Chapter 14. Pedagogical Stylistics

INTRODUCTION

Stylistics has always claimed a close and privileged relation to pedagogy. Indeed stylistics has at times been regarded by some outsiders as only or primarily a pedagogical activity rather than a field for research. *Language and Literature*, the leading international journal for stylistics, has had two special issues with pedagogical themes in recent years for example (Burke ed., 2010; Knights and Steadman-Jones eds., 2011). Many of the names appearing in the survey that follows, not coincidentally, are themselves acknowledged as unusually good teachers. Pedagogy has historically and conceptually always been close to the core of what stylistics is all about because it is an empirical discipline testing ideas against texts and even generating ideas through textual interrogation. Such activities require students, classrooms and seminar rooms to engage in stylistic activity to keep advancing our understanding of how texts work, particularly as earlier more formalist stylistics moved to greater recognition of the role of readers in making meaning from texts. Thus, stylistics research will often come out of classroom activity, or it will be immediately clear how an analysis or approach can offer productive affordances to teachers and learners.

Stylistics in a broad sense - careful linguistically-informed attention to language use in texts – may also be opposed to stylistics in more technical or specialist academic senses. But there is arguably more of a continuum. Language study and language awareness at the lower end of a generously defined 'stylistics' is of more immediate interest to pedagogical stylistics than (say) some of today's more leading edge stylistics research into cognitive processes of reading or more rarefied reaches of speech and thought representation.

To begin this survey of pedagogical stylistics then our area of concern can be indicated as the use of stylistics in pedagogy. I will examine xamples and concerns of this broadly defined stylistics (close and systematic, linguistically informed study of language use and language choice) rather than what can be termed the narrower 'pedagogy of stylistics' (cf. Jeffries and McIntyre, 2010; 2011), how better to teach stylistics as a pedagogical end in itself. Stylistics claims to have wider-ranging applied utility and relevance beyond the sphere of stylistics itself as applications, technologies and even an attitude to the gaining of knowledge and understanding.

The pedagogical value of stylistics.

Practitioners have claimed that the study of style can be of value to a wide range of learning situations. Some key overlapping areas in which the value of stylistics to learning is claimed may be catalogued here:

-Stylistics can be used to teach literature or at least facilitate the study of literature, or the study of linguistic creativity more broadly understood

- stylistics can support the study of texts in contexts and discourse more widely, as of genre, register, and sociolinguistics, variation, as well as of the grammar of standard spoken and written language through its fundamentally comparative method

-stylistics is of value for foreign language or second language learning programmes where attention to language use should facilitate language acquisition or where study of language use is valued

-stylistics can be used to teach language use, language awareness and language arts as a resource for language users

- stylistics is claimed to be of value in creative writing programmes, as well as in professional, academic or technical writing development

- stylistics can be used to teach linguistics, an inductive way into a sometimes demanding subject area ('bottom up' rather than 'top down' investigation) that teaches as much (or prompts as many questions) about 'language' as it does about 'literature'

-Stylistics may be used to teach empirical research skills, but also transferable intellectual and social skills and rhetoric (evidence-based argument, careful and systematic description and presentation; argumentation)

- stylistics has recently been used in the study of readers and reading, to investigate questions of social and cognitive psychology, and topics in psycholinguistics, particularly the study of cognition in reading, including topics such as 'noticing', attention, value, affect (Emmott, 1997; Miall, 2007; Stockwell, 2002)

- stylistics can be used to introduce and learn corpus stylistics and ICT skills, quantitative and qualitative learning and understanding

- in more recent multimodal stylistics, it is argued that film, cultural studies, the internet and complex multimodal texts more generally, can be explored more precisely and systematically with the aid of stylistics (e.g. van Leeuwen, 1999)

In short, then, stylistics is claimed to be of value wherever precise and articulated description and analysis of language and communication is felt to be of value in pedagogy. Stylistics offers both methods and a vocabulary for such analysis and is claimed to be eminently teachable, and to act as empirical groundwork and a training for more advanced analysis and argumentation. Stylistics is claimed to be of value at various levels of education and in varying contexts, whether L1 ('mother tongue' education) or L2 (foreign or second language education).

 An expanding field of enquiry

In the broad understanding which I started out by proposing, stylistics is seen to deal with not only literature, canonical and non-canonical, its main endeavour historically, but also the features of style of newspapers, advertising and a whole broad range of more and less creative and expressive language use, to include sociolinguistically register, style and other variation study informed by linguistic awareness. In such an understanding the language of humour, of magazines, of sports commentary, or of media, comics, newspapers, ICT (see, for example, the range of titles in Routledge's 'Intertext' series) or interviews or instructions (Delin, 2000) can all be seen as stylistic concerns with clear pedagogical relevance to the wider world of work our students need to function in. Stylistics promotes principled study of language use and concentration on functional explanations for the forms found: why were

those forms used in that sequence, presented like that? In this way stylistics can also be seen as intrinsic to discourse analysis more widely. Study of patterns, regularities, deviance and foregrounding will reveal much of how meaning is made in a given text, even though stylistics today also insists on the final importance of the reader for meaning making. The study of expressive uses of language, of language in the formation of identity (e.g. Coupland, 2007), language in use, and language as text and discourse – will all help us understand better the social world around us and how we can interact more successfully with it and stylistics can offer ways into these complex areas.

The basic question and method of pedagogical stylistics is comparative: how are given texts (typically literary texts) different yet the same as other uses of language? In a prototypical stylistics class a poem may be juxtaposed with a non-poetic text on the 'same' topic or situation to investigate their linguistic differences and the effects of these. Intuitively we know the difference between a formal letter and a note on a fridge door, between a poetic elegy and an obituary notice in a newspaper. Stylistics claims it is valuable to be able to describe this difference explicitly and precisely in a way that will make sense to others and even enable those who can do this to produce such texts more effectively for themselves in future. What features in a given instance, as well as across a range of instances, differentiate a specific text or type of text from others? '[T]exts must always be related to other texts' (McRae, 1996: 26). Features of texts combine to make meaning. Meaning is made from a text by a reader both from features of the text itself and also by noticing these differences from other texts that have been known.

Pedagogically, it is of great importance to note that a stylistics approach is also typically transformative and hands on (as advocated and exemplified *par excellence* by Pope, 1995). Students are usually asked not just to contemplate differences abstractly, but to rewrite the sentence or a whole text in another style, by changing syntax, or to consider choice of lexis, or other syntagmatic and paradigmatic choices prompting attention to unusual or specific features of language use and so on to interpretative activity in readers. What linguistic or textual changes prompt what changes in meaning for which readers? At what point and how does one genre transmute into another? If hybrid genres are the norm in communication today, how does an apparently chatty and friendly message from a stranger we have never met from our bank work or not to convince us to borrow more money we cannot afford? The most common word in advertising used to be 'new' (Leech 1972). Fairclough (2000) then showed it was the favourite word of Blair's 'new Labour' political spin in the U.K. And what does it tell us to learn the greater importance today of terms like 'natural' in advertising? (Cook, 2004; what satirical magazine 'Private Eye' has called 'green-wash', itself a stylistically interesting neologism). The students will be invited to contemplate the effects of given linguistic changes to the meanings that can be achieved. This is a key method for raising language awareness, but also feeds directly into areas such as creative or professional writing and other communication or rhetoric as a set of resources the students can be encouraged in practical ways to develop for their own ends. In this sense, hands on, transformative stylistics ties back into the basic principles and precepts of classical pedagogical rhetoric as it was taught in antiquity. The classic linguistic definition of style was Joos's (1961) formal – informal cline to describe levels of style. This is a basic level at which such pedagogic activities might take place, for example for a class of foreign language learners, or 'translating' a text from written into spoken mode to highlight some characteristic differences. Indeed, translation itself inevitably raises stylistic issues too in

many educational contexts and is less frowned upon today than it has sometimes been in pedagogical circles (see Cook, 2010).

Studies of social theory or even business studies arguably often leave the student as a spectator on the sidelines, at worst intimidated and diminished, perhaps at best understanding better, but no more able to participate fully than when they started their course. Stylistic activities build confidence by offering systematic approaches (often even a 'toolkit', as in Short, 1996), and so can promote autonomy and empower. In this way stylistics can help to bridge school and university study of English and the world of study and world of work. There is a growing conviction across many educational sites that 'doing' is at least as important as 'knowing', but also of course that such 'procedural knowledge' as the psychologists term the doing, is actually linked to declarative knowledge. Being able to describe what you are doing for others means it can be better analysed, discussed, even improved by sharing practices. We learn to teach by teaching, to read by reading. But the best readers and the best teachers are actually those who have also successfully discussed their teaching and their reading with others.

With global expansion and extension of education at all levels, surprising gaps in the abilities and knowledge of students are widely reported by teachers who generally came from more privileged sectors of society in the past when education was less widely available. In the UK, for example, 'false fluency' and even a misplaced confidence and assertiveness are often noted among students who have actually not fully mastered basic but essential lower level skills or knowledge in literacy or other communication skills. Literature professors complain of students who detect the workings of power and gender at every turn but cannot point to a line in the text they are studying to support their arguments. Such students cannot describe the form and structure of a sonnet or define iambic pentameter, cannot identify Biblical allusions or hear the dactylic rhythm of 'The Charge of the Light Brigade'. They talk past each other in unproductive ways. At the same time employers report dissatisfaction with graduates of English who cannot write a business letter, take notes at a meeting or answer a phone appropriately even if they may be able to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of globalisation or decry the world's pollution. The solution to all this is not of course to 'return to basics' with prescriptive spelling bees and punctuation tests as some simplistic politicians advocate. It is rather to 'teach the conflicts' as Graff (1993) once advocated, to help students understand why alternative spellings might exist and why they might matter more to some than others, to see gender and power in the workings of language not as abstractions that can or should be considered outside of concrete instances of human interaction. A feature such as a 'dactyl' has no value or interest in itself but is a way to direct attention to the workings of language in the service of communication and the intertextual workings of Tennyson's imagination and his appeal to (some) readers. To consider an author or editor's choice of punctuation is not a question of deciding which version is 'right' but to understand how and why different preferences might mean and might have become available. The transformation of a 'Times' newspaper report from the Crimean front into 'The Charge of the Light Brigade' is indeed a classroom activity as well as a scholarly enquiry I have pursued myself across many different contexts and countries. Why not in the same way begin a classroom enquiry into gender by considering given names (John vs Jenny) or a corpus enquiry into collocations of 'small' and 'little' rather than with a reading of Judith Butler? Butler's idea of speech acts comes out of linguistics and is best understood by starting with those linguistic origins. The subtle workings of power and

resistance will be easier to approach through one of Rampton's (2006) classroom transcripts than through a reading of a postmodern philosopher like Foucault. Gender and the workings of power need to be understood and should be contested, globalisation is a complex process to be negotiated, pollution matters, but it is in the workings of everyday stylistic practices of language and communication that most individuals can best and most consistently make a difference. (See also Cameron, 1995).

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Historically, in Britain and its empire from the late 19th century, the new discipline of literature in schools, colleges and universities was in search of means in classrooms to teach the effective reading of literature. As the 20th century wore on and literature became an established 'subject' in education, this search for pedagogically valid method came to be combined, or even eclipsed, with an increasing awareness of problems of mediated reading of literature through cribs, secondary works of criticism and the like on to the use of internet sources today. The cry went up that students needed to read primary literary texts for themselves and with due respect for the exact uses of language and exact presentation (Atherton, 2005). Wider crises of literacy have also been raised at least ever since we were all able to read them. (For critical accounts, see Graff, 1987; Street, 1985; through to Liu, 2004.) Literary criticism did not ultimately offer sufficient pedagogical facilitation. Pedagogical stylistics would argue that this was because of its neglect of linguistic aspects of literary texts.

The new 'Schools of English' in British universities assumed one's own language did not need to be studied except perhaps historically (as with Anglo-Saxon philology at Oxford). Outside the Anglo-American world, language and literature were usually both required in a balanced way of all students in philology departments and in departments of English. Ironically, however, graduates of English, even some with named degrees in 'English language and literature' began to emerge from British universities in the twentieth century with little or no declarative or systematic knowledge of English or any other language or linguistics. Linguistic matters were taken to be obvious and to require no training or conscious study. Retrospectively the gap and need for stylistics seems painfully clear but at the time it was seen by very few (see Hall, forthcoming). Close examination of a text was held to be necessary but it wasn't quite clear what exactly was being looked for or how. Those who asked for more precision and clarity, as in the notorious exchanges between Bateson and Fowler (see Simpson, 2004: 148-157) thereby only showed that they were not sensitive readers, so far as the literature professors were concerned. Calls for more objectivity, professors like Bateson said, threatened the pleasures of reading. This attitude can still be traced in Gower (1986) and beyond.

The 'close readings' of Practical Criticism arguably represent the beginnings of literary study as a replicable, teachable and testable subject (Atherton, 2005) including the democratising urges, or at least expansion of (higher) education however patrician and uninformed those efforts look now. Arguably in some ways too, stylistics was originally elaborated most fully as pedagogy, first to bring respectability and rigour to the study of literature in the second language classroom, later extended (in principle) to all classrooms.

As the century advanced, however, phenomenology, structuralism, cultural studies, semiotics, and other social sciences, altogether a supposed 'linguistic turn' in the human sciences and more generally, insisted on the need to study the previously overlooked taken-for-granted everyday world around us. It became less possible to look through language and ever more necessary to look at it, whether in literary text or elsewhere. Language use was no longer obvious and unproblematic. Literary language was to be demystified not fetishised. To leave intellectual history for pedagogical practicalities, for example, many UK English graduates in the twentieth century (as had Joyce or Empson) found themselves at one stage or another teaching English in some way, often EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and quickly realised that they knew nothing or little about their own language except intuitively, certainly not compared to their own better-informed non-native speaking students.

Through the post second world war period, with the strong growth of TEFL, with enlightened and better trained teachers obliged by syllabuses or wanting to share their own pleasure in the reading of literature, literary criticism in EFL contexts was necessarily succeeded by increasingly sophisticated stylistics in classrooms for EFL learners. By the end of the century in the UK with English language A level and ever more 'non-traditional' learners coming into 'English' classrooms, increasingly for L1 learners too at least up to school leaving levels, stylistics seemed a more convincing solution than traditional literary criticism. Thus when the UK English schools curriculum was being revised the UK government called in Widdowson and Carter to advise, even though ultimately neither could quite conscientiously deliver the simplistic answers the governments of the time desired.

STYLISTICS IN TEACHING TODAY: EFL, ESL AND L1.

For many, however, pedagogical stylistics begins most decisively with Widdowson (1975), then Carter, Short and colleagues publishing from the early 1980s, and has EFL/ ESL education as its first priority. The collection edited by Brumfit and Carter (1986) showed how much pedagogical stylistics was already going on in TEFL by that time.

Henry Widdowson (EFL)
With decidedly traditionalist views of the nature of literature and literary value, maintained to this day, Widdowson has always insisted that literary texts and non-literary texts can be shown to be quite different kinds of communication that work in different ways, and it is stylistics that will best enable students to see this. The contrast is more apparent than real with Carter, Simpson or others who would maintain that literature is just one more use of language. It is one more use of language – and all uses of language are special, so literature is or is not distinctive according to the emphasis we wish to give. The main difference between the views of Widdowson and others seems to lie in an insistence of the limited relevance of context, or a formalist notion of context. The context that matters for Widdowson is the one the poem will make, rather than a context a reader brings to it; literature is by nature a relatively decontextualised form of communication in this view. Widdowson insists on the importance of individual readers' agency and distinctiveness in

meaning making rather than considering the literary text as participating in social interaction, perhaps itself a pedagogic preference over more scholarly study of literature.

Widdowson argued that literary criticism is not opposed to stylistic analysis, but on a continuum (1975: 1). Stylistics was seen as particularly valuable as a preparation for literary study (1975: 106) but also as of value in itself for students of language use. Literature is of value as 'a use of language' (124), 'a particular selection and arrangement of linguistic forms' (114). Widdowson particularly argued for literary texts as distinctive communicative uses of language in so far as literary language characteristically exceeds what simple 'referential' information exchange uses of language would call for. By looking at how language is used to make meaning in the literary text 'ordinary' language use can be learned even as the wider expressive possibilities of the language are also noticed and understood. Widdowson insisted on the importance of 'precision of reference to the text in support of a particular interpretation' (1992: xii), and so the value of stylistics in requiring student engagement with the primary text rather than with biographies, study notes or rehashing of a teacher's thoughts, the familiar bugbears of the literature teacher then as now. Interestingly in 1992 Widdowson also insisted on the value of stylistics for what it could *not* explain as well as for what it could, the limits of our understanding and of our linguistics in the face of valued aesthetic experience. Widdowson spends more than half of his 1992 book giving detailed examples of techniques and strategies for the classroom of the kind Duff and Maley (1990) or Carter and Long (1987) were already urging on teachers particularly of English as a foreign language, through their publications and their own teaching but also through more wide ranging workshops and seminars overseas as well as in the UK, often supported or otherwise associated with The British Council. These were very influential activities and helped establish the reputation and knowledge of pedagogical stylistics across a generation of teachers and lecturers. The 'practical stylistics' Widdowson so influentially advocated is pursued in 2004 and beyond: 'there is something distinctive about literature and [that] this calls for a different mode of interpretation and a different kind of critical practice from those relevant to other kinds of language use' (Widdowson, 2004: 161)

Cook in 1986, 1996 and elsewhere has also provocatively argued the distinctive literariness and value of literature in unfashionable, Widdowsonian mould. Cook nevertheless has rendered profound service to pedagogical stylistics by showing in detail how literature can be appreciated by students using stylistic approaches. Important wider stylistic work on advertising, promotional discourse and the importance of play in language learning followed (Cook, 2001; Cook, 2004; Cook, 2000).

Carter, Short (EFL and L1)
What pedagogical stylistics offered students and teachers in the work of Widdowson, Carter and others was a move from facts to skills, a move always of interest to literature teachers as well as language teachers, but also the teachability of such skills and the possibilities for assessment of demonstrable, specifiable abilities with unseen or other texts under exam conditions. In Carter's case this goes along with a conscious and often explicit awareness of the challenges from literary criticism and literary theory (Carter and Long, 1991; Carter, Walker and Brumfit, 1989) as well as deference to those with greater practical expertise in TEFL (Carter and McCarthy exchanges with Prodromou reprinted in Seidlhofer, 2003:

Section 2). Carter's position remains modest but firm: 'in pedagogic terms, the aim is to provide a systematic set of analytical tools, drawn from linguistics, that can foster insights into the patterning of literary texts in ways which allow those insights to be open, evidenced, and retrievable' (Carter 2010: 68)

For L1 teaching situations in the UK, A level English language as conceived from the 1990s was a natural outcome of experience and learning in earlier EFL applications of stylistics. Just as there is no essential difference between literary and non-literary texts, so the thinking went, there is no essential difference between so-called native speakers and non-native speakers, and indeed with increasingly mixed international classes in most realms of education today, so it has proved in practice. The attempt was to move away from fine-sounding but generalised essays on literature to the demonstration of ability to analyse specific texts in an informed, explicit and systematic way and to communicate the analysis to others. Here as in EFL pedagogical stylistics Carter played a key role in the advocacy, spread and popularisation of the new ideas, including teacher training and higher education, workshops, book series and more. At the same time stylistics was also moving away from more formalist beginnings into more discourse-based understandings of how texts work (exemplified by Carter and Simpson (eds.), 1989). McRae and Boardman (1984) also influentially pointed to the importance of 'reading between the lines', a key idea for 'discourse' studies – 'considering what is absent or implicit in a text' (McRae and Clark, 2004: 333). The skilled reader needed to consider the meaning of what was and was not included and how in a text, literary or otherwise. In *Literature with a small 'l'*, McRae (1991), again stressed that there was no sharp linguistic dividing line between the literary text and the non-literary text. This approach is critically pursued in Wallace (2003: 3), arguing after Fairclough and others that ideology works 'by omission, imbalance and distortion', and readers must learn to look for these gaps and biases. Wallace further aligns her work with what I have identified as a loosely characterised 'stylistics' when she argues the importance of 'declarative, explicit knowledge' (2003: 21) and students learning to read intertextually, 'to focus on the interdependence between texts rather than their discreteness or uniqueness' if education is to encourage critical rather than compliant readers (Montgomery et al., 1992; quoted in Wallace, 2003: 14). Davies (1998) similarly showed in a subtle but at the same time perfectly practical fashion how to use stylistics to help second language readers who are reading too literally and not seeing what lies between the lines: 'Non-native readers often miss the hidden discourse in a text' (271). Davies then introduced a precisely and fully reported set of useful exercises (including transformations) on modalisation, cliché and others to raise L2 readers' awareness of the evasive and rather myopic character of Stevens in Ishiguro's *Remains of the Day*, to avoid his first person narrative being taken at face value.

From the 1980s also Short co-taught then led the large and successful (ongoing at time of writing) 'Language and Style' first year course for literature and linguistics students of English at Lancaster University, resulting in a stream of valuable stylistics publications, most with more than half an eye toward pedagogy. Short (ed.) (1989) is a good example of this borderland work of hands-on pedagogically-oriented research. In 1996 Short finally offered a set of tools or 'toolkit' based on his many years of teaching language and literature through a stylistics inspired approach. An electronic version of the course itself went online in 2006 and is currently deliberately open access and free of charge. The 1996 textbook is

exemplary in its clarity and organisation, including worked examples, extension activities and above all in its no nonsense 'Checksheets' at the end of each chapter. This is stylistics at its most provocative and assertive, reductive or emancipatory according to your perspective. Work through these headings with any text in this genre or topic, the Checklists claim, and you will inevitably notice what you need to notice to get you up and started with the text and speaking or writing about it more convincingly than if you have just quickly found a crib on the internet the night before the seminar. These ideas have been promulgated by Short in many international contexts, including China from as early as the 1980s, Japan and others. While many will feel the techniques need supplementation, there is no doubt of their effectiveness for many students and their teachers. An important idea in Short and many other of the pedagogical stylistics publications I have mentioned is to offer students scaffolding to help them deal with a particular text at hand but also more generally to offer a transferable approach to their wider reading and to other interactions with and uses of language.

Later developments

Short's materials from his 'Language and Style' course went on line in 2006 and have been used across a range of countries and contexts (see, e.g., Crisp 2006 for Hong Kong applications). Elsewhere computers and software were ever more commonly used for stylistic approaches to pedagogy, from Louw (1997, for example) to Mahlberg (2012) to Goddard (2011), or McIntyre (2012) to cite only a few strong studies. Stockwell as editor of the series 'English Language Introductions' (Routledge) and Carter as co-author of 'Working with Texts' (Routledge) and series editor of 'Intertexts', with Goddard, herself a Chair of Examiners for English Language A level in the UK, were other important initiatives to propagate stylistic approaches to pedagogy beyond the narrow circles of stylistics or even applied linguistics specialists.

Clark and Zyngier (2003) in their own earlier survey article on pedagogical stylistics, raised the question I have asked in this piece as well: are L2 and L1 contexts so different? Their answer like mine is that probably the line if it still exists is ever more blurred in an ever more interconnected world with education expanding globally and exponentially. Thus it is proposed that language awareness, empirical classroom research including a growth of interest in cognitive activities of readers, discourse processing in educational contexts, and meaning making in groups in institutions, as well as the growth of 'English' globally, including language in UK schools and universities, the expansion of (higher) education needing 'to promote linguistically aware readers who can perceive the qualities of language which are manipulated for particular effects (including the aesthetic)', all augur a bright future for stylistic approaches to pedagogy (Clark and Zyngier, 2003: 342).

Badran (2007) in an impressive essay shows how a stylistic approach can be used to investigate vocabulary use in discourse with students, rather than as isolated referential items in a 'vocab' book. The educator's concerns with memory, learning, proficiency and the ability to manipulate language to make one's own meanings are shown to result from engagement and interest, deep processing and more extended attention. This is the kind of study Paran (2008) calls for in critical comments I return to below in 'Future Directions'.

Knights and Thurgar Dawson 2006 arguably continue and develop Pope's (1995) valuable 'heuristic' transformative approach to pedagogy. In the first more theoretical part of their book they deplore the lack of interest in language and indeed in the practicalities of teaching in many literature classrooms. 'It is a pedagogic tragedy that the theory revolution of the 1970s and 1980s was in general so temperamentally averse to empirical language study' (Knights and Thurgar-Dawson, 2006: 11) The second more practically oriented part of the book then goes on to look at what might be termed post-Pope interventions in English learning, particularly with reference to first year undergraduates in the UK and to the teaching of creative writing. (See also Scott (2012), on stylistics in the teaching of creative writing and Burke (2012) in that same volume on his 'systemic' approach to pedagogical stylistics, namely, (i) knowledge (rhetoric), followed by (ii) analysis (stylistics) followed by (iii) synthesis and creative production/ creative writing.)

Shen (2012) describes an impressive range of pedagogical work extending its influence through China, much published in Chinese, while Teranishi (2012) shows further influence of such approaches in Japan. In both cases the influence can be seen to be moving beyond the stylistics of English language texts and English pedagogy to L1 texts in non-English language teaching. At the same time Paran (ed.) (2006) includes in his valuable collection of case studies of literature in English language education examples of pedagogic stylistics in practice by Rosenkjar (2006) from Japan, or Lin (2006) from Singapore. Carrioli (2008) writes on the teaching of modern foreign languages in Australia, particularly Italian, with some awareness of the relevance of Hallidayan systemic-functional stylistics and Yáñez-Prieto (2010) reports on teaching US Spanish language learners grammar through cognitive stylistics. McRae has for many years advocated and showed the value of using 'world Englishes' texts in education (e.g. in Watson and Zyngier, 2007). An approach most strongly developed in the UK in the 1980s and 1990s, as we have seen, is demonstrably becoming ever more internationalised.

Finally, in the field of rhetoric, where it paradoxically all began, notable attempts to develop stylistic approaches to teaching may be found in Burke (2010; 2012) or Badran (2012). Cognitive poetics looks for example at foregrounding, metaphor, the importance of precise word choices in processing of discourse, including an increasing interest in emotional response to literary text reading, and a stress which must be of interest to educators on the experience of hypothesised 'ordinary readers' (Emmott, 1997 or Stockwell, 2002).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In a perceptive article, Paran (2008), writing particularly from the perspective of EFL and L2 education argues that pedagogical stylistics has been too much concerned with text and not enough with educational and methodological issues such as the dynamics of classrooms. Paran (2006) is part of his own important effort to address this issue. I would also add, for example Badran (2007; 2012). Empirical work is beginning to be reported but much more is undoubtedly needed in place of speculation, assertion and counter-assertion which have tended to dominate too largely in the past. What do stylistic approaches to texts do for language learning? We don't know enough and the question is a complicated one. Perceived or argued limited relevance to classrooms has to be responded to with empirical reports of

actual classes and learning events and situations. There is a danger too often courted of 'linguistics applied' in Widdowson's terms (see e.g. Hall, 2012) usurping language education. What affordances do literary texts and stylistic investigations offer to learners? Why use literature? why use stylistics? How best to use it for what purposes? What are the values of product or teacher-centred vs. process-oriented literary reading, students exploring meanings for themselves? Carter and McRae raised such enquiries in 1996 and earlier but the questions are not yet fully or well enough answered. Or again, what of the charge that stylistics over-simplifies, reduces, may be appropriate to lower secondary schooling but not tertiary? Such charges are usually predictions made on the basis of looking at the method, but is there evidence of this in the work of students?

Claims of Carter and others for the value of pedagogical stylistics are in terms of language awareness and evidence of engagement. There has to date been pedagogical work on task design, reports on interesting lessons, materials, methodology but little actually on what learning has been achieved which is ultimately the key question for pedagogical stylistics to answer. Effects are assumed or asserted not proven. We find advocacy rather than evidence, How is dealt with rather than Why.

Also there is too much about 'English'. Even if we understood more about the pedagogical stylistics of English, this could not necessarily be generalised. More is needed on the stylistics and stylistic pedagogy of other languages and contexts. One promising direction is being pursued by the Brazilian research group REDES, associated with Zyngier, van Peer, and other members of IGEL, by Miall (2007), or Fialho from the next generation of researchers (Zyngier et al., 2002). Experimentalist research of this kind is open to criticism and certainly needs to be supplemented by more qualitative work (e.g. Swann and Allington, 2009) but van Peer is right to suggest that at least such work has the virtue of actually opening up rather than closing down questions of the complexity of literature and literature reading: 'it is precisely because the world is so complex, that we cannot do without empirical research.' (van Peer, 2002: 23)

No doubt also more important work will come out of researchers in rhetoric such as Burke, and the PEDSIG group of PALA (Poetics and Linguistics Association). Critical pedagogical research should also continue, as e.g. Wallace (2003). Second language acquisition research should tell us more than it has done so far of the effects of intensive reading but also of reading discussion groups. Reading behaviours of less fluent readers could be another area of interest, or social cognition and reading as a social and cultural practice. In the study of multimodality, visual and verbal design some ingenious frameworks for analysis have been proposed. What are the effects however of using these in educational programmes? Creativity has been an important buzz word in applied linguistics recently. This research can be related to learners' use of transformation and comparativist methodologies in pedagogical stylistics.

To conclude: "we [do] need stylisticians to engage less in conversation among themselves, and more with language teachers" (Paran, 2008: 487). We need professional conversations between researchers and teachers at all levels and in a greater variety of contexts. We do need more educational research to investigate better the value and possible problems of using stylistics in education. There is a need for longitudinal studies, case studies, to

investigate task parameters – all kinds of pedagogical research as advocated in Hall (2005). We note the vagueness (and modesty) of 'awareness' as aim and achievement of pedagogical stylistics. Even if 'awareness' can be shown, what might this translate into in terms of more tangible educational benefits?

My list of references grew ever longer as I wrote this piece and newly published or forthcoming publications kept having to be added, and yet still I am aware I omit too much valuable work and am probably unaware of much more. I return to my opening comment that stylistics and pedagogy are effectively inseparable. They feed off each other and this symbiotic relationship is as strong and healthy today as it has ever been. To study or contribute to pedagogical stylistics is a central contribution to stylistics research more widely.

RELATED TOPICS

Rhetoric and Poetics, Formalist Stylistics, Corpus Stylistics, Creative Writing and Stylistics.

FURTHER READING

Brumfit and Carter, 1986. The classic 'first wave' pedagogical stylistics collection. Still enormously stimulating today. Multiple examples as well as discussion of principles and rationales.

Carter and McRae 1996. Ten years on from Brumfit and Carter, 1986 and the good ideas were still flowing. A more confident collection in some ways as pedagogical stylistics became less marginal and suspect and the L1/ L2 distinction less compelling.

Pope, 1995. Bold and stimulating ideas with examples for textual transformations in any classroom setting. Hands on, defiantly showing how respect for literature and creative writing comes from doing it rather than contemplating it.

Short, 1996 also on line Short 2006. A related classic textbook (1996) and on line course (2006) in practical pedagogical stylistics training users in what to look for and how across a very full range of features, genres and text types. Explicit, replicable, systematic.

Relevant journals to browse:
Language and Literature (Sage)
Language Awareness (Multilingual Matters)
English Language Teaching Journal (ELT Journal)(Oxford University Press)

References

Atherton, C. (2005) *Defining Literary Criticism.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Badran, D. (2007) Stylistics and language teaching: Deviant collocation in literature as a tool for vocabulary expansion. In M. Lambrou and P. Stockwell (eds) *Contemporary Stylistics.* London and NY: Continuum, pp. 180-192.

Badran, D. (2012) Metaphor as argument: A stylistic genre-based approach. *Language and Literature* 21 (2): 119-135.

Brumfit, C.J. and Carter, R.A. (eds) (1986) *Literature and Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Burke, M. (ed) 2010 special issue Pedagogical issues in stylistics. *Language and Literature* 19 (1).

Burke, M. (2012) Systemic stylistics: An integrative, rhetorical method of teaching and learning in the stylistics classroom. In M. Burke et al. (eds) *Pedagogical Stylistics*. London: Continuum, pp. 77-95.

Burke, M., Csábi, S., Week L., and Zerkowitz, J. (eds) (2012) *Pedagogical Stylistics. Current Trends in Language, Literature and ELT.* London: Continuum.

Cameron, D. (1995) *Verbal Hygiene* London: Routledge

Carrioli, P. (2008) *Literature in Second Language Education.* London: Continuum.

Carter, R. (2010) Methodologies for stylistic analysis: practices and pedagogies. In: McIntyre, D. and Busse, B. (eds) *Language and Style. In Honour of Mick Short*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 55-68.

Carter, R. and Long, M.N. (1987) *The Web of Words: Exploring literature through language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Carter, R. and Long, M.N. (1991) *Teaching Literature.* Harlow: Longman.

Carter, R. and McRae, J. (eds) (1996) *Language, literature and the learner.* Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman

Carter, R. and Simpson, P. (eds) (1989) *Language, Discourse and Literature.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Carter, R., Walker, R. and Brumfit, C. (eds) (1989) *Literature and the Learner. Methodological Approaches. ELT Documents 130.* London: Modern English Publications with The British Council.

Clark, U. and Zyngier, S. (2003) Toward a pedagogical stylistics. *Language & Literature* 12(4): 339-351

Cook, G. (1986) Texts, extracts, and stylistic texture. In Brumfit, C.J. and Carter, R.A. (eds) *Literature and Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 150-166.

Cook, G. (1996) Making the subtle difference: literature and non-literature in the classroom. In Carter, R. and McRae, J. (eds) *Language, Literature and the Learner*. *Creative Classroom Practice.* London: Longman, pp. 151-165.

Cook, G. (2000) *Language Play and Language Learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (2001) *The Discourse of Advertising.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Cook, G. (2004) *Genetically Modified Language.* London: Routledge.

Cook, G. (2010) *Translation in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coupland, N. (2007) *Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Crisp, P. (2006) E-learning and 'Language and Style' in Hong Kong. *Language & Literature* 15(3): 277-290

Davies, D. (1998) Metadiscourse and the evasive narrator: A process-based approach to teaching Ishiguro's *Remains of the Day. Reading in a Foreign Language* 12(1): 271-279

Delin, J. (2000) *The Language of Everyday Life.* London: Sage.

Duff, A. and Maley, A. (1990) *Literature. Resource Books for Teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emmott, C. (1997) *Narrative Comprehension.* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language.* London: Routledge.

Goddard, A. (2011) 'Type you soon!' A stylistic approach to language use in a virtual learning environment. *Language and Literature* 20 (3): 184-200.

Gower, R. (1986) Can stylistic analysis help the EFL learner to read literature? *ELT Journal* 40(2): 125-130

Graff, G. (1993) *Beyond the Culture Wars.* New York: Norton

Graff, H.J. (1987) *The Legacies of Literacy*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Hall, G. (2005) *Literature in Language Education.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, G. (2012) *Revenons à nos moutons!* Metaphor and idiom in EFL and ESL teaching and learning. In Burke, M. et al. (eds) *Pedagogical Stylistics.* London: Continuum, 179-192.

Hall, G .(forthcoming) Stylistics and literary criticism. In Stockwell, P. and Whiteley, S. (eds) *Handbook of Stylistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jeffries, L and McIntyre, D. (2010) *Stylistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jeffries, L. and McIntyre, D. (eds) (2011) *Teaching Stylistics.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Joos, M. (1961) *The Five Clocks*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Knights, B. and Steadman-Jones, R. (eds) 2011 special issue 'Stylistic analysis and pedagogic research'. *Language and Literature* 20 (3).

Knights, B. and Thurgar-Dawson, C. (2006) *Active Reading. Transformative Writing in Literary Studies.* London: Continuum.

Leech, G. (1972) *English in Advertising. A Linguistic Study.* London: Longman.

Lin, B. (2006) Exploring the literary text through grammar and the (re-)integration of literature and language teaching. In Paran A (ed) *Literature in Language Teaching and Learning.* Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), pp. 101-116.

Liu, A. (2004) *The Laws of Cool. The Culture of Information.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louw, B. (1997) The role of corpora in critical literary appreciation. In Wichmann A, et al (eds) *Teaching and Language Corpora*. Harlow: Longman, 240-251.

McIntyre, D. (2012) Corpus stylistics in the classroom. In Burke, M. et al (eds) *Pedagogical Stylistics.* London: Continuum, pp. 113-125.

McRae, J. (1991) *Literature with a Small 'l'* London: Macmillan.

McRae, J. (1996) Representational language learning. In Carter, R. and McRae, J. (eds) *Language, Literature and the Learner.* Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman, 16-40

McRae, J. and Boardman, R. (1984) *Reading Between the Lines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McRae, J. and Clark, U. (2004) Stylistics. In Davies, A. and Elder, C. (eds) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 328-346.

Mahlberg, M. (2012) *Corpus Stylistics and Dickens's Fiction* London: Routledge.

Miall, D. (2007) *Literary Reading.* New York: Peter Lang

Paran, A. (ed) (2006) *Literature in language teaching and learning.* Alexandria, VA.: TESOL

Paran, A. (2008) The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching: An evidence –based survey *Language Teaching* 41 (4): 495-496

Pope, R. (1995) *Textual Intervention. Critical and Creative Strategies for Literary Studies.* London: Routledge.

Rampton, B. (2006) *Language in Late Modernity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenkjar, P. (2006) Learning and teaching how a poem means: Literary stylistics for EFL undergraduates and language teachers in Japan. In Paran, A. (ed.) pp. 117-131.

Scott, J. (2012) Creative writing: a stylistics approach. In Burke, M. et al. (eds) *Pedagogical Stylistics.* London: Continuum, pp. 96-112.

Seidlhofer, B. (ed) (2003) *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shen, D. (2012) Stylistics in China in the new century. *Language and Literature* 21 (1) 93-105

Short, M. (ed) (1989) *Reading, Analysing and Teaching Literature*. Harlow: Longman

Short, M. (1996) *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose.* Harlow: Longman.

Short, M. (2006) On line stylistics course 'Language and Style' - http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/

Simpson, P. (2004) *Stylistics. A resourcebook for students.* London: Routledge.

Stockwell, P. (2002) *Introduction to Cognitive Poetics.* London Routledge

Street, B. (1985) *Literacy in Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swann, J. and Allington, D. (2009) Reading groups and the language of literary texts. *Language and Literature* 18 (3): 219-230.

Teranishi, M., Saito, A., Sakamoto, K., Nasu, M. (2012) The role of stylistics in Japan: A pedagogical perspective. *Language and Literature* 21 (2): 226-244.

van Leeuwen, T. (1999) *Speech, Music, Sound.* London: Macmillan.

van Peer, W. (2002) Why we need empirical studies in literature. In Zyngier, S. et al (eds) *Fatos & Ficções.* Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 17-23.

Wallace, C. (2003) *Critical reading in language education.* Basingstoke*:* Macmillan

Watson, G. and Zyngier, S (eds) (2007) *Literature and Stylistics for Language Learners: Theory and Practice.* Basingstoke, Hants.: Palgrave Macmillan.

Widdowson, H.G. (1975) *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature*. London: Longman.

Widdowson, H.G. (1992) *Practical Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2004) Verbal art and social practice: a reply to Weber. *Language and Literature* 11 (2): 161-167.

Yáñez-Prieto, M.C. (2010) Authentic instruction in literary worlds: learning the stylistics of concept-based grammar. *Language and Literature* 19 (1): 36-59.

Zyngier, S. et al. (eds.) (2002) *Fatos & Ficções*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

*Geoff Hall is Professor of Sociolinguistics and Head of the School of English at the University of Nottingham Ningbo China (UNNC) and Editor of the journal 'Language and Literature' (Sage). He has used stylistic approaches in teaching English in many differing countries and contexts. A revised second edition of **Literature in Language Education** (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) is in preparation.*