

Linguistic Shaping of Epistemology, Ethics, and Social Ontology: Implications and Applications

Sanae Ejjebli

Language is the lens through which we perceive and understand reality. It has a subtle and complex effect on our environment. It influences how we interact with others and view the world. Academics have long been interested in the intersection between language and philosophy due to its ongoing and shifting dynamics in our increasingly interconnected globalized society. In this chapter, we look at how cross-cultural contexts affect how social ontology, ethics, and epistemology are linguistically shaped. In order to understand how language influences how we perceive information in various cultural contexts, the literature will be thoroughly and methodically analyzed. Through a nuanced exploration of cross-cultural contexts and the influential role of language in identity formation, moral judgments, and the construction of social reality, we embark on a journey to unravel the multifaceted implications and applications of linguistic influences on cross-cultural contexts.

Language; epistemology; social ontology; cross-cultural context; implications and applications.

Introduction

In the vast landscape of human cognition, language stands not only as a medium for communication but as a dynamic force that forms the very essence of our existence. This section delves into the multifaceted influence of language on cognition and social behavior. It sets the stage for a deep exploration into the intricate relationship between language and philosophy. Language is the lens through which we view the world, a dynamic force shaping our thoughts, and interactions. As Pinker asserts, it is not merely a means of communication but a fundamental aspect of human cognition. Lakoff's exploration of metaphors further elucidates how our conceptual system is intricately tied to the language we use. In understanding the power of language, we recognize its role in shaping not only our individual minds but the collective consciousness of societies.

Language, a core of human culture, transcends its part as a simple means of communication. It shapes our understanding of morality, and molds our whole social

reality. It possesses the amazing capacity to shape the way we think, perceive the world, and connect to one another. This power of language to shape our cognitive and social scenery has garnered increasing interest from scholars, especially within our progressively interconnected and globalized world. Language as our defining feature affects our perception of the world around us, including concepts of space and time (Boroditsky, 2011). Paivio (1974) suggests that language is a vehicle for knowledge, with information stored as perceptual images accompanied by verbal descriptions, as it is a practical and historically changing activity that influences meaning-making and interpretation (Savcı, 2017). Language as a prime vehicle for knowledge construction, emphasizes the context-dependent nature of knowledge and highlights its interactivity, context dependency, functional, and its creative nature (Renzl, 2007).

Language, in molding the very fabric of our social reality, shapes our understanding of ethics. Rumsey (2010) argues that elements of the ethical are built into language at its core, and that recent work in linguistic anthropology sheds new light on the role played by language in ethical thought and action. Björk (2016) suggests that the processes of communicating information and receiving instructions are linguistic by nature, and that autonomous and heteronomous ethical thinking is expressed by way of language use. In addition, Millie (2012) and Lambek (2010) both argue that ethics is profoundly ordinary and pervasive, and that ethical practice, judgment, reasoning, responsibility, cultivation, commitment, and questioning are central to social life. Thus, language does not only stand as a tool for expressing ethical ideas, but a fundamental part of how we think about and engage with ethical matters.

Therefore, linguistics has significant implications for epistemology, ethics, and social ontology. Koopman (2011) discusses the significance of the linguistic turn in twentieth-century philosophy, which shifted philosophical scrutiny from certain ideas formulated in seventeenth-century philosophy to words, sentences, and meanings. New materialism's relational ontology, which emphasizes becoming and non-binary thinking, can aid in gaining interdisciplinary perspectives in applied linguistics Toohey (2018). In this regard, Schalley (2007) explored how ontological structures are reflected in intra- and cross-linguistic regularities, and Rumsey (2010) shows how recent work in linguistic anthropology and related fields has demonstrated that elements of the ethical are built into language at its core, shedding new light on the role played by language in ethical thought and action.

With no doubt, language plays a significant role in shaping our understanding of social reality. Language not only reflects our thoughts, but also shapes them, and that understanding the interaction between language and thought is important for effective communication across languages and cultures (Mykhailyuk, 2015). At the level of cognition and social behavior, Fiedler (2008) notes that verbal interaction can lead to unintended or emergent outcomes. Through Language, people create their own roles and perform them accordingly (Clair, 1982). As social beings, language learning is primarily

driven by a desire to belong, and language must therefore be made to fit for social interactions as well as for the speaker's perceptual motor system (Clair, 1982; Wallentin, 2008). The different scientific studies emphasize how important language is for forming our understanding of social reality and how crucial it is to comprehend how language and thought interact in order to communicate effectively. As an elaborate tool that both reflects and affects the very fabric of human existence, it has significance that goes beyond the realm of communication. The complex relationship between language and reality is becoming more and more fascinating at the nexus of philosophy, linguistics, and social studies. The ways in which language creates and alters our ontological frameworks, honest paradigm, and the fabric of social reality as a whole are the subject of extensive study by academics. The current chapter aims to shed light on this active interaction with its many ramifications and potential outcomes in a similar vein.

Purpose and Scope of the paper

The purpose of this paper is twofold: to explore how language serves as a powerful agent in shaping our epistemology, ethics, and social ontology, and to investigate the profound ramifications of linguistic influences in diverse cross-cultural contexts. We embark on a journey that dissects the intricate relationships between language and these critical facets of human existence, with an emphasis on highlighting the rich tapestry of diversity that characterizes our globalized world. In our examination of epistemology, ethics, and social ontology, we navigate the linguistic landscapes of different cultures, recognizing that language serves as both a mirror and a sculptor of worldviews. By venturing beyond the boundaries of language and culture, we aim to shed light on universal and context-specific mechanisms through which linguistic influences shape our understanding of the world. In an increasingly interconnected world, understanding the implications of linguistic shaping becomes imperative. It equips us with the cultural awareness necessary for effective cross-cultural communication, diplomacy, and cooperation, ultimately fostering a more harmonious and empathetic global society.

Language and its Influence on Perception

The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis

A fundamental tenet of linguistic theory, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, asserts a close relationship between language and mind. According to this theory, language actively influences our cognition and experience of reality rather than just acting as a vehicle for the expression of already held beliefs. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which contends that language affects thought, is still hotly debated. The idea is the subject of disagreement, according to Cibelli (2016), who also offers a model that takes into consideration language-consistent biases in English speakers' color memory reconstruction. Skerrett (2010) studies cross-cultural psychology research in another

empirical study to see the degree to which the hypothesis can be demonstrated to be accurate, and she comes to the conclusion that language appears to exert significant impact over how people categorize, evaluate, and remember the world. Kay (1983) also presents experimental evidence from the domain of color perception for a weaker version of the hypothesis than is usually proposed. While it remains a topic of immense doubt, there exist some evidence for the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, particularly in the domain of color perception, but the extent of its influence on thought is still a matter of debate.

Linguistic relativity, which holds that a language's structure and vocabulary affect its speakers' experience of the outside world, is a fundamental component of this idea. An amalgam of scholarly research on linguistic relativity is shown here. Seven categories of hypotheses on the potential influences of language on mind were identified in Wolff's (2011) study, which found evidence in favor of the idea that language may make some distinctions impossible to avoid and that it can enhance particular forms of thinking. Nevertheless, January (2007) details six unsuccessful efforts to replicate a significant discovery in the literature on linguistic relativity and comes to the conclusion that the Whorfian hypothesis is not supported by the original report. However, Niemeier (2000) provides data that goes beyond language, including evidence from language production, interpretation, and change, to demonstrate that language and culture may influence cognition and discourse. Mihatsch (2004) specifically looks at how obligatory vs. optional number marking influences nonverbal categorization and lexical change. Niemeier (2000) and Everett (2013) both discuss evidence from language production, interpretation, and change, as well as cognition, discourse, and culture. Suggesting that the relationship between language and thought is complex and thus remains a topic of debate in the field.

The stronger version of the notion, known as linguistic determinism, maintains that language fundamentally controls cognition, constricting or enlarging our conceptual horizons. Cruz (2009) addresses the question of whether language affects how we perceive the world and whether speakers of other languages have distinct conceptions of reality. According to Bod (2006), learning is improved by probabilistic grammars since language is a probabilistic system. Based on introspective linguistic data, Croft (1998) addresses the mental representations of grammatical and lexical knowledge and contends that the evidence can only constrain the range of potential mental representations a priori. Regarding dialects, Trudgill (2000) contends that dialect mixture and the emergence of new dialects are not random processes and that it is feasible to forecast how the mixture will turn out based on linguistic and demographic information. While there is evidence for probabilistic language systems and the influence of language on cognition, the extent of linguistic determinism remains a topic of debate.

The authors Langland-Hassan (2021) and Neuman (2012) contend that language facilitates abstract cognition. Langland-Hassan (2021) discovered that patients with

aphasia had longer reaction times for more abstract activities, suggesting that language facilitates abstract reasoning. Neuman (2012) suggests that language supports abstraction through hypostatic abstraction. On the other hand, Hampton (2002) proposes a more conventional role for language in thought as providing the foundation for the cultural development and transmission of domain-general abstract knowledge and reasoning abilities, whereas Douglas (2003) contends that language abstraction can be influenced by explicit communication goals. The results point to a potential function for language in supporting abstract cognition, but the specifics of this link remain unknown and may be altered by a number of variables. While the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has garnered both admiration and criticism, it has undergone various modifications over the years, as researchers seek a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between language and perception.

Linguistic Relativity and its Implications

Language acts as a conceptual framework that structures and organizes our thoughts. We start to understand how the structure of our language might affect our cognitive processes through the concept of linguistic relativity. For instance, languages like Russian that distinguish between different blue tones make their speakers more aware of these differences. While there is no evidence to support the notion that language defines the fundamental categories of thinking, there is mounting evidence that language has a significant impact on cognition. The seven kinds of hypotheses Wolff (2011) proposed about the potential impacts of language on mind include motion, color, spatial relations, number, and false belief understanding. The ongoing discussion and research on linguistic relativity must take an interdisciplinary approach and a macro-micro viewpoint to take into account the cognitive processes associated with language use (Slobin, 2003).

In the field of education, Hudson (2004) advocates the notion that linguistics has a significant role to play in language instruction and that it is vital to do research whose findings cut over the boundaries between linguistics and education. It is essential to provide an interdisciplinary review of contemporary linguistic relativity techniques, encompassing empirical and theoretical investigations as well as thoughts on linguistic relativity from many angles (Athanasopoulos, 2016). The ramifications of linguistic relativity on language instruction and learning are significant. According to Lucy (2016), the development of linguistic relativity in middle childhood has an impact on one's capacity to acquire a second language. Students get a wide cultural perspective through the teaching of foreign languages that incorporates the idea of linguistic relativity, and by research whose findings span the boundaries between linguistics and other disciplines is vital (Ardila, 2000; Hudson, 2004). Consequently, linguistic relativity can inform language teaching and education by providing a cultural perspective and understanding of the impact of language on thought and behavior.

The ramifications of linguistic relativity are shown through several cross-cultural instances. For instance, the Hopi language, a Native American language, does not include tense markers for the past, present, or future. Events are described according to whether or not they were seen. This framework questions established ideas about how time is perceived and may result in a more comprehensive and event-based understanding of time. In contrast, English makes extensive use of tense markers to indicate time. Compared to Hopi, this grammatical divergence may lead to a more linear and segmented experience of time.

Another example can be found in the Chinese language system where characters are logographic, with each character representing a morpheme. For instance, characters like "人" (rén) for "person" or "山" (shān) for "mountain" encapsulate distinct meanings within single symbols. This logographic nature potentially shapes specific cognitive patterns involved in recognizing and recalling characters among Chinese speakers. Diacritic marks and logographic characters add additional layers of visual information to the written language, which may impact the way speakers recognize, remember, and process linguistic elements. In Arabic, diacritic marks, also known as "tashkeel," play a crucial role in indicating vowels and differentiating between homographic words. For example, the diacritic mark "ʾ" signifies a short vowel in Arabic, affecting pronunciation and meaning. While Romanian also uses diacritics, such as accents on vowels, they primarily serve to indicate stress and pronunciation rather than changing the meaning of words. An example is the use of the diacritic "ă" in words like "mănânc" (I eat), where it indicates the stressed syllable. Nevertheless, these diacritic marks still add a layer of visual complexity that could potentially influence memory processes. The subtleties of linguistic relativity are still being revealed by modern study. Cognitive psychologists use experimental methods to investigate how language affects perception, showing that linguistic relativity encompasses conceptualization as well as vocabulary.

Cultural Variations in Language and Perception

The linguistic fabric of the world offers a rainbow of variation, and the offered diverse worldviews result from the diverse ways that languages encode concepts. For instance, although Western languages frequently compartmentalize different realms, certain Indigenous languages smoothly blend environment and culture, expressing a holistic viewpoint. The way we think and see the world is influenced by language, which also reflects a society's culture (Deutscher, 2010). According to Chabal's (2015) research, the linguistic information that speakers of different languages have access to influences how they direct their attention when taking in the visual environment. Additionally, Altakhaineh (2014) revealed that EFL students utilized terms considerably differently from speakers from other cultures, while Garimella (2016) built cross-cultural word models to detect words with cultural bias. EFL students encounter difficulties in conveying messages to native speakers of English due to cultural factors related to these speakers. Language and culture are therefore highly interconnected, and that different cultures perceive the same language differently.

Another diverse aspect both within and between cultures is the way emotions are expressed. According to Semin (2002), linguistic representations of emotions and emotional experiences are a reflection of cultural differences in the importance put on relationships and uniqueness. According to Beier (1972), there is an emotional language that is universal across cultures and that is communicated in vocal extraverbal mood expressions. The link between languages and emotions can be better understood by looking at bilingual life writing, which implies that various languages allow for varied emotional expressions (Besemeres, 2004). Similar to the previous finding, Zyl (2015) discovered that cross-cultural variances exist both inside and between languages, with people and entire cultures not all vocally expressing their emotions in the same way. Language and culture thus represent two sides of the same coin in the many ways that emotions are perceived and conveyed.

For instance, while universally expressed fundamental emotions like anger, contempt, fear, pleasure, sadness, and surprise might be vocalized, the bulk of positive emotions were communicated through culturally specific signals (Sauter, 2010). Additionally, variables like how and when a language was learned, its current use, the total number of languages known, and the level of emotional intelligence possessed all had an impact on multilinguals' self-perceived competence, attitudes, communicative anxiety, language choice, and code-switching when expressing emotions (Dewaele, 2010). According to Perlovsky (2009), language's emotional content diminishes as conceptual richness increases and that emotional distinctions are often tied to grammar and cannot be copied. Similarly, Semin (2002) argued that in cultures where relationships and interdependence are valued, emotion terms serve as relationship markers, and as self-markers in cultures where individuality is valued, the linguistic representation of emotions and the events that give rise to them is influenced by cultural regulation. The abundance of linguistic variation is evidence of the flexibility and originality of human intellect, according to all the results described above. Each language embodies a distinct viewpoint that affects how its speakers see societal conventions, power structures, and even emotional expression.

Case Studies Demonstrating Linguistic Influence on Perception

In the following examples, we look at individual case studies to show how language has a real effect on perception. We examine instances in which language affects perception and make comparisons between various cultural contexts. The past is described in front of the speaker and the future is described as being behind the speaker in the indigenous language of Aymara, which is used in the Andes of South America. Many other languages, including English, conceive time in the opposite way. Due to the distinctive temporal framing of their language, Aymara speakers frequently display a different cognitive viewpoint. Their perception is that the past is something they know and can see, but the future is something they can't see. This linguistic relativity may result

in a unique manner of conceiving of and organizing the future, with a focus on what is known and familiar, as opposed to what is unknown. Mandarin Chinese uses temporal terms such as "前天" (qiántiān - the day before yesterday) and "后天" (hòutiān - the day after tomorrow) that emphasize proximity to the present. Speakers of Mandarin Chinese, because of the language's temporal terms, may have a heightened awareness of temporal proximity. This can affect their planning and decision-making, causing them to be more aware of the recent past and the near future than speakers of languages that don't make these distinctions. As was previously established, the Native American language Hopi lacks tenses. In contrast to many other languages, the Hopi language does not employ past, present, or future tenses. Instead, it emphasizes whether the incident was observed or not. Hopi speakers would therefore see time as being more flexible and event-based. They could be more interested in whether an event has been noticed or not and less concerned with the exact time of events. This language configuration might result in a distinctive cognitive viewpoint on reality's temporal aspect. These examples demonstrate the intricate interplay between language and cognition, highlighting how linguistic relativity manifests in various cultural contexts. In the following section, we will continue our examination of how language shapes epistemology, ethics, and social ontology, going even further into the tremendous impact of language on these facets of human thinking.

Epistemology and Language

The Role of Language in Knowledge Acquisition

The relationship between language and epistemology is profound; language is not just a tool for communication but a vehicle through which we construct our understanding of reality. In our quest to learn, convey, and share ideas, language—the carrier of knowledge—plays a crucial role. It acts as a conduit for people to share their ideas and experiences, which promotes the transmission of information. The language environment is not always easy to navigate, and it can act as a barrier to some types of knowledge. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which contends that a person's language structure affects how they comprehend the world, provides compelling evidence that language alters the way we think and learn (Gentner, 2003). Boroditsky (2011) focused on how people's views of the environment, especially their understanding of space and time, are influenced by the languages they speak. In addition to place and time, Jackendoff (1996) contends that inner speech facilitates cognition by acting as a "handle" for attention, enabling one to pay attention to relational and abstract components of thought. As evidence that first language does affect ideas, Johansen-Berg (2001) reports research in which it was discovered that respondents' first languages affected priming effects while making true/false judgements regarding time. What types of knowledge are available can be significantly influenced by language. For instance, profound ecological and cultural knowledge is frequently encoded

in indigenous oral traditions, but others who do not speak the language may not be able to access this information. Additionally, linguistic communities play a crucial role in defining epistemic practices by defining the parameters of what is regarded as genuine knowledge in each cultural setting. In this section, we have seen how language shapes not only what we know but also how we come to know it, illustrating the intricate relationship between language and our epistemic foundations.

Cultural Variations in Epistemological Frameworks

The study of knowledge, or epistemology, exposes an intriguing tapestry of cultural perspectives on what is seen as true, legitimate, or acceptable. Different cultures have unique epistemological frameworks, which are frequently impacted by linguistic quirks and cultural norms. Different cultural perspectives on information acquisition and validation exist, and culture has a big impact on how people behave when it comes to knowledge. In individualistic societies, a higher value is placed on individual, evidence-based epistemologies, while others place a higher value on community knowledge, where truth is formed collectively. These contrasting methods reveal ingrained linguistic and cultural impacts on the conceptualization and validation of knowledge.

The cultural factor is present in these debates between individualized epistemology and communal knowledge. In many African indigenous societies, the significance of collective knowledge is quite high. In such collectivistic cultures, oral traditions and stories are common forms of knowledge transmission that are passed down through the generations. When deciding what is thought to be real or genuine, these cultures place a high value on consensus and communal knowledge, rather than individual facts. In their grammatical repertoires, these languages' grammatical structures frequently highlight how information is validated and acquired collectively. For instance, some grammar markers and terms that emphasize group action and shared knowledge are used in various African languages. In Western scientific communities, where personalized, evidence-based epistemology is strongly emphasized. The scientific method and empirical investigation are used to validate knowledge; Individual expertise and evidence are paramount in determining truth and validity.

Acquiring knowledge differs across individualistic and collectivistic cultures. In contrast to individualistic systems, there is a strong regard for tradition and authority in various Asian cultures, such as Japan, which has an impact on how people acquire knowledge. With a hierarchical system, a high value is placed on seniority and experience where knowledge is often obtained. This cultural perspective may have an impact on how information is interpreted and verified. Through the use of honorifics and levels of politeness that signify hierarchy and respect, the Japanese language reflects these cultural values. The language's grammatical structure enables speakers to show respect for others and recognize their standing, which is consistent with the culture's value placed on seniority, knowledge and experience.

Similarly, In terms of belief systems, culture has a significant impact. Religious values and beliefs have a significant influence on how some Middle Eastern societies and the MENA area define knowledge and reality. What is regarded as true knowledge is significantly influenced by the authority of religious scriptures and ecclesiastical authorities. Arabic is a language that has great religious significance to Islam, and as such, it has certain terms and phrases that are connected to religious ideas. The epistemological framework of the society is fundamentally shaped by these language quirks, which make it easier to share and validate religious information and beliefs.

Language as a Tool for Shaping Epistemic Values

The range of human intellect, including concepts of certainty, doubt, and skepticism, is constructed through language. Ideas are expressed with varied degrees of certainty through linguistic framing. Our sense of knowledge and truth is significantly shaped by the subtle representations of belief that are contained in language. According to Paivio (1974), in order to comprehend people's inner lives, including those of teachers, it is crucial to include both representational and presentational interpretations of language data. Knowledge is thought to be stored in the mind as perceptual images accompanied by verbal descriptions. This emphasizes how knowledge is context-dependent and how language plays a crucial part in its construction (Freeman, 1996; Renzl, 2007). Because language and culture interact to generate epistemic values, it is crucial to take into account the social and cultural context in which language is employed. According to Nuyts (2001), who investigated the connection between language and conceptualization, particularly in the context of epistemic modalities in Dutch, German, and English, culture has a significant impact on how one develops intellectually and how they learn about other cultures (Hofer, 2008). Matsui (2006) investigated how language contributes to how Japanese-speaking infants perceive others as epistemic beings. Therefore, it is crucial for cross-cultural studies to look at the connections between age, learning, and epistemic growth. Language subtleties, such as the use of modal verbs (such as "might," "could," and "must"), might reveal a speaker's epistemic position. These language devices have an impact on how we move through the world of knowledge, encouraging either open-mindedness or dogmatism. We will look at case examples where linguistic elements have a real impact on belief structures and the perception of knowledge to show how language affects epistemic values.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Epistemological Concepts

Exploration across cultures exposes jarring differences in epistemic perspectives. As the bases of knowledge, certain cultures may place more importance on empirical data and first-hand sensory experience than others, which may place more emphasis on intuition, storytelling, or tradition. The usage of modal verbs like "might," "could," and

"must" expresses varied degrees of confidence and uncertainty, for example, and has a profound linguistic impact on English. She must be at home, for instance, conveys a high level of assurance, but "She might be at home" connotes ambiguity. The subtle use of modal verbs, which enables the speakers to articulate their epistemic attitude about a belief or assertion, illustrates how it affects epistemic values. This language trait promotes receptivity and recognizes the possibility of opposing ideas. It develops a culture skepticism, as individuals can express doubt without rejecting ideas outright. On the other hand, the Japanese handle epistemic modality differently. To indicate assurance or skepticism, it frequently depends on environmental clues and politeness levels, and directly expressing skepticism or doubt may not be acceptable in some situations. Its language rules, which may prohibit overt statements of doubt or skepticism and encourage a culture of respect and deference to authority, have an impact on epistemic values. People could be less willing to publicly contest widely held opinions, and their perceptions of knowledge might be more strongly correlated with reputable, established sources.

Another important cultural variation is in Arabic and its inclusion of the word "Inshallah" which means "God willing." This phrase is often used when discussing future plans or outcomes, indicating that the realization of these plans is contingent upon God's will. The use of "Inshallah" in Arabic reflects a cultural and linguistic influence on epistemic values. It acknowledges uncertainty about future events and reinforces the belief that ultimate control lies with a higher power. This linguistic nuance can influence how individuals approach future planning and the perception of certainty or doubt in everyday life. When "Inshallah" is used in discussions about future plans or outcomes, it serves as a reminder of the inherent uncertainty in life. It conveys the idea that while individuals may make plans and set goals, the realization of those plans is not guaranteed, as it ultimately depends on the will of a higher power. The use of "Inshallah" reflects a cultural value of humility and surrender to the divine will. It encourages individuals to recognize their limited control over future events and to approach their plans with a sense of humility, acknowledging that they are subject to external factors beyond their control. In some cultural contexts, a strong emphasis on self-confidence and assertiveness may be tempered by the inclusion of "Inshallah." This linguistic nuance can prevent individuals from becoming overly confident or presumptuous about the success of their plans. This cultural and linguistic influence can lead to a greater acceptance of unforeseen events and a reduced sense of frustration when plans do not unfold as anticipated.

These examples show how linguistic characteristics and cultural norms affect how confidence, doubt, and skepticism are expressed in language. This in turn shapes the epistemic values and knowledge-seeking strategies inside various cultures, which in turn shapes their whole reality. Understanding how language affects epistemology has significant ramifications for intercultural communication and comprehension. It encourages us to approach other epistemological frameworks with consideration and respect, promoting a more open and compassionate interchange of ideas on a global scale.

We will examine the relationship between language and ethics in the parts that follow, looking at how linguistic factors affect our moral judgements and ethical reasoning in diverse cultural situations.

Ethics and Language

Moral Relativism and Linguistic Diversity

Language is not neutral; it carries a grand ethical weight; our moral judgments compass which guides and influences our actions. Austin's exploration of speech acts and Grice's theory of conversation reveal how language is inherently tied to ethical considerations. In cross-cultural communication, the nuances of language become particularly pronounced, as the ethical implications of words vary across cultural contexts. We now enter the intricate interplay between ethics and language as a result of moral relativism, a philosophical position that recognizes the variety of ethical values held among cultures. Moral relativism, at its foundation, admits that moral viewpoints are not universal but rather are socially created. These moral ideas are effectively framed by language. The literature displays a rich mixture at the intersection of language varieties and moral relativism. Language proficiency, for instance, may moderate moral decision-making, according to Stankovic (2022), who discovered that bilinguals with higher self-reported reading proficiency were less likely to make a utilitarian choice in a foreign language. Sidnell (2012) also proposed a third locus of linguistic relativity, arguing that a language's resources provide the means for carrying out fundamental interactions. While Brogaard (2008) contended that moral contextualism may explain the same evidence as relativism without relating the veracity of statements to the situations in which they are made.

A society's multilingualism may have an impact on how individuals see morality. In particular, learning a foreign language can result in less harsh moral judgements (Geipel 2015), less emotional processing of moral issues (Hayakawa 2017), and more utilitarian moral judgments (Costa 2014). According to Cipolletti (2016), moral judgment requires a variety of mental operations, and speaking a foreign language can stimulate more methodical thought processes. Thus, language variety may affect moral decision-making and various linguistic resources may influence social interactions and moral assessments. Additionally, moral judgements formed in a foreign language may differ from those made in one's own tongue. Moral ideals and ethical standards are fundamentally shaped by language in a community. The language used to discuss moral ideas and ethical conundrums serves as a prism through which people view what is good and wrong. But since various languages may not have equivalent names for some moral concepts or may highlight alternative ethical goals, the diversity of languages poses special ethical issues.

Language's Role in Moral Judgment and Reasoning

Language serves as a conduit for the presentation, discussion, and resolution of moral predicaments. Previously acknowledged by ethical philosophers, language framing may elicit many moral meanings and affect ethical judgements. According to Geipel (2015), processing information in a foreign language reduced the severity and confidence of moral judgements and decreased the activation of social and moral standards during moral judgments. The CNI model of moral decision-making was utilized in this empirical investigation, and it indicated that learning a foreign language decreased sensitivity to consequences and sensitivity to norms without influencing general action inclinations. Nadarevic (2021), however, found discrepancies in his findings and was unable to reproduce the moral foreign-language impact. Therefore, language may affect moral judgements, but more research is needed to determine the full scope and underlying processes of this effect.

In the public sphere, how a problem is phrased may have a big influence on how people feel about it. For instance, Shulman (2017) found that adopting simple language in public opinion surveys resulted in higher ratings of political interest and efficacy than using complex language. According to a theory put out by Pérez (2016), language influences survey responses by making some political concepts easier for people to understand. It was discovered that interview language also affected the accessibility of concepts and heightened people's attitudes. Similarly, Goetz (2008) found that the words used to describe a policy can have an impact on how well-liked that program is, with some people stigmatizing and associating the term "affordable housing" with race. While prior research by Nelson in (1999) asserted that frames impact attitudes by changing the priority people give to problem-relevant beliefs, this study also found that framing may independently affect both belief content and importance, both of which affect issue opinion. The ethical ramifications of linguistic relativism are therefore brought to the forefront when taking into account how various languages present moral quandaries. As an illustration of the substantial impact that language has on ethical reasoning, discussions on issues like, assisted suicide, euthanasia, or abortion may greatly affect public perception and policy debates depending on the language deployed.

Ethical Implications of Linguistic Framing

Beyond philosophical discussion, ethical questions can have real-world implications for distinct cultural situations. Analyzing particular cases in which linguistic quirks have an ethical influence offers concrete illustrations of how language and morality are related. These cases highlight the nuanced ways in which language forms moral conundrums, impacts moral judgments, and generates a range of ethical sentiments. Cultural differences displayed in obtaining or expressing consent, as an illustration, shows remarkable differences between thought systems, in contrast to the explicit verbal style of expression common in the West, nonverbal clues and subtleties play a more major

part in indicating permission in a conservative Middle Eastern nation, for instance. Consequently, when handling intimate situations, in particular, this language and cultural mismatch might cause misunderstandings and moral quandaries. Therefore, cross-cultural comparison increases our awareness of ethical variety. It emphasizes the relevance of linguistic awareness in navigating ethical issues in a multicultural environment by highlighting how linguistic elements contribute to the construction of distinctive moral frameworks. We will examine the connection between language and social ontology in the parts that follow, looking at how language creates social identities and affects how we perceive the world at large.

Social Ontology and Language

The Social Construction of Reality Through Language

Our social reality is a linguistic construct, shaped by the words we use to describe and define it. Geertz's exploration of cultural interpretation and Foucault's analysis of power dynamics reveal the intricate relationship between language and social ontology. The words we choose not only describe our social reality but actively participate in its construction and preservation. The formation of our common world is significantly influenced by language as a social instrument. Language serves as a tool for social categorization and definition, influencing how we view the world and our role in it. Language is crucial in creating and maintaining social hierarchies, categories, and norms, eventually affecting the whole social structure. According to Mykhailiuk (2015), language not only expresses our thoughts but also forms them, and this has a significant impact on how we create reality. Language, according to Patton (2000), influences how people see things, what constitutes "reality," and how people communicate with one another. In addition, Beedham (2005) provides evidence that the way language is structured influences how we comprehend the world and that language shapes the reality we see. By using language to construct and act out their own roles, individuals may shape their own social scene, according to research into the function of language in society (Clair, 1982). On the other end of the spectrum, this construction's foundational element is the interaction between language and power. Social reality is significantly influenced by those who steer the conversation, define the terminology, and construct the narratives. Language may both reflect and serve as a tool for challenging or reshaping current power arrangements.

Identity Formation and Linguistic Expression

Language in addition for being an instrument of communication, is important for constructing and upholding one's identity. As a result of the intricate interaction of linguistic, cultural, and social elements, it helps to shape both individual and collective identities. The

idea of intersectionality emphasizes how language interacts with several facets of identity, including gender, race, and social class, to produce complex identities. The area has shown a great deal of interest in poststructuralist theories of language, identity, and power because they provide fresh views on language teaching and learning (Norton, 2011). With a focus on code-switching, dialect, and self-perceived language proficiency, Padilla (2016) investigates how language is used to express individual identity. She also discusses the connections between group membership and the languages that are significant to each group and the relationships between languages, dialects, and identities, paying particular attention to religious, ethnic, and national allegiances (Edwards, 2009). On a global scale, Higgins (2011) looks at the ways that globalizations affect language learners, including how transnationalism, intercultural interaction zones, and globalized media influence learners' identities as they pick up and utilize new languages. Evidently, language has a significant impact on how people and groups identify. Prospective case studies on the relationship between language use and identity construction offer specific illustrations of how language affects the creation and negotiation of identities in various cultural situations. The development and negotiation of identities across a variety of cultural settings heavily depends on linguistic expression, including language choice, accent, and code-switching. People use language as a potent instrument to establish, confirm, and modify their identities in response to cultural and societal reestablished conditions.

Social Ontology and Linguistic Categorization

Languages classify social relationships, positions and organizations, which aid in shaping how society is structured. The many address, honorific, and title forms employed in various cultures show the linguistic variety of social ontology. According to Searle (2008), institutional truths are logically antecedent to the objects themselves. His argument centers on the ontology of social entities and the function of language in establishing and sustaining such entities. These language classifications serve to maintain and reflect social norms, hierarchies, and expectations. In light of this, social ontology can benefit greatly from linguistic classification. The cognitive functions of various linguistic categories used to characterize people and their activities are examined in a significant earlier study by Semin (1988), who discovers that language mediates between social cognition and social reality. To understand social identity and the social world, categorization is therefore essential, and how categorization impacts identity depends on its effects and the ability of actors to make their identifications of other people matter (Jenkins, 2000). According to (Bickhard, 2008), social ontology is composed of a variety of hierarchical, interconnecting norms. This convention is patterned after one developed by David K. Lewis. Language impacts our perception of social roles and relationships, as revealed through comparative research of social ontology ideas across cultural boundaries. We get insights into the cultural intricacies of social organization by analyzing how various languages encode these notions.

Comparative Analysis of Social Ontology Across Cultures

By examining variations in language across cultures and navigating the nuances of cultural relativism and universalism, we delve into the complexities inherent in cross-cultural communication, enriching our appreciation for linguistic diversity. The considerable disparities in social ontology amongst language cultures are clarified through comparative research. It stresses how various linguistic systems provide various methods for classifying and identifying social entities. These language differences have significant effects on intercultural communication, teamwork, and social engagement. In an increasingly varied and linked society, understanding and accepting these distinctions in social ontology is essential for encouraging empathy and successful cross-cultural research and intercultural communication. It encourages us to approach social structures and identities with consideration for language quirks and cultural perspectives.

The comparative investigation of social ontology across linguistic cultures was examined in several academic works with an emphasis on how language affects social interactions and cross-cultural understanding. Language influences perception and cognition, especially social ontology, according to research based on Benjamin Lee Whorf's theory of linguistic relativity. Analyzing how language reflects and shapes cultural ideas and social realities is the focus of the area of cultural linguistics, which was founded by scholars like Anna Wierzbicka. according to research comparing honorifics and politeness techniques across languages, such as those of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, language choices reflect social ties and hierarchies. Language and culture interact to create social realities, and interdisciplinary studies at the junction of linguistics, anthropology, and sociology examine this interaction. These disciplines have benefited from the work of scholars like Susan Ervin-Tripp and Clifford Geertz. While scholars like Stuart Hall and James Paul Gee have explored the relationship between language usage and social identity in their research on language and identity.

In addition, the linguistic choices made in public discourse and educational institutions have an impact on how people conceive of their identities and social hierarchies, according to studies on language policy and multilingualism. Last but not least, Geert Hofstede contribution, a distinguished social psychologist and researcher from the Netherlands, well-known for his work on cultural factors and how they affect behavior in various cultures enriched cross-cultural research pallet. Even though Hofstede's study generally focuses on cultural issues, some of his findings have implications for how language and communication affect social ontology and intercultural dialogue. All these and other contributions testify to the power of linguistics in shaping our worldviews, including its theoretical contributions, real-world applications, and the significance of linguistic awareness in diverse circumstances, which will be discussed in the parts that follow.

Implications of Linguistic Framing

Theoretical Implications for Philosophy and Linguistics

In the real world, the implications of linguistic shaping are far-reaching and touch upon every aspect of our lives. In the context of contemporary issues, we see how language becomes a powerful tool in shaping belief systems, mobilizing movements, and influencing political landscapes. The implications extend to education and cross-cultural engagement, where language plays a pivotal role in shaping perspectives and fostering understanding. The following examples breathe life into the implications of linguistic shaping on our worldviews and construction of social ontology. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the choice of terminology significantly influenced public perception and response. The use of phrases like "social distancing" and "lockdown" conveyed a sense of urgency and necessity, while the term "Chinese virus" raised concerns about stigmatization and blame. This had profound implications for how the virus was framed to the public. In addition, discussions on Climate Change issues went from "Global Warming" to "Climate Crisis", the terminology used to describe climate change has shifted from "global warming" to "climate crisis" or "climate emergency" which has framed the issue as an immediate and urgent threat, affecting public discourse, policy, and activism as a result. Similarly, the discourse surrounding immigration, makes the distinctions between refugees vs. migrants. This distinction in media and political discourse has profound implications, because labeling individuals as "refugees" highlights their vulnerability and the need for protection, while categorizing them as "migrants" can downplay their dire circumstances. The same applies for the "Defund the Police" phrase used by the Black Lives Matter movement, which illustrates how language can shape public discourse. Supporters argue that it calls for reallocating funds to community services, while opponents perceive it as advocating for the complete abolishment of law enforcement.

Theoretically, philosophy and linguistics both benefit greatly from the study of linguistic shaping. It calls into question long-held beliefs about the objectivity of knowledge and morality, leading philosophers to reconsider key ideas like ethics, belief, and truth. It also contributes to linguistic theory by illuminating the processes through which language shapes social reality and affects cognition. According to Rastall (2000), knowledge of the boundaries of linguistic communication is crucial for metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of science, and ethics. Linguistic abilities are key to total semiotic activity and awareness, he claims. More than ever, linguistics' application to philosophy is crucial. Skepticism, realism, hermeneutics, and functionalism are choices for the philosophy of languages, according to Harris (1993). The linguistic change in philosophy transferred the emphasis from concepts of mind and experience from the seventeenth century to concepts of words, sentences, and meanings from the twentieth century (Koopman, 2011). The linguistic turn brought new issues into the philosophy of language, such as the study of contexts and premises of utterances, objectified language

structures, and the functions of language, as shown by an analysis of the role of non-classical philosophy of language in the study of linguistic reality by (Kornienko, 2022). As a result, linguistic shaping is a key component of philosophical conceptions of language, and a variety of philosophical questions need an understanding of the nature and constraints of linguistic communication. Linguistic philosophers explore topics related to epistemology, ethics, and social ontology using the insights into linguistic shaping. These observations help us comprehend how language and philosophy interact on a deeper level since they are based on the complex interaction between language and human cognition.

Practical Applications in Cross-Cultural Contexts

Understanding linguistic impacts has practical benefits in cross-cultural settings outside of academics. In diplomacy, international relations, and cross-border economic dealings, cultural sensitivity, which is cultivated via linguistic awareness, is essential. People and organizations may successfully traverse the complexities of other cultures by understanding how language forms worldviews. Crossing cultural barriers can be made easier by understanding linguistic factors. Since language reflects culture, learning a new language may help people become contributing members of society while also posing challenges for cross-cultural interactions (Ahtif, 2022; Yeung, 2012). In order to find cross-cultural variances, Gutiérrez (2016) offers a statistical approach that may uncover variations in viewpoints on typical themes among linguistic populations. In cross-cultural collaboration, communication failures can broaden our perspectives and foster more creativity (Nakakoji, 1996). For instance, the use of educational linguistics to encourage cross-cultural dialogue highlights the uniting power of language variety in a society that is dependent on all of its languages (Alatis, 1994). To this purpose, translation challenges cultural differences by including cultural aspects that can close the communication gap between source and destination texts (Sun, 2003). From this knowledge, practical cross-cultural communication techniques result. To establish rapport, negotiate, and work together in multicultural contexts, practitioners from a variety of areas can use linguistic sensitivity. This will ultimately result in more fruitful and peaceful interactions, as well as culturally sensitive and accurate cross-cultural research.

Education and Awareness About Linguistic Influences

It is crucial for educating students to be linguistically aware if they are to succeed in a multicultural world. Educational institutions must value linguistic variety and provide students with the resources needed for its understanding and management. Students can be given the ability to understand and negotiate linguistic variants in a multicultural environment by using a number of instructional approaches, such as mini-lectures, interactive lectures, reading, audio-visual resources, and group discussions (Pelekani, 2009).

According to Lado's (1970) "thought" perspective of language training, mind and language are separate yet connected. Additionally, Jackson (2020) suggests employing language analysis techniques like comparative linguistics and natural-language processing to shed light on issues relating to a variety of academic fields, including psychology.

Briefly expressed, educating others about how language affects mind may be accomplished through a range of techniques and approaches, and current developments in cognitive science and language analysis provide fresh avenues for its investigation and understanding. Promoting cultural competency via language proficiency creates a larger perspective of the world, a deeper regard for variety, and empathy for others. By fostering individuals who are well-rounded and culturally knowledgeable, it promotes critical thinking regarding the way ideas are expressed via language. Navigating a world that is becoming more linked and varied requires an understanding of the consequences of linguistic shaping, ranging from theoretical contributions to practical applications and pedagogical awareness. It promotes an all-encompassing knowledge of the intrinsic connection between language and social ontology.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this extensive article unknots the intricate tapestry woven by the interplay of language and philosophy. The importance of language has never been more pronounced, particularly with the surge of online communication and globalization. As we navigate this ever-evolving linguistic landscape, a call to action is declared, to stay informed, engage in linguistic awareness initiatives, interdisciplinary collaborations, and contribute to ongoing research. By doing so, we embark on a journey of understanding and navigating the profound linguistic shaping of our world, recognizing its implications on our united future. We examined the complex connections between language, epistemology, ethics, and social ontology throughout the whole study. We discovered that language is a basic factor that shapes our sense of reality as well as a means for communication. Cultural differences in language have also been proven to create various ethical paradigms, social realities, and epistemological frameworks, which bears significant weight on the ways in which cross-cultural research is understood, conducted and interpreted.

In a globalized environment, and progressively AI advanced world, studying the intricate interplay between philosophy and linguistics becomes a necessity. Particularly, the ethical discussions surrounding AI and language have emerged. Linguists, philosophers and ethicists will debate the responsibilities of AI developers, addressing concerns about bias, discrimination, and the potential for AI to shape societal values and norms through language. In addition, collaborations amongst linguists, philosophers, psychologists, and cultural theorists can shed more light on how language affects our social, ethical, and cognitive aspects. More generally, linguistic knowledge is essential for forging cross-cultural understanding and collaboration. It provides people and

businesses with the cultural competence required for successful diplomacy, effective international relations, and successful economic negotiations. Understanding the effects of linguistic impacts enables us to traverse the difficulties of a heterogeneous society with profound knowledge, compassion and understanding, leading to a more peaceful and ethical multicultural coexistence; In Ludwig Wittgenstein's wise words, "The limits of my language are the limits of my world".

References

- Ahtif, M.H., & Gandhi, N. (2022). The Role of Language in Cross Cultural Bonds. *Journal of Asian Multicultural Research for Social Sciences Study*. DOI:10.47616/jamrsss.v3i4.321
- Alatis, J.E. (1994). Educational linguistics, crosscultural communication, and global interdependence.
- Alexander, P.A., Winters, F.I., Loughlin, S.M., & Grossnickle, E.M. (2012). Students' Conceptions of Knowledge, Information, and Truth. *Learning and Instruction*, 22, 1-15. DOI:10.1016/J.LEARNINSTRUC.2011.05.004
- Altakhaineh, A.R., & Zibin, A. (2014). Perception of Culturally Loaded Words by Arab EFL Learners. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6, 1-22. DOI:10.5296/IJL.V6I3.4922
- Appiah, K. A. (2010). The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ardila, J.A. (2000). Linguistic Relativity in foreign Language Teaching: A didactic Proposal. *Informatica Didactica*, 12, 43-53. DOI:10.5209/DIDA.20514
- Athanasopoulos, P., Bylund, E., & Casasanto, D. (2016). Introduction to the special issue: new and interdisciplinary approaches to linguistic relativity. *Language Learning*, 66, 482-486. DOI:10.1111/LANG.12196
- Beedham, C. (2005). Language and Meaning: The structural creation of reality. DOI:10.1075/sfsl.55
- Beier, E.G., & Zautra, A.J. (1972). Identification of vocal communication of emotions across cultures. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 39 1, 166 . DOI:10.1037/H0033170
- Besemeres, M. (2004). Different Languages, Different Emotions? Perspectives from Autobiographical Literature. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25, 140 - 158. DOI:10.1080/01434630408666526
- Białek, M.J., Paruzel-Czachura, M., & Gawronski, B. (2019). Foreign language effects on moral dilemma judgments: An analysis using the CNI model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. DOI:10.1016/J.JESP.2019.103855
- Bickhard, M.H. (2008). Social Ontology as Convention. *Topoi*, 27, 139-149. DOI:10.1007/S11245-008-9036-1
- Björk, I., & Kavathatzopoulos, I. (2016). Robots, ethics and language. *ACM SIGCAS Computers and Society*, 45, 270 - 273. DOI:10.1145/2874239.2874277
- Bod, R. (2006). Is There Evidence for a Probabilistic Language Faculty. *Cognitive Science*, 28.
- Boroditsky, L. (2011). How language shapes thought. *Scientific American*, 304 2, 62-5 . DOI:10.1038/SCIENTIFICAMERICAN0211-62
- Brogaard, B. (2008). Moral Contextualism and Moral Relativism. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 58, 385-409. DOI:10.1111/J.1467-9213.2007.543.X
- Chabal, S., & Marian, V. (2015). Speakers of different languages process the visual world differently. *Journal of experimental psychology. General*, 144 3, 539-50 . DOI:10.1037/xge0000075
- Cibelli, E., Xu, Y., Austerweil, J.L., Griffiths, T.L., & Regier, T. (2016). The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and Probabilistic Inference: Evidence from the Domain of Color. *PLoS ONE*, 11. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0158725
- Cipolletti, H., McFarlane, S., & Weissglass, C. (2016). The Moral Foreign-Language Effect. *Philosophical Psychology*, 29, 23 - 40. DOI:10.1080/09515089.2014.993063
- Clair, R.N. (1982). Language and the social construction of reality. *Language Sciences*, 4, 221-236. DOI:10.1016/S0388-0001(82)80006-5
- Costa, A., Foucart, A., Hayakawa, S., Aparici, M., Apesteguia, J., Heafner, J., & Keysar, B. (2014). Your Morals Depend on Language. *PLoS ONE*, 9. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0094842
- Croft, W.B. (1998). Linguistic evidence and mental representations. DOI:10.1515/cogl.1998.9.2.151
- Cruz, H.D. (2009). Is linguistic determinism an empirically testable hypothesis. *Logique Et Analyse*, 208, 327-341.

- Deutscher, G. (2010). Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages. DOI:10.5860/choice.48-3114
- Dewaele, J. (2010). Emotions in Multiple Languages. *Modern Language Review*. DOI:10.1057/9780230289505
- Douglas, K.M., & Sutton, R.M. (2003). Effects of communication goals and expectancies on language abstraction. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84, 4, 682-96. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.682
- Dykstra, C., Lindbeck, G.A., McClendon, J.W., Murphy, N.C., Briggs, S., West, C., & Stout, J. (1989). *Ethics After Babel: The Languages of Morals and Their Discontents* by Jeffrey Stout. Boston, Beacon, 1988. 338 pp. \$27.50. *Theology Today*, 46, 55 - 73. DOI:10.1177/004057368904600109
- Edwards, J.R. (2009). Language and Identity: Introduction. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511809842.001
- Everett, C. (2013). Linguistic Relativity: Evidence Across Languages and Cognitive Domains. DOI:10.1515/9783110308143
- Fiedler, K. (2008). Language: A Toolbox for Sharing and Influencing Social Reality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 38 - 47. DOI:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00060.x
- Freeman, D.C. (1996). "To Take Them at Their Word": Language Data in the Study of Teachers' Knowledge. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 732-761. DOI:10.17763/HAER.66.4.3511321J38858H69
- Garimella, A., Mihalcea, R., & Pennebaker, J.W. (2016). Identifying Cross-Cultural Differences in Word Usage. *International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- Geipel, J., Hadjichristidis, C., & Surian, L. (2015). How foreign language shapes moral judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 59, 8-17. DOI:10.1016/J.JESP.2015.02.001
- Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (1994). *Semantic and lexical universals: Theory and empirical findings*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Goetz, E.G. (2008). Words Matter: The Importance of Issue Framing and the Case of Affordable Housing. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 74, 222 - 229. DOI:10.1080/01944360802010251
- Gottlieb, E., & Institute, M.L. (2007). Learning How to Believe: Epistemic Development in Cultural Context. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 16, 35 - 5. DOI:10.1080/10508400709336941
- Gutiérrez, E.D., Shutova, E., Lichtenstein, P., de Melo, G., & Gilardi, L. (2016). Detecting Cross-Cultural Differences Using a Multilingual Topic Model. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4, 47-60. DOI:10.1162/tacl_a_00082
- Hampton, J.A. (2002). Language' role in enabling abstract, logical thought. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 25, 688 - 688. DOI:10.1017/S0140525X02370122
- Harris, R. (1993). What is philosophy of linguistics. DOI:10.1016/B978-0-08-041937-4.50006-4
- Hayakawa, S., Tannenbaum, D., Costa, A., Corey, J.D., & Keysar, B. (2017). Thinking More or Feeling Less? Explaining the Foreign-Language Effect on Moral Judgment. *Psychological Science*, 28, 1387 - 1397. DOI:10.1177/0956797617720944
- Higgins, C. (2011). Identity formation in globalizing contexts : language learning in the new millennium. DOI:10.1515/9783110267280
- Hofer, B.K. (2008). Personal Epistemology and Culture. DOI:10.1007/978-1-4020-6596-5_1
- Hudson, R.A. (2004). Why education needs linguistics (and vice versa). *Journal of Linguistics*, 40, 105 - 130. DOI:10.1017/S0022226703002342
- Jackendoff, R. (1996). How language helps us think. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 4, 1-34. DOI:10.1075/PC.4.1.03JAC
- Jackson, J.C., Watts, J., List, J., Puryear, C., Drabble, R., & Lindquist, K.A. (2020). From Text to Thought: How Analyzing Language Can Advance Psychological Science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17, 805 - 826. DOI:10.1177/17456916211004899
- January, D., & Kako, E. (2007). Re-evaluating evidence for linguistic relativity: Reply to Boroditsky (2001). *Cognition*, 104, 417-426. DOI:10.1016/j.cognition.2006.07.008
- Jenkins, R. (2000). Categorization: Identity, Social Process and Epistemology. *Current Sociology*, 48, 25 - 7. DOI:10.1177/0011392100048003003
- Johansen-Berg, H. (2001). Language shapes thought. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5. DOI:10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01783-6
- Kay, P., & Kempton, W. (1983). What is the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis? *American Anthropologist*, 86, 65-79. DOI:10.1525/AA.1984.86.1.02A00050
- Koopman, C. (2011). Rorty's Linguistic Turn: Why (More Than) Language Matters to Philosophy. *Contemporary Pragmatism*, 8, 61-84. DOI:10.1163/18758185-90000183

- Kornienko, M.A. (2022). Thematic horizon of the study of linguistic reality: the context of non-classical philosophy of language. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Kul'turologiya i iskusstvovedenie*. DOI:10.17223/22220836/46/6
- Lado, R. (1970). Language, Thought, and Memory in Language Teaching: A Thought View*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 54, 580-585. DOI:10.1111/J.1540-4781.1970.TB02300.X
- Lambek, M. (2010). Ordinary Ethics: Anthropology, Language, and Action.
- Langland-Hassan, P., Faries, F.R., Gatyas, M., Dietz, A., & Richardson, M.J. (2021). Assessing abstract thought and its relation to language with a new nonverbal paradigm: Evidence from aphasia. *Cognition*, 211. DOI:10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104622
- Lucy, J. A. (1992). Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis. Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, J.A. (2016). 4. The Implications of Linguistic Relativity for Language Learning. DOI:10.21832/9781783094837-006
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Matsui, T., Yamamoto, T., & McCagg, P. (2006). On the Role of Language in Children's Early Understanding of Others as Epistemic Beings. *Cognitive Development*, 21, 158-173. DOI:10.1016/J.COGDEV.2005.10.001
- Mihatsch, W. (2004). Experimental Data vs. Diachronic Typological Data: Two Types of Evidence for Linguistic Relativity. DOI:10.1515/9783110197549.371
- Millie, J. (2012). Ordinary Ethics: Anthropology, Language, and Action. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 23, 117-118. DOI:10.1111/J.1757-6547.2011.00170.X
- Mykhailiuk, O., & Pohlod, H.Y. (2015). THE LANGUAGES WE SPEAK AFFECT OUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE WORLD. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 2, 36-41. DOI:10.15330/JPNU.2.2-3.36-41
- Nadarevic, L., Klein, L.C., & Dierolf, J. (2021). Does foreign language alter moral judgments? Inconsistent results from two pre-registered studies with the CNI model. *Open Psychology*, 3, 66 - 86. DOI:10.1515/psych-2020-0112
- Nakakoji, K. (1996). Beyond Language Translation: Crossing the Cultural Divide. *IEEE Softw.*, 13, 42-46. DOI:10.1109/52.542293
- Nelson, T.E., & Oxley, Z.M. (1999). Issue Framing Effects on Belief Importance and Opinion. *The Journal of Politics*, 61, 1040 - 1067. DOI:10.2307/2647553
- Neuman, Y., Turney, P.D., & Cohen, Y. (2012). How Language Enables Abstraction: A Study in Computational Cultural Psychology. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46, 129-145. DOI:10.1007/s12124-011-9165-8
- Niemeier, S., & Dirven, R. (2000). Evidence for linguistic relativity. DOI:10.1075/CILT.198
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44, 412 - 446. DOI:10.1017/S0261444811000309
- Nuyts, J. (2001). Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. DOI:10.1075/hcp.5
- Padilla, C.A. (2016). Language and Identity. DOI:10.4324/9781315673158-17
- Paivio, A. (1974). Language and Knowledge of the World1. *Educational Researcher*, 3, 12 - 5. DOI:10.3102/0013189X003009005
- Patton, M.Q. (2000). Overview: Language matters. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2000. DOI:10.1002/ev.1168
- Pelekani, C. (2009). Language-teaching methodology. *International Journal of Teaching and Case Studies*, 2, 193. DOI:10.1504/IJTC.2009.031062
- Pérez, E.O. (2016). Rolling off the Tongue into the Top-of-the-Head: Explaining Language Effects on Public Opinion. *Political Behavior*, 38, 603 - 634. DOI:10.1007/s11109-015-9329-1
- Perlovsky, L.I. (2009). 2009 Special Issue: Language and emotions: Emotional Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. *Neural Networks*, 22, 518-526. DOI:10.1016/J.NEUNET.2009.06.034
- Rastall, P. (2000). A linguistic philosophy of language.
- Renzl, B. (2007). Language as a vehicle of knowing: the role of language and meaning in constructing knowledge. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 5, 44-53. DOI:10.1057/palgrave.kmrp.8500126
- Rumsey, A. (2010). Ethics, Language, and Human Sociality.
- Sautera, D.A., Eisner, F., Ekmand, P., & Scott, S.K. (2010). UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository) Cross-cultural recognition of basic emotions through nonverbal emotional vocalizations.
- Savcı, E. (2017). Language and social knowledge. *Ethnography*, 18, 57 - 67. DOI:10.1177/1466138115592416
- Schalley, A.C., & Zaefferer, D. (2007). Ontolinguistics: How Ontological Status Shapes the Linguistics Coding of Concepts. DOI:10.1515/9783110197792

- Searle, J.R. (2008). Language and social ontology. *Theory and Society*, 37, 443-459. DOI:10.1007/S11186-008-9068-Y
- Semin, G.R., & Fiedler, K. (1988). The cognitive functions of linguistic categories in describing persons: Social cognition and language. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 558-568. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.558
- Semin, G.R., Görts, C.A., Nandram, S.S., & Semin-Goossens, A. (2002). Cultural perspectives on the linguistic representation of emotion and emotion events. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 11 - 28. DOI:10.1080/02699930143000112
- Shulman, H.C., & Sweitzer, M.D. (2017). Varying Metacognition Through Public Opinion Questions: How Language Can Affect Political Engagement. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 37, 224 - 237. DOI:10.1177/0261927X17707557
- Sidnell, J., & Enfield, N.J. (2012). Language Diversity and Social Action. *Current Anthropology*, 53, 302 - 333. DOI:10.1086/665697
- Skerrett, D.M. (2010). Can the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis save the planet? Lessons from cross-cultural psychology for critical language policy. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11, 331 - 340. DOI:10.1080/14664208.2010.534236
- Slobin, D. (2003). Language and thought online: cognitive consequences of linguistic relativity.
- Sun, Y. (2003). Translating cultural differences. *Perspectives-studies in Translatology*, 11, 25-36. DOI:10.1080/0907676X.2003.9961459
- Toohey, K. (2018). The Onto-Epistemologies of New Materialism: Implications for Applied Linguistics Pedagogies and Research. *Applied Linguistics*. DOI:10.1093/APPLIN/AMY046
- Trudgill, P.W., Gordon, E., Lewis, G., & MacLagan, M. (2000). Determinism in new-dialect formation and the genesis of New Zealand English. *Journal of Linguistics*, 36, 299 - 318. DOI:10.1017/S0022226700008161
- Wallentin, M., & Frith, C.D. (2008). Language is shaped for social interactions, as well as by the brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 31, 536-537. DOI:10.1017/S0140525X0800527X
- Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. MIT Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wolff, P., & Holmes, K.J. (2011). Linguistic relativity. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews. Cognitive science*, 2 3, 253-265 . DOI:10.1002/wcs.104
- Yeung, A.S., Brown, E.L., & Lee, C. (2012). Communication and language : surmounting barriers to cross-cultural understanding.
- Zyl, H.V., & Meiselman, H.L. (2015). The roles of culture and language in designing emotion lists: Comparing the same language in different English and Spanish speaking countries. *Food Quality and Preference*, 41, 201-213. DOI:10.1016/J.FOODQUAL.2014.12.003

Sanac Ejebli, is a doctoral student in philosophy at the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences within Mohamed I University. She also holds a Master's degree in Communication, Culture and Translation, obtained in 2018 at the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences. Her research areas tackle the following interests: Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Cross-cultural research, linguistics, Communication and Translation studies. She is a member of the Applied Communication in Context Laboratory. She is currently teaching English for undergraduates in the major of Science of Information and Communication at University Mohamed I. (S.eljebli@ump.ac.ma)