ORCID 0000-0002-6574-1673

VOVK Olena

Doctor of Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of English Philology
and Methods of Teaching the English Language,
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University in Cherkasy,
e-mail: vavovk66@gmail.com

ORCID 0000-0001-5845-1953

PASHIS Larysa

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of English Philology and Methods of Teaching the English Language,
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University in Cherkasy
e-mail: larysa_pashis@yahoo.com

UDC 378.091.33:81'36'38-027.63(045)

TEACHING STYLISTIC GRAMMAR AS A METHODOLOGICAL ISSUE

Introduction. This study explores the issue of stylistic grammar and the methodology of teaching it to University students – teacher-trainees.

The purpose of this article is to analyze registers and styles of foreign language communication, specify their discriminative features, and devise a relevant methodology incorporating the stages of instruction and a corresponding system of stylistically oriented activities.

Results. In the article, fostering learners' stylistic competence is identified as a target of learning stylistic grammar. Respectively, stylistic competence is defined as students' ability to produce a spoken or written output relevant to a communica-

tive setting when exposed to real life interaction. This definition implies that in a University language course students are thought to acquire proper grammatical and stylistic awareness. The premise is advanced that to achieve a set target University teacher-trainees should learn how to switch and shift registers and mix styles of communication. Accordingly, linguistic variations are viewed as contextually dependent: this means that they are determined by the conditions within which a communicative interaction takes place.

The emphasis is placed on the idea that stylistic variations might be introduced yet at the initial stage of foreign language acquisition so that students are able to create stylistic fields, broaden or narrow them in accordance with connotative meanings of linguistic units, and synonymously vary them, following formal or informal conventions of spoken and written communication.

The opinions of leading scholars are furnished regarding the need to acquire stylistic grammar, which is considered to be the highest level of foreign language proficiency. The idea is highlighted that developing stylistic competence is a gradual process, during which students must progress through definite stages of linguistic and communicative literacy and levels of grammar.

With this in mind, a corresponding methodology is designed, which incorporates a system of stylistically oriented activities. They embrace non-communicative receptive, quasi-communicative receptive-reproductive and communicative productive exercises to be employed in the English classroom. The exercises are illustrated with relevant English examples. It is maintained that the employment of the proposed system of activities begins in the junior years and continues through the University course in order to obtain expected learning outcomes.

Conclusion. Learners of English need to be sensitive to styles and social role registers so they could detect them and use them appropriately. To this end, University teacher-trainees are supposed to acquire stylistic competence, which will ensure not only their stylistic awareness but also booster their ability to produce stylistically and grammatically accurate utterances in accordance with a communicative context. Furthermore, it is important for teacher-trainees to be able to teach stylistic grammar to pupils in their future pedagogical career.

Keywords*: stylistic grammar; foreign language stylistic competence; registers and styles of communication; register and style switches; mixture and variation of registers and styles; stylistic fields; synonymous linguistic variation; stages of learning; system of stylistically oriented activities.*

Introduction. This paper deals with the issue of advancing foreign language (FL) stylistic competence of University students – teacher-trainees. In particular, the study focuses on the factors, which promote and maintain students' ability to come up with appropriate communicative outputs congruous to communicative settings and conventions. This issue is relevant, but insufficiently studied in terms of grammatical constituents, as in the methodological literature they are either deficient in support or examined only in relation to lexis (vocabulary). Moreover (though it seems quite reasonable), teachers introduce these issues primarily to undergraduates, though junior students are also supposed to possess stylistic awareness. At the same time, grammatical appropriateness, norms and usage, relevance to a communication setting and an ability to make a pragmatic effect on the interlocutor largely depend on the level of stylistic competence of FL learners.

The evidence seems to be strong that currently there are fewer studies of grammatical as opposed to lexical variation in the English language, in order to highlight relative distributions of grammatical forms and the social and linguistic factors, which affect them. According to D. Britain, this is due to the fact that larger corpora are needed to analyze grammatical phenomena because of their less frequent occurrence in spoken language than the segmental lexical features that tend to dominate in the methodological literature. The data indicate that research on the social embedding of grammatical variation is even less well advanced [1, p. 76].

The purpose of this article is to identify and analyze registers and styles of FL communication, instantiate their lexical and grammatical features, and propose a corresponding methodology, which embraces the stages of learning and an applicable system of stylistically oriented activities beneficial for promoting students' stylistic competence.

Formulation of the problem. Commonly, communication outputs of junior students – teacher-tranees – are distinguished as stylistically neutral, which is determined by the application of one of the basic principles of foreign language acquisition (FLA) – the principle of approximation. That is why the spoken output of undergraduates significantly differs from the similar output of native speakers in many respects, including stylistic inadequacy in terms of registers. Therefore, the correctness and culture of speech should be one of the main foci of teachers from the very start of a University FL course. The compliance with this requirement would eliminate the issue of retraining and consequently increase the effectiveness of FLA, especially in the cultural aspect of communication.

Analysis of the literature on the theme. Interestingly, the term *register* was first introduced by linguist T.B. Reid [2, p. 45] yet in 1956. In the 1960s, it was brought into utilization by a group of scholars aiming to differentiate between variations in language according to the *user* (as dependent upon one's

social background, education, location, gender and age) and variations in language according to the *use* "in the sense that each speaker has a range of varieties and choices between them at different times" [3, p. 62]. In their research, the emphasis was placed on the way language might be used in definite settings or spheres, like scholarly fields, news report, entertainment grounds and others.

M.A.K. Halliday, being one of the first linguists to address the concept of *'register'* in the 1960s and 1970s, interprets this notion as "a semantic concept", which "can be defined as a configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular situational configuration of field, mode, and tenor" [4, p. 38f.]. The linguistic features (specific lexico-grammatical and phonological expressions) and the particular values of the three dimensions of field, mode and tenor determine the functional variety of a language. These three parameters can be used to specify the context of a situation in which language is used [5].

Considerably, the use of a certain register is the product of choices concerning the topic of a communicative interaction (*field*), the social distance between the interlocutors to the spoken or written exchange (*tenor*), and the employed means of communication – spoken or written. It largely depends on one's perspective. Conventionally, language variation according to the use is called 'register', whereas language variation according to the user is called 'dialect': dialects imply the same thing using different lexico-grammatical structures (*mode*) [6, p. 111].

Halliday distinguishes closed and open registers. *Closed (or restricted) registers* have a number of possible meanings that are "fixed and finite and may be quite small" (they are 'the language of the air' or 'the languages of games'). In *open registers*, "the range of the discourse is much less constrained" (letters and instructions) [4, p. 39].

Similar to Halliday's concept of register, D. Hymes developed the 'Model of interaction of language and social setting' or the 'Speaking model' to categorize speech situations and consequently, the register employed in them. By dint of eight constituents, speakers may characterize the context of an interaction, and thus, make appropriate use of language. Specifically, Hymes' variables of discourse are: setting, participants, ends, form and content of text, key, interactional norms, medium, and genre [7, p. 244].

Extending the abovementioned, R. Quirk et. al. present a 'five-term distinction' to categorize linguistic varieties and narrow down the range of registers from very formal – formal – neutral – informal to very informal [8, p. 25].

Expounding on the concept of *register*, D. Biber designates it as 'situationally defined varieties' [9, p. 1] and concentrates primarily on the grammatical characteristics of different types of text. He considers four major registers: conversation, fiction, newspaper language, and academic prose . Furthermore, Biber examines lexico-grammatical structures of text samples from each register and concentrates on the actual use of these features in different varieties of English [10, p. 8]. In this way, Biber can describe a specific register according to its linguistic features, and it is possible to distinguish the major registers from each other, with more or less distinct idiosyncrasies.

In his turn, P. Trudgill utilizes the term *register* in the sense of a variety of language determined by topic, subject matter or activity, such as the register of mathematics, the register of medicine etc. In English, this is almost entirely a matter of lexis, although some registers, notably the register of law, are known to have special syntactic characteristics. It is also clear that the education system is supposed to have as one of its tasks to transmit particular registers to students – for example, academic, technical or scientific registers; and certainly, it is a necessary part of the instruction for students to acquire the corresponding registers [11, p. 118].

Although there seems to be a close relationship between style and register these concepts are considered to be fundamentally different. Specifically, Trudgill characterizes *style* as varieties of language viewed in relation to formality, which can be ranged on a continuum from very formal to very informal [12, p. 35]. Moreover, the choice of style usually reflects the formality of a social situation in which they are employed – which is not to say, however, that speakers are 'sociolinguistic automata', who respond blindly to the particular degree of formality of a social setting. On the contrary, speakers are able to influence and change the degree of formality of a social situation by manipulation of stylistic choice [13, p. 91].

Essentially, the term *style* refers to a language variety that is split up into formal and informal styles based on the opposition a speech vs. speaking situation. Individuals can speak very formally or very informally; their choice of the styles is governed by circumstances. Besides, interlocutors can employ *style shifting*, which is defined as variation within the speech of a single speaker whereby speakers may shift in their

use of grammatical, phonological, and lexical variants in response to social conditions [14, p. 244].

There is also a view (which sounds rather debatable and not shared by everyone) that style relates more to written texts, and refers to *how* the text is written to suit a specific purpose (for example, to comment on or explain something, persuade someone, describe a situation, suggest a solution to a problem etc.). Respectively, such writing styles are persuasive (to convince the reader of something), narrative (to tell a story), expository (to explain or expose a topic), and descriptive (to create an image in the reader's mind) [15].

Furthermore, speaking about *style* it deems plausible to mention styles of communication – different ways in which individuals approach the process of communication. In particular, psychologist J. Bourne distinguishes such types of communication styles [16, p. 312]: submissive (focused on pleasing other people and avoiding conflicts); aggressive (presuming winning at all costs, which may often happen at the expense of others); passive-aggressive (involves people appearing passive on the surface, while they are actually indirectly expressing their anger); manipulative (implies shrewd behavior a person takes on in order to achieve the desired outcomes); assertive (emerges from self-esteem and represents the healthiest and most effective style of communication one can adopt). For individuals, these styles of communication may be dominant, or may be used in specific situations and with specific people. Definitely, employing the aforementioned styles, individuals will utilize specific grammatical and lexical means.

In the similar vein, M. Murphy at al. differentiate four basic styles of communication [17]: analytical (focused on data), intuitive (seeing 'the big picture'), functional (concentrated on processes), and personal (driven by emotions). Substantially, these styles of communication assume how individuals prefer to communicate information and hence, what lexico-grammatical units they use in various settings.

To bridge the gap between styles and registers we may hypothesize that by tacit conventions of communication they are in close correlation and are dependent to a great extent on a scope of knowledge and level of FL proficiency of interlocutors.

From a FL teacher's perspective, the most functional classification of registers is the one suggested by American linguist M. Joos [18, p. 46]: frozen – formal – consultative – casual – intimate. Since they are most relevant for University students, further they will be specified in a cursory way.

Frozen register represents very formalized speech that is mostly produced via recitation rather than spontaneous speech production. This is primarily ritualistic speech, that is why it is also called the 'static register' because each time exactly the same utterances are spoken. They embrace reciting a pledge, a prayer, or wedding vows. Typically, the audience knows what the speaker will say because utterances of the frozen register are learned verbatim and do not change over time.

Formal register constitutes precise speech, which is frequently professional, official, or impersonal in nature. In English, many components of the formal register involve the use of standard grammar. A speaker employing the formal register uses complete sentences, accurate grammar, standard vocabulary, and the exact pronunciation of words. The topics discussed within the formal register are usually official matters, such as a professional meeting, graduation ceremony, or academic lecture.

Consultative register illustrates speech that involves the participation of all parties. A speaker employs the consultative register to discuss a topic, and the listener(s) is expected to contribute feedback. The speaker and listener(s) are both members of the audience. In English, this register can imply both standard and nonstandard grammatical forms, the use of which is heavily reliant on a social context. This type of discourse may commonly occur between a doctor and a patient, a student and a teacher, or a boss and an employee etc.

Casual register represents speech that is informal or imprecise. This type of register allows nonstandard grammatical forms, incomplete sentences, or regional phrasing. The casual register is often used between people who are already acquainted with one another and relies on a relaxed social context. The topics of discussion for this register are informal but not too personal.

Intimate register describes personal topics used between close acquaintances, such as family members, close friends, or romantic partners, and can employ standard or nonstandard grammatical forms. The intimate register is used to discuss topics that the speaker does not wish to be public knowledge, such as personal stories, problems at work or school, or secrets.

Certainly, the above mentioned five types of register are not conclusive, but they aim to describe the most typical types of language variations used by English speakers. Besides, Joos also defines four differentiating factors that influence the use of a language register. These factors comprise audience (speakers–

listeners), topic (the subject matter being discussed), purpose (intentions of the speaker), location (the place of communication). They relate to the modification of a language register because they each indicate to speakers and listeners what is appropriate and influence acceptable uses of speech [18, p. 55].

It is worth mentioning at this stage that formality in English is not necessarily confined only to lexis, however, grammatical constructions vary as between informal and formal English – it is often claimed, for instance, that "the passive voice is more frequent in formal than in informal styles" [12, p. 67].

On balance, register and style though often used interchangeably are not similar in their meanings. Register conveys the type of language the writer or speaker chooses to employ, that is it refers to the ways individuals use language grounded on *who* they are conversing with, under what circumstances, and in what settings. Register is often mentioned in relation to the level of formality, whereas style implies *how* a text is adjusted to suit a particular context. Both are associated with a specific situation, but whilst register refers to the particular vocabulary chosen, style also includes grammatical variation. Grammar use can signify how far formal or informal a narrative is. For example, a formal narrative will use standardized grammar, avoid contractions, and follow standard layout guidelines. An informal narrative is less constrained to standardized grammar and spelling, and may use contractions and abbreviations. Admittedly, English instructors adhere to five basic types of register – frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. The register of a text can be identified by the spelling, grammar, and vocabulary choices.

Irrespectively of the controversies in interpretations of register and style, their appropriate manifestation is dependent upon the level of stylistic competence of students. Hence, enhancing stylistic competence requires a relevant methodology compatible with the educational goals and expected learning outcomes. That is why it is worthwhile at this stage to consider the stages of FLA with regard to stylistic grammar and a pertinent system of activities.

Results. Unfortunately, currently the number of English text- or workbooks for junior students with a special focus on registers or communication styles is quite limited. They do not include stylistically marked texts, which students receive as samples for communication. Withal, such books contain an insufficient set of exercises aimed at sty-

listic differentiation of language material. One of them is illustrated beneath [19, p. 322]: *Synonyms within the following pairs differ in style. Point out which of them are bookish, colloquial or neutral: picture – house – cinema; to get on in years – to age; to endeavour – to try; to sing (perform) – to render; desolate – sad; to clap – to applaud.* Such exercises occur in the textbooks sporadically. They are valuable from a linguistic perspective but they definitely do not conduce to effective communication. In most cases, exercises of this type are mainly targeted at differentiating the studied vocabulary, whereas grammatically oriented exercises remain disregarded.

There are different approaches to the question at what stage of study students should start dealing with stylistic differentiation of communicative inputs. This is where the disagreements and controversies begin. In particular, some researchers (for instance, Ye.I. Passov [20, p. 41]) advise not to rush to learn registers. Therefore, it takes a quite a time (namely, two years) to assimilate stylistically undifferentiated or neutral information. This view has a clear theoretical basis. Before imbibing stylistically congruent information, it is necessary that oral communicative skills and abilities should be fully developed in terms of fluency, grammatical accuracy, lexical appropriatness, syntactic correctness etc. Only after reaching the appropriate level of communication skills and abilities, it is possible to set the task to students to employ language tools adequate to different communication settings. Thus, the phasing here is seen in the gradual transition from learning to speak correctly in terms of FL standards and norms to the correctness and accuracy in terms of adequate usage of registers.

Other methodologists [21, p. 59] justify FLA based on neutral lexis and grammar by the need to master the 'neutral' literary language (standards and norms) arguing that junior students acquire FL basics, and the focus on language 'neutrality' does not direct students' attention to the context of communication and choice of language means. This idea is arguable, since literary standards significantly differ in their spoken manifestations (for example, professional and routine communication). In order to avoid such artificial detachment from 'live' communication, the concept of basic language should take into account the factor of real functional and stylistic differentiation. Consequently, knowledge of the literary norm involves mastering not only the neutral language stratum, but also registers and functional styles of communication.

To elaborate, functional styles should be the starting point for teaching a FL to non-native speakers, as it is possible to assimilate linguistic means of the target FL for different purposes only by being familiarized with linguistic features of different registers and styles of communication. That is why it is expedient to focus on stylistic differentiation of communication at the initial stage of a University language course, which will be conducive to enhancing students' stylistic competence – the ability to construct utterances adequate to a specific setting when exposed to real life communication [22, p. 91; 21, p. 60]. It must therefore be recognized that such an ability implies a certain stylistic proficiency not only with regard to FL lexis but also to grammar.

As an illustration of this premise, W. Labov introduces the progressive model of language development, which inter alia involves an individual's awareness of speech differentiation and control over speech. This model incorporates six stages [23, p. 81]: 1) basic grammar, 2) the vernacular, 3) social perception, 4) the consistent standard; 5) stylistic variation, 6) the acquisition of the full range. In accordance with the model, children are monostylistic speakers until late adolescence. In this view, they are monostylistic in the dialect used in their family environment until the age of five, when they become monostylistic in the preferred dialect of their peer group. It is only after having understood the social value ascribed to linguistic variants that they become able to vary their use of dialect and standard forms according to the degree of formality of the situation. Moreover, the model implies the gradual transition from non-standard to standard language, the change from informal to formal style, and emphasizes the need to master the stylistic variability of communication.

To extend the abovementioned, educators distinguish between five levels of grammar that an individual acquires in their language development [24]: a) the organization of words; b) studying the rules of organization and use of words; c) judgments based on the use and organization of words; d) school grammar; e) stylistic grammar. So, mastering stylistic features of speech is also mandatory here. Amenably to P. Hartwell, most teachers take into account only one of the five above levels of grammar, paying attention to the grammatically correct statement following 'rules of the language being studied'. Instead, one should also take into account both the stylistic adequacy of speech and its stylistic differentiation and variability [25]. Therefore, stylistic grammar acquires increasing im-

portance in language development, especially for University students.

Some experts [26, p. 443] pinpoint the idea of the established 'variation theory', which describes different variations in language and its use. This theory is based on the postulate, according to which, the real verbal behavior of a person is determined not only by their linguistic competence, but also by their knowledge of socially determined connotations, or additional meanings accompanying the main meaning of a word. The indications are therefore that inasmuch as people master language in different social conditions they eventually acquire 'different grammars of this language', so it is requisite to describe these differences via special 'extension rules', which allow for the information about both linguistic units themselves and about their connotations: *cf.: It's chow time./ I am hungry./ I am starving./ I am as hungry as a hunter./ I feel like eating./ Isn't it time we eat something?/ I guess we might have a bite etc.* [27, p.100].

It is noteworthy that there are two approaches to teaching stylistic grammar: romantic and classical [25]. The romantic approach, which is predominately based on the philosophical theory of language, rather than linguistic, is aimed at implementing declarative knowledge of an individual. This approach is successfully used by teachers, but causes difficulties for students because it does not involve teaching stylistic differentiation of spoken and written speech. The classical approach, which offers prescriptive rules concerning the choice of style / register of speech, is aimed at implementing the procedural knowledge of an individual. It is clear therefore that the main emphasis in the FL classroom should be placed on the classical approach since it has an indubitable practical value.

In addition to the aforementioned, P. Hartwell posits that teaching stylistic grammar involves advancing the skills of two levels [25]: rhetorical and metalinguistic. The former provide communication in a variety of settings. The latter ensure active manipulation of language to achieve a stylistic effect on the interlocutor. At this, more attention is paid to the external form of lexical and grammatical units. Accordingly, when acquiring FL grammar, students should equally develop both rhetorical and metalinguistic skills, which will conduce to a high level of their stylistic competence.

The pragmatic effect of communication plays a pivotal role in affecting the speaker's goal while constructing a narrative. This effect occurs within such parameters as expressiveness (eloquence), correctness (se-

mantic and grammatical), and stylistic colorings of speech (considering speakers' social status, settings, age etc.). The stylistic 'design' of the narrative contributes to the effect it exerts on the interlocutor, and this influential force can be regarded as one of the sides of the pragmatic aspect of speech, which is based on the selection of special linguistic means [28, p. 137].

Given the evidence, it may be inferred that FL instructors are supposed to familiarize students with stylistic differentiation of spoken and written speech starting from the junior years of study in the University. Gradi-

ually students are to be inured first in recognizing and differentiating stylistic variations of speech units, later – reproducing and stylistically modifying them, and in senior years – producing communication outputs of different registers and styles.

The following part of this study will illustrate the stylistically oriented activities targeted at promoting FL stylistic competence of University students – teacher-trainees.

The development of stylistic competence begins, foremost, with receptive non-communicative exercises aiming at differentiation of registers and styles. For instance:

Example 1

Identify who the reporter addresses in the picture gallery.
Do the matching work:

1. Do you like it?	a) a worker
2. Like it?	b) a gentleman
3. May I ask you if you like it?	c) two teenagers
4. Excuse me, please. Would you mind if I ask you whether you like the picture?	d) an old lady

Example 2

Arrange the following answers from the most informal to the most formal.

How are you?	Who's calling?
1. I'm very well, thank you.	1. My name is White.
2. Oh, not so bad, you know.	2. This is White.
3. Fine, thanks.	3. White here.
4. Oh, surviving.	4. White speaking.

The next activity, which is a modification of the exercise [29, p. 111] instantiates a more complicated task completing which students are supposed not only identify and differentiate speech registers but also do the matching work and make stylistic grading of requests according to the level of their formality.

Example 3

Read the text and do the assignments at the end of it:

Polite Requests

Max Millward used to be a popular comedian on British radio. He's nearly 70 now, but he still performs in clubs in the Midlands and North of England. He's on stage now at the All-Star Variety Club in Wigan.

Well, good evening, ladies and gentlemen … and others! It's nice to be back in Wigan again. Well, I have to say that, I say it every night. I said it last night. The only trouble was that I was in Birmingham. I thought the audience looked confused! Actually, I remember Wigan very well indeed. Really! You know, the first time I came here was in the 1930s. I was very young and very shy … thank you, mother. No, you can't believe that, can you? Well, it's true. Anyway, the first Saturday night I was in Wigan, I decided to go to the local dance-hall. Do you remember the old "Majestic Ballroom" in Wythenshawe Street? There's a multi-storey car park there now. It was a lovely place … always full of beautiful girls (the ballroom, not the car park). Of course, most of them are grandmothers now! Oh, you were there too, were you, love? I was much too shy to ask anyone for a dance. So I sat down at a

table, and I thought I would watch for a while. You know, see how the other lads did it. At the next table there was a lovely girl in a blue dress. She had arrived with a friend, but her friend was dancing with someone. So, this first bloke came over to her, he was very posh, wearing a dinner-jacket and a bow tie! Well, he walked up to her and said, 'Excuse me, may I have the pleasure of the next dance?' She looked up at him (she had lovely blue eyes) and said, 'Eh? What did you say?' So, he said, 'I wonder if you would be so kind enough to dance with me … er … if you don't mind.' 'Eee … no, thank you very much,' she replied.

A few minutes later, this other chap arrived. He had a blue suit, a nice tie, and a little moustache. He gave her this big smile, and said, 'Would you be so kind as to have the next dance with me?' 'Pardon?' she said. I thought to myself 'She is a bit deaf … or maybe she hasn't washed her ears recently'. 'Would you mind having the next dance with me?' he said, a bit nervously this time. 'Eee, no thanks, love. I'm finishing my lemonade,' she replied. 'Blimey! I thought. This looks a bit difficult.'

Then the third fellow came over. He was very good-looking, you know, white teeth, black hair! 'May I ask you something?' he said, ever so politely. 'If you like,' she answered. 'Can I … I mean … could I …no, might I have the next dance with you?' 'Oooh, sorry,' she said. 'My feet are aching. I've been standing up all day at the shop'.

By now I was terrified. I mean, she had said 'no' to all of them! Then this fourth character thought he would try. 'Would you like to dance?' he said. 'What?' she replied. She was a lovely girl, but I didn't think much of her voice. 'Do you want to dance?' he said. She looked straight at him. 'No',

she said. That's all. 'No.' Well, I decided to go home. I was wearing an old jacket and trousers, and nobody would say that I was good-looking! Just as I was walking past her table, she smiled. 'Er … dance?' I said. 'Thank you very much,' she replied. And that was that! It's our fortieth wedding

1. Would you mind having the next dance with me?
2. Can I … I mean … could I …no, might I have the next dance with you?
3. Would you like to dance?
4. I wonder if you would be so kind enough to dance with me … er … if you don't mind.
5. Do you want to dance?
6. Would you be so kind as to have the next dance with me?
7. Er … dance?
8. Excuse me, may I have the pleasure of the next dance?

anniversary next week.

The assignments to be completed:

1. Match the phrases of the requests to dance with the people who expressed them.

2. Grade the requests to dance according to the level of their formality (from casual to formal).

A. The fellow who was wearing an old jacket and trousers, and nobody could say that he was good-looking.
B. A fellow in a blue suit, a nice tie, and with a little moustache.
C. A posh guy, wearing a dinner-jacket and a bow tie.
D. The unknown character.
E. A very good-looking guy with white teeth and black hair.

3. _Answer the questions:_
   1) _Why did the girl prefer Mr. Millward to all the other guys, who had asked her to dance? Reason your answer._
   2) _Do you think that she turned them down because they were too polite?_
   3) _Could you classify the guys, who asked the girl to dance, by their education and social status?_
   4) _Do you think these factors tell on a person's manner of speech?_

The illustrated examples of activities do not have an ostensible communicative focus, as their purpose is not producing an adequate stylistically coloured communicative output, but differentiating styles or registers, which does not make these cases less important. At the initial stage of learning a FL, stylistic grammar is mainly introductory.

The next stage of advancing stylistic competence of students is the transition to quasi-communicative receptive-reproductive exercises, completing which students first perceive and then reproduce fully, partially or with changes the perceived communication input.

Example 4

Ask your neighbours in the dorm: to turn down the radio; to keep their voices down; to have their parties somewhere else; to stop slamming doors; to keep quiet. Use various styles to reach your goal.

Model:

St. 1: Would you, please, keep quiet!

St. 2: Please, keep quiet!

St. 3: Quiet!

Example 5

Make the following orders of your rude roommate less imperative.

Model:

St. 1: Close the window!

St. 2: Would you be so kind as to close the window?

1. Open the door! 2. Put the luggage up! 3. Pass the pepper! 4. Get one of the tins on the top! 5. Lend some cash! 6. Give a book! 7. Call in the evening! 8. Fetch a dictionary!

The illustrated quasi-communicative receptive-reproductive activities involve not only the identification and differentiation of communication registers, but also the stylistic transformation of definite speech patterns, which complicates the purpose of learning whilst developing stylistic competence.

The transition to communicative exercises should be moderate. To this end, the FL instructor is to create communication settings, the conditions of which determine the correlation of the realization of speech intention with a definite stylistic feature, that is in a particular situation, the speaker's choice of certain grammatical forms is stylistically marked.

Example 6

You have made some appointments, which you can't keep. Break the appointments, observing the appropriate registers. Speak as: a) a student to a teacher; b) a patient to a dentist; c) a clerk to the boss; d) a fellow to a girlfriend.

Further, we will illustrate the activity that takes into account the situational context and the dependence of the chosen register on the status or social roles of interlocutors.

Example 7

Account for your missing the class to the monitor of the group, the Dean and your intimate friend. Consider the register you will employ. Use the appropriate grammar.

Students are expected to express themselves within a definite context, varying registers and using appropriate lexical and grammatical means. Their speech will be changing from an intimate register when conversing to a friend, to casual when talking to the monitor, and to formal when talking to the dean.

As can be seen from the examples given above, the suggested activities are aimed at observing stylistic adequacy of communication taking into account the social status and age of the recipients. This implies primarily the alternation of formal and informal registers and communication styles.

The evidence seems to be strong that learning formal and informal speech is important in enhancing stylistic competence of

University students. It stands to reason to begin with a synonymous variation of verbs to express a certain idea and gradually move to mixing different registers. Starting from junior years, students are confronted with samples of both formal and informal registers and styles. Systematically, they come to understand that native speakers' speech is affected by their social status, cultural conventions, conditions of communication and so on. In order to avoid 'stylistic salad' in speech, at the initial stage stage students should be taught to clearly distinguish between formal and informal registers and styles of communication, and adequately correlate them with corresponding communicative settings.

In this regard, the idea of J. Hill about changes in registers of communication and their mixing in the process of learning FL communication seems opportune [30, p. 98–99]. The point is that each speaker possesses a number of registers, which allows them to 'switch' from one register to another according to a communication setting, the speaker's social role, addressee, topic of conversation, presence / absence of social control and self-control and so on. For instance, a doctor uses a casual register speaking to his family and friends, and a consultative register communicating with patients, a formal register and medical jargon conversing with the staff. Changing registers according to the context is called *situational switching* [31, p. 128].

Native speakers switch registers subconsciously, but non-native speakers should be purposefully trained in such switching. Therefore, in the process of FLA there should a sufficient number of activities aimed at mixing and varying communication registers in order to avoid stylistic inadequacy. The FL instructor has to familiarize students with non-specific language units, teach them to navigate the situation, create stylistic fields according to the situation, be able to 'switch' to a new modality, using appropriate grammatical structures and varying pertinent lexical means.

To implement this idea, students are to be taught to synonymously vary verbs according to a communicative setting. A language register may be considered a type of linguistic variation. Linguistic variation describes the complex ways speakers modify their language use according to social cues, communication context, and personal expression. Language register, therefore, can be defined as a type of linguistic variation that indicates a level of formality and speaker-audience relationship. For instance, English learners are supposed to be aware that phrasal verbs are widely used in informal communication, for example, *to brood over, to spit out, to sound out* etc. In formal communication, in written speech, on the contrary, it is more appropriate to avoid phrasal verbs and use more formal verbs that can convey the same idea, for example, instead of *to say* it is more better to use *to remark, to explain, to mention, to advise, to recommend, to admit, to promise, to inform, to clarify, to report, to indicate*, etc., instead of *to ask* – *to wonder, to request, to inquire, to question*, etc., instead of *to answer* – to reply, to respond, to retort, etc. [22, p. 98]. The activities that follow illustrate the mentioned above requirement.

Example 8
Identify the register and three extra reporting verbs, which do not match this register. Classify the verbs according to their connotations: to wonder, to ask, to request, to retort, to reply, to fathom, to claim, to enunciate, to say, to yell, to add, to utter, to pronounce, to report, to articulate, to declaim, to reckon, to remark, to suggest, to affirm, to advise, to answer.

Example 9
Categorize the following verbs according to the registers "formal – informal – casual": to ask, to go on, to continue, to offer, to communicate, to guess, to mention, to say, to tell, to assert, to present, to crave, to deny, to proclaim, to hint, to refuse, to determine, to explain, to agree, to support, to affirm, to inform, to prohibit, to clarify, to admit, to argue, to suspect, to confess, to question, to pray, to sigh, to oar, to weep, to wonder, to wail, to state, to greet, to enumerate, to turn down.

The instantiated examples of exercises are non-communicative, they are targeted at developing the skill to stylistically differentiate input.

To summarize, the methodology of advancing stylistic competence to University students – teacher-trainees encompasses a system of activities comprising receptive non-communicative, receptive-reproductive quasi-communicative and productive communicative activates targeted at different outcomes. Acquiring the sought-for competence is a gradual process lasting through the whole language course.

Conclusion. The language register describes the way a person speaks in relation to their audience. A speaker modifies their language register to signal levels of formality according to the relationship to their audience and the intended purpose of speech. A speaker might modify their speech to fit a formal language register by using more complex vocabulary and grammatical structures, and by omitting any slang or informal speech.

One of the important educational tasks of a University language course is to familiarize students with registers and styles of commu-

nication. This is a gradual and time-consuming process, which requires students' progressing through different grammatical levels. Students are supposed to be consistently and systematically taught the elements of stylistic differentiation and linguistic variation, which will significantly conduce to their stylistic competence. Moreover, they are to be aware how to create stylistic fields and be able to switch registers in accordance with the conditions and conventions of communication. Issues of both register and style are particularly important for learners of English – teacher trainees, as they are expected to know how to teach such issues to their future pupils.

Further implications. This study though far from being conclusive yet offers several insights into an issue of how stylistic grammar can be acquired by University students. Simultaneously, in the light of this discussion the study entails a question whether registers and styles of communication overlap as well as how close their correlation may be, which outlines a perspective for further research in this respect.

References
1. Britain, D. (2007). Grammatical variation in England. In D. Britain (ed.) *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 75–104.
2. Reid, T.B. (1956) Linguistics, Structuralism, Philology. *Archivum Linguisticum,* 8. P. 45–56.
3. Halliday, Michael A.K. (2004). The linguistic sciences and language teaching. London: Longman. 322 p.
4. Halliday, Michael A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1990). Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 126 p.
5. Register (discourse). Retrieved from http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Register_(discourse)
6. Halliday, Michael A.K., Ruqaiya H. (1994). Cohesion in English. London: Longman. 392 p.
7. Hymes, D. (1979) Soziolinguistik: zur Ethnographie der Kommunikation. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. 278 S.
8. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Geoffrey L. (1989). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman. 898 p.
9. Biber, D. (1995). Dimensions of register variation: a cross-linguistic comparison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 428 p.
10. Biber, D. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Longman. 1204 p.
11. Trudgill, P. (1999). Standard English: what it isn't. In T. Bex & R.J. Watts (eds.). Standard English: the ?dening debate. London: Routledge. 1999. 117–128.
12. Trudgill, P. (1992) Introducing language and society. London: Penguin. 80 p.
13. Giles, H. (1973) Accent mobility: a model and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics 15*. P. 87–105.
14. Wolfram, W., Schilling, N. (2015). American English: Dialects and Variation, 3d Edition: Wiley-Blackwell. 464 p.
15. What are the different styles of writing? Retrieved from https://examples.yourdictionary.com/4-fundamental-types-of-writing-styles-with-examples.html
16. Bourne, J.E. (1995). The Anxiety and Phobia Workbook, 2nd edition. New Harbinger Publications, Inc. 528 p.
17. Murphy, M. (2015). Which Of These 4 Commu-?ication Styles Are You? Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/markmurphy/2015/08/06/which-of-these-4-communication-styles-are_you/
18. Joos, M. (1961). The Five Clocks: a linguistic excursion into the five styles of English usage, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. 108 p.
19. Maslyko, Ye.A., Babinskaya, P.K., Budko, A.F., Petrova, S.I. (2001). A handbook of a foreign language teacher. Minsk: Vysheishaya shkola. 522 p. [in Rus.].
20. Passov E.I. (2000). Communicative foreign language education (The concept of the development of individuality in the dialogue of cultures). Lipetsk: Lipetsk GPI. 154 p. [in Rus.].
21. Faenova M.O. (1991). Teaching the culture of communication in English. Moscow: Higher school. 144 p. [in Rus.].
22. Vovk, O.I. (2008). Enhancing English grammatical competence teacher-trainees in conditions of intensive training. Theses of PhD Dissertation in Pedagogy. Kyiv 345 p. [in Ukr.].
23. Labov, W. (1964). Stages in the acquisition of Standard English. In R. Shuy, A. Davis & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English. P. 77–104.
24. Pedagogical Issues. Style, Grammar, and Usage. Retrieved from http://www.Style, Gramm-?rAndUsage.htm
25. Hartwell, P. Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar. Retrieved from http://www.english.vt.edu/~grammar/GrammarForTeachers/readings/hartwell.html
26. Bierwisch, M. (1986). Social Differentiation of Language Structure Language in Focus: Foundations, Methods and Systems. In A. Kasher (Ed.). Dordrecht: Plenum Press. P. 442–461.
27. Vovk, O.I. (2004). Teaching stylistic differentiation of English speech to junior University students in the process of mastering the grammatical aspect of communication. *Studia Germanica et Romanica. Foreign Languages. World Literature. Teaching methodology*; *Scientific journal*, 1(3): 92–105 [in Ukr.].
28. Kolshansky, G.V. (1994). Communicative function and structure of language. In G.V. Bulygina (Ed.). Moscow: Science. 175 p.
29. Side, R., Wellman, G. (2005). Grammar and Vocabulary for Cambridge Advanced and Proficiency. England: Pearson Educated Ltd. 288 p.
30. Hill, J. (1991). Using Literature in Language Teaching. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 120 p.
31. Hymes, D., Gumpez, J. (1972). Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Commu-?ication. University of Pennsylvania: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 373 p.

Список бібліографічних посилань
1. Britain, D. (2007). Grammatical variation in England. In D. Britain (ed.) *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 75–104.
2. Reid, T.B. (1956) Linguistics, Structuralism, Philology. *Archivum Linguisticum,* 8. P. 45–56.
3. Halliday, Michael A.K. (2004). The linguistic sciences and language teaching. London: Longman. 322 p.
4. Halliday, Michael A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1990). Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 126 p.
5. Register (discourse). URL: http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Register_(discourse)
6. Halliday, Michael A.K., Ruqaiya H. (1994). Cohesion in English. London: Longman. 392 p.
7. Hymes, D. (1979) Soziolinguistik: zur Ethnographie der Kommunikation. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. 278 S.

8. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Geoffrey L. (1989). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman. 898 p.

9. Biber, D. (1995). Dimensions of register variation: a cross-linguistic comparison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 428 p.

10. Biber, D. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Longman. 1204 p.

11. Trudgill, P. (1999). Standard English: what it isn't. In T. Bex & R.J. Watts (eds.). Standard English: the w-?dening debate. London: Routledge. 1999. 117–128.

12. Trudgill, P. (1992) Introducing language and society. London: Penguin. 80 p.

13. Giles, H. (1973) Accent mobility: a model and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics 15.* P. 87–105.

14. Wolfram, W., Schilling, N. (2015). American English: Dialects and Variation, 3d Edition: Wiley-Blackwell. 464 p.

15. What are the different styles of writing? URL: https://examples.yourdictionary.com/4-fundamental-types-of-writing-styles-with-examples.html

16. Bourne, J.E. (1995). The Anxiety and Phobia Workbook, 2nd edition. New Harbinger Publications, Inc. 528 p.

17. Murphy, M. (2015). Which Of These 4 Communication Styles Are You? URL: https://www.forbes.com/sites/markmurphy/2015/08/06/which-of-these-4-communication-styles-are_you/

18. Joos, M. (1961). The Five Clocks: a linguistic excursion into the five styles of English usage, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. 108 p.

19. Маслыко Е.А., Бабинская П.К., Будько А.Ф., Петрова С.И. Настольная книга преподавателя иностранного языка. Минск: Вышэйшая школа, 2001. 522 с.

20. Пассов Е.И. Коммуникативное иноязычное образование (Концепция развития индивидуальности в диалоге культур). Липецк: Липецкий ГПИ, 2000. 154 с.

21. Фаенова М.О. Обучение культуре общения на английском языке. М.: Высшая школа, 1991. 144 с.

22. Вовк О.І. Формування англомовної граматичної компетенції у майбутніх учителів в умовах інтенсивного навчання: дис. ... канд. пед. наук. Київ, 2008. 345 с.

23. Labov, W. (1964). Stages in the acquisition of Standard English. In R. Shuy, A. Davis & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning.* Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English. P. 77–104.

24. Pedagogical Issues. Style, Grammar, and Usage. URL: http://www.Style, GrammarAndUsage.htm

25. Hartwell, P. Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar. URL: http://www.english.vt.edu/~grammar/GrammarForTeachers/readings/hartwell.html

26. Bierwisch, M. (1986). Social Differentiation of Language Structure Language in Focus: Foundations, Methods and Systems. In A. Kasher (Ed.). Dordrecht: Plenum Press. P. 442–461.

27. Вовк О.І. Навчання стилістичної диференціації англійського мовлення студентів початкового ступеню університету у процесі оволодіння граматичним аспектом спілкування. *Studia Germanica et Romanica. Іноземні мови. Зарубіжна література. Методика викладання*: науковий журнал, 2004. Т.1. № 3. С. 92–105.

28. Колшанский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка / Отв. ред. Г.В. Булыгина. М.: Наука, 1994. 175 с.

29. Side, R., Wellman, G. (2005). Grammar and Vocabulary for Cambridge Advanced and Proficiency. England: Pearson Educated Ltd. 288 p.

30. Hill, J. (1991). Using Literature in Language Teaching. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd. 120 p.

31. Hymes, D., Gumpez, J. (1972). Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. University of Pennsylvania: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 373 p.

ВОВК Олена Іванівна
докторка педагогічних наук, доцентка,
професорка кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови,
Черкаський Національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького
ПАШІС Лариса Олександрівна
кандидатка філологічних наук, доцентка,
завідувачка кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови,
Черкаський Національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького

НАВЧАННЯ СТИЛІСТИЧНОЇ ГРАМАТИКИ ЯК МЕТОДИЧНА ПРОБЛЕМА

Анотація. Статтю присвячено розгляду актуальної методичної проблеми навчання стилістичної граматики студентів університету. Метою статті є проаналізувати стилі і регістри різних сфер іншомовної комунікації та їхні лексичні і граматичні особливості, а також запропонувати відповідну методику, яка включає етапи навчання та релевантну систему стилістично зорієнтованих вправ.

Аргументується доцільність навчання стилістичної граматики студентів вже на молодших курсах мовних факультетів. Наводяться думки провідних методистів щодо необхідності вивчення стилістичної граматики, що є вищим рівнем володіння іноземною мовою, зокрема англійською.

Підкреслюється, що оволодіння стилістичною граматикою передбачає сформованість у студентів іншомовної стилістичної компетенції, яка має на меті формування граматичної і стилістичної усвідомленості та здатності продукувати коректні повідомлення відповідно до комунікативної ситуації в реальних умовах спілкування. Формування означеної компетенції є поступовим процесом, впродовж якого студенти мають пройти певні етапи мовної і мовленнєвої грамотності. Остання, крім усього іншого, передбачає вміння переключати регістри та міксувати стилі спілкування. Відповідно, регістрові та стилістичні варіювання є контекстуально залежними: це означає, що вони детермінуються умовами, в межах яких відбувається комунікативна взаємодія.

Передбачається, що формування іншомовної стилістичної компетенції має починатися вже на початковому етапі оволодіння іноземною мовою з тим, щоб студенти могли створювати стилістичні поля, розширювати і звужувати їх відповідно до конотативних значень мовних одиниць, також синонімічно їх варіювати відповідно до формального чи неформального спілкування та усного чи писемного мовлення. Пропонується відповідна система стилістично зорієнтованих завдань, які складаються з некомунікативних рецептивних, умовно-комунікативних рецептивно-репродуктивних і комунікативних продуктивних вправ. Вправи ілюструються релевантними прикладами англійською мовою. Підкреслюється, що використання запропонованої системи вправ починається на молодших курсах і триває до старших курсів навчання у вищій школі для отримання очікуваного навчального результату.

Ключові слова: стилістична граматика; іншомовна стилістична компетенція; регістри і стилі спілкування; регістрове і стилістичне переключення; міксування та варіювання регістрів і стилів; стилістичні поля; синонімічне варіювання мовних одиниць; етапи навчання; система стилістично зорієнтованих вправ.