

## **THE STRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION OF BILINGUAL LEARNER'S DICTIONARIES**

**Nashirova Shaxnoza Buriyevna,**

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Karshi State University, Uzbekistan

### **Abstract**

The present article examines the structural organization of bilingual learner's dictionaries with particular reference to English-Uzbek and Uzbek-English lexicographic practices. The study focuses on macrostructure, microstructure, and access structure as the core components determining dictionary functionality and communicative equivalence. Drawing on metalexigraphic theories proposed by Gouws, Hausmann, Wiegand, Kromann et al., and Zöfgen, the paper analyses how different types of equivalence relations—especially congruence and divergence—are represented in bilingual learner's dictionaries. A comparative approach is applied to reveal structural asymmetries between English-Uzbek and Uzbek-English dictionaries, demonstrating how insufficient treatment of semantic divergence and weak access structures hinder communicative equivalence for learners. The article argues for a user-oriented structural model that integrates enhanced access structures and context-based microstructural representation to improve dictionary usability in a multilingual educational context.

### **Keywords**

bilingual learner's dictionaries, structural organization, macrostructure, microstructure, access structure, communicative equivalence.

### **Аннотация**

В данной статье рассматривается структурная организация двуязычных учебных словарей на материале англо-узбекской и узбекско-английской лексикографической практики. Основное внимание уделяется макроструктуре, микроструктуре и структуре доступа как ключевым компонентам, определяющим функциональность словаря и достижение коммуникативной эквивалентности. Опираясь на металексикографические концепции, разработанные Р. Х. Гоувсом, Ф. Хаусманном, Х. Э. Вигандом, Кроманном и др., а также Зёфгеном, в статье анализируются способы представления различных типов эквивалентных отношений, в частности конгруэнтности и дивергенции, в двуязычных учебных словарях. Сравнительный анализ позволяет выявить структурные асимметрии между англо-узбекскими и узбекско-английскими словарями и показать, что недостаточная проработка семантической дивергенции и слабая организация структуры доступа препятствуют достижению коммуникативной эквивалентности для пользователей-обучающихся. В статье обосновывается необходимость разработки ориентированной на пользователя структурной модели, интегрирующей усовершенствованные структуры доступа и контекстуально обусловленную микроструктурную репрезентацию с целью повышения эффективности использования словарей в многоязычной образовательной среде.

### **Ключевые слова**

двуязычные учебные словари, структурная организация, макроструктура, микроструктура, структура доступа, коммуникативная эквивалентность.

### **Annotatsiya**

Mazkur maqolada ikki tilli o'quv lug'atlarning strukturaviy tashkil etilishi inglizcha–o'zbekcha va o'zbekcha–inglizcha leksikografik amaliyotlar misolida tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot lug'at funkcionalligi va kommunikativ ekvivalentlikni belgilovchi asosiy tarkibiy qismlar sifatida makrostruktura, mikrostruktura va kirish (access) strukturasi alohida e'tibor qaratadi. Maqolada Gouws, Hausmann, Wiegand, Kromann va Zöfgen tomonidan ilgari surilgan metaleksikografik nazariyalarga tayangan holda, ikki tilli o'quv lug'atlarida ekvivalent munosabatlarning, xususan, moslik (kongruensiya) va tafovut (divergensiya) turlarining qanday aks ettirilishi tahlil qilinadi. Qiyosiy yondashuv asosida inglizcha–o'zbekcha va o'zbekcha–inglizcha lug'atlar o'rtasidagi strukturaviy nomutanosibliklar aniqlanib, semantik divergensiyaning yetarli darajada yoritilmasligi hamda kirish strukturalarining sustligi o'quvchilar uchun kommunikativ ekvivalentlikka erishishni qiyinlashtirishi asoslab beriladi. Maqolada ko'p tilli ta'lim muhitida lug'atlardan foydalanish samaradorligini oshirish maqsadida kuchaytirilgan kirish strukturalari va kontekstga asoslangan mikrostruktura elementlarini o'z ichiga olgan foydalanuvchiga yo'naltirilgan strukturaviy model taklif etiladi.

### **Kalit so'zlar**

ikki tilli o'quv lug'atlar, strukturaviy tashkil etilish, makrostruktura, mikrostruktura, kirish strukturasi, kommunikativ ekvivalentlik.

In contemporary multilingual societies, bilingual learner's dictionaries play a crucial role as functional linguistic instruments facilitating cross-linguistic communication. Unlike general bilingual dictionaries, learner-oriented dictionaries are expected not only to provide translation equivalents but also to guide users toward communicative equivalence, enabling accurate language production in real contexts. However, achieving communicative equivalence remains a persistent challenge due to structural limitations inherent in many bilingual dictionaries.

Metalexigraphic research emphasizes that the effectiveness of a bilingual dictionary is largely determined by its structural organization, including macrostructure, microstructure, and access structure (Hausmann & Wiegand, 1989). Inadequate structuring of these components often results in user confusion, especially in cases of semantic divergence where a single source-language lemma corresponds to multiple target-language equivalents.

This article aims to analyse the structural organization of bilingual learner's dictionaries through a comparative study of English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English dictionaries, focusing on how structural decisions affect the representation of equivalent relations and the achievement of communicative equivalence.

The structural organization of a dictionary is traditionally divided into three interrelated components: macrostructure, microstructure, and access structure. According to Hausmann and Wiegand (1989), these components collectively determine the dictionary's functionality and user-friendliness.

Macrostructure refers to the overall organization of lemma signs forming the dictionary's word list. In bilingual learner's dictionaries, macrostructural decisions must be guided by the needs and reference skills of the target user group. However, many English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English dictionaries adopt macrostructures derived from general bilingual dictionaries, without sufficient adaptation for learners.

As Gouws (1995) notes, learner's dictionaries often emerge as reduced versions of general dictionaries, resulting in a macrostructure that lacks pedagogical prioritization. High-frequency lexical items, polysemous lemmas, and culturally marked units are not always adequately highlighted, which diminishes the dictionary's instructional value.

Microstructure encompasses the internal structure of dictionary articles, including pronunciation, grammatical information, translation equivalents, usage labels, and examples. In bilingual learner's dictionaries, microstructure plays a decisive role in ensuring communicative equivalence.

Gouws (1989) distinguishes between congruence and divergence as fundamental types of equivalent relations. Congruence implies a one-to-one correspondence between source and target language items, where semantic equivalence generally ensures communicative equivalence. In such cases, microstructural representation is relatively straightforward.

Divergence, however, introduces complexity. Lexical divergence occurs when a lemma corresponds to a paradigm of synonymous equivalents, whereas semantic divergence arises when a polysemous lemma requires different equivalents for distinct senses. English–Uzbek dictionaries frequently fail to mark these distinctions explicitly, presenting uncommented lists of equivalents that provide little guidance for learners.

Comparative analysis reveals that Uzbek–English dictionaries tend to provide more extensive grammatical labeling, whereas English–Uzbek dictionaries often prioritize lexical equivalence at the expense of semantic clarity. In both directions, insufficient contextualization remains a major weakness, particularly in articles involving polysemy.

The access structure defines the search path through which users retrieve information. It consists of outer access structure (leading to the lemma) and inner access structure (leading to specific information categories).

In many English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English learner's dictionaries, the outer access structure is monoaccessible, presupposing a high level of linguistic competence. This assumption is problematic in multilingual contexts, where users may lack proficiency in one of the languages.

Innovative solutions, such as supplementary macrostructures and typographical markers, have proven effective in enhancing accessibility. However, such practices remain rare in Uzbek bilingual lexicography.

Kromann et al. (1991) identify three central criteria for modern bilingual dictionaries: the user aspect, the linguistic aspect, and the empirical aspect. Among these, the user aspect is paramount, as it determines the relevance and usability of structural decisions.

In bilingual learner's dictionaries, communicative equivalence can only be achieved if structural organization is explicitly aligned with user needs. This requires a reassessment of traditional typological classifications and the development of learner-specific structural models.

The present study has demonstrated that the structural organization of bilingual learner's dictionaries plays a decisive role in determining their functional efficiency and their capacity to ensure communicative equivalence. The analysis of English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English learner's dictionaries confirms that macrostructure, microstructure, and access structure are not merely formal components of dictionary design but constitute an integrated system that directly influences users' ability to retrieve and apply lexical information in real communicative contexts.

The findings indicate that many bilingual learner's dictionaries still rely on traditional structural models originally developed for general bilingual dictionaries. As a result, these dictionaries often presuppose a level of linguistic competence and cultural familiarity that learner-users do not necessarily possess. This is particularly evident in the treatment of equivalent relations. While congruent equivalents generally allow for relatively straightforward semantic transfer, cases of lexical and semantic divergence pose significant challenges for learners. Insufficient differentiation between polysemous senses, lack of contextual support, and the presentation of uncommented lists of translation equivalents frequently obstruct the achievement of communicative equivalence.

The comparative analysis further reveals structural asymmetries between English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English dictionaries. English–Uzbek dictionaries tend to prioritise lexical correspondence, whereas Uzbek–English dictionaries more often include grammatical information; however, both types show deficiencies in the systematic representation of semantic divergence and pragmatic usage. These shortcomings highlight the need for a more consistent and theoretically grounded approach to microstructural design, particularly with regard to sense discrimination, contextual examples, and usage guidance.

A key outcome of this study is the recognition of the access structure as a crucial but often underestimated component of dictionary organization. In multilingual educational contexts, a mono-accessible structure is insufficient to meet learner needs. Enhanced outer and inner access structures, as well as the inclusion of additional access paths linking dictionary information to communicative contexts, significantly improve dictionary usability and information retrieval. Such improvements are especially important for users with limited reference skills or asymmetric proficiency in the language pair.

In line with contemporary metalexigraphic research, the study confirms the primacy of the user-oriented approach in the compilation of bilingual learner's dictionaries. Structural decisions must be co-determined by a clearly defined target user profile, including users' linguistic competence, learning objectives, and reference skills. The results support the argument that a reassessment of traditional typological classifications is necessary and that bilingual learner's dictionaries should be designed as functionally differentiated tools rather than as simplified derivatives of general bilingual dictionaries.

In conclusion, achieving communicative equivalence in bilingual learner's dictionaries requires a comprehensive rethinking of their structural organization. A user-oriented structural model integrating a carefully designed macrostructure, a context-sensitive and semantically explicit microstructure, and an enhanced access structure offers a viable solution to many of the problems identified in this study. The implementation of such a model would not only increase the pedagogical value and usability of English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English learner's dictionaries but also contribute to the broader development of bilingual lexicography in multilingual educational environments. Future research may build on these findings by incorporating

empirical user studies and corpus-based analyses to further refine structural models and adapt them to evolving learner needs.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Bergenholtz, H., & Tarp, S. (1995). *Manual of Specialised Lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
3. Gouws, R. H. (1989). *Leksikografie*. Pretoria: Academica.
4. Gouws, R. H. (1993). "Bilingual Dictionaries and Communicative Equivalence for a Multilingual Society." *Lexicographica*, 9, 45–62.
5. Gouws, R. H. (1995). "Dictionaries and the Dynamics of Language Change." *Lexikos*, 5, 13–32.
6. Gouws, R. H., & Ponelis, F. A. (1992). "The Development of Afrikaans Lexicography." *South African Journal of Linguistics*, 10(2), 47–58.
7. Hartmann, R. R. K. (1989). *Sociology of the Dictionary User*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
8. Hartmann, R. R. K., & James, G. (2002). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge.
9. Hausmann, F. J., & Wiegand, H. E. (1989). "Component Parts and Structures of General Monolingual Dictionaries." In F. J. Hausmann et al. (Eds.), *Wörterbücher / Dictionaries / Dictionnaires* (pp. 328–360). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
10. Kromann, H. P., Riiber, T., & Rosbach, P. (1991). "Principles of Bilingual Lexicography." In F. J. Hausmann et al. (Eds.), *Wörterbücher / Dictionaries / Dictionnaires* (pp. 2711–2728). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
11. Landau, S. I. (2001). *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Svensén, B. (2009). *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Wiegand, H. E. (1998). *Lexikographische Theorie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
14. Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton.
15. Zöfgen, E. (1991). "Learners' Dictionaries: Problems and Perspectives." *International Journal of Lexicography*, 4(4), 287–306.
16. Zöfgen, E. (1994). *Lernerwörterbücher in Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.