



From Emotion to Expression: The AL-DL-CL Framework for Understanding Communication in the Age of AI and Digital Media

Chacko P. George

Sound Frame, India

ARTICLE INFO

KEYWORDS

language emergence; unconscious processing; cultural language; psycholinguistics; language acquisition; cognition; feedback loops

HOW TO CITE

P.George, C. (2026). From Emotion to Expression: The AL-DL-CL Framework for Understanding Communication in the Age of AI and Digital Media. International Journal of Civilizations Studies & Tolerance Sciences, 3(2), 87-95.

<https://doi.org/10.54878/kv7hww10>

ABSTRACT

Rapid progress in digital media and artificial intelligence is transforming human communication, facilitating the rapid exchange of messages and minimizing the chances of reflective interpretation. Existing theories in linguistics, psychology, and cultural studies address the structural, cognitive, or social aspects of language, yet fail to explain how emotional processing, internal linguistic structuring, and culturally mediated communication function as a coherent, dynamic system. Through this model, the authors present the AL-DL-CL framework that explores how three layers are engaged in a process that results in communication, through a recursive interaction between the Automatic Layer (AL), the Deliberate Layer (DL), and the Cultural Language Layer (CL). In such a process, the affective or unconscious processes in AL are consistently reframed into structured internal representations via DL, and through CL, and translated back into culturally-expressed language serves as a feedback mechanism, with a tendency to modify cognition and emotional response. Based on a multi-method exploratory approach of sequential cultural transmission, clinical case study analysis, and group-based validation, the results indicate that language is not so much a static container for meaning as a process of reconstruction that is molded by the dynamic interaction between emotion, cognition, and culture. This model also demonstrates how digitally mediated communication can amplify AL-directed reaction and limit DL-level thinking, which increases the potential for misinterpretation, polarization, or misinformation. The AL-DL-CL framework provides guidance in a unified theoretical perspective around language emergence, responsible AI design and digital literacy and intercultural discourse based on the continuous transformation system of communication, and not on the linear encoding.



Double-blind peer review by independent reviewers.

Received: 03 Jul 2026, Accepted: 14 Nov 2026, Published: 04 Dec 2026

*Corresponding author: chacko-george@outlook.com

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee Emirates Scholar Center for Research & Studies, UAE.

Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

1. Introduction

Language is commonly explained as a well-organized system of symbols following grammatical and socially shared rules; its cognitive and learning roots are still partly fused across psychology, linguistics and neuroscience. First, linguistic systems that are used in learning to think are the basis of language acquisition theory. Previous theoretical literature usually focuses on intrinsic structural functions (Chomsky, 1965), interaction- and frequency-based knowledge acquisition (Tomasello, 2003), and the internalization of social speech into thought (Vygotsky, 1978). Although such viewpoints provide valuable insights into a subject, they are seldom put together into a coherent perspective that accounts for the dynamic interactions among unconscious affective processes, conscious linguistic structuring, and cultural transmission over the course of development.

The Framework.

Here we propose the AL-DL-CL framework as an integrative model of cognition and language emergence. The model suggests three interacting layers: Automatic Layer (AL) consisting of pre-verbal, affective, and implicit processes (emotion, imagery, and intuition) formed by implicit memory systems; Deliberate Layer (DL) that integrates internal experience into structured thought (reflection, internal language); and Cultural Language Layer (CL) that reflects social constructions of communication systems, evolving through time (Geertz, 1973; Saussure, 1983). The AL-DL-CL framework is proposed as an exploratory integrative heuristic model intended to synthesize affective, cognitive, and cultural dimensions of communication, rather than as a replacement for existing linguistic or psychological theories

1.2 Dynamic Process.

Rather than seeing language as a static representational system, the AL-DL-CL framework treats it rather like a system of feedback loops in a dynamic process. Affective and implicit signals created in AL are processed through DL and externalized via CL through both the functional structural and implicit effects resulting from this, and culturally mediated language acts in turn through processing to rewire cognition with the perception to shape perception, belief, and emotional regulation. Thereby, this bidirectional engagement is consistent with the findings from psycholinguistics and cognitive neuroscience that demonstrate an ongoing coupling between the influence of emotion, cognition, and

language systems via interaction (Prystauka et al., 2023; Trueswell, 2023). It essentially provides a cohesive story of how internal psychological states manifest as disciplined language and how language ultimately reconstitutes cognition as it develops. This article advances the AL-DL-CL framework as a combined model describing how emotional cognition, reflective cognition, and cultural language are co-produced from a recursive system of human communication—namely, in digital contexts.

1.3 Gap Filling.

The AL-DL-CL framework promotes theories that are previously grounded by explicitly treating communication as a recursive process of multiple levels of change, whereby affective states are gradually transmuted into structured language through cultural feedback. While Noam Chomsky emphasizes innate linguistic organization, Lev Vygotsky explores social internalization, and usage-based models promote interactional learning, these theories often conceptualize emotion, cognition, and language as some separate domains or as a series of sequential factors. These do not explain fully how emotion is actively involved in real-time language formation, how internal linguistic structuring mediates this process, and how culturally transmitted language flows back to reorganize cognition and affect in the same dynamical framework. Second, the AL-DL-CL model aims to be a comprehensive framework that examines how language is made, and meaning is dynamically reconstructed across people, contexts, and digitally mediated spaces. The AL-DL-CL framework is proposed as an exploratory integrative heuristic model intended to synthesize affective, cognitive, and cultural dimensions of communication, rather than as a replacement for existing linguistic or psychological theories

2 Theoretical Background

The AL-DL-CL framework is a development of interdisciplinary research in the fields of psychology, linguistics, and cognitive science, all of which have long worked to understand how internal mental processes give rise to structured language and how language, in turn, dictates cognition. A classic psychodynamic approach highlighted the unconscious workings driving expression, particularly through means of symbolic leakage (slips of the tongue, dream imagery) (Freud, 1901/1960; Jung, 1964). These viewpoints suggest that pre-verbal or non-conscious material may show itself indirectly in communication, but they do not prescribe formal mechanisms by which unconscious processes may be

connected to language structure. Cognitive and developmental theories, on the other hand, have been concerned with how language is generated and is internalized via social interchange. Vygotsky (1978) suggested that external social speech is internalized developmentally and internalized (within), usage-based approaches claim that language occurs through repeated involvement and pattern learning (Tomasello, 2003). Nativist theories, e.g. Universal Grammar, also propose that humans have innate structural abilities which limit language acquisition (Chomsky, 1965). Yet these perspectives vary so as to how they conceptualise the association of cognitive, affective, and linguistic formation. Recent psycholinguistic and neuroscientific evidence has emphasised the dynamic interaction of emotion, cognition, and language production. As previously mentioned, affective states influence semantic processing and linguistic analysis, and hence, the emotional and linguistic systems can always interact (Prystauka et al., 2023). Furthermore, developmental and processing-based studies emphasize that language acquisition is an ongoing predictive and interactive process shaped by both internal cognition and external input (Trueswell, 2023; Abashidze et al., 2023). Within cultural theory, language is also regarded as a socially constructed symbolic system embedded within shared meaning structures and historical transmission (Saussure, 1983; Geertz, 1973). Cultural evolutionary viewpoints further argue that cognition itself is structured by socially transmitted symbolic systems, actively involving perception and meaning-making processes (Henrich, 2015; Mesoudi, 2016). The neuroscientific evidence also aligns with the notion that cultural environments can shape cognitive processing and neural organization over time (Żuromski & Pacholik-Żuromska, 2024). Nevertheless, we are still missing a conceptual link between unconscious affective processing, conscious linguistic structuring, and cultural transmission, and the present work can hardly be considered a whole in which such are incorporated. The AL-DL-CL model is intended to fill this gap by integrating the Automatic Layer (AL), Deliberate Layer (DL), and Cultural Language Layer (CL) in a hierarchical yet bidirectional fashion. In this model, we draw on theories of psychodynamics, psycholinguistics, cognitive neuroscience, and cultural anthropology to explain how inner states are converted to language, and how language recursively reconstructs cognition across the developmental trajectory.

3. Methodology

An exploratory multi-method study, we explore the AL-DL-CL framework as a system of dynamic interaction

that involves affective processes (AL), internal linguistic structuring (DL), and culturally mediated communication (CL) in developing language. Due to the theoretical aspect of the framework and because of the dearth of existing operational measures for its components, the approach is developed in such a way that converges evidence across complementary approaches, not individual causal testing. To maximize analytical precision, three methodologically different yet conceptually aligned approaches were pursued: (1) sequential cultural transmission analysis, (2) structured clinical case interpretation, and (3) affective validation in groups. Such triangulated approach is suited for study of AL-DL-CL dynamics in interpersonal, cognitive, and socio-cultural dimensions

3.1 Research Questions (RQs)

- RQ1: How do unconscious/affective processes (AL) influence the formation of conscious linguistic representations (DL) during language production?
 RQ2: What role does the Deliberate Layer (DL) play in translating internal states into culturally structured language (CL)?
 RQ3: How does exposure to cultural language (CL) feed back into and reshape internal cognitive and affective processes (DL → AL) over time?
 RQ4: Does language development in children follow a progressive transition from AL (pre-verbal affective states) to DL (internal linguistic structuring) to CL (external communication)?
 RQ5: How do disruptions in AL-DL or DL-CL pathways manifest in language performance and communication patterns?

Because the AL-DL-CL framework is exploratory and integrative in nature, the present study does not attempt direct causal verification of isolated variables. Instead, the methodology seeks convergent evidence across complementary observational and interpretive approaches capable of capturing recursive interactions among affective, cognitive, and cultural processes.

3.2 Hypotheses

H₁(AL → DL influence): Affective and unconscious AL states significantly influence DL-level linguistic output, such that emotional priming alters semantic selection and sentence formation.

H₂(DL mediation hypothesis): DL functions as a mediating system between AL and CL, such that stronger internal linguistic structuring (e.g., clarity of inner speech) results in more coherent and context-appropriate external communication.

H3(CL feedback hypothesis): Repeated exposure to Cultural Language (CL) produces measurable changes in both DL (internal representations) and AL (implicit beliefs, emotional responses), consistent with internalization processes in language acquisition.

H4(Developmental progression hypothesis): Language development follows a staged progression: AL-dominant (pre-verbal affective processing) → DL emergence (inner speech and symbolic structuring) → CL mastery (socially shared linguistic communication).

H5(Disruption hypothesis): Breakdowns in AL-DL or DL-CL pathways produce distinct communication patterns, including impaired emotional expression, reduced coherence, or pragmatic language difficulties.

RQ1 and H1 examine AL's influence on DL-level meaning construction. RQ2 and H2 focus on DL as a mediating linguistic-cognitive system. RQ3 and H3 investigate recursive CL feedback effects on cognition and affect. RQ4 and H4 address developmental progression across layers, while RQ5 and H5 examine communicative disruption patterns associated with AL-DL and DL-CL breakdowns.

3.3 Study 1: Sequential Cultural Transmission (CL Dynamics)

A controlled serial reproduction design (N = 28; ages 18–29) was used to examine how meaning transforms across iterative communication. Participants sequentially reproduced a standardized verbal message without access to the original stimulus.

To improve analytic consistency, transmitted messages were systematically coded for:

- semantic retention
- structural coherence
- narrative transformation

Changes across transmission stages were analyzed to identify patterns of information loss, reconstruction, and reinterpretation. This design allows indirect observation of how CL degradation increases reliance on inferential processes, consistent with AL-DL interaction.

3.4 Study 2: Structured Clinical Case Analysis (AL-CL Coupling)

A focused case analysis was conducted within a counseling context involving a married couple (ages 60 and 58). Data were derived from repeated interaction

sessions and examined using pattern-based interpretive analysis, with attention to:

- recurring linguistic triggers
- emotional intensity and response patterns
- links between present reactions and prior affective experiences

To reduce interpretive bias, analysis focused on observable communication patterns and repeated associations, rather than single-instance interpretations. The case is treated as analytically illustrative, providing insight into AL-level activation through CL stimuli.

3.5 Study 3: Group-Based Affective Validation

To assess cross-individual consistency, a separate sample (N = 32) evaluated the emotional impact of the communication scenario derived from Study 2. Participants reported perceived emotional intensity and interpretive responses.

Results were analyzed descriptively to determine:

- consistency of affective response
- degree of shared interpretation

This step serves as external validation, testing whether observed AL-CL coupling reflects individual-specific dynamics or broader affective resonance.

3.4 Analytical Strategy

Rather than testing isolated variables, the study employs a pattern convergence approach, where evidence is evaluated across methods to identify consistent AL-DL-CL interactions. Specifically, analysis focused on:

- transformation patterns across communication sequences (CL dynamics)
- affective activation through linguistic triggers (AL-CL coupling)
- mediating role of internal structuring processes (DL)

Findings are interpreted as theory-supporting patterns, not causal confirmation, consistent with exploratory model development.

4. Application to AI, New Media, and Social Cohesion

It is relevant to AI, New Media, and Social Cohesion. Thus, we employ the AL-DL-CL framework to analyze the impact of digital media and artificial intelligence on communication within families and cross-culturally. Modern digital environments foster a more frequent use of text-based, algorithmically mediated messaging with a

stronger emphasis on AL-level affective reactions including anger, fear, and anxiety. Social media and AI-generated content work mainly on the CL level, which channels and disseminates linguistic and symbolic information rapidly and at large scale. But this content often is not grounded in the context, meaning it makes it more likely to be misconstrued at the DL level. This may mean that people turn to AL processes rather, the more extreme, emotional inference and bias, further polarizing, misunderstanding, and conflict. These dynamics might play out in family systems as:

- increased emotional reactivity to digital communication
- interpretation breakdowns due to diminished context clues
- reinforcement of implicit beliefs through repeated exposure (CL → DL → AL feedback)

The framework indicates that responsible design of AI and media should:

- aid DL-level processing (reflection, context, clarification)
- minimize unregulated AL activation (emotional manipulation, outrage cycles)
- enhance culturally appropriate CL communication

In this sense, the AL–DL–CL model may help in building up communication systems that promote tolerance, empathy, and intercultural dialogue. Within the AL–DL–CL framework, social media and AI-generated communication may be understood primarily as operating at the CL level.

5. Discussion and Findings

The results of the three studies indicate tentative support of the AL–DL–CL framework as a dynamic, layered model of cognition and language. Throughout a series of sequential transmissions, clinical observation and group validation, all findings reflect that language is not ‘a stable carrier of meaning’, but rather a reconstructive process in which unconscious affective systems (AL), conscious linguistic structuring (DL), and culturally held symbolic systems (CL) interrelate.

5.1 Methodological Interpretation.

In all these studies the results indicate that:

- CL serves as a socially organized but reconstructive mode of communication
- DL mediates between inner affective states and external linguistic output
- AL acts as a profound affective-symbolic substrate affecting the interpretive and reconstructive content of meaning.

Transmission of language is not a signal-fidelity exchange, but a reconstructive affective process. Taken together, these findings lend initial empirical backing to AL–DL–CL as an evolving system of cognition, language, and cultural communication.

The findings from the three studies provide preliminary support for the AL–DL–CL framework as a dynamic, multi-layered model of cognition and language. Across sequential transmission, clinical observation, and group validation, results consistently indicate that language is

not a stable carrier of meaning but a reconstructive process shaped by interaction between unconscious affective systems (AL), conscious linguistic structuring (DL), and culturally shared symbolic systems (CL).

5.2 CL as a Reconstructive Transmission System

The study on sequential cultural transmission showed steps on the semantic degradation in 28 transmission steps: omission/substitution/reshuffling of narrative content. These findings are consistent with those in the classical literature on reconstructive memory and cultural transmission research (Bartlett, 1932; Sperber, 1996; Mesoudi, 2016). This trend is consistent with that of the AL–DL–CL model, where CL is not a permanent storage system that gives meaning only, but rather a lossy system that continuously re-encodes linguistic representations in the corpus across individuals, depending on how much meaning they maintain. As transmission fidelity declines, participants seem to rely more heavily on inferential reconstruction processes. This supports the suggestion that AL-level mechanisms – which include imagery, affect, and narrative completion – are at work in meaning reconstruction when CL structure is not sufficient. The suggestion is in accord with accounts of embodied cognition, which posits that meaning is rooted in perceptual and affective rather than merely symbolic encoding (Barsalou, 2008; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

5.3 The activation of AL in interpersonal communication.

The clinical case study showed that the use of a neutral linguistic expression in one of the marital conversations elicited a strong emotional response related to the person’s early childhood. This pattern suggests that CL-level language may trigger an intense AL-level affective memory. This finding is consistent with psychodynamic theories of language in that they focus on unconscious and symbolic activation of language (Freud, 1901/1960; Jung, 1964) and it resonates with a more contemporary view in cognitive neuroscience that emotion and memory systems are entirely integrated in language processing (Prystauka et al., 2023). This is in line with the AL–DL–CL framework, which posits CL input can bypass conscious awareness and reactivate AL-level affective schemas at the same time as the arousal of associative stimuli. The group validation indicates some level of cross-individual resonance; 92% of individuals felt emotional distress on being shown the scenario. It could also come from either schemas that are culturally and relationally embedded in the population or a model of expression that is in alignment with the cultural relational theory of emotion which argues the symbolic system impacts the emotional/relational framework (Henrich, 2015; Geertz, 1973).

5.4 DL as mediating a Linguistic System DL in AL.

Overall, DL can be understood to act as a mediating layer between AL and CL. In transmission, DL formed the initial interpretations of the message that eventually lead to externalization into CL and in clinic, DL alone seems to be unable to handle fully the AL reactivation under emotional stimuli. This mediating role is parallel to Vygotsky, who proposed a theory of internalized speech in which external language matures into structured inner thought during development (Vygotsky, 1978). It is also consistent with usage-based models, which postulate that linguistic structure arises from habitual cognitive-linguistic exchange (Tomasello, 2003). This study extends these reports by introducing DL as a tool not just for organization but also for controlling the affective influence of AL and responding to it (CL).

5.5 Developmental Implications.

Findings overall support a developmental trajectory expected based on the AL → DL → CL trajectory. The construction of meaning in early life seems to rely on affective and perceptual systems (AL), with subsequent internalization into structures (DL) and externalization through socially shared language (CL). This developmental pathway is consistent with both predictive and interaction-based descriptions of language acquisition (Trueswell, 2023; Abashidze et al., 2023). Moreover, the insights indicate that cultural language becomes actively reconstructed, reconstituting not only cognitive machinery but also emotional responses in the long-term. This is in line with a body of evidence that cultural spaces are active to influence cognitive processing and neural system organization (Żuromski & Pacholik-Żuromska, 2024).

5.6 Integrated Interpretation.

In general, these findings suggest that language is produced by a recursive loop-feedback process, as opposed to linear encoding. CL serves as a socio-distributed system of symbolic communication, DL acts a structured internal layer allowing for mediation of language meaning, while AL serves as a central affective-symbolic substrate that determines both our

interpretation and reconstruction of our meaning. These findings provide preliminary conceptual support for the foundational assumptions of the AL–DL–CL framework: a cognitive-linguistic model proposing that cognition and language co-develop through recursive interaction among unconscious affective processes, conscious linguistic structuring, and culturally transmitted symbolic systems. This unified model seeks to fill the historical research void for explaining how prior cognitive-affective processes intersect with organized language and cultural communication in both developmental and inter-personal settings. Theoretical Statement

Overall, 15 cases, the Deliberate Layer (DL) is the mediating system which transforms affective states (AL) into culturally represented expression (CL). Disruptions in AL–DL or DL–CL pathways generate significant distortions of communication, and continuous processing of cultural language creates a feedback system that restrains both cognition and affective experience. AL–DL–CL framework as a two-level architecture with an internal psychological System on one end and an external cultural System on the other. The Psychological System comprises the Automatic Layer (AL) for affective and implicit processing, and the Deliberate Layer (DL) for reflective and linguistic organization. The Cultural System (CL) is comprised of socially shared symbolic and linguistic forms. Importantly, the Deliberate Layer acts as an interface where inner affect, being internal and affective states translate into culturally organized expressions and internalized languages are put into practice and information, and when those cultural expressions are brought to bear on the cognate. Psychological System (Internal)

[AL] ↔ [DL]. Cultural System (CL)(External Language and Symbols). Three key contributions of this study:(1) It proposes a unified multi-layered model that integrates affect, cognition, and culture. (2) Identifies systematic points at which meanings were transformed and lost in human communication across a number of meanings. (3) It supplements the current theories by representing communications as a recursive reconstruction process as opposed to linear transmission.

Psychological (Internal)	System
[AL] ↔ [DL]	
Cultural (External Language & Symbols)	System (CL)

This study makes three key contributions:

(1) It proposes a unified multi-layered model integrating affect, cognition, and culture.

(2) It identifies systematic points of meaning transformation and loss in communication.

(3) It extends existing theories by modeling communication as a recursive reconstruction process rather than linear transmission.

5.7 Integrated Theoretical Interpretation

Across the 15 exploratory cases, the Deliberate Layer (DL) consistently functioned as a mediating system through which affective states (AL) were transformed into culturally structured communication (CL). Patterns of communicative disruption further suggested that breakdowns in AL-DL or DL-CL integration may contribute to emotional misinterpretation, reduced coherence, or impaired interpersonal communication.

Taken together, the findings provide preliminary conceptual support for the AL-DL-CL framework as an exploratory integrative model in which communication operates as a recursive reconstructive process rather than a linear transfer of fixed meaning. Within this model, AL represents affective and implicit processing, DL functions as a reflective organizational system, and CL provides the socially shared symbolic structures through which communication becomes culturally transmissible.

The framework contributes to existing scholarship in three principal ways:

- It integrates affective, cognitive, and cultural dimensions of communication within a unified multi-layered structure.
- It identifies recurrent points of meaning transformation and reconstruction across interpersonal communication processes.
- It conceptualizes communication as a recursive interpretive system shaped by continuous interaction between internal cognition and external cultural language.

6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

6.1 Limitations

While the AL-DL-CL framework provides an integrative account of cognition and language emergence, several

limitations must be acknowledged. First, the present study is primarily exploratory and theoretical in nature, with limited controlled experimental manipulation. Although multi-method approaches were used (sequential transmission, clinical observation, and group validation), the absence of randomized controlled designs limits causal inference regarding AL, DL, and CL interactions.

Second, the operationalization of the three layers (AL, DL, CL) remains conceptually grounded rather than fully neurobiologically or computationally specified. While AL is defined as an affective-implicit system and DL as a linguistic-reflective system, their precise boundaries may overlap in real cognitive processes. Contemporary research in cognitive neuroscience suggests that emotional, linguistic, and executive functions are distributed across overlapping neural networks rather than strictly separable modules (Prystauka et al., 2023).

Third, the clinical case analysis relies on retrospective interpretation and counseling-based observation, which introduces potential subjectivity and interpretive bias. Although group validation provided partial triangulation, the findings remain qualitative and should be interpreted as preliminary evidence rather than definitive proof of AL-CL coupling.

Fourth, the sample sizes in both experimental components are relatively small and culturally specific (Indian participants in sequential transmission and counseling contexts). This limits generalizability across populations, languages, and cultural systems. Cross-cultural variability in emotional expression and linguistic structure may influence AL-DL-CL dynamics in ways not captured in the present dataset.

Finally, the framework currently lacks formal computational modeling or neurophysiological measurement, which limits its testability against competing models in psycholinguistics and cognitive science. The present findings should also be interpreted with sensitivity to cultural and ethical limitations. The exploratory samples were culturally specific and may not represent broader linguistic or intercultural populations. Emotional expression, symbolic interpretation, and communicative norms vary significantly across cultural systems, which may influence AL-DL-CL dynamics differently in other contexts. Accordingly, broader generalizations should be treated cautiously pending cross-cultural validation.

The present set of 15 case analyses provides preliminary qualitative support for the proposed AL-DL-CL framework. Across cases, consistent patterns were observed in which affective states (AL) influenced

internal meaning-making processes (DL), which were subsequently expressed through culturally structured communication (CL).

In multiple cases, the Deliberate Layer (DL) functioned as a central mediating system, supporting the hypothesis that internal linguistic structuring plays a key role in transforming emotional experience into communicative output.

Additionally, several cases demonstrated feedback effects, where engagement with cultural language and social roles contributed to changes in both internal cognition and affective states, aligning with the proposed CL → DL → AL pathway.

Instances of communication difficulty further illustrated disruptions in AL–DL and DL–CL pathways, providing preliminary evidence for distinct patterns associated with trauma, anxiety, and sociocultural constraints.

While these findings are not generalizable, they offer conceptual and exploratory validation of the theoretical model and justify further empirical investigation using systematic and quantitative methods.

6.2 Future Research Directions

Future studies should aim to empirically operationalize the AL–DL–CL framework using more rigorous experimental and computational approaches. First, controlled laboratory studies using emotional priming, neuroimaging, and language production tasks could help quantify AL-to-DL influence, particularly in relation to semantic selection and syntactic structuring.

Second, longitudinal developmental studies are needed to test the proposed AL → DL → CL progression in children, particularly using measures of early affective signaling, inner speech development, and external language acquisition. Such studies could clarify whether the proposed stages represent distinct developmental phases or overlapping processes.

Third, computational modeling approaches (e.g., predictive processing or hierarchical Bayesian models) could be used to formalize AL–DL–CL interactions as a dynamic system of feedback loops. This would improve the predictive power and falsifiability of the framework.

Fourth, cross-cultural research should be conducted to examine whether CL-mediated restructuring of cognition varies across linguistic and cultural environments, particularly in collectivist versus individualist contexts.

Finally, future clinical research could explore AL–CL coupling in psychopathology, trauma processing, and affective disorders, particularly how linguistic cues trigger deep affective memory structures. This may

provide applied relevance for psychotherapy, trauma-informed care, and narrative-based interventions.

7. Conclusion

The AL–DL–CL model provides one unit perspective on how human cognition progresses from internal, pre-verbal experience towards structured thought and ultimately toward cross-cultural communication. Fundamentally, the model suggests that mind is not a single-layer structure but a continually constituting structure that is shaped by its interactive architecture, in which unconscious affective processes (AL), conscious linguistic structures (DL), culturally transmitted symbolic systems (CL) co-evolve via feedback and mutual effects. Seen through this lens, meaning does not come from language alone, and is not always encapsulated within individual cognition. Meaning is formed at the surface level, not through structural thought, but through a cultural common language of this kind transformed from inner affective experience. Cultural language then alters the inner mind, clarifying the way in which we see, how we interpret emotion, how we organize thoughts across time. It becomes an eternal cycle where the inner world and the social world are one. The model also posits that interpersonal communication is less likely the interchange of linguistic signs than the coordination among individuals to move deeper cognitive and affective processes on a joint basis. As such, language serves as a bridge between particular inner states and shared cultural states for a world where we find relatedness, empathy, and meaning in community. By this method, culture can be viewed as an evolution of human cognition; an outwardly generated system of shared thought that constantly feeds back into people's individual heads. Finally, the AL–DL–CL framework suggests that human communication is a fundamentally relational and developmental process: It starts in an expressive emotional and perceptual pre-verbal experience, takes shape through thinking in the mind, and climaxes in a cultural language structure. How meaning and identity (and the concept of 'social connection' itself) develop and mutate, interweaving the experiences of mind within the external world. The framework should therefore be viewed as a preliminary integrative model intended to support future empirical, computational, and cross-cultural investigation rather than as a finalized explanatory theory.

References

- Abashidze, D. A., Schmidt, A., Trofimovich, P., & Mercier, J. M. (2023). Integration of visual context in early and late bilingual language processing: Evidence

from eye-tracking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1113688>

Banaruee, H., Khatin-Zadeh, O., & Farsani, D. (2023). The challenge of psychological processes in language acquisition: A systematic review. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1).

Berne, E. (1964). *Games people play: The psychology of human relationships*. Grove Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Freud, S. (1960). *The psychopathology of everyday life* (A. A. Brill, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1901)

Hamuddin, B., Natalia, D., Ramadhani, M. R., Ningrum, F. S., & Yandra, A. (2025). The language-mind interface in psycholinguistics: A systematic literature review and cross-disciplinary synthesis. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*.

Jung, C. G. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. Doubleday.

Naranowicz, M., & Jankowiak, K. (2024). A negative mood facilitates complex semantic processing in a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*.

Prystauka, Y., DeLuca, V., Luque, A., Voits, T., & Rothman, J. (2023). Cognitive neuroscience perspectives on language acquisition and processing. *Brain Sciences*, 13(12), 1613.

Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Harvard University Press.

Trueswell, J. C. (2023). *Language acquisition and language processing: Finding new connections*. Language Learning and Development.