AI-ASSISTED TRANSLATION IN WARTIME COMMUNICATION: FROM POST-SOVIET LINGUISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS TO SELF-DETERMINED UKRAINIAN IDENTITY

Oksana Chaika
Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor
Associate Professor at Department of Foreign Philology and Translation
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,
Kyiv, Ukraine

Wartime communication exposes language to pressures that reveal its deepest functions: language is not simply used to describe reality, it is equally employed to organise perception, distribute responsibility, and sustain identity. In the Ukrainian context since the 2022 full-scale invasion of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, these functions have become particularly visible. One of the analytic lenses will include discourse as well as its increasingly important functions to articulate agency, resist imposed narratives, and assert a self-determined national position. Within this evolving communicative environment, AI-assisted translation has assumed a central mediating role, shaping how Ukrainian discourse is rendered locally and internationally, and how it is interpreted beyond its linguistic boundaries.

From this perspective, any attempt to analyse this phenomenon solely through the single lens of translation risks overlooking the more fundamental processes at work. The question is not only how language is transferred; these days, it is about how identity is recognised, mediated, and sometimes distorted in technologically assisted communication. In this vein, the conceptual foundations offered by recognition theory provide a necessary starting point. As developed by Charles Taylor (1994), *identity* is formed through processes of recognition, where individuals and communities depend on accurate acknowledgment of their distinctiveness. *Mis*recognition, in turn, does not remain a symbolic issue; it can shape self-perception and constrain the possibilities of expression.

When we bring this perspective into the Ukrainian wartime context, linguistic consciousness appears as a space in which recognition is negotiated. The persistence of post-Soviet discursive patterns, marked by reduced agency and implicit hierarchies, may be read as residues of earlier forms of misrecognition, where language encoded a diminished sense of subjectivity. The current shift toward more explicit, agentive, and value-oriented discourse signals an effort to reconfigure this

condition. Language becomes a means of reclaiming authorship over one's own narrative.

Yet this transformation unfolds within a communicative infrastructure that is increasingly mediated by artificial intelligence (AI). Here, the problem acquires a different dimension. AI-assisted translation systems do not generate meaning in a vacuum; they rely on statistical regularities derived from existing corpora. As emphasised in the *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI* issued by the European Commission (2019), such systems must be evaluated in light of principles including fairness, accountability, and the avoidance of bias. These principles are not abstract recommendations; they respond to the concrete risk that AI may reproduce patterns embedded in its training data. Moreover, this concern becomes particularly acute when considered alongside the risk-based framework of the EU *AI Act* (2024), which places strong emphasis on the protection of fundamental rights and the need for human oversight. When applied to translation, these frameworks draw attention to a structural tension: automated systems produce outputs that appear linguistically coherent, yet may carry forward historical asymmetries that are no longer acceptable within contemporary communicative contexts.

In the Ukrainian to English translation space, this tension is reinforced by the legacy dominance of Russian-language material in multilingual datasets. The result is not necessarily overt distortion, but more subtle shifts, e.g. lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic, that may attenuate agency or reframe perspective. From an ethical standpoint, this raises the question of responsibility: if meaning is mediated through systems that embed past discursive configurations, *how can present-day communicative intent be preserved?*

The answer cannot be found in technical adjustments alone. It requires a broader normative framework that addresses the relationship between ***language, identity,*** and ***respect***. Here, the principles articulated in European and international cultural policy become relevant (UNESCO, 2001) as largely developed in Article 22 of the *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union* (2012), which affirms respect for linguistic and cultural diversity as a foundational value. This commitment is echoed in the White Paper on *Intercultural Dialogue* (2008), which frames intercultural interaction as a process of "living together as equals in dignity" and in the *Framework Convention on AI, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law* (2024). All the above drives to conclude that such formulations shift the focus from *tolerance* to *recognition.* They imply that cultural and linguistic identities must be represented in ways that preserve their integrity (Chaika, Sharmanova &

Makaruk, 2024), rather than being subsumed under dominant frameworks. The theoretical contributions of Will Kymlicka (1995) reinforce this position by linking cultural identity to conditions of equal participation, while Tariq Modood (2013) highlights the need for public acknowledgment of minority perspectives within plural societies.

When viewed against this background, translation acquires a different status. It stretches beyond understanding it as a technical operation, it becomes a practice that participates in the recognition (or misrecognition) of identity. AI-assisted translation, in particular, appears to be a site where normative commitments to diversity encounter the practical realities of automated language processing. If translated discourse fails to preserve agency, perspective, or evaluative force, it risks undermining the very principles of dignity and equality that European frameworks seek to uphold.

At this point, the analytical focus returns to language itself, but now with a clearer understanding of what is at stake. Translation studies and discourse analysis offer the means to examine how these tensions materialise in concrete texts. It becomes possible to observe how shifts in Ukrainian wartime discourse (toward explicit attribution of responsibility, stronger evaluative positioning, and internally grounded narratives) are either maintained or diluted in AI-generated translations (Chaika, 2025a; 2025b).

What emerges is a layered interaction as compared to opposition between that of human and machine. Under this framework AI systems provide rapid and accessible outputs, yet these outputs require interpretation. The human role, therefore, does not disappear; it becomes more demanding. It involves recognising where automated language aligns with communicative intent and where it diverges, often in subtle ways.

This has direct implications for education, particularly in multilingual environments. The use of AI-assisted tools is already widespread, yet it is frequently approached as a matter of efficiency. The preceding analysis suggests that this approach is insufficient. Students and teachers must develop the capacity to engage with language as a bearer of identity, to understand the ethical dimensions of technological mediation, and to intervene critically when necessary (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).

Such competencies cannot be reduced to language training in the traditional sense. They require an interdisciplinary perspective in which psychological insight, ethical reasoning, and linguistic awareness are brought into relation. Within this

framework, translation becomes a practical arena in which these competencies are exercised, rather than a specialised skill isolated from broader concerns.

Furthermore, AI-assisted translation in wartime communication reveals itself as a complex field in which multiple dimensions converge. Psychological transformation shapes how language is produced; ethical frameworks define the conditions of responsible mediation; cultural theories articulate the importance of recognition and respect; and translation practices make these dynamics visible in textual form. The challenge lies in maintaining coherence across these levels, ensuring that technological mediation does not disrupt the alignment between identity, meaning, and representation.

References:

1. Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton University Press. https://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/i7668.pdf

2. European Commission High-Level Expert Group on AI. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

3. European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng

4. UNESCO. (2001). Universal declaration on cultural diversity. https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/unesco-universal-declaration-cultural-diversity

5. European Union. (2012). Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Article 22). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/char_2016/art_22/oj/eng

6. Council of Europe. (2024). Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law. https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/the-framework-convention-on-artificial-intelligence

7. Council of Europe. (2008). White paper on intercultural dialogue: Living together as equals in dignity.

8. https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/white%20paper_final_revised_en.pdf

9. Chaika, O., Sharmanova, N., & Makaruk, O. (2024). Revitalising Endangered Languages: Challenges, Successes, and Cultural Implications. *Futurity of Social Sciences, 2*(2),38-61. https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2024.06.20

10. Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon Press.

11. Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

12. OECD. (2019). OECD principles on artificial intelligence. https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles

13. UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics

14. Chaika, O. (2025a). Translation as a Strategic Tool in Cross-Cultural Communication: Countering Russian Propaganda and Preserving Ukrainian Identity. *Pereiaslav Studies in Linguistics and Linguodidactics, 3*(1), 35-50.

15. Chaika, O. (2025b). Artificial Intelligence for Developing Translation Competence in Multicultural Higher Education. *Pereiaslav Linguistic and Language Didactics Studies, 3*(2), 5-17. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/398234173

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ТА РОЛЬ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ У СФЕРІ МІЖНАРОДНОГО ДОКУМЕНТООБІГУ

Черінко С. І.

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри української мови, історії та інформаційної діяльності
Державного університету «Київський авіаційний інститут»,
м. Київ, Україна

У сучасних умовах глобалізації та цифровізації суспільства міжнародний документообіг набуває особливої ваги як невід'ємний компонент інформаційної діяльності та управління. Ефективність обміну інформацією щодо процесів документування між представниками різних країн суттєво залежить від рівня сформованості міжкультурної комунікації. Саме це обумовлює необхідність інтеграції відповідних компетентностей у підготовку фахівців з документознавства та інформаційної діяльності, особливо в умовах технічних закладів вищої освіти.

Міжкультурна комунікація розглядається як процес взаємодії представників різних культур, що передбачає обмін інформацією, цінностями, нормами та моделями поведінки. У сфері міжнародного документообігу цей процес ускладнюється необхідністю дотримання стандартів оформлення документів, мовних і правописних норм, а також культурних особливостей ділового спілкування. Як зазначає О. Селіванова, «міжкультурна комунікація є ключовим чинником ефективної взаємодії у професійному середовищі, де мовні та культурні бар'єри можуть суттєво впливати на результат діяльності» [2, с. 112].

У контексті документознавства міжнародний документообіг охоплює процеси створення, обробки, передачі та зберігання документів, що функціо-