

## CONTEXTUALIZATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING CLASSROOMS: A STUDY OF VARIED APPROACHES

---

**Dr. Antony Joseph**

Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam, Kerala

---

### **Abstract**

The present examination attempts to research the growing need to figure out how to utilize language suitably in setting or context. Compelling English language educators treat language as overall, utilizing it as a “context” to encourage their students learning. Today, contextualization is of great significance since it causes students to comprehend the elements of language, helps them in creating proper utilization of language, enacts their own experience information to make the language learning progressively important and so on. We have to reevaluate our disposition towards contextualization because of its crucial role in language learning and instructing or teaching.

**Keywords:** Contextualization, language, content, learning, teaching

### **Contextualization: Introduction**

As per Auer and Di Luzio (1992), contextualization alludes to significant language use for communicative purposes inside a given circumstance or setting. The method of reasoning for this sort of approach is to illustrate genuine or real world language use, how language is utilized by speakers of that language, and to assist students with developing language in their learning surroundings, contingent upon their motivation and, the necessities of a given situational setting. Johnson (2002) characterizes contextualization as “A diverse group of instructional techniques” intended to all the more consistently connect the learning of primary abilities and scholarly or word related substance by concentrating educating and adapting solidly on solid applications in a particular setting that is important to the understudy. Auer and Di Luzio (1992) proceed to state that in most broad terms, “contextualization” in this manner contains all exercises by members which cause pertinent, to look after, reexamine, drop ... any part of setting which, thusly, is liable for the understanding of an expression in its specific locus of event. Such a part or aspect of context might be the larger activity participants are occupied with (the “speech genre”), the little scope action (or “speech act”), the state of mind (or “key”) in which this action is played out, the theme, yet additionally the participants jobs (the member heavenly body, involving “speaker”, “beneficiary”, “spectator”, and so on.), the social connection between members, the connection between a speaker and

the data he passes on by means of language (“modality”), even the status of “focused interaction” itself.

### **Contextualization: Reasons**

According to Walz (1989), reasons for contextualizing language are as follows:

- “It can help learners to understand the functions of language.
- It can assist learners in developing appropriate use of language.
- Learners can activate their own background knowledge to make the language learning more meaningful.
- It adds the cultural element, combining language and culture”.

The blend of all of the above given reasons can be stirring for both learners and teachers.

According to Goode (2000), the contextualized approach depends on the acknowledgment that the improvement of ability necessitates that a student create content as well as procedural information, for example, the meta-cognitive awareness with when and how to apply what has been realized. In Hartman’s (2001) words, this sort of information can be obtained distinctly through practice.

### **Characteristics of De-contextualized Language**

As per Cummins (1994) characteristics of de-contextualized language are:

- Meaning is basically principally passed on through phonetic cues, for example cohesion devices, that are free of the prompt open setting.
- Comprehension relies essentially upon information on the language utilized.
- Classroom language errands, for example, controlling content, fall at this finish of the range.

As per De Temple, Wu, & Snow (1991)

- Text is grounded in reality.
- There is little suspicion of shared foundation information or setting.
- Thematic signs are lexicalized.
- Linguistic gadgets, for example, complex grammatical development and express sentential connectives, move straightforwardly to composed passage development.

As per Marvin (1995):

- Use of distant time referents.

As per Pelligrini (1985):

- Meaning is conveyed textually or by language itself.

### **Characteristics of Contextualized Language**

As per Cummins (1994) characteristics of contextualized language are:

- Contextual or relational signs, for example, pitch, signals, and facial expressions, support appreciation of content.
- Meaning can be haggled by members, for example, by means of input from audience members about how the message was comprehended.

- Typical of ordinary discussions.
- Paralinguistic and situational signs are significant for perception.

As per De Temple, Wu, & Snow (1991)

- Shared physical setting is abused.
- Shared foundation information is used.
- Paralinguistic signs pass on union.
- Use of prosodic ally checked developments that do not have a direct composed simple.

As per Marvin (1995):

- Talk about the here-and now (p. 187), by referencing people, objects and action present in the immediate context.

As per Pelligrini (1985):

- Contextual cues and shared knowledge is used to convey meaning.

### **Contextualization: Approaches**

**Gumperz' approach to contextualization:** Gumperz (1991) states that the idea of contextualization proposes an adaptable thought, a setting that is constantly reshaped in time. In any case, the connection among context and text should likewise be a reflexive one, for example one in which language is not controlled by setting, yet contributes itself in basic approaches to the development of setting. Gumperz (1991) demands the need to build setting so as to convey. This implies: language is not just a semiotic framework the real utilization of which is controlled by the specific circumstance; this semiotic framework (or, as we should better say, this arrangement of semiotic frameworks) is in itself likewise liable for the accessibility of the very setting which is vital so as to decipher the structures encoded in it. Setting, along these lines, is not simply given all things considered in an association, yet is the result of members joint endeavors to make it accessible.

It is anything but an assortment of material or social 'realities', (for example, the collaboration occurring in such and-such area, among such-and-such roles-bearers, and so on.), yet (various) subjective schema (ta) (or model(s)) about what is significant for the collaboration at some random point in time. What is significant right now avoid or incorporate certain realities of the material and social environmental factors of the cooperation as they may be expressed by a 'goal' on-looker who attempts to portray setting without seeing what happens in it (as, for example, the social researcher of some previous hypothetical and methodological conviction), yet it might likewise incorporate data not storable before the communication starts, or autonomously of it. These eminent setting parameters allude, e.g., to kinds of semantic exercises not unsurprising from the 'really' or socially' condition of the collaboration by any means, yet in addition to features of information which may 'actually' be shared by co-members from the earliest starting point, yet must be abandoned 'invisible' (and interactionally immaterial) subjective auras of the members into regularly accessible grounds on which to lead the connection.

The two most significant attributes of this increasingly explicit way to deal with contextualization are the accompanying:

**a) Focus on specific classes of contextualization signals.**

Gumperz (1989) states that “Contextualization cues” are, as a rule, all the structure related methods by which members contextualize language. Given the general idea of an adaptable under flexive setting as sketched out above, unmistakably any verbal and an incredible number of non-verbal (gestual and so forth.) signantia can fill this need.

There is in this way no apriori limitation to the class of contextualization signals. Be that as it may, contextualization research has confined this class for handy reasons (which, thusly, have methodological outcomes) to the class of non-referential, non lexical contextualization prompts, most eminently: prosody, signal/act, look, backchannels, and etymological variety (counting discourse styles). The limitation to non-referential prompts bars mostly two classes of signantia. In the first place, every single unequivocal definition of setting are outside the field of contextualization examine right now, for example forthcoming or review proclamations by members about what will occur or has occurred. For example, declarations of the up and coming action as a joke would be avoided. Typical contextualization cues, for example, an expansion in clamor, code-exchanging or look abhorrence don't have their very own referential significance. Second, the limitation to non-referential prompts prohibits the class of deictic which absolutely serves a contextualizing capacity in that they find language in reality, and thusly interpret the earth (Umfeld, in K. Bailer's terms) where connection happens. In any case, they do this by setting up perspectives right now are thusly referential methods. The class of contextualization prompts thought about sets off contextualization explore in the structure set up by Gumperz from a large portion of discussion investigation, yet in addition certain pieces of pragmatics.

**b) Naturally happening communication as information or data.**

In opposition to most research on data organizing, contextualization examine is unfathomable without deal with normally happening information. Gumperz (1989) manages fine-grained contextualization signs which can't be reproduced from the investigator's memory or fitness as an individual from a discourse network however must be seen in precisely recorded information.

**Contextualizing through Content**

Agreeing Walz (1989), contextualizing is a procedure that is ideal, or possibly most effectively, organized around content, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situation. This should be possible through a substance based educational program, in which a subject is instructed through the mode of English, or through a point or theme based educational plan. Utilizing content is a decent method to use what students definitely think about a theme. The instructor presents new data with regards to known data, using both

---

phonetic and world information. This makes a characteristic spiraling or reusing of language and data utilized in past exercises, as past material is checked on and actuated in introducing new material. The substance itself sets the language setting, or gives data from which the instructor can set a language setting. The following stage is for instructors to pick genuine materials common to that unique situation, which would likewise be open to themselves and to their understudies. The materials, thusly, propose valid exercises, which mean exercises that require “real” correspondence.

One of the most habitually utilized instances of this procedure is content identified with movement, or the traveler business, halfway in light of the fact that content for this subject is open for the two educators and understudies. As per Darling-Hammond and Snyder (2000), a few instances of bona fide materials and circumstances are as per the following: Brochures written in English for vacationers who visit the students nation or city; the travel industry sites (written in English) about the nation or city in English; a few neighborhood lodgings or eateries who would accept brings in English from understudies.

Exercises that initiate true information:

In peer groups, students make a rundown of the considerable number of organizations in their town that either rely upon or are connected somehow or another to the travel industry and/or a rundown of the same number of various occupations as they can consider in the nearby the travel industry. Students can make a rundown of various correspondence occasions that a visitor visiting the city may have (looking into an inn, heading off to a cafe, and so forth.). Students can get ready for the unit by visiting foundations that manage guests (any guests, not simply English-speaking ones) and make notes about language utilized, eye to eye connection, non-verbal communication, and other suitable behaviors. Spiraling (re-use or reusing of exercise content):

The educator can do a survey of recently learned good manners language and language lumps, which may be utilized for exchanges right now.

Linguistic Focus: Introduction of increasingly gracious language (polite) structures utilizing modals; travel-related jargon; maybe fitting or appropriate phone formulas, and so forth. Correspondence occasions (assignments): Reading data on the Internet, making lodging/café reservations, purchasing transport/plane/train tickets; requesting data, and so on. Viewing an English film/video, that incorporates a portion of these correspondence occasions and contrasting fitting practices in the objective culture to notes about nearby practices (contingent upon the capability level of the understudies).

### **Constructing Approach to Contextualization**

As per Walz (1989), some portion of contextualizing language is helping understudies figure out how to build language for a given circumstance. A successful process for developing language in a homeroom has both intellectual and social perspectives. In the psychological procedure students build their own significance or information from the information they get, input which will incorporate data about the specific circumstance or circumstance. The social viewpoint incorporates the possibility of students helping different students to get thoughts and ideas, open doors for which can be encouraged through gathering and pair work. The two viewpoints are significant in setting up a useful learning condition contextualizing language. What's more, for the two viewpoints, the student is the focal point of the learning procedure, the person who develops language dependent on circumstance, input, and reason. One of the choices an educator must make concerns how much situational and social data to give about the different factors in a given setting past the phonetic data, for example Data about member jobs, fitting non-verbal communication, register, anticipated practices, etc. What amount is required for fitting language use and what amount can the students handle at their degree of capability? As students take a shot at building language suitable to a given setting, Goode (2000) gives a rundown of a portion of the factors that need to be considered as follows:

- Communicators motivation,
- Roles and status of the members in the correspondence occasion, which will incorporate thoughtfulness regarding register and tone, and
- Socially worthy standards of conduct and connection in the particular circumstance, which will incorporate thought of the subject of the correspondence, the medium, and the class.

As per Nikitina (2006), in the sort of learning condition portrayed over, the instructor's primary duty is to give valuable, precise, and fathomable information, secondly, to structure language learning exercises that encourage language development and thirdly, to offer help for student's endeavors at whatever point required. How, then, can the instructor plan this sort of learning condition? Contextualizing language in a functioning learning condition can be especially hard for the English educator in a non-English setting, an EFL situation. In that condition, course book language is frequently felt to be more open to the two students and educators than contextualized language. Be that as it may, there are instructing methodologies that can be utilized very well in an EFL circumstance. The instructor can alter the measure of logical data in the info dependent on their own solace level.

### **Socio-cultural Approach to Contextualization**

As per Wenger (1998), contextualized way to deal with guidance focuses on the social idea of genuine exercises, the benefit of building a learning network inside the homeroom, and the significance of accidental discovering that happens when information and abilities are

procured inside a social setting. For instance, when the aptitude of “filling out forms” becomes out of a quick real world need of outsider students and is tended to in a network of students, issues, for example, understanding the conditions under which rounding out structures is fundamental, when and how to bring in a “specialist”, for example, an attorney, and the advantages and disadvantages of approaching relatives for help become some portion of the educational plan. This research to practice note centers on the accompanying key suppositions/ assumptions:

- Effective learning requires the procurement as well as the dynamic application of information, abilities, and procedures.
- To urge move to different settings, successful learning requires the obtaining of an unpredictable information base including content information, abilities, and intellectual and meta-cognitive procedures.
- Learning is a capacity of the action itself as well as of the unique circumstance and culture in which it happens.

### Conclusion

In this day and age, there is a developing need to figure out how to utilize language fittingly in setting. Successful English language educators treat language in general, incorporated integrated communicative framework and utilize that framework as a context to encourage their understudies' learning. Contextualization has been characterized as utilizing any data that can be utilized to portray the circumstance of an entity. Helping students to comprehend the elements of language, helping students in creating suitable utilization of language, actuating their own experience information to make the language learning progressively significant and including the social component, joining or combining language and culture are among the principle reason of contextualization. There are various ways to deal with contextualization: Gumperz' way to deal with contextualization, Contextualizing through Content, Constructing way to deal with contextualization and socio-cultural way to deal with contextualization. It appears that considering these methodologies out and out in language educating and materials improvement gives a progressively extensive picture of contextualized language.

### References:

- Auer, P., A. Di Luzio. 1992. *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Darling-Hammond, L., J. Snyder. 2000. *Authentic assessment of teaching in context*. Teaching and Teacher Education 16(5): 523-545.
- Dey, A. K. 2001. Understanding and using context. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing Journal* 5(1): 4-7.
- Goode, D. 2000. *Creating a context for developmental English*. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. 27(3): 270-277.

- Gumperz, J. 1989. "Contextualization cues and meta pragmatics: The retrieval of cultural knowledge". *MS thesis*, University of Berkeley.
- Gumperz, J. 1991. *Contextualization and understanding*. In A. Durand & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp.123-165). Cambridge: CUP.
- Hartman, H. J. 2001. *Metacognition in learning and instruction: Theory, research and practice*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Johnson, E. B. 2002. *Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it's here to stay*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Nikitina, S. 2006. Three strategies for interdisciplinary teaching: Contextualizing, conceptualizing, and problem-centring. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 38(3): 251-271.
- Walz, J. 1989. Context and contextualized language practice in foreign language teaching. *The Modern Language Journal* 73(2): 160-168.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.