A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN AND WRITTEN ENGLISH: LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMATIC DIFFERENCES

Samarkand State University, Urgut Branch
Faculty of Pedagogy and Language Teaching
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature (English)
Group-108
Rozzoqova Bekposhsha Hurmatbek qizi
bekposhorazaqova@gmail.com
G'afurova Shodiyona Sherzod qizi
gafurovashodiyona07@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This article presents a comparative analysis of spoken and written English from linguistic and pragmatic perspectives. Drawing on established frameworks in discourse analysis, pragmatics, and applied linguistics, the study examines how the two modes of communication differ in terms of phonological, lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and pragmatic features. The findings are further applied to the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching, with particular attention to learner challenges and instructional strategies. The research demonstrates that spoken and written English are not simply two versions of the same code, but rather two distinct systems shaped by different communicative purposes, contextual conditions, and cognitive demands.

Keywords: spoken English, written English, discourse analysis, pragmatics, linguistic features, EFL teaching, communication modes

INTRODUCTION

Language is one of the most fundamental human capacities, and it manifests in two primary modes: spoken and written. While both serve communicative purposes, they differ substantially in structure, function, and use. The comparative study of

spoken and written English has attracted considerable scholarly attention since the pioneering work of Halliday (1985), Biber (1988), and Crystal (2006), who demonstrated that the two modes are not simply different channels for conveying the same message, but rather two systems governed by distinct organizational principles.

The relevance of this topic is underscored by the growing demands placed on learners of English as a foreign language, who must develop competence in both modes. In academic, professional, and everyday contexts, the ability to navigate between spoken interaction and written composition is essential. Yet many EFL learners struggle precisely because they fail to recognize the systematic differences between the two modes, leading to errors such as overly formal speech or colloquial written expression.

The aim of this study is to conduct a systematic comparative analysis of spoken and written English from both linguistic and pragmatic standpoints.

The objectives are:

to define and characterize spoken and written English as communicative modes;

to identify key linguistic differences at phonological, lexical, grammatical, and syntactic levels;

to examine pragmatic differences in meaning construction and discourse organization;

to explore the pedagogical implications of these differences for EFL instruction.

The research object is the English language in its spoken and written forms. The research subject is the linguistic and pragmatic features that differentiate these two modes. The methodology of the study is based on descriptive and comparative linguistic analysis, drawing on corpus-based research, discourse analysis, and pragmatic theory.

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SPOKEN AND WRITTEN ENGLISH

1.1. Spoken and Written Language as Two Modes of Communication

Spoken and written language represent the two primary realizations of human linguistic capacity. According to Crystal (2006), spoken language is the primary form, both evolutionarily and developmentally, as children acquire speech before literacy, and all known human communities possess spoken language, while writing is a later cultural invention.

Spoken English is defined as language produced through the vocal tract and perceived through the auditory channel. It is characterized by real-time production, immediate feedback, shared physical context, and prosodic features such as intonation, stress, and rhythm. Written English, by contrast, is language encoded in visual symbols intended for reception in the absence of the producer, and it typically allows for planning, revision, and permanence.

Halliday (1985) argues that these two modes serve different functions: spoken language tends to serve interpersonal functions (building and maintaining social relationships), while written language tends to serve ideational functions (encoding complex information and knowledge). This functional distinction underlies many of the structural differences observed between the two modes.

1.2. Linguistic Features of Spoken and Written English

Research by Biber (1988) using large corpora of English texts revealed systematic patterns of co-occurrence among linguistic features that cluster into spoken or written registers. At each level of linguistic analysis, clear differences emerge.

Phonological level: Spoken English is shaped by phonological processes such as assimilation (e.g., don't you → dontcha), elision (e.g., next day → nex' day), and weak forms (e.g., and → /ən/). These processes reflect the pressures of real-time articulation. Written English, of course, does not directly encode these processes, though punctuation and orthography attempt to represent some prosodic features.

Lexical level: Spoken English tends to use a smaller, more frequently occurring vocabulary, with a higher proportion of general-purpose verbs (do, get, make, have), vague language (thing, stuff, sort of), and informal lexis. Written English employs a richer, more varied vocabulary, a higher proportion of content words,

and greater use of nominalization (e.g., the implementation of the policy rather than they implemented the policy).

Grammatical level: Spoken English favors coordination (and, but, so) over subordination, uses more pronouns, and relies heavily on deixis (this, that, here, now). It also features constructions rare in writing, such as left-dislocation (My sister, she lives in London) and tag questions (It's cold, isn't it?). Written English, by contrast, employs more complex subordinate clauses, passive constructions, and grammatical metaphor.

Syntactic level: Spoken sentences are shorter, often incomplete, and may violate the norms of written grammar (e.g., sentence fragments, anacolutha). Written sentences are longer, more syntactically integrated, and more likely to feature noun phrase elaboration.

1.3. Pragmatic Aspects of Spoken and Written Discourse

Pragmatics — the study of how context shapes meaning — is central to understanding the differences between spoken and written English.

Context and deixis: Spoken interaction is embedded in a shared physical and temporal context. Speakers can rely on deictic expressions (here, now, this) because both parties share the same situational context. Written language must create its own context linguistically, making greater use of explicit reference and textual cohesion. **Speech acts:** Both spoken and written English realize speech acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), but the distribution and realization differ. Directives, for instance, are commonly expressed face-to-face through imperative forms or intonation, while in writing they are more often mitigated by modal verbs and hedging devices. **Discourse markers:** Spoken discourse is rich in markers such as well, you know, I mean, right, okay, which serve to manage turn-taking, signal attitude, and organize interaction. Written discourse uses different cohesive devices such as however, furthermore, in contrast, which signal logical relationships between propositions.

CHAPTER II. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SPOKEN AND WRITTEN ENGLISH

2.1. Structural Differences Between Spoken and Written English

The structural differences between spoken and written English can be analyzed along several dimensions:

Sentence complexity and information density: Written English typically displays a higher lexical density (ratio of content words to total words) than spoken English. Halliday (1985) calculated that written texts contain approximately twice the lexical density of spoken texts. Spoken English compensates for lower lexical density with higher grammatical intricacy, realized through multiple clause combinations linked by coordination and subordination.

Cohesion and coherence: Written texts achieve cohesion through explicit lexical and grammatical ties: reference (it, they), substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (repetition, synonymy, collocation). Spoken discourse relies more heavily on prosody, gesture, and shared context to create coherence. Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle applies to both modes, but the maxims operate differently: written texts must be more explicitly informative, while spoken interaction relies on implicature extensively.

Turn-taking and interaction: Spoken English is fundamentally interactive and sequential, governed by turn-taking conventions (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Speakers negotiate floors, produce adjacency pairs (question-answer, greeting-greeting), and repair misunderstandings in real time. Written English lacks turn-taking structure in the same sense, though some genres (such as correspondence or online chat) approximate dialogic exchange.

2.2. Pragmatic Differences in Meaning Construction

Implicit vs. explicit meaning: Spoken language relies heavily on implicature, shared background knowledge, and contextual inference. The utterance "Can you pass the salt?" is pragmatically interpreted as a request, not a question about ability. In writing, such indirectness must be more carefully managed, as the

absence of shared context increases the risk of misinterpretation.

Politeness strategies: Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory distinguishes positive politeness (affirming the hearer's wants) from negative politeness (respecting autonomy). Both strategies appear in spoken and written English, but their realization differs. In speech, positive politeness is expressed through address forms, humor, and intonation. In writing, negative politeness is more prominent, realized through hedges (I was wondering if you could...), passive voice, and formal register.

Register and style-shifting: Spoken English is highly sensitive to register, with speakers shifting continuously based on participant relationships, topic, and setting. Written English also varies by register, but register choices are typically more deliberate and stable within a single text.

2.3. Implications for EFL Teaching

The linguistic and pragmatic differences between spoken and written English have significant implications for EFL pedagogy.

Learner challenges: Many EFL learners receive instruction primarily through written language, leading to a gap in spoken competence. They may produce written-style speech (overly formal, syntactically complete, lacking natural prosody) or conversely, produce informal, spoken-style writing. Research by Carter and McCarthy (2006) highlights the underrepresentation of spoken grammar in EFL textbooks, arguing that learners are rarely taught naturally occurring spoken forms.

Teaching strategies: Effective EFL instruction should explicitly raise learners' awareness of mode differences. This includes exposure to authentic spoken corpora (such as the CANCODE or BNC spoken sections), analysis of discourse markers in spoken interaction, and practice in producing both formal written texts and natural spoken discourse. Role plays, conversation analysis tasks, and genre-based writing instruction are all valuable pedagogical tools.

Curriculum design: Curricula should be designed to develop both modes in

parallel, rather than privileging writing over speech (or vice versa). Assessment instruments should be sensitive to the different norms governing spoken and written production, and teachers should be trained to recognize and appreciate the systematic nature of spoken grammar rather than treating informal speech as simply "incorrect" writing.

CONCLUSION: This article has demonstrated that spoken and written English constitute two distinct communicative systems, each shaped by its own contextual conditions, functional demands, and organizational principles. At the linguistic level, the two modes differ in lexical density, syntactic complexity, phonological form, and grammatical structure. At the pragmatic level, they differ in their use of context, implicature, politeness strategies, and discourse organization.

These differences are not merely academic: they have profound implications for EFL teaching and learning. A linguistically informed pedagogy that explicitly addresses both modes — their similarities, their differences, and the contexts in which each is appropriate — will better prepare learners for the full range of communicative demands they face in academic, professional, and social life.

Future research might profitably explore the growing "third space" between spoken and written language created by digital communication (texting, social media, online chat), which blends features of both modes in novel ways.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press.

2. Biber, D. (1988). Variation Across Speech and Writing. Cambridge University Press.

3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.

4. Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide to Spoken and Written Grammar and Usage. Cambridge

University Press.

5. Crystal, D. (2006). Language and the Internet (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

6. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

7. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). Spoken and Written Language. Deakin University Press.

8. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50(4), 696–735.

9. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.