

Unlocking the Power of Language: Navigating Linguistic Diversity in Cross-Cultural Research

Sanae Ejebli,*

Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, University Mohamed I, Oujda 60000, Morocco

Received: 06.01.2024 • Accepted: 15.02.2024 • Published: 22.02.2024 • Final Version: 28.02.2024

Abstract: In the expansive realm of cross-cultural and intercultural research, the power of language lies in its direct and indirect influence on scholarly investigations and outcomes. This paper investigates the intricate relationship between language, culture, and interpretation. It unveils the transformative power of language in modifying communication styles, influencing study outcomes, and shaping societal perspectives. The challenges posed by diverse languages are addressed while concurrently providing valuable guidance to research enthusiasts to enhance research methods, minimize linguistic prejudice, and foster empathy within society. Through insightful instances and case studies, it vividly portrays the notable impact linguistic variations have on the communication and results of cross-cultural research while signaling potential zones for upcoming multicultural exploration regarding lingual philosophy.

Keywords: Linguistic diversity, Cross-cultural research, Cultural sensitivity, Research ethics, Linguistic bias.

1. Introduction

In the global landscape of intercultural research, the dynamic interplay between language, culture, and interpretation takes center stage. Language, as a powerful force, holds the key to understanding and navigating the complexities of cross-cultural studies. Language is a transformative force, shaping how we express ourselves, understand others, and conduct research. It goes beyond mere communication, becoming a lens through which, we interpret and analyze the world. By understanding the transformative power of language, researchers can unlock new dimensions in their studies and contribute to a more nuanced understanding of cross-cultural dynamics. Cross-cultural study has become an essential tool for comprehending the intricacies of our global civilization in today's interlinked global society. Underneath this thrilling endeavor, however, is a significant yet sometimes disregarded factor: the huge impact of linguistic variation. This introduction delves into the importance of linguistic philosophy in cross-cultural situations. It sets forward the main argument of the study, which is that linguistic variations have a significant impact on the communication and results of cross-cultural research.

Language is a mere tool for communication, it is a reflection of culture, identity, and cognitive processes. The philosophy of language assumes utmost significance in the setting of cross-cultural inquiry. It acts as the filter through which we view and interact with people from various cultures. The many nuances of language, such as its grammar, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, offer a

* Sanae Ejebli: S.eljebli@ump.ac.ma

singular window into a culture's ontology. For researchers to undertake insightful and culturally aware cross-cultural comparisons and analyze intercultural communication dynamics, a thorough awareness of the enormous impact that language has on cognition and perception is imperative. Due to variations in linguistic and cultural conventions, unpacking the interwoven nature of language and culture can be difficult. Language and communication, according to Hennink (2008), are essential to qualitative research, but cross-cultural research has particular difficulties that call for the support of interpreters and translators as “cultural brokers.” Understanding a language's meanings requires analyzing and comprehending that language's distinctive culture; as language serves as a marker of cultural identity. According to Gao (2006), differences in talk, pacing, intonation, indirectness, and other aspects of communication can lead to misunderstandings in cross-cultural communication (Peng, 2016).

The idea of cross-cultural communication has evolved through time from being formed by culture to shaping culture (Claes, 2009), and language philosophy impacts cross-cultural communication by affecting how people understand and interpret language and cultural norms. While communication and language are essential instruments for qualitative research, cross-cultural research presents particular difficulties that may compromise the validity and rigor of the study. In a study by Choi (2012), the difficulties of translating concepts between languages are highlighted, as well as the need for a hermeneutical expansion in cross-cultural philosophy to close the hermeneutical gap with its subjects of study (Berger, 2017). Therefore, it is crucial to comprehend language and communication to carry out a thorough cross-cultural study. The central aim of our investigation is that communication and research outcomes in cross-cultural studies are greatly influenced by linguistic disparities. The credibility of our study is impacted by the languages we use, the subtleties of translation, and the cultural meanings ingrained in words and phrases. These linguistic nuances have the potential to either narrow or widen the cultural gap, which has an impact on the reliability of data collection, the interpretation of results, and the success of cross-cultural collaboration. Unlocking the full potential of cross-cultural research requires first acknowledging this basic assumption.

1.1. Overview of the Paper's Structure

This work is divided into the following sections to comprehensively analyze the complex interactions between linguistic diversity and cross-cultural research. We start by summarizing the body of research on the use of language in cross-cultural research, emphasizing major findings and knowledge gaps. A thorough theoretical framework is provided in this part that combines cross-cultural psychology, linguistic anthropology, and philosophy of language. We explore practical examples that show how language variety might affect research outputs and communication in various cross-cultural situations through a series of informative case studies. The core questions of the paper are how language shapes our research approach and influences outcomes, and how linguistic diversity presents both challenges and opportunities for scholars. To efficiently navigate linguistic diversity in cross-cultural research, practical insights, and recommendations will be offered to researchers and practitioners near the end. The main points of each section will then be summed up, emphasizing how crucial it is to continue recognizing language diversity in cross-cultural research. To develop a more complex and culturally sensitive strategy for international research and collaboration, the main goal is to provide an in-depth exploration of the complex relationship between language and cross-cultural research.

2. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Language in Cross-Cultural Research

2.1. Semantics Across Cultures

The perception of reality is shaped by the nuances that language has as a complicated communication system. When one engages in cross-cultural research, where the meaning of words and phrases significantly changes, these nuances become especially apparent. Language has broad, low, close-to-the-ground roots, as Edward Sapir correctly observed, and is not an abstract creation of the learned or of dictionary makers. Rather, it is something that results from the work, needs, ties, joys, affections, and tastes of long generations of humanity. In a study by Machery (2004), reference intuitions were examined in Westerners and East Asians, and it was discovered that there are cultural differences in semantic intuitions, which is important when evaluating translation equivalency in cross-cultural studies. Goddard and Wierzbicka (2013) looked at important expressions from several lexical areas in a variety of languages and discovered that semantics differed throughout domains, languages, and cultures. While semantics differ throughout cultures, there can be inherent characteristics of language usage that are common to all.

2.2. Cross-Cultural Semantic Variations

Different languages possess remarkably different connotations for the same word. The word “time” for example, is frequently viewed as a scarce resource in English, and the proverb “time is money” captures this viewpoint. However, several Indigenous cultures emphasize harmony over urgency because they view time as cyclical and intertwined with nature. The interpretation of data in cross-cultural analysis may be significantly impacted by this variation. Participants from these various linguistic and cultural backgrounds, for instance, may react differently when surveying period management, eventually producing biased results. Collectively, these linguistic and cultural occurrences imply that many cultures have various ways of understanding the same terms. Both Garimella (2016) and Hu (2017) employed computational techniques to find terms with notable cross-cultural usage variations. Since the observed findings in these differences reflect various cultural values, it is necessary to compare cultures from a perspective that is not culturally biased (Wierzbicka, 1990). In this context, Hale (2014) emphasizes the need for clearer standards and guidelines by focusing on the challenges that translators confront while addressing cross-cultural disparities in legal situations, for instance. According to this line of reasoning, there are cultural variances in word perception that are impacted by context and cultural values.

2.3. Implications for Research

Cross-cultural semantic differences bear significant consequences for research. To prevent misconceptions and prejudices, researchers must be acutely aware of these disparities. Translation problems arise when multilingual surveys are used for research. The interpretation of survey questions by respondents might vary depending on minute semantic differences across languages. For instance, the semantic meaning of a word like “sustainability” may vary from language to language, influencing the validity and reliability of the survey across cultures. To evaluate dimensions like personality characteristics or psychological well-being, researchers in cross-cultural psychology frequently employ standardized psychological assessment methods, downplaying the power of change, contextual variations, and situational factors. These research procedures may induce cultural bias if the semantic subtleties of each are not properly explored and tailored for many cultures. For instance, in certain cultures, a question concerning “self-esteem” may not have an analogous term, which might result in misunderstandings or incorrect responses. Researchers may

find cross-cultural semantic differences in respondents' ideas or attitudes throughout the data processing process. There may not be a perfect translation equivalence used to convey a specific viewpoint in another culture; and so, in analyzing the data and making cross-cultural comparisons, researchers must consider these variances.

In qualitative research, techniques like focus group interviews, and cross-cultural semantic disparities may reduce the effectiveness of communication between researchers and participants. If a question is phrased in one language but has no clear equivalent in another, the researcher may need to alter their communication strategy and take additional steps to ensure understanding. Depending on the society, social science concepts like “happiness”, “family”, and “justice” may have different cultural and semantic ramifications. When assuming that these structures share common knowledge, researchers must proceed with caution. Lexical variations in how these concepts are interpreted and applied in various cultures may even be relevant to ethical research issues like informed consent and confidentiality. Since misunderstandings might result in ethical lapses, researchers need to make sure that ethical concepts are adequately communicated and are sensitive to cultural differences. Accordingly,

Interdisciplinary cooperation is frequently included in cross-cultural studies. Conducting thorough analyses and integrating data might be difficult due to semantic differences in language and concepts throughout fields. Hence, semantic alignment and effective communication are essential for cross-disciplinary research. In a 2004 study, Machery discovered that there are differences between East Asians' and Westerners' intuitions regarding reference, demonstrating that different cultures have different semantic intuitions. Similar to Goddard (2003), who examined cross-linguistic variance in “thinking” discourse and identified six aspects of variability, these include various ethnotheories of the person and various cultural scripts that may support or undermine specific modes of thought. Additionally, Maclay (2007) covered the cross-cultural use of semantic difference, a psychological tool that may show where every word is situated in a conceptual space with meanings as its dimensions. This could help account for variations and difficulties encountered in obtaining the entire equivalency. Therefore, cross-cultural semantic differences affect multidisciplinary research as well as the development of theories of reference in interdisciplinary research.

2.4. Pragmatic Considerations

In addition to semantics, pragmatics of language is of equal importance for cross-cultural communication. Context, implicature, and the unwritten laws that guide dialogue all fall under the heading of pragmatic variables. When diverse pragmatic standards collide, these factors further complicate verbal interactions and can result in misunderstandings. To bridge the gap between their cultural perceptions and those of the target culture, learners must acquire an awareness of cultural variations in language usage, including speech actions, social deixis, and etiquette (Liddicoat, 2014). Similarly, Austin (1998) underlined the value of cross-cultural pragmatic knowledge in communication and offered examples from Japanese to show how it aids students in creating meanings. Peng (2016) highlighted eight factors that might lead to a breakdown in cross-cultural communication, including conversation, silence, pauses, and indirectness. Davies (2004) highlighted three interconnected conversational style factors that are significant. As a result, pragmatic competence and awareness are crucial for successful cross-cultural communication and can aid in bridging linguistic barriers in cross-cultural research.

2.5. The Role of Context

The interpretation of utterances is substantially shaped by context, both social and contextual. Consider a scenario in which respondents from various Arabic-speaking nations are asked about the distribution of household work. In certain situations, even though their actual behavior differs, individuals' appropriacy supports established gender norms for social desirability reasons. Accordingly, when analyzing replies, experts must take into account the social environment and societal expectations. Follow-up interviews, for instance, are necessary for a thorough knowledge of gender roles and the underlying social dynamics. From another perspective, it could be difficult for a researcher to understand how Arabic-speaking families understand their duties and obligations because Arabic has a rich family language with distinctions based on social ties and hierarchies, which carries significant weight on the analysis. Researchers must thus manage the contextual changes in language when addressing family dynamics since it might have a significant influence on the research. For instance, the title "aunt" may denote varying levels of intimacy and accountability in various cultures, particularly in Arabic-speaking countries. Consequently, language interpretation depends heavily on context, which Allan (2018) divides into three categories: the world being discussed, the situation of utterance, and the situation of interpretation. How can an addressee detect what information a communicator wishes to transmit through an utterance? is a question posed by Sinclair (2012). Paying close attention to the process might reveal more about the objectives and ideological positions of participants when investigating the idea of contextualization in translation and interpreting (Baker, 2006). Sanford (2002) provides evidence that lexical meaning access is a graded process and that a word's contribution to the meaning of a phrase relies on its applicability to the context and the sentence's main points. Simply said, context is a key element in language interpretation and has a significant impact on the translation and interpretation of data in cross-cultural research.

2.6. Misunderstandings Due to Pragmatic Norms

The relevance, quality, and quantity of communication are stressed by the Gricean Maxims although these adages might be used differently in different cultures. For instance, whereas explicitness is valued in certain cultures, indirectness is prioritized in others as a sort of politeness. Communication breakdowns may occur if these various pragmatic rules are not acknowledged, and Grice's communication guidelines might not apply to all social contexts as a result. According to Cutrone (2015), Grice's maxims might not always be accurate because Japanese EFL speakers lack sociolinguistic English proficiency, and it can be difficult for them to communicate with people from other cultures. Similarly, Herawati (2013) found that although Indonesian culture frequently adheres to Grice's maxims, there are some instances where speakers purposefully disregard or intentionally break them due to high context culture, communication harmony, and social norms of communicative politeness. Yang Jun (2011) suggests that Grice's maxims, for instance, can be adapted to the teaching of writing, but readers' interpretations of the maxims may vary. Although Vogel (2013) shows that the cooperative principle and its guiding principles of relevance, quality, and quantity are derived from the multi-agent decision theory, this does not mean that they are universally applicable. Grice's principles may therefore need to be altered or interpreted differently depending on the cultural context.

In addition, pragmatism has a significant positive impact on our understanding of written materials. Practical methods like the relevance theory (Sinha, 2021), speech act theory, conversational implicature, and politeness theory can be useful for the study of literary texts. Because speakers and writers frequently mean much more than they say or write and want their listeners or

readers to understand them, Igiri (2000) contends that the concept of the speaker or author's intended meaning is crucial in the study of pragmatics. Carston (2016), on the other hand, makes a distinction between imaginative engagement with the imagery of an utterance, which has private importance, and language rules, which communicate public propositional meaning. Pragmatic interpretation, according to Sperber (2002), entails an inferential process in which the hearer infers the speaker's intended meaning from the information supplied, which calls for the use of suitable contextual presumptions. All in all, pragmatic standards including a common environment, values, social norms, and worldview influence how written texts are interpreted, which is extremely important for cross-cultural research. Finally, it should be noted that the semantics and pragmatics of language are complex aspects of cross-cultural studies that need careful consideration. The validity of study findings can be questioned and successful communication in a variety of contexts can be hampered by a failure to recognize the enormous influence of language variances and pragmatic norms among cultures. To guarantee that their work respects and fairly depicts the complex tapestry of human expression and interaction across cultures, researchers must attempt to comprehend these subtleties on a deeper level.

3. Linguistic Relativism and Its Impact

Language serves, not only as a means of communication but as a lens through which we view and create our reality. According to Benjamin Lee Whorf and Edward Sapir's theory of linguistic relativism, language molds our cognitive functions and affects how we think and see the world. Whorf stated that "We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages". This theory provides a conceptual framework for comprehending the tremendous impact that language has on cognition, perception, and ultimately cross-cultural studies. However, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which contends that language affects thought, is a contentious subject. Cibelli (2016) contends that probabilistic inference might assist in elucidating the controversy around the hypothesis and offers a model that takes into account language-consistent biases in English speakers' color memory reconstruction. Skerrett (2010), on the other hand, looks at cross-cultural psychology studies to see the amount to which the hypothesis can be demonstrated to be accurate, and she concludes that language seems to have a significant impact on how individuals categorize, evaluate, and recall the environment. In previous work, Kay (1983) provides experimental support for a weaker form of the hypothesis than is often put out in the field of color perception. The Sapir-Whorf theory may have some support from research, notably in the area of color vision, although the magnitude of its effect on thought is still a matter of debate.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which asserts the two major concepts of linguistic relativity and linguistic determinism, is at the heart of the theory of linguistic relativism. The latter strong version implies that our ability to think is fully influenced by language. Whorf asserts that "Language shapes the way we think, and determines what we can think about". In essence, various languages create unique cognitive realities that can constrain or broaden our mental horizons. Although there is some proof that probabilistic language systems exist, according to Bod (2006), learning is improved by probabilistic grammar since language is a probabilistic system. Cruz (2009) explores the argument over whether language affects how we see the world and if people who speak various languages have distinct conceptions of reality; which remains a subject of debate. According to Trudgill (2000), dialect mixture and new-dialect development are not random processes and linguistic and demographic data may be used to anticipate how the mixture will exhibit. Croft (1998), on the other hand, argues that the evidence can only narrow the range of potential mental representations when considering the mental representations of grammatical and lexical knowledge based on introspective

linguistic data. The degree of linguistic determinism is still up for discussion, even though probabilistic language systems and the impact of language on cognition are supported by research.

Language does affect and shape the mind, but it does not dictate it, according to the weaker theory of linguistic relativity. Whorf believed that “We can never fully understand a culture without first understanding its language”. Here, language is viewed as a lens through which we perceive the world and have experiences. Seven categories of hypotheses concerning the potential influences of language on the mind are identified by Wolff (2011), who finds evidence in favor of the idea that language may make some distinctions harder to avoid and that it can enhance some forms of thinking. Nevertheless, January (2007) details six unsuccessful efforts to replicate a significant discovery in the literature on linguistic relativity and concludes that the Whorfian hypothesis is not supported by the original report. Niemeier (2000) nevertheless provides evidence that language and culture may affect cognition and discourse, including data from language production, interpretation, and change as well as evidence from other domains. The link between language and thinking is still a complicated issue and a source of doubt. Current discoveries on linguistic relativity are varied, helping to address the question of whether the language one speaks impacts how one thinks.

3.1. Linguistic Relativism in Cross-Cultural Research

There is continuous discussion over whether language relativism may be used in cross-cultural research. While some studies say that language has a significant impact on cognition, others claim it has a more modest effect. The concept of linguistic relativism has significant effects on cross-cultural study. According to Gales (2003), organizational behavior theories and notions are frequently adapted from American culture and language and may not apply to other cultures. Similarly, Hennink (2008) points out that while language and communication are crucial to qualitative research, they become more complicated in cross-cultural study and demand careful consideration. When working with participants from different backgrounds, researchers must be aware of their preconceptions and biases. They must also conduct research that is sensitive to cultural differences (Ford, 2008). In addition, Temple (2002) emphasizes the difficulties of utilizing interpreters and translators in cross-language research as well as the significance of taking concept meanings into account and communicating differences. To guarantee that their techniques are suitable and rigorous, researchers must make efforts to ensure that they are aware of the cultural and language background of their study.

The idea that language limits thought, however, is called into question by the existence of general concepts. For instance, research on infant cognition has shown that infants already have some basic cognitive skills, such as object permanence and fundamental numerical concepts, suggesting that language is not solely responsible for these cognitive processes. The picture is further complicated by the language phenomenon. Depending on the language they are using, fluent people can easily switch between cultures and acquire a variety of mental patterns. This suggests that language is not a fixed determinant, although it does affect thought. In conclusion, language relativism is a framework for thought that emphasizes the complex relationship between language and thought in cross-cultural research. Although it is undeniable that language has some influence on cognition, continuing research and discussion continue to focus on its extent. For researchers attempting to conduct cross-cultural studies that are accurate and sensitive to their culture, understanding the role of language relativism is essential because it emphasizes the importance of appreciating the rich diversity of languages and how it affect human cognition and perception.

4. Translation Challenges in Cross-Cultural Research

4.1. Challenges and Nuances

While linguistic diversity enriches our cultural tapestry, it introduces challenges in cross-cultural research. Navigating diverse languages requires a keen awareness of potential pitfalls, biases, and misunderstandings that may impact the validity of study outcomes. Translation is a complex ballet that requires circumnavigating a rich variety of languages, cultures, and worldviews. It is not just a mechanical procedure of changing words from one language to another. Gregory Rabassa, a famous translator, once stated “Translating literature is like trying to kiss someone through a pane of glass”. The challenge of translating research materials, concepts, and questions while maintaining their integrity is made more difficult in the field of cross-cultural research. While cross-cultural research has several challenges, the ones related to translation specifically lodge in the majority. Pea (2007) underlines the need to take into account functional, cultural, and metric equivalents in addition to language equivalence to assure the validity of cross-cultural research. Similarly, Sechrest (1972) points out that it's crucial to achieve equivalence in translations of orienting instructions and task replies and that language, idiom, and concepts need to be taken into account. Similarly, Al-amer (2015) emphasizes the significance of a clear and methodical approach to translation to preserve credibility and guarantee cultural sensitivity. On the other hand, Choi (2012) underlines the value of communication between the researcher and translator as well as the challenge of locating a qualified translation. Hence, to ensure the validity and reliability of cross-cultural research, translation is a complicated process that calls for careful consideration of language, cultural, and conceptual aspects.

There are several difficulties involved in translating research materials. Think of translating a psychological test that measures a certain quality, like “resilience”. Another language or culture does not directly translate the notion of resilience. To accurately convey the meaning of a term, translators must make thoughtful decisions and may need to combine many words or phrases. This raises the prospect of minor changes in interpretation and meaning. Additionally, colloquial phrases, analogies, and cultural allusions in research materials might create problems with translation. The term “the elephant in the room” from an English questionnaire, for instance, would need to be translated into another language because different languages may not share the same idiom. If these nuances are not handled carefully, misinterpretations are inevitable. Translation problems might cause misunderstandings that have a substantial impact on the results of the study. For instance, translating the term “risk aversion” may be necessary for research on cross-cultural attitudes about risk. The concept of risk aversion could be conveyed differently in other languages, which could affect how participants respond. These differences may lead to biased statistics and inaccurate representations of the topic's cultural perspective. The process of translation is interwoven with culture and involves more than mere language. Cross-cultural research might lose its authenticity when cultural nuances that are ingrained in the language are lost or changed during the translation process of different cross-cultural methods. Cultural nuances are embedded in language, and words and phrases that have a strong cultural connection to their original cultures are frequently found in languages. For instance, the Japanese term “tsundoku” describes the practice of buying books and letting them accumulate unread. This expression captures a certain cultural attitude toward literature. It might be difficult to adequately represent the depth of the cultural background involved in their usages while translating such terms.

4.2. Role of Cultural Experts

Cultural specialists must be included to effectively handle the intricacies of cultural subtleties in translation. These specialists can assist close the language gap and have a thorough awareness of the target culture. They can offer guidance on how to modify study topics, materials, and questions to make sure they are pertinent and appeal to participants' cultures. Translation should also take into account cultural variances. Three strategies are put out by Yang (2014) to address cultural issues in translation: literal translation with cultural explanation, loan translation, and faithful translation. Alwazna (2014) makes the case for a middle ground by employing a double-strategy as a cultural translation technique that tries to both maintain the substance of the source text in the target text and produce a target text that the target reader can understand. According to Al-Dosari (2013), teaching students how to translate literary corpora from the culture of the target language into Arabic culture helps Saudi EFL learners understand the cultural characteristics of the literary eras to which the writings belonged. Furthermore, Al-Sofi (2019) reaffirms that culture is at the core of translation and that an in-depth comprehension of the cultural context of the text is a must for successful translation. Translators should thus offer culture the respect it deserves during the translating process. In conclusion, there are several difficulties with translation in cross-cultural research, including language complexities and cultural quirks. To ensure that research materials are accurately and sensitively translated, researchers must be aware of the degree of complexity involved and seek the advice of both seasoned translators and cultural specialists. In doing so, they will be better fit to negotiate the challenging landscape of cross-cultural research and produce insights that respect and appreciate the variety of human experiences and perspectives.

5. Conceptual Frameworks and Cultural Presuppositions

5.1. Impact on Research Questions

The foundation of each research project is its specific set of research questions. They influence an investigation's scope, direction, and objectives. However, the process of developing research questions is not uniform; language and cultural variations have their place of significance. As previously stated by Franz Boas "Culture determines the questions that are asked and the answers that are sought". As a result, language and culture carry a huge significance in how study questions are constructed. According to Harzing's (2003) findings, questionnaire language can affect response patterns, with respondents unconsciously changing their answers to match the cultural values associated with that language. In his (2014) study of the language used in experimental research questions in doctoral dissertations on applied linguistics, Lim discovered that candidates use a variety of expressive resources to formulate their inquiries. He also offered suggestions for how to prepare teaching materials to show how research queries can be created using relevant, real-world examples used by PhD writers. To fully understand the role of context in language learning research, Wendt (2002) argued that qualitative research techniques are required to look into how mental processes transform reality into contexts. Similar ideas were discussed in Gabel (2000), which emphasized the dynamic nature of survey language use and the significance of language in every stage of the survey life cycle, including question formulation, data collection, and interpretation.

5.2. Influence of Linguistic and Cultural Differences

Variations in the phrasing of research questions can result from language nuances. How does family impact adult behavior, for instance, according to a study of family dynamics? How do people contribute to the harmony of the family in an individualistic culture as opposed to a collectivist

culture? The emphasis on differences in this instance is a reflection of the societies' particular cultural values and priorities. The following case studies illustrate the cultural perspectives. Researchers from the Eastern perspective might concentrate on individual behaviors and decisions in a study on environmental sustainability, asking questions like, "What drives people to adopt eco-friendly practices?" Researchers from an Aboriginal culture, on the other hand, may draw attention to the environment as a whole by asking, "How does the society's relationship with nature affect environmental restoration efforts?" Study questions can be very diverse when looking into healthcare access. Researchers may wonder, "How do individuals manage the healthcare system?" in a culture where self-reliance is strongly valued. On the other hand, "What part does the extended family play in ensuring healthcare access for its members?" might be a question in an environment where communal support is essential. Researchers may also work to prevent overgeneralizations and simplification of the study's communities. To study different communities respectfully and holistically, researchers ought to avoid oversimplification or broad generalizations.

5.3. Cultural Presuppositions in Methodology

The implicit assumptions and ideas that are part of a culture are known as cultural presuppositions, and they have a big impact on research methods. They have an impact on how studies are designed, how data is collected, and how the results are interpreted. Thus, cultural assumptions influence study design in a variety of ways. In the case of international cross-cultural management research, Sackmann (2004) contends that various political, economic, and social contexts have shaped preexisting conceptions of culture, giving rise to various assumptions about culture that have influenced research methodologies and research questions. Additionally, Scott-Findlay (2005) contends that organizational culture influences how practitioners use research and provides leadership tactics that managers may find useful in promoting evidence-based practice. Additionally, Kim (2022) contends that culturally sensitive research design is crucial for the legitimacy of knowledge production in Comparative, International, Developing, and Educational (CIDE) contexts and that research strategies that bridge the hegemonic versus alternative research dichotomy strengthen the validity of studies in the field of Social Sciences. To generate and develop alternative options toward the development of a culturally anchored methodology that strikes a balance between the demands for rigor and sensitivity, Hughes (1993) also highlighted the need to carefully examine and expose the underlying cultural assumptions at each step of the research process. Cultural assumptions have a wide range of effects on research. Cultural norms surrounding privacy, communication methods, and the appropriateness of certain questions, for instance, might differ greatly when it comes to data gathering. Data may be distorted or lacking if a query is viewed as invasive in one culture but innocent in another. Cultural presuppositions can influence how facts are analyzed and interpreted in a study. Researchers could unintentionally insert their cultural perspectives into the data, overlooking crucial subtleties and insights that fit the cultural context of the participants.

5.4. Effect on Data Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation

The impact of cultural presuppositions can be shown by research on mental health stigma in various cultural contexts, for instance. In a Western society, where openness is prized, researchers may create a survey with straightforward questions regarding attitudes about getting mental health care. Participants may give replies that are socially acceptable in a context where mental illness is stigmatized, hiding their genuine opinions. The procedure of gathering data is heavily influenced by cultural preconceptions regarding mental health, which might result in findings concerning stigma

levels that are not correct, and researchers may find it challenging to understand the nuances of cultural expressions and the context-specific interpretations of replies during the analysis phase. Therefore, the inclination to homogenize or oversimplify cultural diversity is dangerous. In summary, cultural presuppositions have a huge impact on research at every level, from the creation of research questions to the gathering, analyzing, and interpreting of data. To conduct reliable, culturally sensitive research that respects the distinct individuality and values of the cultures under study, researchers must always be on the lookout for and address these presuppositions.

6. Language, Power, and Cross-Cultural Dynamics

6.1. Language as a Tool of Power

In cross-cultural settings, language may be used as an instrument of power and domination in addition to serving as a method of communication. In cross-cultural studies, language plays a critical role in determining power relations. According to Fitzgerald (2004), research should be carried out in a way that acknowledges the participants' strong positions and voices. Usunier (2011) proposes that language can be used as a resource to assess cross-cultural equivalence in quantitative management research, whereas Hennink (2008) emphasizes the significance of language and communication in cross-cultural research and the need to address language and communication issues that underlie the entire research process. In research interviews, particularly in Confucian countries, Kim (2022) highlights the significance of identifying sociocultural circumstances and their effects on power interactions. Therefore, it is crucial to carefully address linguistic and cultural settings while doing cross-cultural research to prevent the perpetuation or amplification of power dynamics. People or groups frequently employ speech in cross-cultural interactions to assert dominance or control. Language Gatekeeping is just one example of how this may be exhibited. In some situations, people or organizations may use a specific language to restrict access to knowledge. For instance, English-language academic journals are frequently viewed as more exclusive, supporting English as the primary academic language while ignoring others who believe they are unworthy of recognition. Language also has a different kind of energy dynamic and influence in operational contexts. The use of a specific language for formal communication in international organizations or government institutions can elevate its status and give speakers of that language authority. In the end, this results in social imperialism, in which dominant cultures impose their language on subordinate cultures, eradicating native languages and strengthening cultural hierarchies.

6.2. Implications of Linguistic Hierarchies

Cultural and social inequality can be sustained through linguistic hierarchy. When English is used as the main language of communication in international diplomacy, for instance, non-English speaking countries may be marginalized and their ability to influence international events may be constrained. Furthermore, in a heterogeneous society, people who speak the prevailing language may have an unfair advantage over those who do not. As a result, linguistic hierarchy influences how cross-cultural research is carried out. According to Claes (2009), over time, the idea of intercultural communication has changed from being formed by culture to creating culture. According to Gales (2003), organizational constructions and theories are also products of culture, hence caution must be exercised when conducting cross-cultural study on issues that have their roots in a particular culture. The difficulties of obtaining conceptual equivalency between two languages in cross-cultural research, particularly in translation, are further highlighted by Choi (2012). Harzing (2005)

discovered that the language of the questionnaire affects answer patterns and that using the same language (English) while responding across nations homogenizes replies and hides country variations. As a result, linguistic hierarchies significantly influence how cross-cultural research is carried out, and researchers need to be mindful of the possibility that language and culture will have an impact on their study.

6.3. Linguistic Imbalances in Research

In cross-cultural research, the linguistic balance between researchers and participants is a crucial variable that can have a big influence on the process and conclusions. Language limitations between researchers and participants can have a major effect on the quality of the study, introducing power imbalances and ethical problems. In particular, Squires (2009) discovered that much cross-language qualitative research failed to adhere to guidelines for generating reliable results, such as admitting translation as a study restriction and utilizing the proper methodological frameworks. While acknowledging a rise in studies on language obstacles in healthcare, Schwei (2016) argued that these studies should go beyond just identifying these barriers and instead concentrate on the impact of language-concordant treatment on patient outcomes. To ensure that people with language barriers have a voice in the evidence influencing healthcare practice and policies, Squires recommended rigorous cross-language research methods, including the proper use of interpreters and legitimately translated survey instruments. Premji (2018) also suggested a tool to help funding organizations and qualitative researchers take language barriers into account when conducting research. To raise the caliber of research, researchers must therefore methodically address the scientific problems relating to language barriers between researchers and participants. The power imbalance impact on research dynamics is one of the difficulties that may occur when experts and participants do not speak the same language. Language-speaking researchers may have more influence, which could result in biased data collection and understanding. Additionally, language barriers may cause research questions to be misunderstood, leading to inaccurate answers and data further reinforcing linguistic divides.

6.4. Linguistic Discrimination and Research Ethics

Researchers have to remedy linguistic inequalities morally. It is against fairness and justice principles to discriminate against people based on their language or to give one language priority over another. For instance, researchers who insisted on conducting interviews solely in English barred a sizable segment of the community from participation in a healthcare study that involved immigrants who did not understand English. This not only distorted the results but also prompted moral issues about inclusion and justice. Inaccurate results may be the consequence of linguistic biases in study questions and data-gathering techniques. According to Clark (1973), researchers frequently fall victim to the language-as-fixed-effect fallacy, which can result in major mistakes when extrapolating results from the particular sample of language materials used. Egger (1997) discovered that reviews and meta-analyses had an English language bias because writers were more willing to publish randomized controlled trials in English-language publications if the results were statistically significant. Additionally, Abu-Shanab (2013) emphasized a statistically significant difference in the results of surveys conducted in Arabic and English, indicating that the language employed in a study might affect the findings. In addition, Yuan (2021) talks about linguistic bias in visual question responses, which weakens the model's resilience and has a negative effect on real-world applications. These and other studies emphasize how crucial it is to recognize language biases

in research and take precautions to prevent them from getting accurate results. This is because language biases in research questions and data collection techniques can produce erroneous results.

For instance, Messner (2017) discovered that linguistic response bias might taint market research surveys in India, resulting in nonrandom measurement errors. Additionally, Gal's (2016) study demonstrates that the language of feedback surveys can directly affect the outcomes, resulting in a bias in the replies. Researchers during the entire research process must take linguistic biases into account when developing research questions and data-gathering techniques to ensure accurate results. The inclusion of researchers who are proficient in the participants' language can improve communication and lessen power disparities, therefore researchers should think about joining multilingual research teams to address these linguistic imbalances. Individuals can also be sure to fully comprehend the research process and questions by using interpreters and translating and interpreting study materials. In summary, language has a strong influence on power dynamics in research and cross-cultural contexts. To ensure that their study respects the voices of all participants, regardless of language background, researchers may be keenly aware of language imbalances, constantly work to address them, and abide by ethical principles.

7. Ethical Considerations in Cross-Cultural Research

7.1. Informed Consent and Cultural Sensitivity

The cornerstone of ethical research is informed consent, which ensures that subjects participate fully and willingly in study activities. However, obtaining informed permission while retaining cultural sensitivity can be particularly difficult in cross-cultural investigations. As Margaret Mead put it, "To keep from being entangled in someone else's intellectual baggage you must understand that your data is your own, and can only be used in your way". Ethical considerations in informed consent are never a one-size-fits-all idea to be given. The way consent is sought and granted is influenced by social variations. The conversation techniques employed in research may be taken into account by researchers. For instance, immediate verbal consent may be seen as hostile or disrespectful in some cultures. Nonverbal cues, like nodding or remaining silent, may be more effective at expressing assent. Additionally, there is a hierarchy of decision-making because social norms frequently specify who has the power to grant consent. Even if a single participant agrees, family or community leaders may still need to be consulted in hierarchical societies. Researchers can use a variety of techniques to ensure social sensitivity when obtaining informed consent using materials that have been historically tailored, translating consent forms into the languages of the participants, and making sure they are appropriate for the target culture. Furthermore, explaining complicated ideas using visual aids or narrative techniques is advisable. To direct the consent process and encourage respectful participation from participants, there should also be community involvement and interaction with local community leaders or social experts in the research process.

Linguistic discrimination might have ethical repercussions in cross-cultural research, which results in unfair treatment, as it may reject or marginalize participants based on their language competency. This problem has to be addressed by researchers to guarantee linguistic equality in research procedures. The consequences of linguistic discrimination are exclusion; because participants who do not speak the dominant language may be excluded from the study, and linguistic prejudice can lead to exclusion, reducing the generalizability of findings. Language problems may cause people to misread research questions or informed consent forms, which might compromise the integrity and morality of the study. This could also result in misunderstandings and conflict at later stages.

7.2. Guidelines for Promoting Linguistic Equality

Researchers should take into account several tactics that may be employed to guarantee that all languages are given equal weight in their study to foster linguistic equality in research methods. Im (2016) argues that building a network of potential collaborators, reviewing guidelines, establishing rules and procedures for translation, examining existing language versions of instruments, and establishing rules for authorship beforehand can all be used to mitigate some of the difficulties that come with conducting cross-cultural research. According to Holmes (2013), researchers must take into consideration the interactions and research environments that multilingual research fosters. To assess test and item comparability, Sireci (2010) advises a comprehensive examination of the translation procedure as well as statistical analysis of test and item response data. Schembri (2022), on the other hand, emphasizes the significance of recording ethically relevant methodological information on language usage and promotes publication methods that favor the inclusion and prominence of L1 data. Consequently, the elimination of linguistic prejudice and a comprehensive awareness of cultural variances in informed consent processes are both necessary for ethical concerns in cross-cultural research. Therefore, researchers need to handle these difficulties with tact, respect, and dedication to fair and inclusive research techniques that value the many opinions and viewpoints of all participants.

8. Practical Guidelines for Researchers

Conducting ethical and relevant research requires effective cross-cultural communication. To successfully traverse the linguistic tapestry, researchers must place a high priority on clarity, cultural sensitivity, and adaptation of the culture under study. Additionally, spending time getting to know the individuals' cultures and languages too prevents misunderstandings and misinterpretations; it is important to be familiar with cultural norms, beliefs, and communication methods. Moreover, it is important to choose the language in study materials and questions that is simple and unambiguous and to avoid language that can be difficult to interpret or understand, such as jargon, idioms, and complicated sentence patterns. Before conducting the study, research materials should be tested with members of the target culture or linguistic group. Potential linguistic or cultural hurdles might be exposed during this procedure, allowing for any required corrections. Including team members who are conversant in the languages or cultures of the participants is also crucial, for they can help with interpretation, translation, and cultural oddities. Participants should also be encouraged to seek clarification or ask questions, and be open to their comments and feedback. Research findings may contain bias and inaccuracy due to linguistic factors. Through cooperative and inclusive research approaches, researchers must be proactive in reducing its impact. One of the practical strategies to be employed is investing in qualified translation and interpretation services to guarantee that participant communication is accurate and clear. Moreover, it is also important to choose the language in study materials and questions that is simple and unambiguous, and allowing them to select the language of engagement is preferred. For effective research results, collaborating with researchers from the target culture can offer insights, social sensitivity, and language proficiency. This will surely create equitable research questions and methodologies that can be used with a variety of linguistic backgrounds.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, this article has unraveled the complexities of navigating linguistic diversity in cross-cultural research. From the transformative power of language to the challenges posed by linguistic diversity, and from strategies for effective communication to the tangible impact on fieldwork findings, the journey through these themes highlights the nuanced interplay between language and cross-cultural research. As scholars continue to unlock the power of language, embracing its diversity and challenges, they open doors to a more comprehensive understanding of the rich cultural tapestry that defines our interconnected globalized world. In addition, we have looked at how semantics, pragmatics, linguistic relativism, difficulties with translation, power dynamics, and the ethical issues that affect translation. The recognition that linguistic variations considerably influence study findings and communication in cross-cultural research was at the heart of our investigation. This paper has served to emphasize the significance of appreciating and valuing linguistic variety as a necessary component of carrying out thorough and sensitive research in our globalized society. Researchers may establish deeper connections, unearth subtle discoveries, and contribute to a more egalitarian and inclusive global research community by embracing the diversity of linguistic nuances in cross-cultural research investigations. Prospective research could focus on studying the changing role of technology in bridging linguistic gaps, such as machine translation and artificial intelligence.

References

- [1] Abu-Shanab, E.A., & Nor, K.M. (2013). The influence of language on research results. *Management research and practice*, 5, 37-48.
- [2] Al-amer, R.M., Ramjan, L.M., Glew, P.J., Darwish, M., & Salamonson, Y. (2015). Translation of interviews from a source language to a target language: examining issues in cross-cultural health care research. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 24 9-10, 1151-62. DOI:10.1111/jocn.12681
- [3] Al-Dosari, H. (2013). Effects of Using Culture-laden Texts on Culture-specific Translation Skills in Arab Students. DOI:10.20429/CR.2013.040103
- [4] Allan, K. (2018). Getting a grip on context as a determinant of meaning. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-72173-6_9
- [5] Al-Sofi, B.B., & Abouabdulqader, H. (2019). Bridging the gap between translation and culture: towards a cultural dimension of translation. *International journal of linguistics, literature, and culture*. DOI:10.21744/ijllc.v6n1.795
- [6] Alwazna, D.R. (2014). The Cultural Aspect of Translation: The Workability of Cultural Translation Strategies in Translating Culture-Specific Texts.
- [7] Austin, T.Y. (1998). Cross-cultural pragmatics-building in analysis of communication across cultures and languages: examples from Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 326-346. DOI:10.1111/J.1944-9720.1998.TB00580.X
- [8] Baker, M. (2006). Contextualization in translator- and interpreter-mediated events. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 321-337. DOI: 10.1016/J.PRAGMA.2005.04.010
- [9] Berger, D.L., Moeller, H., Raghuramaraju, A., & Roth, P.A. (2017). Symposium: Does Cross-Cultural Philosophy Stand in Need of a Hermeneutic Expansion? DOI:10.2979/jourworlphil.2.1.09
- [10] Carston, R. (2016). Linguistic Conventions and the Role of Pragmatics. *Mind & Language*, 31, 612-624. DOI:10.1111/MILA.12122
- [11] Choi, J., Kushner, K.E., Mill, J.E., & Lai, D.W. (2012). Understanding the Language, the Culture, and the Experience: Translation in Cross-Cultural Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11, 652 - 665. DOI:10.1177/160940691201100508
- [12] Claes, M. (2009). The linguistic shift in cross-cultural studies: culture in discourse. *European J. of Cross-cultural Competence and Management*, 1, 66. DOI:10.1504/EJCCM.2009.026734
- [13] Clark, H.H. (1973). The language-as-fixed-effect fallacy: A critique of language statistics in psychological research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 12, 335-359. DOI:10.1016/S0022-5371(73)80014-3

- [14] Cutrone, P. (2015). Examining Potential Sources of Miscommunication between Japan and the West: Using Grice to Bridge the Sociolinguistic Gap for Japanese EFL Learners.
- [15] Davies, C.E. (2004). Developing awareness of crosscultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. *Multilingua-journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 23, 207-231. DOI:10.1515/MULT.2004.010
- [16] Egger, M., Zellweger-Zähner, T., Schneider, M., Junker, C., Lengeler, C., & Antes, G. (1997). Language bias in randomised controlled trials published in English and German. *The Lancet*, 350, 326-329. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(97)02419-7
- [17] Fitzgerald, T. (2004). Powerful Voices and Powerful Stories: reflections on the challenges and dynamics of intercultural research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 25, 233 - 245. DOI:10.1080/0725686042000315740
- [18] Ford, D.Y., Moore, J.L., Whiting, G.W., & Grantham, T.C. (2008). Conducting Cross-Cultural Research: Controversy, Cautions, Concerns, and Considerations. *Roeper Review*, 30, 82 - 92. DOI:10.1080/02783190801954924
- [19] Gabel, T.J., & Sha, M.M. (2020). The Essential Role of Language in Survey Research. DOI:10.3768/rtipress.bk.0023.2004
- [20] Gal, Y., & Gal, A. (2016). Knowledge Bias by Utilizing the Wording on Feedback Questionnaires: A Case Study of an Israeli College. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 7, 753-770. DOI:10.1007/S13132-015-0244-9
- [21] Gales, L. (2003). Linguistic Sensitivity in Cross-cultural Organizational Research: Positivist/Post-positivist and Grounded Theory Approaches. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 3, 131 - 140. DOI:10.1080/14708470308668097
- [22] Gao, F., & Weinan (2006). Language is Culture – On Intercultural Communication.
- [23] Garimella, A., Mihalcea, R., & Pennebaker, J.W. (2016). Identifying Cross-Cultural Differences in Word Usage. *International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- [24] Goddard, C. (2003). Thinking across languages and cultures: Six dimensions of variation. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 14, 109-140. DOI:10.1515/COGL.2003.005
- [25] Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A.M. (2013). Words and Meanings: Lexical Semantics Across Domains, Languages, and Cultures. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199668434.001.0001
- [26] Hale, S. (2014). Interpreting culture. Dealing with cross-cultural issues in court interpreting. *Perspectives*, 22, 321 - 331. DOI:10.1080/0907676X.2013.827226
- [27] Harzing, A. (2003). The use of English questionnaires in cross-national research.
- [28] Harzing, A. (2005). Does the Use of English-language Questionnaires in Cross-national Research Obscure National Differences? *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 5, 213 - 224. DOI:10.1177/1470595805054494
- [29] Hennink, M. (2008). Language and Communication in Cross-Cultural Qualitative Research. DOI:10.1007/978-1-4020-8567-3_2
- [30] Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principle: Is Grice's Theory Suitable to Indonesian Language Culture? *Lingua Cultura*, 7, 43-48. DOI:10.21512/lc.v7i1.417
- [31] Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2013). Researching multilingually: New theoretical and methodological directions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 285-299. DOI:10.1111/IJAL.12038
- [32] Hu, T., Song, R., Abtahian, M.R., Ding, P., Xie, X., & Luo, J. (2017). A World of Difference: Divergent Word Interpretations Among People. *International Conference on Web and social media*. DOI:10.1609/icwsm.v11i1.14911
- [33] Igiri, O.T., Onyekachi, A.J., & Chukwuemeka, O.M. (2020). Pragmatics: The Study of Its Historical Overview, Meanings, Scope and The Context In Language Use.
- [34] Im, E., Kim, S., Tsai, H., Nishigaki, M., Yeo, S.A., Chee, W., Chee, E., & Mao, J.J. (2016). Practical issues in multi-lingual research. *International journal of nursing studies*, 54, 141-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.02.008
- [35] Kim, G. (2022). Sociocultural contexts and power dynamics in research interviews: Methodological considerations in Confucian society. *Qualitative Research*. DOI:10.1177/14687941221110189
- [36] Li, Y., & Tian, J. (2010). Evolution of the Chinese Classifiers That Modify the Tree Name Nouns. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 11, 62-65. DOI:10.3968/N
- [37] Liddicoat, A.J. (2014). Pragmatics and intercultural mediation in intercultural language learning. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 11, 259 - 277. DOI:10.1515/ip-2014-0011
- [38] Lim, J.M. (2014). Formulating research questions in experimental doctoral dissertations on Applied Linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 35, 66-88. DOI: 10.1016/J.ESP.2014.02.003

- [39] Machery, E., Mallon, R., Nichols, S., & Stich, S. (2004). Semantics, cross-cultural style. *Cognition*, 92, B1-B12. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2003.10.003
- [40] MacLay, H.S., & Ware, E.E. (2007). Cross-cultural use of the semantic differential. *Behavioral science*, 6, 185-90. DOI:10.1002/BS.3830060303
- [41] Messner, W. (2017). Market research in India: does the choice of language cause questionnaire contamination? *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 9, 149-168. DOI:10.1108/JIBR-09-2016-0100
- [42] Peña, E.D. (2007). Lost in translation: methodological considerations in cross-cultural research. *Child development*, 78 4, 1255-64. DOI:10.1111/J.1467-8624.2007. 01064.X
- [43] Peng, X. (2016). The Pragmatics in Cross-Cultural Communication. DOI:10.2991/ICPEL-16.2016.8
- [44] Premji, S., Kosny, A., Yanar, B., & Begum, M. (2019). Tool for the Meaningful Consideration of Language Barriers in Qualitative Health Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 30, 167 - 181. DOI:10.1177/1049732319856303
- [45] Sackmann, S.A., & Phillips, M.E. (2004). Contextual Influences on Culture Research. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4, 370 - 390. DOI:10.1177/1470595804047820
- [46] San Cristóbal G., M.M. (2022). Culturally Responsive Research Design as Complement to Hegemonic Paradigms in the Comparative, International, Development Educational Context. *International Journal of Higher Education*. DOI:10.5430/ijhe. v11n4p220
- [47] Sanford, A.J. (2002). Context, Attention and Depth of Processing During Interpretation. *Mind & Language*, 17, 188-206. DOI:10.1111/1468-0017.00195
- [48] Schembri, N., & Jahić Jašić, A. (2022). Ethical issues in multilingual research situations: a focus on interview-based research. *Research Ethics*, 18, 210 - 225. DOI:10.1177/17470161221085857
- [49] Schwei, R.J., Del Pozo, S., Agger-Gupta, N., Alvarado-Little, W., Bagchi, A.D., Chen, A.H., Diamond, L.C., Gany, F., Wong, D.P., & Jacobs, E.A. (2016). Changes in research on language barriers in health care since 2003: A cross-sectional review study. *International journal of nursing studies*, 54, 36-44. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.03.001
- [50] Scott-Findlay, S.D., & Golden-Biddle, K. (2005). Understanding How Organizational Culture Shapes Research Use. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 35, 359-365. DOI:10.1097/00005110-200507000-00008
- [51] Sechrest, L.B., Fay, T., & Zaidi, S. (1972). Problems of Translation in Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 3, 41 - 56. DOI:10.1177/002202217200300103
- [52] Sinclair, M. (2012). The effects of context on utterance interpretation: Some questions and some answers. DOI:10.5842/22-0-503
- [53] Sinha, K.K. (2021). The Role of Pragmatics in Literary Analysis: Approaching Literary Meaning from a Linguistic Perspective. DOI:10.47631/IJECLS.V2I2.211
- [54] Sireci, S.G. (2010). Cross-Cultural Research Methods in Psychology: Evaluating Test and Survey Items for Bias Across Languages and Cultures. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511779381.011
- [55] Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, modularity and mindreading. DOI:10.1111/1468-0017.00186
- [56] Squires, A.P. (2009). Methodological challenges in cross-language qualitative research: a research review. *International journal of nursing studies*, 46 2, 277-87. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.08.006
- [57] Squires, A.P., Sadarangani, T.R., & Jones, S.A. (2019). Strategies for overcoming language barriers in research. *Journal of advanced nursing*. DOI:10.1111/jan.14007
- [58] Temple, B. (2002). Crossed Wires: Interpreters, Translators, and Bilingual Workers in Cross-Language Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12, 844 - 854. DOI:10.1177/104973230201200610
- [59] Usunier, J. (2011). Language as a resource to assess cross-cultural equivalence in quantitative management research. *Journal of World Business*, 46, 314-319. DOI: 10.1016/J.JWB.2010.07.002
- [60] Valdez, D., & Goodson, P. (2020). Language Bias in Health Research: External Factors That Influence Latent Language Patterns. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 5. DOI:10.3389/frma.2020.00004
- [61] Vogel, A., Bodoia, M., Potts, C., & Jurafsky, D. (2013). Emergence of Gricean Maxims from Multi-Agent Decision Theory. *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- [62] Wendt, M. (2002). Context, Culture and Construction: Research Implications of Theory Formation in Foreign Language Methodology. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15, 284 - 297. DOI:10.1080/07908310208666652
- [63] Wierzbicka, A.M. (1990). Cross-cultural pragmatics and different values. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 43-76. DOI: 10.1075/ARAL.13.1.03WIE
- [64] Yuan, D. (2021). Language bias in Visual Question Answering: A Survey and Taxonomy. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.08531.