

THE ROLE OF INTERACTIVE METHODS IN TEACHING STYLISTICS

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17540011>

PhD.dotsent D.Djumambetova

Abstract: *This article examines the pedagogical importance of using interactive teaching methods in the study of stylistics. It explores how techniques such as brainstorming, clustering, debates, inserts, case-studies, and role-playing enhance students' analytical thinking, communicative competence, and awareness of stylistic nuances. Practical classroom and text-based examples are provided to demonstrate how interactive methods transform stylistics from a theoretical discipline into a dynamic, practice-oriented field. Implications for implementation and assessment are discussed.*

Keywords: *stylistics, interactive methods, language teaching, communicative competence, analytical thinking, pedagogical technology.*

Stylistics, as a branch of linguistics, studies how language choices shape meaning, tone, and emotional effect in various communicative contexts. Traditionally, stylistics has been taught by means of lectures, textbook readings, and teacher-led text analyses. While these approaches provide students with foundational knowledge, they often fall short in fostering deep engagement, critical thinking, and the ability to apply stylistic insight in new contexts. In recent years, pedagogical research has highlighted the importance of **interactive teaching methods** in language and stylistics education. For example, Akhmedova & Dilmurodova (2021) show that interactive methods support independent cognitive activity and cooperation in students. Similarly, Mareva (2018) demonstrates the applicability of such methods in teaching a rigid style (scientific style) in higher-education contexts. These findings suggest that for stylistics—a subject that bridges theory and practice—interactive methods are not just beneficial but perhaps essential.

Interactive teaching methods are rooted in constructivist educational theory: students build their own understanding through active participation, interaction, and reflection rather than passively receiving information. According to Kalinina, Shakarova & Yadgarova (2021), interactive methods help in forming professional competence by enabling students to engage with material actively rather than reproduce it. In the context of stylistics, students must not only recognise stylistic devices (such as metaphor, epiphora, nominalisation) but also interpret their function, compare usages across registers, and apply their understanding in new texts. Interactive methods lend themselves precisely to these tasks.

Another dimension is motivation and affect: Egamberdiyeva (2023) argues that interactive techniques enhance learner interest and autonomy. For stylistics, this is particularly relevant because the subject can seem abstract or detached from students'

immediate concerns. Interactive tasks help connect theory to meaningful, engaging activity.

Given these theoretical premises, the following sections describe key interactive methods and illustrate them with extended classroom/text-based examples.

In one classroom session on literary style, the teacher presents the sentence: “Her heart carried a mountain of sorrow.” Students are asked to generate ideas about stylistic devices in the sentence. Within minutes, responses surface: the metaphor “*mountain*” intensifies emotional expression; the phrase evokes hyperbole; the imagery creates a literary tone. The class then organizes the suggestions into categories such as metaphor, hyperbole, imagery. This strategy—brainstorming—moves students from expression to analysis, and from passivity to participation.

In another context (a module on register shift), a newspaper headline such as “Company halts production following safety breach” is presented. Students brainstorm re-phrasings (“The firm has suspended manufacturing due to a violation of safety protocols”; “Production has been stopped by the company in light of a safety incident”). They then compare which version is more formal, which is more direct, which is more public-friendly. This exercise helps them see how style choices (vocabulary, syntax) reflect audience and context.

In yet another example, in an advertising-style lesson the slogan “Unleash the beast within your engine!” is examined. Students brainstorm: “*unleash*” (verb evokes liberation), “*beast*” (metaphor, emotive imagery), “*within your engine*” (direct address). They then list alternatives (“release”, “empower”, “dominate”) and discuss how each would shift the persuasive register. These activities illustrate how brainstorming encourages divergent thinking about style.

Clustering helps visualise the connections among stylistic concepts. In a lesson on synonyms, students place the word “Synonyms” at the centre of a board. Branches are created: lexical synonyms (beautiful – lovely – pretty), stylistic synonyms (pass away – die – depart this life), emotional synonyms (angry – furious – enraged). Next, students discuss contexts of each term (formal, neutral, informal). In another session on “Register Variation,” the central node “Register” is branched into formal, informal, technical. Under “technical”: “*heat flux*,” “*momentum transfer*,” “*specimen retrieval*”. Under “colloquial”: “*hang out*,” “*get rid of*,” “*a bit of a mess*”. Then sub-clusters such as tone, vocabulary, sentence complexity are added. Students thereby gain a holistic view of how register and style interact.

In a third example, students explore “Expressive Means”. Starting with “Expressive Means”, they branch into metaphor, hyperbole, understatement, irony, epigraph. Under hyperbole: “*I have told you a million times*”. Under understatement: “*It’s just a scratch*”. They then select texts (literary, journalistic, everyday) to map examples to branches. By visualising these relationships, they deepen their stylistic insight.

The method of debate encourages students to defend or oppose stylistic statements, using linguistic evidence and real texts. One statement might be: “The simpler the sentence in an academic paper, the weaker the argument.” Students are divided: Team A argues simplicity improves clarity; Team B argues complexity conveys sophistication and precision. They examine academic excerpts (“The vast majority of studies conducted on the subject exhibit a remarkable convergence of results over a period of five years.”) and simpler forms (“Most studies agree.”). Through argumentation and reflection they learn that stylistic appropriateness depends on context and purpose. In another debate session topic: “Emotional language has no place in official documents.” One side contends neutral tone is necessary; the other argues moderate emotion humanises bureaucratic documents (e.g., health campaigns). Students compare public-policy announcements with legal statutes and extract stylistic features (modal verbs, passive vs active voice, vocabulary). A third example explores headlines: “Metaphor in news headlines misleads the reader.” Students analyze “Stocks Soar as Tech Rockets” and assess “rockets” as metaphor: clarity versus exaggeration. Such debates sharpen analytical, communicative, and stylistic skills simultaneously.

The Insert method (Interactive Noting System for Effective Reading and Thinking) engages students in reading with active annotation. For example, in a scientific-style lesson students read: “In linguistics, the stylistic value of speech units is closely related to communicative intent.” They mark “+” beside “stylistic value” (new concept), “?” beside “speech units” (unclear term), and “!” beside “communicative intent” (important idea). They then pair up to discuss: What are speech units? Why does style link to communicative intent? This deepens comprehension and moves them beyond surface reading.

In a literary-style module, students annotate a poem: “Time’s subtle hand erased the footprints of our youth.” They mark “subtle hand” as metaphor (+), “erased the footprints” as poetic action (!), “our youth” as emotional focus (?). In small-group discussion they explore why “*subtle hand*” is used rather than “*time erased*” and what effect is achieved on tone, voice, and style. In a third example, an advertising text “Just one swipe, and your life changes.” is annotated: “swipe” as informal colloquial (?), “life changes” as grand claim (!). Classroom discussion follows on audience, register, and medium. The Insert method scaffolds detailed understanding of stylistic function.

Case-study methodology situates students in realistic communicative scenarios, enabling application of stylistic theory to authentic texts. For instance, in an advertising case students examine: “Only here – the best, fastest, and most reliable service for you!” They identify the repetition of “the best, fastest, most reliable” (superlatives), dash usage (“Only here –”), direct address (“for you”). Then they redesign the slogan for a different audience (senior citizens) and justify stylistic changes. In another scenario, students analyse a corporate email: “Dear Team, please find attached the updated Q3 report...” vs an informal alternative “Hi everyone, I’ve attached the new Q3 numbers—check them when you can.” Comparison yields register variation (formal salutation, nominalisations vs

first-person pronoun, informal vocabulary). Students produce two versions and explain their choices. A third case uses a literary excerpt: “She tiptoed into the room, the moonlight slicing shadows on the floorboard like secrets spilling out of night.” Students analyse simile (“like secrets”), personification (“moonlight slicing”), sensory imagery. They then rewrite the scene in journalistic style: “The suspect entered the room quietly. Moonlight cast shadows across the floor.” They compare tone and effect. Case-studies thus directly link stylistic theory and real-world textual use.

Role-playing allows students to adopt communicative roles and adjust style accordingly. In one scenario students simulate a conference presentation versus a media interview. Student A (conference): “Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. In today’s lecture I will present an overview of the experimental data concerning...” Student B (media): “Hi there! Glad you asked—I want to share a fascinating discovery we just made...” The class observes differences: sentence length, vocabulary complexity, pronoun use, tone. They switch roles and reflect on

changes. Another scenario: customer support agent vs casual chatbot. Agent: “Thank you for contacting Support. Please specify the issue you are encountering so that we may assist you accordingly.” Chat style: “Hey! What’s wrong with your device? I’ll help you fix it in a sec :)” Students identify register (formal vs informal), emoticons, contractions, sentence fragments, audience. They redesign a support script for younger users and explain stylistic choices. A third scenario: diplomat statement vs social media influencer post. Diplomat: “We reaffirm our commitment to collaborative frameworks and sustainable development initiatives.” Influencer: “Team USA crushed it at the games – stay tuned for the next big thing!” Students compare tone, vocabulary, pronoun use, audience. They then craft a statement for the same topic aimed at teenagers, reflecting on language adjustment. Role-play gives students lived experience of stylistic variation, which strengthens their awareness and adaptive capacity.

Interactive teaching methods thus provide numerous pedagogical advantages. As noted by Akhmedova & Dilmurodova (2021) and Kalinina et al. (2021), such methods create conditions for independent cognitive activity, cooperation, and professional competence development. They foster student engagement: tasks transform learners from passive listeners into active participants. They cultivate analytical and critical thinking: students interpret, compare, and evaluate stylistic choices rather than simply memorising devices. They improve communicative competence: collaborative work demands articulation of ideas, listening, negotiation, and reflection. They bridge theory and practice: real texts and scenarios show how stylistic devices function across literature, journalism, advertising, and official discourse. They enhance stylistic sensitivity and adaptability: students become aware of tone, register, audience, emotional nuance, and how to adjust language appropriately. They raise motivation and learner autonomy: students become more invested and willing to explore texts independently. They support differentiation and

collaboration: clustering, brainstorming, peer-group work enable learners of varying levels to engage and learn from one another.

Nevertheless, implementation of interactive methods demands thoughtful planning. Teachers must align tasks with objectives, monitor participation, manage group dynamics, and evaluate both process and product. Challenges include time constraints, large class sizes, students unfamiliar with active learning, and limited resources. Mareva (2018) notes that in technical-specialty cohorts, students sometimes resist interactive stylistics tasks, seeing them as “soft” rather than “hard” skills. To address this, educators might introduce interactivity gradually, scaffold tasks clearly, and combine traditional lecture with interactive methods. Assessment should reflect collaborative and individual contributions, with peer and self-assessment as part of the process.

In conclusion, teaching stylistics benefits substantially from the incorporation of interactive methods. By moving students from passive absorption to active inquiry, methods such as brainstorming, clustering, debate, insert, case-study and role-play help develop analytical, communicative and stylistic skills. Research indicates that these approaches support student engagement, cognitive development, and autonomy (Akhmedova & Dilmurodova, 2021; Kalinina et al., 2021). When thoughtfully implemented, interactive methods bridge the gap between stylistic theory and practical application, preparing students to become competent, reflective, and adaptable users of language style. For educators in linguistics, literature and language teaching, the challenge is not simply to transmit knowledge of stylistics but to engage students actively in its discovery and use. Interactive pedagogy provides the means to achieve this objective.

REFERENCES:

- 1.Akhmedova, M., & Dilmurodova, N. (2021). The use of interactive methods in teaching professional speech to students. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1122–1130.
- 2.Egamberdiyeva, I. A. (2023). Using interactive techniques in teaching foreign languages. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*.
- 3.Kalinina, O. N., Shakarova, F. D., & Yadgarova, G. I. (2021). The role of interactive teaching methods in the formation of students’ professional competence. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1424–1430.
- 4.Mareva, M. V. (2018). The use of active and interactive teaching methods in the study of scientific style of the Russian language by students of technical specialties and training areas. *Vestnik of Samara University: History, Pedagogics, Philology*, 24(1), 142–148.