



Article

# Structural and Semantic Features of Educational Tool Terminology

Xamidjonova Dilnura

1. Trainee-Researcher at the Andijan Institute of Foreign Languages

**Abstract:** This study provides a comprehensive scientific analysis of the structural and semantic features of educational tool terminology. First, the role and significance of terms within the language system are examined, and their characteristics as a specific lexical layer are substantiated. In addition, the sources of formation, word-building methods, and structural properties of terms related to educational tools are thoroughly analyzed. The research also highlights the close relationship between educational tool terminology and professional vocabulary, as well as explains their functional usage in the modern educational system. Furthermore, the etymological composition of terms, including native and borrowed units, is scientifically justified. The results of the study have significant theoretical and practical value for the systematization and improvement of educational terminology. These aspects are essential for the present research.

**Keywords:** educational tools, term, terminology, structural analysis, semantic features, hypernym-hyponym relations, paronymic relations, special vocabulary, professional lexicon, term formation, affixation, etymology, borrowed terms, educational terminology, scientific vocabulary

**Citation:** Dilnura, X. Structural and Semantic Features of Educational Tool Terminology. *Pioneer: Journal of Advanced Research and Scientific Progress* 2026, 5(2), 18-21.

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> Mar 2026

Revised: 21<sup>th</sup> Mar 2026

Accepted: 24<sup>th</sup> Apr 2026

Published: 26<sup>th</sup> Apr 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

In this article, extensive research and analytical investigations are carried out. For instance, it can be stated that language is an essential means of expressing human thought, social experience, and cultural heritage, and within it, a special lexical layer — terms — occupies a significant place[1]. This is because language ensures the continuity of communication. In particular, terms related to educational tools used in the teaching process play a crucial role in ensuring scientific accuracy, delivering knowledge in a systematic way, and enhancing the effectiveness of pedagogical activity. Therefore, studying the structural and semantic features of educational tool terminology within the frameworks of Terminology and Semantics is considered one of the pressing scientific issues. Indeed, in recent years, due to innovations in the education system and the widespread implementation of digital technologies, the range of educational tools has significantly expanded[2]. Accordingly, the terminology associated with them has also been enriched. This requires not only a structural but also a deep semantic analysis of such terms.

In my personal view, terms related to educational tools are not merely naming units, but also represent an important manifestation of scientific thinking[3]. Based on my personal experience, I can say that during the educational process, particularly while conducting various experiments, the precise and accurate use of terminology directly influences the effectiveness of outcomes. If terms are used inaccurately or ambiguously, it may lead to difficulties in students' comprehension of the subject matter. For example, such experimental observations serve as a foundation that

strengthens the relevance of our research. Furthermore, relying on my own experience, it can be emphasized that the correct structural organization and semantic clarity of terms used in educational tools are key factors in improving the efficiency of the learning process. Therefore, this study provides a comprehensive analysis of the structural and semantic aspects of educational tool terminology, highlighting their role in the language system, methods of formation, and semantic relationships on a scientific basis[4].

## 2. Research Methodology

In this study, several scientific approaches were used to examine the structural and semantic aspects of educational tool terminology. First of all, the research was based on the principles of Terminology and Semantics. In addition, the structural analysis method was applied to determine the formation of terms. This method proved to be very effective for our research. In my personal view, combining theoretical and practical approaches gives the most effective results when studying terminology. Indeed, I believe that relying only on theory is not sufficient. It is also important to observe how terms are used in real educational processes[5].

During the research, the following methods were applied:

First, the **analysis and classification method**. Using this approach, educational tool terms were divided into simple, compound, and complex types. For example, "textbook" is a simple term, "teaching manual" is a compound term, and "interactive educational platform" is a complex term. In addition, "interactive games" can also be considered a complex term[6].

Second, the **semantic analysis method**. This method was used to study the relationships between meanings of terms. Of course, meaning is very important for us. For instance, "educational tool" is a general concept, while "textbook," "test," "assessment," "materials," "handouts," and "module" represent its specific types. Similarly, the concept of a "textbook" consists of parts such as chapters, topics, and exercises, which are usually organized into a table of contents[7].

Third, the **comparative method**. Through this method, native and borrowed terms were compared. For example, "textbook" (a native unit) was analyzed in contrast with borrowed terms such as "platform" and "test." In other words, some terms can also have alternative names, such as "assessment task" for "test"[8].

Fourth, the **observation method**. Based on my personal experience, I can say that directly observing how terms are used in the educational process is very important. For example, during lessons, there were cases when students did not fully understand terms like "module" or "platform." This shows the need for clear explanation of terms. Of course, understanding what a "platform" includes and what it consists of is also an important aspect[9]. Based on my methodological approaches, the research considered not only the theoretical description of terms but also their practical usage. Indeed, the accuracy and proper use of terminology directly influence the effectiveness of education. These methods helped to deeply analyze the structural and semantic features of educational tool terminology and ensured the scientific validity of the research. These foundations, in turn, contribute to a deeper understanding of our field of study[10].

## 3. Literature Review

In this research, several local and foreign scientific sources were analyzed. These works focus on the structural and semantic features of educational tool terminology. The study is based on the principles of Terminology and Semantics. I studied many books and articles written by Uzbek linguists. These sources explain how terms are formed and used in the language. For example, in Uzbek linguistics, the term "textbook" is explained as a basic educational tool. The term "notebook" is explained as a personal learning material. These examples helped me understand the practical use of terminology. Indeed, when I analyzed foreign literature, I noticed important similarities. Foreign researchers also study terminology as a system. They explain that terms are not only names but also carriers of knowledge. For example, in English linguistic studies, "textbook," "module," and "assessment" are considered key educational terms. These terms are widely used in modern education systems[11].

While reading foreign literature, I also found that semantic relations are very important. For example, a general term like “educational tool” includes specific terms such as “textbook,” “test,” “handout,” “material,” and “module.” These are simple examples of hypernym and hyponym relations. This helped me better understand the structure of terminology systems. In my personal reading experience, I understood that terminology is a dynamic part of language. It changes and develops over time. For example, new terms like “online platform,” “digital learning,” and “interactive game” are now widely used in education. These terms did not exist in earlier literature[12].

When I compare local and foreign literature, I see both similarities and differences. Uzbek sources focus more on traditional education terms like “darslik” (textbook) and “daftar” (notebook). Foreign sources focus more on digital and modern terms like “platform,” “learning system,” and “e-learning module.” My personal analysis shows that both types of literature are important. Uzbek literature helps to understand the national system of education[13]. Foreign literature helps to understand global trends. For example, in my studies, I observed that the term “test” is used both in Uzbek and English education systems, but its structure and usage can differ. The studied literature clearly shows that terminology has both structural and semantic features. Structure shows how terms are formed. Semantics shows their meaning. My reading and comparative analysis of both local and foreign sources helped me understand this topic more deeply. These findings are important for my research on educational tool terminology[14].

#### **4. Discussion and Result**

In this section, the results of my research and my personal analysis are presented. The conclusions are based on the data I collected and the observations I made during the study of educational tool terminology. If we focus on my results, it can be clearly seen that educational tool terminology has a structured and systematic nature. My analysis shows that these terms are not random. They are organized in a logical system. For example, the term “educational tool” acts as a general concept. Under this concept, we find specific terms such as “textbook,” “test,” “module,” “handout,” and “materials.” These terms are connected in a clear semantic system. Based on my conducted analysis, I observed that structural features of terms are very important. Terms can be simple, compound, or complex. For example, “textbook” is a simple term. “Teaching manual” is a compound term. “Interactive learning platform” is a complex term. My personal findings confirm that complex terms are mostly used in modern education.

If we consider my personal interpretations, I can say that semantic relations between terms are very strong. For example, a general term includes many specific units. “Educational tool” includes “test,” “assignment,” and “module.” These relationships are called hypernym-hyponym relations. I also observed part-whole relations. For example, a “textbook” consists of “chapters,” “topics,” and “exercises.” I found that terminology becomes clearer when it is analyzed in real educational practice. When I conducted my own observations in learning environments, I noticed that students understand terms better when they are explained with examples. For instance, when I explained the term “module” using practical tasks, students understood it more easily. If we talk about my methodological conclusions, I can say that combining theoretical study with practical observation gives more reliable results. My personal analysis shows that only reading theory is not enough. Real classroom practice is very important. For example, during my observations, I noticed that some students confused the meaning of “platform” and “module.” This shows that terminology must be clearly defined. My results also show that modern education introduces new terminology very quickly. Words like “interactive learning,” “digital platform,” and “online assessment” are now widely used. These terms were not common in older educational systems. This proves that terminology is constantly developing[15].

**TABLE 1.** Structural and Semantic Classification of Educational Tool Terminology

No	Type of term	Structural feature	Semantic feature	Examples
1	Simple terms	Consist of one root	Clear and unambiguous meaning	textbook, notebook, test, module
2	Compound terms	Formed by two or more bases	Express broader concepts	teaching manual, assessment task, learning material
3	Complex terms	Presented as word combinations	Express scientific/technological concepts	interactive educational platform, digital learning resources
4	Borrowed terms	Taken from foreign languages	Express modern and technical meanings	platform, test, module, internet
5	Native terms	Belong to the Uzbek language	Related to everyday education	textbook, notebook, exercise, book

## 5. Conclusion

Based on my own analysis, I can conclude that both structure and meaning are equally important. Structural analysis helps to understand how terms are formed. Semantic analysis helps to understand what they mean. For example, without structure we cannot classify terms, and without semantics we cannot understand their meaning.

To summarize my findings, I can say that my personal research confirms the importance of systematic study of terminology. My analysis results clearly show that educational tool terminology is a developing, organized, and meaningful system. These findings are based on my own observations, practical experience, and analytical work, and they strongly support the theoretical part of my research.

## REFERENCES

1. Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. (2016). *We Will Build Our Free and Prosperous Democratic State Together*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
2. Abdullayev, F. (1949). *On Some Issues of Uzbek Lexicology*. Tashkent.
3. Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. (1962). *Uzbek Literary Language and Dialects*. Tashkent.
4. Sobirov, S. (2004). *Research on the Systemic Principles of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat.
5. Uzbek Language Lexicology. (1981). Tashkent: Fan Publishing.
6. Bulatov, S. S., & Tursunaliyev, N. (2002). *Pottery Art*. Tashkent.
7. Ibrohimov, S. (1959). *Vocational Vocabulary of the Fergana Dialects*. Tashkent.
8. Usmonov, S. (1964). *Some Issues of Uzbek Terminology*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi Publishing.
9. Navoiy Works Dictionary. (1978). Compiled by P. Shamsiyev & S. Ibrohimov. Tashkent: Fan Publishing.
10. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics (Vol. 1–2)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
13. Sager, J. C. (1990). *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
14. Picht, H., & Draskau, J. (1985). *Terminology: An Introduction*. Guildford: University of Surrey.
15. Felber, H. (1984). *Terminology Manual*. Paris: UNESCO.