

## National-Cultural Markedness of Colloquial Vocabulary

Faleeva Anastasiya Vadimovna

Department of Second Foreign Languages, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan



DOI : <https://doi.org/10.61796/ijss.v3i2.121>



### Sections Info

#### Article history:

Submitted: March 05, 2026

Final Revised: March 20, 2026

Accepted: April 10, 2026

Published: April 30, 2026

#### Keywords:

Colloquial vocabulary

National-cultural markedness

Linguoculturology

Pragmatic meaning

Contemporary english

### ABSTRACT

**Objective :** The given article deals with the problem of national-cultural markedness of colloquial vocabulary as a functional-semantic and culture-specific, linguistically conditioned phenomenon reflecting the collective experience, social norms and culturally specific modes of conceptualization. **Method :** The article inspired by theoretical ideas from linguoculturology, sociolinguistics and pragmatics explores the national-cultural determinants of semantics, pragmatics and employs colloquial expressions in modern English language. **Results :** Evidence illustrates the codification of value judgments, social relationships, and shared background knowledge in terms of cultural coding in colloquial units. The results show that informal lexis is a major site of cultural specificity and until recently has been fraught with translation, lexicographic and cross-cultural issues. **Novelty :** They explore colloquial units both as informal lexical items and as the carriers of cultural meanings inscribed in everyday interaction.

## INTRODUCTION

Colloquial vocabulary has become one of the most rapidly changing and culturally dependent parts of the lexical system[1], which garnered more attention from language scientists. Considered to be a more marginal colouristically, socially peripheral layer of language up until now, colloquial lexis is only just beginning to be redressed in terms of its status as an important site for the depiction of social norms and value orientated representations, embedded in culturally determined patterns of interaction. Due to its deep connection to everyday communications, it reacts especially strongly to national and cultural influences [2].

Colloquial vocabulary exemplifies the national-cultural markedness by expressing in lexical units culturally determined experiences (the so-called national-culturally specific experience), social practices and jointly built assumptions[3]. These colloquial expressions do not have the benefit of neutral or glossed lexical items: they go home – implicitly assume a second culture knowledge and memory that remains impenetrable to non-speakers. For this reason, informal vocabulary constitutes a key part of even the construction and maintenance of cultural identity within a speech community.

Theoretical ramifications/ Theoretically, national-cultural markedness interfaces with a variety of linguistic disciplines such as linguoculturology, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and cognitive semantics. These approaches all converge on the view that meaning is not a distinctly linguistic construct, but at least partly culturally modeled social actions through communicative conventions[4].

The significance of this problem is especially present today in the context of globalization and increasing intercultural communication. Although English is the

current global lingua franca, many expressions of colloquial vocabulary remain specific to particular nation and culture context[5]. This tug-o-war between being worldwide and rooted in local culture offers dilemmas to language learners, translators and lexicographers alike.

In this context, the main purpose of the present research is to find out the national-cultural markedness of colloquial vocabulary in modern English and its semantic, pragmatic and functional features[6]. This article has the following aims: to characterize national-cultural markedness as a 'trademark' of colloquial vocabulary, to establish basic linguistic means in which cultural semantics is encoded in colloquial units, to study examples and functions of culturally marked colloquial usage empirically [7].

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **1. Empirical Material**

This corpus-based analysis focuses on colloquial lexical units and multi-word expressions attested in present-day English. Examples came from real spoken and written discourse, such as conversation, fiction, media texts and electronic communication. These sources grant access at low cost to naturally occurring vernacular usage in cultural contexts of comparative significance.

Instead, choice of examples was determined by their relevance in the sense of national-cultural meanings, not frequency. They focused on expressions whose interpretation is conditional on what people know in common, their social norms, or their evaluative frameworks.

### **2. Criteria for Identifying National-Cultural Markedness**

National-cultural markedness was based on several interrelated criteria, including the presence of culture-specific referents, practices or social institutions; implicit evaluative or normative meanings grounded in collective experience; pragmatic functions linked to culturally shaped interactional patterns and little transparency or direct translatability into other languages.

These criteria differentiate widely used informal lexical items from highly culture-bound and nationally based entities.

### **3. Analytical Framework**

The obtained result uses a qualitative semantic-pragmatic analysis mixed with traces of linguocultural interpretation. In their discourse contexts, colloquial units of language are examined to uncover possible underlying cultural scripts, value orientations and communicative expectations.

In this way, it can be treated not as an independent lexical level but as a cultural-mechanical system motivated more by the ethos of a specific speech community's worldviews.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Result*

#### **1. Cultural Encoding in Colloquial Semantics**

The study shows that much of the meaning carried by colloquial units is culturally specific and extends beyond their denotative sense. Such units serve as linguistically conventionalized vehicles for shared cultural commonplace, with invocation of the norms, values, and expectations that typify given speech community[8]. Words like "small talk" or "making a fuss" not only indicate varieties of interaction/behavior but attitudes toward social engagement, politeness strategies, and what constitutes an acceptable level of emotional expressiveness that have been influenced by culture [9].

Common semantic supports into these units have a premis of socially founded assumptions around social distance, social role and the appropriateness of communicative exchange. To provide one example, the concept of "small talk" depends upon a shared familiarity with conversational routines designed to maintain social closeness without delving into substantive or potentially face-threatening themes<sup>10</sup>. Quite a similar encoding of evaluative stance toward a behaviour that is too much or too socially excessive (and thus necessarily bound to cultural norms about restraint and emotional regulation) can be found in the expression "to make a fuss" [11].

These colloquial units often act as condensed representations of cultural scripts – encapsulating relevant social evaluations and behavioural expectations in a linguistically thrifty form (Bolinger; Jäkel ). It follows that their meanings are not entirely recoverable from a compositional semantics, but rather rely on access to external symbolic knowledge and internalized interpretive frameworks common to members of the speech community [12].

#### **2. Pragmatic Functions and Social Norms**

In fact, colloquial vocabulary often serves pragmatic purposes that are intimately tied to culturally-specific interactional patterns [13]. On a more everyday level, these functions can serve to mitigate, reassure, build solidarity and regulate interpersonal relations [14]. Phrases like "don't worry about it," or "just chill" are culturally engendered strategies of de-escalation, a way of muting possible conflict and keeping the peace.

The pragmatic effectiveness of such expressions consists in their indexing of culturally preferred modes of interaction, for example those characterised by emotional moderation, informality and positive face maintenance[15]. Crucially, these functions cannot be well explained from purely linguistic perspectives, because they are based on culturally molded assumptions about what sort of communicative behavior is appropriate or desirable in given context.

And since this is the language we have in common, the full pragmatcal force of each colloquial unit becomes intelligible only to a limited extent outside the cultural universe of its speech community. The emotional force, politeness value or social meaning of similar expressions in other languages can differ drastically[16]. Thus, the

literal translation of colloquial expressions often leads to pragmatism mismatch that mark their communicative functions, which are rooted in cultural orientation.

### **3. National-Cultural Constraints on Usage**

The analysis also shows that colloquial units are constrained in terms of their distribution, inferential acceptability and contextual appropriateness since they are subject to both the micro- and macro-level influences of national-cultural markedness [17]. Some expressions are tightly linked to certain cultural contexts and communicative sources that prevent them from transferring across varieties of English or other intercultural contexts [18].

Natural units within a national or other cultural context may be inappropriate, too informal, or otherwise pragmatically ambiguous outside of that context. This phenomenon illustrates the culturally bounded nature of common speech and its dependence on tacit knowledge and social conventions [19].

These restraints go a long way in shedding light on why culturally marked colloquial units often defy direct translation and cause problems for non-native speakers. Lacking visibility into the underlying cultural scripts and evaluative frameworks that govern language use, however, learners may misinterpret a pragmatic expression's intent or use it in contexts where it is understood as socially incongruent. In this paper we examine how learning content has implications for conveying meaning along these dimensions [20].

### ***Discussion***

The results corroborate the findings that colloquial vocabulary represents a focal point of national-cultural specificity in the lexical system [21]. We cannot account for its meanings and communicative functions without that cultural context, those social practices, forms (scripts) of expression, and/or cognitive schemata which people have to carry out everyday interaction [22].

Similarly, the analysis highlights the shortcomings of structural or linguistic frequency-based approaches [23] to colloquial language. Even though such approaches might preserve some sort of syntactic or distributional properties, they completely miss out on the evaluative and pragmatic aspects rooted in culture that characterize colloquial use [24]. In the absence of a linguocultural outlook, lexicographic, pedagogical and translational descriptions of colloquial units run the risk of oversimplifying or misrepresenting their communicative meaning [25].

Furthermore, it matters a lot from translation and intercultural communication perspective [26] as the national-cultural markedness of colloquial vocabulary. Not only semantic equivalence but also cultural resonance, pragmatic force and interactional appropriateness have to be taken into consideration by translators. [27] This often requires adaptive strategies, explanatory paraphrase or functional substitution rather than direct lexical correspondence.

## CONCLUSION

**Fundamental Finding :** The current paper shows that national-cultural markedness is an essential semantic, pragmatic and usage feature of colloquial lexicon. Colloquial units are linguistic representation of social experience, indicative of culturally-generated norms reflected in interactional conventions. **Implication :** The complexity of colloquial vocabulary seems to have not only aesthetic, stylistic nature, but also linguocultural motivation as a subsystem of culture-specific lexis and pragmatic mechanisms that drive communication through speech acts. **Limitation :** In this very context the article can be positioned as an attempt on integration between linguocultural and pragmatic analysis. **Future Research :** This approach may be further extended in future research with cross-linguistic comparison, corpus-based validation and diachronic analysis to elucidate the complex interplay of language, culture and everyday communication even further.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. A. Bushuy, "Frazeografirovaniye v kontrastivnom leksicheskom slovare metodom gnezdoobrazovaniya," *Filologicheskie nauki*, no. 2(6), p. 25, 2010.
- [2] T. A. Bushuy, *Yazyk v sistemnoy strukturatsii*. Tashkent: Fan, 2014.
- [3] T. A. Bushuy, "Otkrytost i dinamichnost sistemy yazyka," *Sovremennyye gumanitarnyye issledovaniya*, no. 2, pp. 70–73, 2015.
- [4] T. A. Bushuy, "Opyt prepodavaniya yazykovedcheskikh distsiplin v vuzakh Uzbekistana," in *European Research: Innovation in Science, Education and Technology*, 2018, pp. 46–48.
- [5] T. A. Bushuy, "Problema yazyka i natsii v lingvokulturologicheskom aspekte," *International Scientific Review*, no. LVI, pp. 48–50, 2019.
- [6] T. Bushuy, *Yazykoznanie: proshloe, nastoyashchee i budushchee*. Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2020.
- [7] T. A. Bushuy, "Kratkiy ekskurs v sovremennuyu nemetskuyu leksikografiyu," *Yazyk i kultura*, pp. 40–46, 2021.
- [8] T. A. Bushuy, "Neolexicography: Problems and Prospectives," *International Journal of Language, Education, Translation*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 7–15, 2022.
- [9] T. A. Bushuy, "Sovremennyy slovar kak produkt opredelennoy nauchnoy kontseptsii," *IQRO*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 10, 2023.
- [10] T. Bushuy, "Kognitivnye osobennosti funktsionalno-tematicheskikh grupp argotizmov russkogo yazyka," *Traditsii i innovatsii v issledovanii i prepodavanii yazykov*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 12–17, 2023.
- [11] A. V. Faleeva, "Transformatsionnye vozmozhnosti kollokvialnogo predlozheniya v angliyskom yazyke," *Inostrannaya filologiya: yazyk, literatura, obrazovanie*, no. 62, pp. 99–105, 2017.
- [12] A. V. Faleeva, "Kollokvialistika kak istochnik popolneniya emotsionalno-ekspressivnykh resursov angliyskogo yazyka," *International Scientific Review*, no. LVI, pp. 72–74, 2019.
- [13] A. V. Faleeva, "Otrazhenie leksiko-semanticheskikh osobennostey skrytogo smysla kollokvializmov-zoonimov v leksikograficheskikh istochnikakh," *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no. 9(455), pp. 192–199, 2021.

- [14] A. V. Faleeva, "Tematicheskaya differentsiatsiya kollokvializmov s implitsitnym znacheniem v leksikograficheskikh istochnikakh," *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no. 7(465), pp. 128–136, 2022.
- [15] A. V. Faleeva, "Leksiko-semanticheskie i derivatsionnye osobennosti kollokvialnykh akronimov i bekronimov," *Miasto Przyszłości*, vol. 35, pp. 540–543, 2023.
- [16] T. Bushuy, "Contextual actualization of phraseology in English expressions," in *Scientific Enquiry in the Contemporary World: Theoretical Basics and Innovative Approach*, 2015, p. 81.
- [17] T. A. Bushuy, "The emergence of language multitude," *Scientific Reports of Bukhara State University*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 62–67, 2018.
- [18] T. Bushuy and K. Khayrullaev, "Life of word during coronavirus," *Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences, Philosophy and Culture*, vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 19–28, 2022.
- [19] T. A. Bushuy, "Language in modern linguistics," *Miasto Przyszłości*, vol. 39, pp. 23–26, 2023.
- [20] T. Bushuy, "Features of representation of some word forms and meanings of phraseological units in contrastive lexicographical sources," *International Journal of Language, Education, Translation*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2023.
- [21] A. V. Faleeva, "Derivational peculiarities of colloquial words in modern English dictionaries," *Yazyk i kultura*, pp. 99–104, 2021.
- [22] A. V. Faleeva, "Investigation of the colloquial formation of modern English language," *International Journal of Language, Education, Translation*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 59–67, 2022.
- [23] A. V. Faleeva, "Grammatical, semantic and structural features of English colloquial words and expressions," *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 202–206, 2023.
- [24] A. V. Faleeva, "Theoretical interpretation of American colloquialisms in lexicographical sources," in *Ilm-fan yangiliklari konferensiyasi*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 45–48, 2023.
- [25] A. Faleeva, "Theoretical and practical research of the formation of colloquialisms of the English language in level interpretation," *International Journal of Language, Education, Translation*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 28–36, 2023.
- [26] A. V. Faleeva, "Traditions and innovations in the study of English colloquialisms in the perspective of modern printed and electronic lexicographical sources," *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, vol. 5, CSPU Conf. 1, pp. 337–341, 2024.
- [27] A. V. Faleeva, "Theoretical experience and representation of English colloquial lexis in dictionary interpretation," *Miasto Przyszłości*, vol. 56, pp. 355–359, 2025.

---

**Faleeva Anastasiya Vadimovna**

Department of Second Foreign Languages, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,  
Uzbekistan

---