year-round: bomber jacket, cardigan, cardigan jacket, cardie, denim jacket, jeans jacket, levi's jacket, jumper, jeans, leggings, overall, coverall, over all, polo shirt, pullover, spencer, tee-shirt, t-shirt, track suit, windbreaker.

Results and Discussion. The results reveal a multi-tiered hierarchy within the women's wardrobe lexical field:

Level 1 (Hyper-hyperonym): Apparel, attire, garments, clothing.

Level 2 (Hyperonym): Women's wear, outfit, costume, ensemble.

Level 3 (Direct Items/Hyponyms): Blouse, skirt, dress, trousers, jacket, gown, cardigan, leggings, etc.

These categories reflect both vertical and horizontal semantic relationships. For example, "blouse" and "shirt" share several semantic features and lie on the same hierarchical level, while both fall under "top wear", a hyperonym. In turn, "top wear" is a subcategory of "women's wear", which is nested under broader terms such as "clothing" or apparel.

This structured organization demonstrates how language categorizes experience with increasing levels of abstraction. Hyper-hyperonymic paradigms allow for a refined understanding of lexical relations, offering potential benefits for machine translation, lexicography, and language teaching.

Furthermore, this paradigm reflects gendered and cultural elements embedded in language. For instance, the richness of terms in women's clothing compared to men's indicates socio-cultural influences on linguistic categorization.

Conclusion. The hyper-hyperonymic paradigm of the semantic field "women's wardrobe" in English shows a systematic and hierarchical organization of lexical items. Identifying such multi-level structures offers insights not only into lexical semantics but also into the cultural and functional motivations underlying vocabulary formation. This study contributes to the broader fields of cognitive linguistics and lexical field theory by highlighting the value of deep hierarchical modeling in semantics.

References:

(1). Macmillan English Dictionary. 2002.

(2). Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.

(3). Oxford Dictionary of Current English. 2006.

(4). Kabulova G.U "Tilshunoslikda milliy kiyim va libos nomlari talqini". Тилнинг лексик-семантик тизими, қиёсий типологик изланишлар ва адабиётшунослик муаммолари материаллар IX тўплами. Buxoro, 2018, 429–431-бетлар.

(5). Kabulova G.U. "Tilshunoslikda milliy kiyim va libos nomlari talqini". Тилнинг лексик-семантик тизими, қиёсий типологик изланишлар ва адабиётшунослик муаммолари материаллар X тўплами, Buxoro, 2019, 392–394-бетлар.

(6). Кабулова Г.У. Ибтидоий жамоа тузуми даврида кийимларнинг асосий турлари. Тилнинг лексик-семантик тизими, қиёсий типологик изланишлар ва адабиётшунослик муаммолари материаллари бўйича республика илмий амалий мақолалар XI тўплами, Buxoro, 2020, 372–374-бетлар.

(7). Kabulova G.U. Linguoculturological features of formation and development of vocabulary of the sphere clothes and fashion. International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities. Finland Academic Research Science Publishers ISSN: (online) | (SJIF) 2945-4492. = 8.09 Impact factor, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10776996. India, p. 54–63.

Sultanova Umidakhan Matkarimovna (Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Biruni; umidaxansultanova750@gmail.com

CONTEXTUALIZED VOCABULARY ACQUISITION: INSIGHTS INTO WORD LEARNING PROCESSES IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Annotation. *This article explores the role of context in vocabulary acquisition from a linguistic perspective. Drawing on the work of scholars such as Norbert Schmitt and Cheryl Zimmerman, it highlights how contextual exposure supports both incidental and explicit learning. The discussion emphasizes the benefits of context in disambiguating meaning, enhancing lexical depth, and promoting syntactic and pragmatic awareness. However, the article also critically examines the limitations of relying solely on context, especially for lower-proficiency learners or culturally nuanced language. It advocates for the integration of multiple vocabulary learning strategies to support long-term retention and deeper processing. Empirical findings from applied linguistics research are used to support the effectiveness of combining context with reflective and morphological strategies.*

Keywords: *Vocabulary acquisition, context clues, incidental learning, linguistic strategies, lexical depth, vocabulary instruction, applied linguistics*

KONTEKSTLI LUG‘ATNI O‘ZLASHTIRISH: AMALIY TILSHUNOSLIKDA SO‘ZLARNI O‘RGANISH JARAYONLARI HAQIDA TUSHUNCHALARI

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqola lug‘at boyligini kontekst orqali o‘zlashtirishning lingvistik jihatlarini tahlil qiladi. Norbert Schmitt va Cheryl Zimmerman kabi olimlarning tadqiqotlariga asoslanib, kontekstual muhitda so‘zlarni o‘rganishning bevosita va bilvosita usullari yoritiladi. Maqolada kontekstning so‘z ma’nolarini aniqlashtirish, leksik chuqurlikni oshirish, sintaktik va pragmatik ko‘nikmalarni rivojlantirishdagi ahamiyati ta’kidlanadi. Shuningdek, kontekstga haddan tashqari tayanishning cheklovlari, ayniqsa, boshlang‘ich darajadagi o‘rganuvchilar va madaniy jihatdan murakkab so‘zlar uchun muammolari muhokama qilinadi. Muallif kontekstual yondashuvni reflektiv strategiyalar, morfologik tahlil va boshqa lug‘at o‘rganish usullari bilan birgalikda qo‘llashni taklif etadi. Maqolada amaliy lingvistika sohasidagi ilmiy izlanishlar asosida samarali so‘z o‘zlashtirish usullari ko‘rsatib beriladi.*

Kalit so‘zlar: *leksik o‘zlashtirish, kontekstdan foydalanish, bilvosita o‘rganish, lingvistik strategiyalar, lug‘aviy chuqurlik, kontekstli o‘qish, amaliy lingvistika.*

КОНТЕКСТУАЛИЗИРОВАННОЕ ПРИОБРЕТЕНИЕ СЛОВАРНОГО ЗАПАСА: ВЗГЛЯД НА ПРОЦЕССЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ СЛОВ В ПРИКЛАДНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Аннотация. *Данная статья посвящена изучению процесса усвоения новых слов с точки зрения лингвистики, с особым акцентом на роль контекста. На основе работ таких исследователей, как Норберт Шмитт и Шерил Циммерман, рассматриваются как инцидентное (непреднамеренное), так и целенаправленное усвоение лексики. Контекст рассматривается как важный инструмент, способствующий уточнению значения слов, расширению лексической глубины и развитию синтаксической и прагматической компетенции. Также анализируются ограничения использования контекста, особенно в случаях, когда учащиеся имеют низкий уровень владения языком или сталкиваются с культурно-специфической лексикой. Подчеркивается необходимость интеграции контекстуального подхода с другими стратегиями изучения слов, такими как морфологический анализ, рефлексия и использование словарей.*

Ключевые слова: *освоение лексики, контекстуальные подсказки, инцидентное обучение, лингвистические стратегии, лексическая глубина, контекстное чтение, прикладная лингвистика*

Introduction. The process of acquiring new vocabulary is central to successful language learning, and understanding the mechanisms by which learners encounter and retain new words has long been a subject of linguistic and pedagogical inquiry. Among the array of strategies used to build lexical knowledge, contextual learning has gained substantial attention for its potential to support both incidental and explicit vocabulary acquisition (Schmitt. 2000). Incidental word learning, where vocabulary is acquired through exposure rather than direct instruction, often relies heavily on the linguistic and situational context in which a word appears. This type of learning highlights the importance of processing words as they occur naturally in discourse, allowing learners to incrementally build meaning and usage patterns (Schmitt,.2000). Schmitt also distinguishes between item learning–learning words individually–and system learning, which involves understanding the relationships between words, such as collocations and lexical sets. Contextual exposure supports both of these processes by presenting vocabulary in real-time usage, enabling learners to make connections and infer meanings over time. Cheryl Zimmerman (2009) emphasizes the significance of reflecting on word usage and asking questions about words as methods to deepen engagement, which often intersect with the use of context. Importantly, context not only disambiguates meanings but also illustrates discourse relationships and reveals pragmatic aspects of vocabulary use, making it an indispensable tool in comprehensive vocabulary instruction. However, relying solely on context can be misleading or insufficient in certain learning environments, especially where local and global cues are limited or culturally opaque (Laufer & Sim. 1985). Despite these limitations, many researchers argue that, when used judiciously, context remains a key vehicle for expanding learners' lexical competence. The value of context in vocabulary learning lies not just in providing clues to a word's meaning, but also in exposing learners to its full semantic and syntactic range. This aligns with Nation's (2001) argument that word knowledge is multifaceted, encompassing form, meaning, and use–each of which can be partially grasped through contextual exposure. Research has shown that successful inference from context depends heavily on a learner's existing vocabulary, background knowledge, and the richness of the context itself (Nassaji. 2003). Zimmerman (2009) expands the understanding of context by proposing that it serves not only to infer meanings but also as a tool for memory, association, and noticing patterns over time. Vocabulary learning strategies (VLS), ranging from shallow techniques like memorization and repetition to deeper methods such

as inference and keyword association, all contribute differently to long-term retention and word mastery (Schmitt. 2000; Zimmerman. 2009).

The study of vocabulary acquisition has undergone significant theoretical development, particularly in understanding how learners acquire words through contextual exposure. Schmitt (2000) highlights two primary modes of vocabulary learning: incidental and explicit. Incidental learning, often occurring during reading or listening, relies on the learner's ability to infer meaning from context without direct instruction. This approach supports incremental word learning, where repeated exposure over time helps build comprehensive word knowledge. Nation (2001) emphasizes that vocabulary learning is most effective when a word is encountered multiple times in varied contexts, allowing learners to acquire not only the word's meaning but also its grammatical behavior, collocations, and pragmatic usage. Zimmerman (2009) extends this idea, suggesting that reflection and contextual analysis allow learners to retain vocabulary more deeply by forming connections between form, meaning, and use. Thus, the interaction between incidental exposure and strategic engagement is central to vocabulary growth.

This is especially true in texts requiring background knowledge or cultural familiarity, which can hinder comprehension and lexical inference (Laufer. 1997). In such cases, learners may fail to recognize contextual signals or may misinterpret them, leading to incorrect word learning. Nation (2013) emphasizes the importance of providing training in recognizing and interpreting context clues, suggesting that instruction in contextual guessing strategies can significantly improve word acquisition. Zimmerman (2009) similarly argues for combining contextual strategies with reflective practices, such as vocabulary notebooks and active questioning, to consolidate learning. Therefore, while context serves as a powerful resource, it must be scaffolded appropriately to maximize its educational potential.

An important critique of context-based learning arises from the view that not all words are equally accessible through context. Beck, Mc Keown, and Kucan (2002) differentiate between tiered vocabulary, noting that abstract or low-frequency academic terms are less likely to be accurately inferred from context, particularly when learners are exposed to global rather than local cues. Global context refers to broader discourse features, while local context includes immediate sentence-level or clause-level cues. Schmitt (2000) warns that learners are often encouraged to "just guess" meanings from context, which may lead to superficial processing and the retention of incorrect or incomplete meanings. This issue is especially pronounced when the learner lacks sufficient background knowledge or when the context is vague or metaphorical. Bensoussan and Laufer (1984) found that even advanced learners had limited success guessing meanings from context, particularly when unfamiliar collocations or idiomatic expressions were involved. Consequently, vocabulary instruction needs to strike a balance between fostering inferencing skills and providing direct teaching of complex or low-frequency vocabulary. Explicit teaching of roots and affixes, as suggested by Zimmerman (2009), can enhance a learner's ability to make educated guesses when context fails. Thus, while context is useful, it is not a panacea and should be integrated with other vocabulary learning strategies.

Discussion. The use of context as a strategy for vocabulary acquisition presents multiple benefits, particularly in the way it supports incremental and system learning. According to Schmitt (2000), one of the primary advantages of context-based learning is that it "disambiguates and delimits meaning," allowing learners to narrow down possible interpretations based on surrounding linguistic cues. Context also provides insight into discourse relationships, helping learners understand how a word functions pragmatically within a larger conversation or text. Zimmerman (2009) argues that learners who actively engage with context–by reflecting on usage and asking questions about word form and meaning–are more likely to achieve long-term retention.

Despite its advantages, context-based word learning is not without its challenges. One of the critical concerns highlighted by Schmitt (2000) and Laufer (1997) is that context is not always a reliable provider of meaning. Context clues can be vague, incomplete, or entirely misleading, especially in cases where cultural or idiomatic knowledge is required for accurate interpretation. The lecture notes rightly point out that guessing from context can be problematic when the surrounding text offers global rather than local clues, making inference more difficult. Research by Bensoussan and Laufer (1984) further confirms that learners often make incorrect guesses, especially with low-frequency or abstract vocabulary, even at advanced levels. Schmitt (2000) distinguishes between shallow strategies–like repetition and note-taking–and deeper strategies, such as inferencing, association formation, and keyword techniques. Zimmerman (2009) similarly suggests combining context use with structured tools such as vocabulary notebooks, memory aids, and word part analysis. These approaches enable learners to deepen their understanding and

better retain lexical items. For instance, when context fails to offer sufficient clues, learners can turn to dictionary use or morphological analysis (roots and affixes) to derive meaning. Mnemonic devices, such as the keyword method or imagery, are particularly effective for abstract or low-frequency words that are not easily learned through exposure alone (Nation. 2001).

Results. Research in applied linguistics has consistently shown that vocabulary acquisition through context leads to significant linguistic development, particularly in the areas of semantic understanding, lexical depth, and discourse competence. As Schmitt (2000) explains, words learned in authentic contexts are more likely to be remembered with accurate meanings, appropriate connotations, and grammatical forms. Quantitative and qualitative studies reveal that context-based strategies produce measurable gains in vocabulary acquisition when combined with learner awareness and strategy training. The following linguistic improvements were commonly observed among learners using context-based strategies:

- Enhanced ability to infer meaning from both local and global textual clues.
- Improved use of new vocabulary in syntactically correct and semantically appropriate ways.
- Increased recognition and production of collocations and idiomatic expressions.
- Greater pragmatic awareness of word use in formal and informal registers.
- Expanded understanding of morphological structures (prefixes, suffixes, roots) through contextual variation.

These results indicate that the integration of contextual strategies within vocabulary instruction supports not only lexical acquisition but also syntactic, morphological, and pragmatic development, essential areas in linguistic proficiency.

Nassaji (2003) similarly found that the success of inferencing relies heavily on existing vocabulary size and prior topic familiarity. Zimmerman (2009) argues that context must be supported by scaffolding, such as teacher-guided questioning or vocabulary-focused tasks, to be effective for lower-proficiency learners.

Conclusion. In the field of linguistics, the acquisition of new vocabulary through context emerges as a vital mechanism for developing comprehensive language proficiency. Contextual learning not only facilitates the recognition of word meanings but also enhances learners' understanding of syntax, morphology, and pragmatics. As supported by Schmitt (2000) and Zimmerman (2009), vocabulary learning is a multi-dimensional process that benefits greatly from exposure to rich, authentic language input. Context empowers learners to develop both item-specific knowledge and system-wide linguistic competence by encountering words in varied grammatical, collocational, and discourse environments. This integrative approach aligns with core linguistic principles, where language is viewed not just as a collection of words but as an interconnected system governed by rules and patterns. By combining context with deeper cognitive strategies such as morphological analysis, inferencing, and metalinguistic reflection, vocabulary instruction can support long-term retention and functional language use. From a linguistic standpoint, effective word learning through context ultimately leads to more fluent, accurate, and contextually appropriate language production.

References:

(1). Barcroft J. (2009). Input-based incremental vocabulary instruction: A principled approach. TESOL Quarterly, 43(1), p. 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00228.x

(2). Beck, I.L., McKeown, M.G., & Kucan L. (2002). Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction. Guilford Press.

(3). Bensoussan, M., & Laufer, B. (1984). Lexical guessing in context in EFL reading comprehension. Journal of Research in Reading, 7(1), p. 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.1984.tb00252.x

(4). Laufer B. (1997). The lexical plight in second language reading: Words you don't know, words you think you know, and words you can't guess. In J.Coady & T.Huckin (Eds.), Second language vocabulary acquisition (p. 20–34). Cambridge University Press.

(5). Laufer B., Sim, D.D. (1985). Taking the easy way out: Non-use and misuse of clues in EFL reading. English Teaching Forum, 23(2), p. 7–10.

(6). Laufer B., Waldman, T. (2011). Verb–noun collocations in second language writing: A corpus analysis of learners' English. Language Learning, 61(2), p. 647–672. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00621.x

(7). Nassaji, H. (2003). L2 vocabulary learning from context: Strategies, knowledge sources, and their relationship with success in L2 lexical inferencing. TESOL Quarterly, 37(4), p. 645–670. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588216

(8). Nation I.S.P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press.

(9). Schmitt N. (2000). Vocabulary in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

(10). Schmitt N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. Language Teaching Research, 12(3), p. 329–363. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921

(11). Zimmerman C.B. (2009). Word knowledge: A vocabulary teacher's handbook. Oxford University Press.