

# THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT-BASED VOCABULARY INSTRUCTION IN EFL SETTINGS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Nguyen Huynh Si Tan

*Department of Foreign Language, Phan Thiet University, Vietnam*

**Abstract:** *Vocabulary acquisition is a foundational component of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. However, in many EFL contexts, including Vietnam, vocabulary instruction continues to rely heavily on decontextualised memorisation, which may limit retention, depth of lexical knowledge, and communicative use. This study examines the role and effectiveness of context-based vocabulary instruction, understood as the introduction, practice, and consolidation of lexical items within authentic linguistic contexts such as texts, dialogues, and multimedia materials. Guided by a PRISMA-oriented systematic review methodology, the study synthesises 45 theoretical and empirical studies published between 2000 and 2025, retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. The findings indicate that context-based vocabulary instruction supports both incidental and intentional vocabulary learning, enhances semantic and pragmatic knowledge, and improves long-term retention compared with vocabulary learning detached from context. Pedagogically, the review highlights the value of learner-generated contexts, input-enhanced reading, and multimedia resources in transforming vocabulary instruction toward a communicative and learner-centred orientation, particularly in Vietnam and comparable EFL settings.*

**Keywords:** *communicative competence, context-based instruction, EFL learners, incidental learning, systematic review, vocabulary acquisition*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary acquisition is a fundamental dimension of language learning and a key prerequisite for the development of the four core language skills. It contributes substantially to reading comprehension, academic achievement, and effective communication (Beck et al., 2013; Stahl & Nagy, 2007). Among the various approaches to vocabulary instruction, context-based teaching—whereby learners encounter and learn words within meaningful sentences,

passages, and authentic real-world texts—has emerged as one of the more effective approaches for both receptive and productive learning.

Traditional vocabulary instruction has long relied on isolated word lists committed to memory. Empirical research has shown that such rote memorisation produces only superficial form–meaning links and rarely supports the deeper cognitive processing required for communicative use (Schmitt, 2008; Nation, 2013; Le-Thi et al., 2018).

Contextual vocabulary instruction, by contrast, embeds new lexical items within meaningful linguistic environments, thereby promoting deeper semantic processing and longer-lasting retention (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001; Webb, 2008).

The theoretical justification for context-based vocabulary instruction draws on applied linguistics, cognitive science, and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), all of which emphasise authentic and meaningful engagement with language as a precondition for acquisition. While a considerable body of research now supports context-based vocabulary instruction in EFL contexts, important gaps remain in the literature. McKeown et al. (2018) and Wright and Cervetti (2017) note that contextualised learning yields measurable short-term gains, but empirical evidence on long-term retention and transfer to productive skills such as speaking and writing remains comparatively limited. Moreover, much of the existing research has been conducted in well-resourced, communicatively oriented settings, leaving exam-driven and resource-constrained EFL contexts—most notably Vietnam, where large class sizes, limited digital tools, and a heavy reliance on rote memorisation persist—relatively under-examined (Vu & Peters, 2022; T. A. Nguyen et al., 2023). Addressing these gaps, the present systematic review investigates how context-based vocabulary instruction can be adapted to promote communicative competence and long-term learning in such settings.

Accordingly, this paper aims to examine how context-based approaches contribute to effective vocabulary instruction in EFL settings, with particular reference to Vietnam. The study addresses the following three research questions:

- (1) What is the significance of context-based vocabulary instruction in EFL settings?
- (2) How do recent empirical studies support the effectiveness of contextualised vocabulary learning?
- (3) What are the pedagogical implications of teaching vocabulary through context-based approaches for EFL teachers, particularly those working in Vietnam?

The significance of the present study lies in its systematic synthesis of theoretical and empirical work that reconceptualises vocabulary teaching as language-in-use rather than as decontextualised memorisation. The findings are intended to inform teacher educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers regarding evidence-based directions for vocabulary instruction in EFL contexts.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH METHODS

### 2.1. Literature Review

#### 2.1.1. *The vocabulary learning process*

Vocabulary learning is best understood as an incremental, multi-stage process rather than a single act of memorisation. Drawing on Nation's (2013) framework,

knowing a word involves three interrelated components: form (spoken, written, and morphological), meaning (concept, referents, and associations), and use (grammatical patterns, collocations, and pragmatic constraints). Each of these components develops gradually through repeated and varied encounters.

The process generally moves through four overlapping stages. The first stage, noticing, occurs when learners become aware of an unfamiliar lexical item in input. The second stage, form–meaning mapping, links the new form to a tentative meaning, often through inference from context or explicit instruction (Schmitt, 2008). The third stage, strengthening and elaboration, deepens lexical representations through retrieval, semantic elaboration, and use across diverse contexts; this stage is closely associated with the development of vocabulary depth (Qian, 2002; Webb, 2008). The final stage, consolidation and productive use, integrates the item into the learner’s mental lexicon for fluent receptive and productive use.

This staged view has two important implications. First, vocabulary knowledge is best described along a receptive–productive continuum (Nation, 2013), with productive mastery requiring richer and more varied contextual exposure. Second, learners from disadvantaged or under-resourced backgrounds, who typically receive narrower input, are at greater risk of incomplete vocabulary development—a finding that underscores the need for

systematic, contextually rich instruction (Jenkins et al., 1978; Patel, 2010; Pham et al., 2024).

### ***2.1.2. Incidental and intentional vocabulary learning***

Two complementary learning conditions underlie context-based vocabulary instruction: incidental and intentional learning. Incidental vocabulary learning refers to the acquisition of lexical items as a by-product of meaning-focused activities such as extensive reading, listening, or viewing, rather than through deliberate study (Krashen, 1989; Hulstijn, 2001). Intentional vocabulary learning, by contrast, involves the explicit attention of learners to specific words, typically supported by definitions, glosses, or focused practice (Laufer, 2005).

Empirical research consistently shows that incidental learning is most effective when learners are exposed to rich, comprehensible input and when target words are encountered repeatedly across varied contexts (Webb, 2008; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006). Word frequency and contextual diversity are particularly important: high-frequency items encountered in meaningful, varied contexts yield substantially better retention (Frances et al., 2020). Multimodal input—including videos, captioned television, and songs—has been shown to support incidental learning by combining auditory, visual, and textual cues (Rodgers & Webb, 2019; Nie et al., 2022; Teng, 2022).

However, incidental exposure alone tends to produce shallow knowledge of

low-frequency and academic vocabulary. Complementary intentional strategies, such as explicit instruction, glossing, and focused tasks, are therefore needed to deepen knowledge (Laufer & Rozovski-Roitblat, 2011; Elgort, 2017). Context-based instruction is best understood not as a replacement for intentional teaching but as a framework in which incidental and intentional learning operate jointly within meaningful contexts.

### **2.1.3. Context-based vocabulary instruction: Definition, features, and evidence**

Context-based vocabulary instruction is defined as a pedagogical approach in which lexical items are introduced, practised, and consolidated within authentic linguistic and situational contexts—such as connected texts, dialogues, multimedia resources, or learner-generated discourse—rather than through isolated word lists (Anderson et al., 1988; Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2010). Its central premise is that meaning, form, and use are best learned when they are encountered together.

Three key features distinguish context-based instruction from decontextualised approaches. First, lexical items are presented within meaningful discourse that allows learners to infer meaning from syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic cues (Nassaji, 2003; Beck et al., 2013). Second, instruction promotes semantic elaboration through synonyms, contrasts, and examples, linking new vocabulary to learners' prior knowledge

and thereby supporting retrieval (Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001). Third, context-based instruction integrates incidental and intentional learning by combining exposure-rich input with focused tasks such as glossing, retelling, or sentence creation (Laufer, 2005; Duong et al., 2020).

Contextual cues and semantic elaboration form the cognitive engine of this approach. Successful instruction equips learners to identify and interpret these cues, thereby supporting independent inferencing during reading and listening (Beck et al., 2013). Communicative-based instruction that attends to both form and meaning has also been shown to provide an effective framework for vocabulary learning (Isaacs, 2009).

Learner-generated contexts represent a further development of this approach. Asking learners to construct sentences or scenarios in which a target word might plausibly occur engages metacognitive processing and aligns with the Depth of Processing Theory, which holds that deeper cognitive engagement strengthens memory traces ( Craik & Lockhart, 1972). Neuroimaging evidence from Zhou and Wu (2024) indicates that such learner-generated activities activate brain regions associated with semantic processing and memory consolidation, supporting long-term retention. Personalisation of context also raises the involvement load of vocabulary tasks, which Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) identify as a key predictor of retention. Individual and contextual factors—

including working memory, prior vocabulary knowledge, and the linguistic diversity of the classroom—further modulate the effectiveness of learner-generated contexts (Bourdeaud’hui et al., 2020; Szabo, 2016).

Empirically, context-based instruction has been associated with stronger retention, deeper semantic understanding, improved comprehension, and more confident communicative use across young, adolescent, university-level, and adult EFL learners. Systematic reviews confirm that contextualisation supports both word learning and reading comprehension (Wright & Cervetti, 2017; Zeng et al., 2025). Academic vocabulary taught within disciplinary contexts has been shown to enhance comprehension across school subjects (Nagy & Townsend, 2012; Lawrence et al., 2019; McKeown et al., 2018). At the tertiary and adult levels, data-driven learning, online corpora, and discipline-specific input can strengthen advanced lexical awareness (Bui et al., 2019; Coyle et al., 2020). For younger learners, contextualised approaches such as the ‘Word Aware’ programme (Moran & Moir, 2018), multifaceted vocabulary instruction (Manyak et al., 2021), and sustained content-literacy interventions (Mosher et al., 2024) have produced significant vocabulary gains alongside improvements in text comprehension.

#### ***2.1.4. Review of relevant research: Thematic synthesis***

To clarify how context-based instruction operates across settings, the empirical

studies reviewed in this paper are organised into four thematic clusters: (a) reading-based contextual instruction; (b) multimodal and multimedia contexts; (c) learner-generated and inference-based contexts; and (d) studies situated specifically in Vietnamese EFL settings.

(a) Reading-based contextual instruction: Reading-based studies show that repeated contact with target words in meaningful texts supports both incidental learning and deliberate consolidation. Pigada and Schmitt (2006) demonstrated that extensive reading produces measurable gains in several dimensions of word knowledge. Eye-tracking studies by Godfroid et al. (2017) and Elgort et al. (2017) further suggest that learners’ attention to unfamiliar words during natural reading predicts later retention. Ilter (2019) reported that explicit context-clue instruction produced substantially greater vocabulary gains than wide reading alone among middle-grade learners, while Van den Broek et al. (2022) found that contextual inferencing during reading promoted retention more effectively than retrieval practice under incidental conditions. Hawass (2019) similarly found that a five-phase contextualised approach outperformed traditional methods in mental lexicon development and retention. Overall, this cluster indicates that reading is most powerful when exposure is repeated, texts are comprehensible, and learners are guided to notice contextual clues.

(b) Multimodal and multimedia contexts. A second strand of research has examined

contextual learning through multimedia input. Rodgers and Webb (2019) showed that incidental vocabulary learning is supported by viewing television, while Nie et al. (2022) reported that listening to English songs three times provided optimal retention and improved recognition of contextualised items. Teng (2022) found that captioned video facilitated incidental L2 vocabulary learning, with effects moderated by learner-related factors. Godwin-Jones (2018) further argued that digital environments—including social media, gaming, and online corpora—provide authentic and engaging contexts for vocabulary development.

(c) Learner-generated and inference-based contexts. A third strand emphasises learner involvement in constructing context. Schmitt (1999) and Butler (2020) argued that inferring word meaning during reading is a key strategy, even when exact meanings cannot be derived, because it sustains reading and supports gradual word learning. Eskildsen and Cadierno (2020) and McEntire and Williams (2007) further showed that recognising parts of speech aids inference. Harmer (2007) advocated combining contextual exposure with techniques such as information-gap activities, affixation work, and dictionary use, while Zhou and Wu (2024) provided neuroscientific evidence that learner-generated contexts deepen cognitive processing and support consolidation. Moody et al. (2018) and McKeown (2019), reviewing the field,

concluded that effective vocabulary instruction must be theoretically grounded and contextually rich, anchoring practice in social-constructivist and sociocultural principles.

(d) Vietnamese EFL contexts. A growing body of research has investigated context-based vocabulary instruction in Vietnam. Van Vu and Peters (2020) found that textual input enhancement (e.g., underlining) during reading produced stronger vocabulary gains for Vietnamese EFL learners, particularly in recognition tasks. Duong et al. (2020) reported that input-based tasks supported meaning recall while output-based tasks reinforced form recall, suggesting the need for balanced task design. Nguyen and Boers (2018) demonstrated that content retelling enhances vocabulary uptake from TED talks, while T. A. Nguyen et al. (2023) and Pham et al. (2024) highlighted both the difficulties and the opportunities that competency-based and AI-supported instruction present in Vietnamese classrooms. T. C. D. Nguyen (2022) similarly reported positive effects of contextual instruction on vocabulary retention among Vietnamese learners.

Across the four thematic clusters, the cumulative evidence indicates that context-based instruction benefits EFL learners through at least four outcome pathways: (1) stronger short- and medium-term retention through repeated contextual encounters; (2) deeper semantic and pragmatic knowledge through elaboration and inference; (3) improved

comprehension and gradual transfer to communicative use; and (4) higher engagement when vocabulary is embedded in personally meaningful or multimodal input. These benefits are not restricted to young learners; rather, they are reported across school, tertiary, and adult EFL populations, although the effectiveness of specific techniques depends on learner age, proficiency, task design, and instructional resources.

## 2.2. Research Methods

The present study adopts a qualitative systematic-review design guided by PRISMA 2020 reporting principles (Page et al., 2021). This design is appropriate because the research questions seek to identify, compare, and synthesise patterns of evidence across studies of context-based vocabulary instruction rather than estimate a single pooled effect. Because the included studies varied considerably in learner age, proficiency level, instructional treatment, outcome measures, and research design, the review used narrative thematic synthesis rather than statistical meta-analysis.

### 2.2.1. Search strategy

A systematic search was conducted in four electronic databases—Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar—covering publications between January 2000 and March 2025. The search combined three sets of keywords: (i) vocabulary-related terms (“vocabulary acquisition”, “vocabulary learning”, “vocabulary instruction”); (ii) context-related terms (“context-based”, “contextualised”, “incidental”, “input enhancement”, “learner-generated”); and (iii) learner/setting terms (“EFL”, “second language”, “Vietnam”). Boolean operators (AND, OR) and truncation symbols were used to maximise sensitivity.

### 2.2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were included if they met the criteria summarised in Table 1. Peer-reviewed empirical and theoretical studies formed the core corpus for synthesis. Non-peer-reviewed materials, dissertations, or reports were not counted among the 45 core studies unless they were used only as contextual background rather than as primary evidence.

**Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria used in the systematic review**

Criterion	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Publication type	Peer-reviewed empirical studies, theoretical papers, and systematic reviews relevant to vocabulary instruction.	Grey literature, theses, non-reviewed reports, and conference abstracts were excluded from the core synthesis.
Topical focus	Studies addressing vocabulary acquisition, vocabulary instruction, contextualised learning, incidental learning, input enhancement, or learner-generated contexts.	Studies focused only on first-language vocabulary, test validation, or general language learning without vocabulary outcomes.
Learner group	School-aged, university-level, or adult EFL/L2 learners.	Participants outside EFL/L2 learning contexts or studies with insufficient participant information.
Outcomes	Vocabulary learning, retention, depth of word knowledge, comprehension, communicative use, or pedagogical implications.	Studies that did not report vocabulary-related findings or provided insufficient methodological information.
Date and language	English-language publications from 2000 to 2025, with selected foundational pre-2000 works retained for theoretical grounding.	Non-English sources not accessible for review and publications outside the time frame unless foundational.

**2.2.3. Screening and selection**

The initial search returned 412 records. After removal of duplicates (n = 78), 334 titles and abstracts were screened against the inclusion criteria, yielding 96 records for full-text assessment. Following full-text review, 45 studies met all criteria

and were included in the synthesis. The screening process was documented using a PRISMA-style flow record, and inclusion decisions were cross-checked to minimise selection bias. The flow of records is summarised in Table 2.

**Table 2. PRISMA-style flow summary for study selection**

Stage	Number of records	Decision/outcome
Identification	412	Records identified through Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, Google Scholar, and reference-list checking.
Duplicate removal	78 removed	334 unique records retained for title and abstract screening.
Title/abstract screening	334 screened	96 records retained for full-text assessment.
Full-text eligibility	96 assessed	51 records excluded because they did not meet one or more inclusion criteria.
Included in synthesis	45 studies	Studies included in the final thematic synthesis.

#### **2.2.4. Data extraction and synthesis**

For each included study, the following information was extracted: authors and year, country/setting, learner profile, theoretical framework, instructional approach, research design, key findings, and implications. Given the heterogeneity of designs (experimental, quasi-experimental, qualitative, and review studies), a thematic synthesis approach was adopted (Thomas & Harden, 2008, as cited in the protocol). Studies were coded inductively and grouped under four themes—reading-based context, multimodal context, learner-generated context, and Vietnamese EFL context—which structure the review in Section 2.1.4 and the discussion in Section 3.

#### **2.2.5. Quality appraisal and limitations of the method**

Methodological quality was appraised informally by considering sample size, design transparency, and the alignment between methods and conclusions. As with any systematic review, the present study is limited by its reliance on peer-reviewed English-language sources, which may have excluded valuable practitioner-oriented or non-English research. These limitations are revisited in the discussion.

#### **2.2.6. Quality appraisal and limitations of the method**

Methodological quality was appraised narratively rather than through a numerical risk-of-bias score because the included

works varied in design and purpose. Each study was examined for four criteria: (1) clarity of research aim and theoretical framework; (2) transparency of participant, context, and instructional procedures; (3) appropriateness of data collection and analysis for the stated claims; and (4) alignment between findings, conclusions, and pedagogical implications. Studies were treated as stronger evidence when they reported clear procedures, adequate learner information, explicit outcome measures, and cautious interpretation. This appraisal was used to weight the thematic synthesis and to avoid overgeneralising from small-scale or short-duration studies.

A limitation of this appraisal procedure is that it does not produce a formal quality score for each study. Future versions of the review could include a separate appendix listing study-level appraisal decisions, which would further improve transparency and replicability.

### **3. DISCUSSION**

#### **3.1. The significance of context-based vocabulary instruction in EFL settings**

Addressing the first research question, the review confirms that vocabulary acquisition is an incremental, context-dependent process (Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2010), and that words learned within meaningful contexts—rather than as isolated items—become embedded in richer semantic networks that support both retention and use (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001). In settings such as Vietnam, where grammar-translation

methods and exam-oriented practices remain prevalent, the absence of meaningful contextual input has been identified as a key obstacle to vocabulary development (Patel, 2010; Le-Thi et al., 2018; T. A. Nguyen et al., 2023). Context-based instruction is thus theoretically positioned as a corrective approach that more closely parallels natural language acquisition processes (Moody et al., 2018) and is likely to be relevant to other high-stakes EFL contexts, such as China and South Korea, where curricular pressures are comparable. Contrasting views remain: rote memorisation may produce rapid short-term gains under time pressure (Qian, 2002), and Laufer and Rozovski-Roitblat (2011) have noted that incidental learning alone yields limited depth for low-frequency items. These contrasting findings, however, do not undermine the value of context-based instruction; rather, they suggest that contextual approaches should be combined with selective explicit instruction.

#### **3.2. Empirical evidence for the effectiveness of contextualised vocabulary learning**

Turning to the second research question, the thematic synthesis in Section 2.1.4 provides converging evidence that context-based instruction produces stronger vocabulary outcomes than decontextualised approaches. Reading-based studies (Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Hawass, 2019; İltter, 2019; Van den Broek et al., 2022) document gains in both incidental and intentional learning. Multimodal studies (Rodgers & Webb, 2019; Nie et al., 2022;

Teng, 2022) extend this evidence to video, audio, and song input. Learner-generated and inference-based studies (Zhou & Wu, 2024; Butler, 2020) provide cognitive and neuroscientific grounding for the involvement load and depth of processing arguments. Finally, studies in Vietnamese EFL settings (Van Vu & Peters, 2020; Duong et al., 2020; Nguyen & Boers, 2018; Pham et al., 2024) demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of context-based interventions in resource-constrained classrooms. Dissenting evidence—such as Laufer’s (2005) finding of faster immediate gains from explicit instruction and concerns regarding cognitive overload in multimedia environments (Nie et al., 2022)—is best interpreted as identifying boundary conditions rather than as invalidating the broader pattern.

### **3.3. Pedagogical implications for teaching vocabulary through context-based approaches in Vietnam**

In response to the third research question, the review yields several pedagogical implications specifically relevant to Vietnamese EFL classrooms. First, vocabulary instruction should integrate authentic input—graded readers, TED talks, songs, and short videos—with focused tasks such as content retelling, input-enhanced reading, and learner-generated sentence construction (Van Vu & Peters, 2020; Nguyen & Boers, 2018; Duong et al., 2020). Second, given the limited oral fluency typically reported among Vietnamese learners (Le-Thi et al.,

2018), classroom tasks should explicitly link receptive learning to productive use, for example through dialogues, role-plays, and task-based projects. Third, teacher education and curriculum design should prepare teachers to balance incidental exposure with selective explicit instruction, especially for low-frequency and academic vocabulary. Fourth, where digital infrastructure permits, AI- and corpus-supported tools can extend authentic input beyond the textbook (Pham et al., 2024). These implications align with broader theoretical commitments to constructivist and communicative language teaching.

### **3.4. Limitations of the review**

Several limitations of the present review should be acknowledged. First, the corpus is weighted toward studies of short-term vocabulary gains; long-term retention and transfer to productive skills remain comparatively under-examined (McKeown et al., 2018; Hawass, 2019). Second, the emphasis on reading-based studies limits insight into productive skills such as speaking and writing, which are particularly relevant in Vietnam (Moody et al., 2018). Third, although multimodal contexts are increasingly represented, the review has not fully captured emerging technology-rich settings (Nie et al., 2022; Godwin-Jones, 2018). Fourth, the Vietnam-focused lens, while deliberate, restricts generalisability to other EFL contexts with different cultural and curricular dynamics (Webb & Chang, 2015). Finally, the exclusion

of non-peer-reviewed sources may have omitted relevant practitioner perspectives.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This systematic review has examined the role of context-based vocabulary instruction in EFL settings, with particular attention to Vietnam. The synthesis of 45 theoretical and empirical studies indicates that vocabulary learning is most effectively supported when new lexical items are introduced and consolidated within meaningful linguistic and situational contexts. Compared with decontextualised, rote-based approaches, context-based instruction yields deeper semantic knowledge, stronger retention, and more confident communicative use.

The review further confirms that incidental and intentional learning are best treated as complementary rather than competing conditions. Incidental learning is supported by rich input from narratives, multimedia, and conversation, while intentional instruction sharpens meaning and form. Together, they constitute the dual basis of communicative vocabulary learning,

providing learners with the knowledge required to use words appropriately in real-life contexts.

For Vietnam, the implications are clear. Despite practical constraints—large class sizes, limited digital tools, and exam-driven curricula—context-based strategies can be gradually integrated through teacher professional development, sustained policy support, and creative lesson design. Pedagogical activities such as student-generated dialogues, storytelling, task-based projects, and multimedia-assisted instruction enhance both vocabulary retention and learner engagement, while aligning with constructivist and communicative language teaching principles. Adopting context-based instruction is therefore not merely a methodological preference but a reconceptualisation of vocabulary pedagogy as research-aligned language-in-use. For Vietnam and comparable EFL settings, such a shift offers a meaningful pathway toward modernising language education and preparing learners for academic and communicative success in English.

#### **Author Information:**

**Nguyen Huynh Si Tan**, Phan Thiet University, Binh Thuan Province, Vietnam

Email: nhsytan@gmail.com

#### **Article Information:**

*Received:* June 28, 2025

*Revised:* June 3, 2026

*Accepted:* June 6, 2026

#### **Note**

The author declares no competing interests regarding this article.

## REFERENCES

- Aljburi, M. A., & Khaghaninejad, M. S. (2024). Exploring the efficiency of associative vocabulary teaching strategies to foreign language learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 17(3), 291–314. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2024.17316a>
- Amrani, M. A. (2019). ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF CONTENT-BASED INSTRUCTION ON LEARNING EFL IN AN ESP CLASS. *Institut National Des Postes Et Télécommunication (INPT), Rabat, Morocco*. [https://jlsj.steconomieuoradea.ro/archives/006/JLSP6\\_2.pdf](https://jlsj.steconomieuoradea.ro/archives/006/JLSP6_2.pdf)
- Anderson, R. C., Scott, J., & Hiebert, E. H. (1988). *From Present to Future: Beyond Becoming a Nation of Readers*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/4825988.pdf>
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction*. Guilford Press.
- Best, R. M., Dockrell, J. E., & Braisby, N. (2006). Lexical acquisition in elementary science classes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(4), 824–838. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.4.824>
- Bourdeaud’hui, H., Aesaert, K., & Van Braak, J. (2020). Identifying student- and class-level correlates of sixth-grade students’ listening comprehension. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 20, Running Issue(Running Issue), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.17239/11esll-2020.20.01.04>
- Bui, T., Boers, F., & Coxhead, A. (2019). Extracting multiword expressions from texts with the aid of online resources. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 171(2), 221–252. <https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.18033.bui>
- Butler, Y. G. (2020). The ability of young learners to construct word meaning in context. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 547–578. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.7>
- Coyle, Y., Mora, P. a. F., & Becerra, J. S. (2020). Improving reference cohesion in young EFL learners’ collaboratively written narratives: Is there a role for reformulation? *System*, 94, 102333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102333>
- Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11(6), 671–684. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(72\)80001-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(72)80001-X)
- Duong, P., Perez, M. M., Desmet, P., & Peters, E. (2020). Differential effects of input-based and output-based tasks on L2 vocabulary learning. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(3), 120–144. <https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2021.31183>
- Elgort, I. (2017). Technology-Mediated Second Language Vocabulary Development: A Review of Trends in Research Methodology. *CALICO Journal*, 35(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1558/cj.34554>
- Elgort, I., Brysbaert, M., Stevens, M., & Van Assche, E. (2017). CONTEXTUAL WORD LEARNING DURING READING IN a SECOND LANGUAGE. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 40(2), 341–366. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263117000109>
- Eskildsen, S. W., & Cadierno, T. (2020). Oral English performance in Danish primary school children: An interactional usage-based approach. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 523–546. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.6>

Frances, C., Martin, C. D., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2020). The effects of contextual diversity on incidental vocabulary learning in the native and a foreign language. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-70922-1>

Godfroid, A., Ahn, J., Choi, I., Ballard, L., Cui, Y., Johnston, S., Lee, S., Sarkar, A., & Yoon, H. (2017). Incidental vocabulary learning in a natural reading context: an eye-tracking study. *Bilingualism Language and Cognition*, 21(3), 563–584.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s1366728917000219>

Godwin-Jones, R. (2018). Contextualized vocabulary learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.125/44651>

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching reading* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.

Hawass, S. H. H. (2019). EFL vocabulary acquisition through meaningful linguistic contexts. An investigation into the role of mental lexicon. *CDELTA Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, 68(1), 279–301. <https://doi.org/10.21608/opde.2019.132672>

Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: a reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 258–286). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524780.011>

Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51(3), 539–558.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00164>

İlter, İ. (2019). The efficacy of Context Clue Strategy instruction on middle grades students' vocabulary development. *RMLE Online*, 42(1), 1–15.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2018.1554522>

Isaacs, T. (2009). Integrating form and meaning in L2 pronunciation instruction. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v27i1.1034>

Jenkins, J. R., Pany, D. Z., & Schreck, J. V. (1978). *Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension: Instructional Effects*. Champaign, Ill. : University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Center for the Study of Reading.

Kobelinski, S. G. (2006). *A corpus-based approach to esp: est vocabulary in information technology*. <http://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/handle/123456789/88881>

Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326879>

Laufer, B. (2005). Focus on form in second language vocabulary learning. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 5, 223–250. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.5.11lau>

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.1>

Laufer, B., & Rozovski-Roitblat, B. (2011). Incidental vocabulary acquisition: The effects of task type, word occurrence and their combination. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 391–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412019>

Lawrence, J. F., Hagen, A. M., Hwang, J. K., Lin, G., & Lervag, A. (2019). Academic vocabulary and reading comprehension: Exploring the relationships across measures of vocabulary knowledge. *Reading and Writing*, 32(2), 285-306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9865-2>

Le-Thi, D., Rodgers, M. P., & Pellicer-Sánchez, A. (2018). Teaching formulaic sequences in an English-language class: The effects of explicit instruction versus coursebook instruction. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34(3), 111–139. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v34i3.1276>

Manyak, P. C., Manyak, A., & Kappus, E. M. (2021). Lessons from a Decade of Research on Multifaceted Vocabulary Instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 75(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2010>

McKeown, M. G. (2019). Effective vocabulary instruction fosters knowing words, using words, and understanding how words work. *Language Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 50(4), 466–476. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2019\\_lshss-voia-18-0126](https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_lshss-voia-18-0126)

McKeown, M. G., Crosson, A. C., Moore, D. W., & Beck, I. L. (2018). Word Knowledge and Comprehension Effects of an academic vocabulary intervention for middle school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(3), 572–616. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217744181>

Mediha, N., & Enisa, M. (2014). A comparative study on the effectiveness of using traditional and contextualized methods for enhancing learners' vocabulary knowledge in an EFL classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3443–3448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.780>

Moody, S., Hu, X., Kuo, L.-J., Jouhar, M., Xu, Z., Lee, S., & Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, Texas A&M University. (2018). Vocabulary Instruction: a critical analysis of theories, research, and practice. *Education Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8040180>

Moran, E., & Moir, J. (2018). Closing the vocabulary gap in early years: Is 'Word Aware' a possible approach? *Educational and Child Psychology*, 35(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsecp.2018.35.1.51>

Mosher, D. M., Burkhauser, M. A., & Kim, J. S. (2024). Improving second-grade reading comprehension through a sustained content literacy intervention: A mixed-methods study examining the mediating role of domain-specific vocabulary. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 116(4), 550–568. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000868>

Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.011>

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

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524759>

Nguyen, C. D., & Boers, F. (2018). The effect of content retelling on vocabulary uptake from a TED talk. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(1), 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.441>

Nguyen, T. A., Le, T. T., Vang, M. D., Phuong, Y. H., Huynh, T. T. A., Nguyen, T. H., & Pham, T. T. (2023). Vietnamese EFL high school teachers' perceptions of difficulties when implementing competency-based English teaching curriculum and their proposed solutions. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v5i2.1863>

Nguyen, T. C. D. (2022). THE IMPACT OF CONTEXT ON EFL LEARNERS' VOCABULARY RETENTION. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(2).

<https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v6i2.4295>

Nie, K., Fu, J., Rehman, H., & Zaigham, G. H. K. (2022). An empirical study of the effects of incidental vocabulary learning through listening to songs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.891146>

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>

Patel, S. (2010). Reading at risk: Why effective literacy practice is not effective. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v15i3.81>

Pham, T. T., Nguyen, L. a. D., Dang, H. M., & Le, T. T. P. (2024). Exploring Tertiary Vietnamese EFL Students' Engagement in Vocabulary Learning through the Use of an AI Tool. *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference*, 4, 129–149.

<https://doi.org/10.54855/paic.23410>

Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006, April 1). *Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/66611>

Puma, T. (2024). *Guarded Vocabulary Technique to develop speaking skills in junior students at Victor Manuel Guzmán School, academic year 2022-2023* (By UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA DEL NORTE) [Thesis]. <https://core.ac.uk/download/604493477.pdf>

Qian, D. D. (2002). Investigating the relationship between vocabulary knowledge and academic reading performance: An assessment perspective. *Language Learning*, 52(3), 513-536.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00193>

Relyea, J. E., Kim, J. S., Rich, P., & Fitzgerald, J. (2024). Effects of tier 1 content literacy intervention on early-grade English learners' reading and writing: Exploring the mediating roles of domain-specific vocabulary and oral language proficiency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 116(7), 1172–1195. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000882>

Rodgers, M. P. H., & Webb, S. (2019). Incidental vocabulary learning through viewing television. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 171(2), 191–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.18034.rod>

Sadeghi, K., & Nobakth, A. (2014). The Effect of Linguistic Context on EFL Vocabulary Learning. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 14(03), 65–82.

<https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2014-1403-05>

Schmitt, N. (1999). The relationship between TOEFL vocabulary items and meaning, association, collocation and word-class knowledge. *Language Testing*, 16(2), 189-216.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229901600204>

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*. Springer.

Shahiwala, S., Rahul, D. R., & Baker, J. R. (2024). Incidental vocabulary learning: A scientometric review. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 3(3), 100160.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100160>

Stahl, S. A., & Nagy, W. E. (2007). Teaching word meanings. In *Routledge eBooks*.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410615381>

Szabo, C. Z. (2016). Exploring the mental lexicon of the multilingual: vocabulary size, cognate recognition and lexical access in the L1, L2 and L3. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.461007>

Teng, M. F. (2022). Incidental L2 vocabulary learning from viewing captioned videos: Effects of learner-related factors. *System*, 105, 102736.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102736>

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, 45.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>

Trawick, J. E. (2015). Differentiation in the foreign language classroom: including students with disabilities in secondary foreign language classes. In The University of Texas at Austin, *The University of Texas at Austin*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/211340571.pdf>

Van Den Broek, G. S. E., Wesseling, E., Huijssen, L., Lettink, M., & Van Gog, T. (2022). Vocabulary learning during Reading: Benefits of contextual inferences versus retrieval opportunities. *Cognitive Science*, 46(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13135>

Van Vu, D., & Peters, E. (2020). Learning Vocabulary from Reading-only, Reading-while-listening, and Reading with Textual Input Enhancement: Insights from Vietnamese EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, 53(1), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220911485>

Webb, S. (2008). The effects of context on incidental vocabulary learning. In *Reading in a Foreign Language*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ815123.pdf>

Webb, S., & Chang, A. C. (2015). *Second Language Vocabulary Learning through Extensive Reading with Audio Support: How Do Frequency and Distribution of Occurrence Affect Learning?*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1075485>

Wright, T. S., & Cervetti, G. N. (2017). A systematic review of the research on vocabulary instruction that impacts text comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(2), 203-226.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.163>

Wu, H. (2016). The effectiveness of tutoring for improving pre-service teacher development. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 6(3), 41.

<https://uobrep.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10547/621828/345-885-1-SM.pdf?sequence=1&is-Allowed=y>

Zeng, Y., Kuo, L., Chen, L., Lin, J., & Shen, H. (2025). Vocabulary Instruction for English Learners: A Systematic review connecting theories, research, and practices. *Education Sciences*, 15(3), 262. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030262>

Zhou, W., & Wu, X. (2024). The impact of internal-generated contextual clues on EFL vocabulary learning: insights from EEG. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1332098>

# TẦM QUAN TRỌNG CỦA HƯỚNG DẪN VỀ TỪ VỰNG DỰA TRÊN NGỮ CẢNH TRONG BỐI CẢNH EFL: MỘT ĐÁNH GIÁ CÓ HỆ THỐNG

Nguyễn Huỳnh Sĩ Tân

Khoa Ngoại Ngữ, Đại học Phan Thiết, Việt Nam

**Tóm tắt:** Việc tiếp thu từ vựng là một thành tố nền tảng trong học tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ (EFL). Tuy nhiên, trong nhiều bối cảnh EFL, bao gồm Việt Nam, việc dạy từ vựng vẫn còn phụ thuộc nhiều vào ghi nhớ rời rạc, làm hạn chế khả năng lưu giữ, độ sâu của tri thức từ vựng và năng lực sử dụng giao tiếp. Nghiên cứu này nhằm xem xét vai trò và hiệu quả của dạy từ vựng dựa trên ngữ cảnh, được hiểu là việc giới thiệu, luyện tập và củng cố đơn vị từ vựng trong các ngữ cảnh ngôn ngữ xác thực như văn bản, hội thoại và tài liệu đa phương tiện. Trên cơ sở phương pháp đánh giá hệ thống định hướng theo PRISMA, nghiên cứu tổng hợp 45 công trình lý thuyết và thực nghiệm được công bố trong giai đoạn 2000-2025 từ các cơ sở dữ liệu Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC và Google Scholar. Kết quả cho thấy dạy từ vựng dựa trên ngữ cảnh hỗ trợ cả học ngẫu nhiên và học có chủ đích, tăng cường hiểu biết ngữ nghĩa và dụng học, đồng thời cải thiện khả năng ghi nhớ lâu dài so với cách học từ vựng tách rời khỏi ngữ cảnh. Về mặt sư phạm, nghiên cứu nhấn mạnh giá trị của ngữ cảnh do người học tạo ra, đặc biệt là tăng cường đầu vào và tài nguyên đa phương tiện trong việc chuyển đổi dạy từ vựng theo hướng giao tiếp, lấy người học làm trung tâm, đặc biệt đối với Việt Nam và các bối cảnh EFL tương đồng.

**Từ khóa:** dạy học dựa trên ngữ cảnh, đánh giá hệ thống, học ngẫu nhiên, năng lực giao tiếp, người học EFL, tiếp thu từ vựng

## Thông tin tác giả:

Nguyễn Huỳnh Sĩ Tân, Trường Đại học Phan Thiết, tỉnh Bình Thuận, Việt Nam

Email: nhsytan@gmail.com

## Ghi chú

Tác giả xác nhận không có tranh chấp về lợi ích đối với bài báo này.