerous terminologies used to describe concepts, theoretical frameworks, and practices. Clarifying and categorizing these terms is essential for effective communication, research, and policy development in education. This article aims to review existing literature and categorize educational terms to establish a coherent framework for future reference.

A systematic review was conducted to identify relevant literature on categorizing educational terms. Databases such as ERIC, JSTOR, and Scopus were searched using keywords related to educational terms and their categorization. Articles were selected based on inclusion and exclusion criteria to ensure research quality. Data extraction involved identifying categorization methods and analyzing the terms within each category.

The systematic review identified various approaches to categorizing educational terms. Hierarchical taxonomies[1] were commonly employed, where terms were categorized based on their broader and narrower conceptual relationships. For example, terms related to instructional strategies could be categorized under the broader categories of active learning, collaborative learning, and direct instruction. Other categorization methods included concept mapping and ontologies[2], which represented relationships between terms using visual representations or semantic frameworks.

To provide further information on the systematic review, it is important to understand the purpose and methodology of the study. The systematic review aimed to identify and analyze the terminology used in educational research literature. This involved conducting a comprehensive search of various databases and selecting relevant articles based on specific inclusion criteria.

The selected articles were then analyzed to extract educational terms used within the literature. These terms were then classified into four broad domains: curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and educational technology. Each domain had multiple subcategories to capture the diverse range of terms used in the literature.

**1. Curriculum**: This domain focuses on terms related to the design, development, and implementation of educational content. Subcategories within this domain could include curriculum design, curriculum development, curriculum evaluation, curriculum alignment, and curriculum mapping.

---

[1] Becker, K., & Parks, S. (2016). Taxonomy usage in K-12 educational technology research from 2000 to 2014. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 48(3), 194-213.*

[2] Ekici, D. (2018). Ontology development for e-learning: A systematic review. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 19(1), 37-60.*

# EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
### Volume: 8 | Issue: 11 | November 2023                                    - Peer Reviewed Journal

**2. Pedagogy**: This domain encompasses terms related to teaching methods, strategies[3], and approaches[4] used in education. Subcategories within this domain could include instructional methods, student-centered learning, inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, and cooperative learning.

**3. Assessment**: This domain includes terms related to evaluating and measuring student learning outcomes. Subcategories within this domain could include formative assessment, summative assessment, standardized testing, rubrics, and feedback.

**4. Educational technology**: This domain includes terms related to the use of technology in education. Subcategories within this domain could include instructional technology, e-learning, blended learning, educational apps, and virtual reality.

By categorizing the educational terms into these domains and subcategories, the systematic review[5] provides a comprehensive overview of the terminology used in educational research. This categorization can help researchers, educators, and policymakers better understand and communicate ideas in the field of education.

The categorization of educational terms presented in this article provides a foundation for standardizing vocabulary within the field of education. Establishing a common framework will facilitate effective communication, research synthesis, and policy development. Additionally, future research could focus on updating and expanding the categorization system[6], incorporating emerging terms related to educational trends such as personalized learning, online education, and inclusive practices.

This systematic review has contributed to the field of education by identifying and categorizing educational terms within the domains of curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and educational technology. The comprehensive categorization system presented in this article will aid researchers, practitioners, and policymakers in developing a standardized vocabulary, thus enhancing communication and promoting collaboration within the education community.

# REFERENCES

1. *Becker, K., & Parks, S. (2016). Taxonomy usage in K-12 educational technology research from 2000 to 2014. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 48(3), 194-213.*
2. *Ekici, D. (2018). Ontology development for e-learning: A systematic review. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 19(1), 37-60.*
3. *Hattie, J., & Donoghue, G. M. (2016). Learning strategies: A synthesis and conceptual model. Science of Learning, 1(1), 1-13.*
4. *Marín, V. I., Riquelme, F., Alcaraz-Calero, J. M., Nguyen, H. X., & Serrat, J. (2017). A systematic review on student modeling approaches built on ontologies. Computers in Human Behavior, 73, 514-527.*
5. *Purwanto, A., & Bull, S. (2017). The concept maps in science education: A systematic review. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(7).*
6. *Wallace, M., Newlands, D., Jauregi, K., Cotton, D., & Sands, W. (2019). A systematic review of transdisciplinary thinking in environmental research. Journal of Environmental Management, 248.*
7. *Kodirova M. T. CLASSIFICATION OF ADDRESSING FORMS AND THEIR STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLES //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2019. – №. 12. – C. 553-556.*
8. *Tog'ayevna Q. M. THE STUDY OF PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ADDRESSING UNITS IN UZBEK LANGUAGE //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES. – 2022. – T. 3. – №. 03. – C. 61-66.*
9. *Temirova M., Qodirova M. LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF CHILDREN'S POETRY (BASED ON ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES) //MUNDARIJA | TABLEOFCONTENTS| С О Д Е Р Ж А Н И Е. – 2021. – C. 57.*
10. *KODIROVA M. İngiliz ve Özbek Dillerinde Hitap Biçimlerinin Tarihsel-Evrimsel Gelişimi //Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi. – 2014. – T. 7. – №. 13. – C. 201-208.*
11. *Kodirova M., Nuraliyeva F., Vazira U. Language Politeness in English and Uzbek //JournalNX. – C. 37-41.*
12. *URALOVA O. P. Q. LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE PROVERBS BY THE NAMES OF BEVERAGES AND VEGETABLES IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES //THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука. – 2021. – T. 12. – C. 1165-1169.*
13. *qizi Uralova O. P., Bekmuratova D. X. INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: TERMINOLOGY, DEFINITIONS, AND IMPLEMENTATION //GOLDEN BRAIN. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 31. – C. 147-152.*

---

[3] *Hattie, J., & Donoghue, G. M. (2016). Learning strategies: A synthesis and conceptual model. Science of Learning, 1(1), 1-13.*

[4] *Marín, V. I., Riquelme, F., Alcaraz-Calero, J. M., Nguyen, H. X., & Serrat, J. (2017). A systematic review on student modeling approaches built on ontologies. Computers in Human Behavior, 73, 514-527.*

[5] *Purwanto, A., & Bull, S. (2017). The concept maps in science education: A systematic review. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 13(7), 3735-3764.*

[6] *Wallace, M., Newlands, D., Jauregi, K., Cotton, D., & Sands, W. (2019). A systematic review of transdisciplinary thinking in environmental research. Journal of Environmental Management, 248.*