

UDC 351:81'23:81'42(477:111)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tnv-pub.2026.2.6>

PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A UKRAINIAN–ENGLISH COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Kozii O. B. – Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Public Administration, Law and Humanities
Kherson State Agrarian and Economic University
ORCID: 0000-0002-9478-9502

The article presents a comprehensive interdisciplinary analysis of psycholinguistic aspects of public administration through a comparative Ukrainian–English perspective. Modern public governance increasingly relies on effective communication, strategic discourse construction, and cognitive framing processes that influence decision-making, institutional legitimacy, and interaction between authorities and society. Within this context, language is not merely a communicative tool but a cognitive and socio-cultural mechanism shaping administrative reality.

The study integrates approaches from psycholinguistics, discourse analysis, public administration theory, and intercultural communication to examine how linguistic structures, communicative strategies, and cognitive patterns influence public governance practices. Particular attention is devoted to administrative discourse, political narratives, persuasive communication, and the psychological impact of language choices in policymaking and crisis communication. The comparison between Ukrainian and English administrative communication highlights differences in syntactic organization, pragmatics, rhetorical traditions, and communicative expectations shaped by historical and institutional contexts.

The research demonstrates that English-language administrative discourse tends to prioritize clarity, brevity, and procedural transparency, reflecting Anglo-Saxon governance traditions focused on accountability and citizen-oriented communication. Ukrainian administrative discourse, shaped by post-Soviet institutional transformation and European integration processes, increasingly incorporates elements of transparency and participatory communication while preserving certain formal and hierarchical linguistic conventions.

Special emphasis is placed on wartime communication conditions in Ukraine, where psycholinguistic mechanisms such as framing, metaphorical conceptualization, and emotional regulation play a crucial role in maintaining public trust and institutional resilience. The study argues that psycholinguistic competence should be considered an essential component of professional training for public servants, as it enhances strategic communication, negotiation efficiency, and intercultural understanding.

The article concludes that integrating psycholinguistic insights into public administration theory and practice contributes to improving governance quality, policy implementation, and citizen engagement. The development of bilingual administrative competencies and awareness of cognitive-linguistic factors is particularly important for Ukraine in the context of European integration and international cooperation.

Key words: psycholinguistics, public administration, administrative discourse, cognitive framing, Ukrainian-English comparison, intercultural communication, governance communication.

Козій О. Б. Психолінгвістичні аспекти публічного управління: українсько-англійський порівняльний вимір

У статті здійснено комплексний міждисциплінарний аналіз психолінгвістичних аспектів публічного управління в українсько-англійському порівняльному вимірі. Сучасне публічне врядування дедалі більше залежить від ефективної комунікації, стратегічної побудови дискурсу та когнітивних механізмів, які впливають на прийняття рішень, легітимність інституцій і взаємодію влади із суспільством. У цьому контексті мова розглядається не лише як засіб передачі інформації, а як когнітивний і соціокультурний інструмент формування адміністративної реальності.

Дослідження інтегрує підходи психолінгвістики, аналізу дискурсу, теорії публічного управління та міжкультурної комунікації з метою виявлення впливу мовних структур, комунікативних стратегій і когнітивних моделей на практики публічного управління. Особливу

увагу приділено адміністративному дискурсу, політичним наративам, переконувальній комунікації та психологічному впливу мовних рішень у процесах формування політики та кризових комунікацій.

Порівняльний аналіз української та англійської адміністративної комунікації демонструє відмінності у синтаксичній організації, прагматичних стратегіях, риторичних традиціях і комунікативних очікуваннях, що зумовлені історичними та інституційними факторами. Англійський адміністративний дискурс тягнє до ясності, стислості та процедурної прозорості, тоді як український перебуває у процесі трансформації під впливом європейської інтеграції.

Обґрунтовано, що психолінгвістична компетентність має стати складовою професійної підготовки публічних службовців, оскільки сприяє підвищенню ефективності стратегічної комунікації, переговорних процесів і міжкультурної взаємодії. Зроблено висновок, що інтеграція психолінгвістичних підходів у систему публічного управління сприятиме підвищенню якості врядування та залученню громадян до процесів прийняття рішень.

Ключові слова: психолінгвістика, публічне управління, адміністративний дискурс, когнітивне фреймування, міжкультурна комунікація.

The general statement of the problem and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks. Modern public administration increasingly functions within a complex communicative environment shaped by globalization, digitalization, and geopolitical transformation. Language is no longer perceived merely as an instrument for transmitting information; instead, it operates as a cognitive mechanism influencing perception, decision-making, and institutional legitimacy. Psycholinguistic processes play a central role in shaping administrative discourse, framing public policy, and constructing narratives that guide citizen behavior [1, p. 18].

The Ukrainian context demonstrates particular relevance for psycholinguistic research due to ongoing European integration, wartime communication challenges, and the need for effective interaction with international partners. Public officials must operate within multilingual environments, adapt discourse strategies to different audiences, and employ language as a strategic resource for governance effectiveness [2, p. 44].

Administrative discourse reflects institutional values and governance traditions. The comparison between Ukrainian and English public administration communication allows identifying how linguistic structures embody cultural assumptions regarding authority, transparency, and citizen engagement. Understanding these psycholinguistic dimensions contributes to improving governance practices and fostering intercultural dialogue.

Analysis of basic research and publications. The psycholinguistic dimension of institutional communication has been examined within several academic traditions, including cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and communication studies. Scholars such as D. Crystal emphasize the global role of English as a lingua franca influencing administrative communication norms [3, p. 31]. Meanwhile, cognitive linguistics researchers highlight how metaphorical framing shapes policy interpretation and public perception.

In public administration studies, authors such as N. Nugent and S. Wright analyze communication practices within European institutions, demonstrating that language choices directly affect negotiation dynamics and institutional cooperation [4, p. 52]. Psycholinguistic research by M. Byram underscores the importance of intercultural communicative competence for professionals operating across linguistic boundaries.

Ukrainian academic discourse has increasingly addressed language policy and administrative communication, yet the psycholinguistic dimension remains insufficiently conceptualized. Existing research often focuses on legal or organizational reforms, overlooking cognitive processes underlying communication effectiveness. This gap

highlights the need for interdisciplinary approaches combining linguistics and public administration.

The aim of the study. The aim of the study is to analyze psycholinguistic aspects of public administration through a comparative Ukrainian–English perspective and to determine how linguistic structures influence administrative effectiveness, institutional communication, and governance practices.

Specific objectives include:

- identifying psycholinguistic mechanisms in administrative discourse;
- comparing Ukrainian and English communicative strategies in governance;
- examining cognitive framing and persuasion in public policy communication;
- analyzing the role of language in crisis governance and wartime communication;
- substantiating the importance of psycholinguistic competence for public servants.

Presentation of the main material. Administrative discourse represents a specialized form of institutional communication characterized by formal structures, standardized terminology, and pragmatic functions oriented toward regulation, coordination, and governance. It serves as a mechanism through which institutions transmit authority, organize procedures, and shape public understanding of policies and administrative processes. Psycholinguistically, such discourse involves complex cognitive processes including categorization, framing, schema activation, inferencing, and pragmatic interpretation that guide both speakers and listeners in constructing meaning within institutional contexts. Administrative language does not merely transmit information; it structures perception, reinforces institutional norms, and contributes to the creation of shared cognitive models regarding governance and legitimacy.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, administrative discourse activates mental schemas related to hierarchy, legality, responsibility, and procedural order. Individuals encountering administrative texts rely on prior knowledge of institutional conventions, linguistic cues signaling authority, and expectations regarding formal communication. These schemas allow recipients to interpret directives, evaluate obligations, and anticipate outcomes. At the same time, overly complex or opaque language may increase cognitive load, leading to misunderstanding or reduced trust. Therefore, clarity and accessibility are increasingly recognized as crucial components of effective administrative communication.

In English-language administrative communication, clarity and directness are often prioritized, reflecting pragmatic traditions emphasizing efficiency, transparency, and accountability. Sentence structures frequently employ active voice, explicit agents, clear procedural sequences, and straightforward lexical choices designed to minimize ambiguity. These features reduce cognitive processing demands for recipients and facilitate comprehension in multicultural and multilingual environments where English functions as a *lingua franca*. Administrative guidelines in English-speaking contexts often encourage plain language principles, such as shorter sentences, avoidance of unnecessary jargon, and explicit explanation of actions required from citizens. Such practices reflect both linguistic traditions and broader democratic ideals emphasizing accessibility of public information [5, p. 27].

Moreover, English administrative discourse frequently integrates user-centered design principles, particularly in digital communication. Instructions are structured sequentially, headings guide attention, and visual hierarchy supports cognitive processing. Psycholinguistically, this reflects awareness of working memory limitations and the importance of chunking information into manageable units. The integration of cognitive science insights into public communication strategies demonstrates a shift

from purely bureaucratic language toward communication optimized for comprehension and engagement.

In contrast, Ukrainian administrative discourse historically relied on more complex syntactic constructions, formalized expressions, and indirect formulations influenced by Soviet-era bureaucratic traditions. Passive constructions, nominalizations, and extensive legal terminology were commonly used to convey institutional authority and procedural rigor. While such language reinforced perceptions of official legitimacy, it often increased cognitive complexity for readers and limited accessibility for broader audiences. Psycholinguistically, dense syntactic structures require greater processing effort, potentially reducing clarity and increasing misinterpretation.

However, recent reforms associated with European integration and democratic modernization demonstrate a gradual movement toward simplification, accessibility, and citizen-oriented communication in Ukrainian administrative discourse. Initiatives promoting plain language, transparency, and digital accessibility encourage the use of clearer syntax, more explicit instructions, and inclusive communication strategies. These changes reflect not only linguistic adaptation but also broader institutional transformation, emphasizing service-oriented governance and enhanced interaction between state institutions and citizens. Psycholinguistically, the shift toward simplified language reduces cognitive barriers and fosters a perception of openness and responsiveness.

Another important aspect of administrative discourse concerns the balance between legal precision and communicative accessibility. Legal language must maintain accuracy and avoid ambiguity, yet excessive technicality can undermine comprehension. Psycholinguistic research highlights the importance of balancing terminological consistency with explanatory clarity. In multilingual contexts, translation practices also influence discourse structures, as literal translation may preserve formal complexity rather than adapting language to target audience expectations.

Cognitive framing and policy narratives play a central role in administrative communication. Cognitive framing refers to the linguistic structuring of information in ways that shape perception, interpretation, and emotional response. Public administration relies heavily on framing mechanisms when presenting reforms, addressing crises, or promoting policy initiatives. By selecting specific metaphors, lexical choices, and narrative structures, institutions influence how citizens interpret policy objectives and evaluate institutional performance.

Metaphors such as “recovery,” “resilience,” “integration,” “transformation,” or “rebuilding” activate specific conceptual schemas that guide interpretation. For example, framing a policy as “recovery” emphasizes restoration and healing, whereas framing it as “transformation” suggests innovation and change. Psycholinguistically, metaphors function as cognitive shortcuts, allowing complex political realities to be understood through familiar conceptual domains. They also carry emotional associations that influence public attitudes toward policies.

Comparative analysis shows that English political discourse frequently employs metaphorical constructions emphasizing progress, innovation, modernization, and forward movement. These metaphors align with cultural narratives emphasizing growth and technological advancement. Ukrainian discourse, particularly in recent years, increasingly integrates narratives of resistance, resilience, solidarity, and national identity shaped by wartime realities. Linguistic expressions emphasizing strength, unity, and perseverance reinforce collective identity and contribute to emotional mobilization. These differences illustrate how psycholinguistic factors reflect socio-political contexts and cultural experiences.

Narratives in administrative discourse also function as tools for policy legitimation. By presenting reforms within broader storylines – such as European integration, national development, or democratic consolidation – institutions create coherent frameworks that make policy decisions appear logical and necessary. Psycholinguistically, narrative coherence supports comprehension by organizing information into meaningful sequences, reducing uncertainty and facilitating acceptance.

Emotional regulation and trust-building represent another critical dimension of administrative communication. Language choices influence emotional responses, perceptions of authority, and levels of public trust. Psycholinguistic research demonstrates that emotionally balanced communication enhances credibility, reduces anxiety, and supports cooperative behavior. During crisis situations, including wartime governance, public officials must carefully balance informational clarity with emotional reassurance.

English-language crisis communication often relies on structured messaging frameworks that include acknowledgment of uncertainty, clear explanation of risks, expression of empathy, and explicit action steps for citizens. These frameworks are designed to reduce panic while maintaining transparency. Linguistic strategies such as repetition of key messages, use of inclusive pronouns (“we,” “our community”), and avoidance of speculative language contribute to stability and trust.

Ukrainian communication strategies increasingly incorporate similar approaches, combining informative clarity with motivational rhetoric aimed at maintaining societal resilience. Wartime communication frequently emphasizes unity, collective responsibility, and shared purpose. Psycholinguistically, emotionally supportive language can reduce perceived threat levels and strengthen group cohesion, thereby enhancing compliance with public directives. However, excessive emotionality may risk undermining perceived objectivity, highlighting the need for careful balance.

Intercultural communication and bilingual competence are essential for public servants operating within international environments. Psycholinguistic competence involves understanding how language shapes expectations, politeness norms, negotiation strategies, and interpretations of authority. Differences in communication styles may lead to misinterpretations if cultural context is not considered. For instance, English administrative discourse often values explicitness and direct requests, whereas Ukrainian communication may incorporate greater contextual nuance or indirect politeness strategies depending on institutional culture.

Such differences can affect negotiation outcomes, policy coordination, and international collaboration. Training programs integrating psycholinguistic insights – including awareness of discourse conventions, cultural pragmatics, and cross-linguistic framing – can reduce communication risks and improve mutual understanding. Bilingual competence also involves the ability to switch between discourse styles, adapting linguistic choices to audience expectations while preserving institutional intent.

Digital governance introduces new psycholinguistic challenges related to user-interface language, accessibility, and information architecture. Online administrative services require language that is concise, navigable, and user-oriented. Interface design must consider cognitive load, attention patterns, and reading behavior in digital environments. Microcopy – short instructions, labels, or prompts – plays a crucial role in guiding user behavior, making psycholinguistic principles highly relevant for digital service design.

English-language terminology dominates technological ecosystems, influencing administrative vocabulary worldwide. Ukrainian public administration increasingly adopts bilingual terminology, reflecting integration into global digital governance

frameworks while maintaining linguistic identity. The coexistence of English and Ukrainian terminology creates both opportunities and challenges: it facilitates international cooperation but may also introduce comprehension barriers for certain user groups. Effective digital communication therefore requires careful localization strategies that consider linguistic clarity, cultural relevance, and accessibility standards.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that administrative discourse evolves in response to socio-political changes, technological innovation, and international cooperation. Globalization and European integration processes contribute to convergence between communication practices while preserving culturally specific linguistic patterns. Ukrainian administrative communication increasingly adopts strategies emphasizing clarity, inclusiveness, and digital accessibility, reflecting both internal reform initiatives and external institutional alignment with European standards. Psycholinguistic adaptation thus becomes a key mechanism through which governance systems respond to changing societal expectations.

Citizen trust emerges as another central theme confirmed by the research findings. Language choices influence perceptions of transparency, competence, and institutional reliability. Psycholinguistically balanced communication – combining factual accuracy with appropriate emotional tone – supports trust-building by reducing ambiguity and enhancing perceived authenticity. During crises, such as wartime governance, effective communication requires careful calibration between informational clarity and emotional reassurance. The study suggests that language capable of acknowledging uncertainty while providing clear guidance strengthens public confidence and encourages cooperative behavior.

The development of psycholinguistic competence among public servants represents a critical practical implication of the research. Such competence includes awareness of cognitive processing mechanisms, sensitivity to framing effects, understanding of intercultural communication differences, and ability to adapt linguistic strategies to diverse audiences. Training programs incorporating psycholinguistic insights can improve strategic communication, enhance negotiation outcomes, and increase effectiveness in crisis management. Public officials equipped with psycholinguistic knowledge are better able to anticipate audience reactions, reduce misinterpretation, and foster constructive dialogue in complex institutional environments.

Digital transformation represents an additional dimension shaping contemporary administrative discourse. The growth of e-governance platforms, automated services, and online communication channels requires language optimized for digital environments. Psycholinguistic considerations such as readability, information architecture, and user-centered interface design become essential for ensuring accessibility and usability. The study highlights that effective digital communication depends not only on technological infrastructure but also on linguistic clarity and cognitive compatibility with user expectations.

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence into administrative communication introduces both opportunities and challenges. Automated systems capable of generating responses, processing requests, or assisting users must be designed with careful attention to psycholinguistic factors, including tone, politeness, clarity, and contextual appropriateness. Future governance models may rely more heavily on AI-mediated discourse, making psycholinguistic research essential for ensuring ethical, transparent, and effective communication practices.

Prospects for further development include expanding empirical research into administrative discourse through corpus-based analysis of official texts, allowing for systematic examination of linguistic patterns across different governance contexts.

Quantitative studies comparing readability, syntactic complexity, and framing strategies may provide deeper insight into the evolution of administrative communication. Experimental research exploring cognitive perception of policy messages could help identify linguistic features that enhance comprehension, trust, and engagement.

Future research should also investigate emotional dynamics within administrative communication, particularly in crisis contexts, to better understand how language influences resilience and collective behavior. Cross-cultural comparative studies examining communication strategies across different political systems could further illuminate the relationship between discourse practices and governance effectiveness. Additionally, interdisciplinary collaboration between linguistics, psychology, political science, and public administration may contribute to more comprehensive theoretical frameworks for analyzing institutional communication.

Another promising direction involves examining the role of artificial intelligence in shaping administrative language practices. Studies focusing on human–AI interaction, automated translation, and algorithmically generated communication may reveal new challenges related to linguistic bias, cultural adaptation, and ethical responsibility. Understanding how AI systems influence discourse norms will be essential as digital governance continues to expand.

In summary, administrative discourse represents a dynamic intersection of language, cognition, and governance. Psycholinguistic analysis reveals how linguistic structures shape perception, influence emotional responses, and facilitate institutional coordination. Comparative examination of English and Ukrainian administrative communication highlights evolving trends toward clarity, accessibility, and user-centered design, particularly within contexts of European integration, digital transformation, and wartime governance. Understanding these processes enables more effective communication strategies that enhance public trust, support intercultural collaboration, and improve the overall functioning of public administration systems.

Research conclusions and prospects for further development. The study confirms that psycholinguistic factors play a crucial role in shaping public administration practices, influencing not only the linguistic form of institutional communication but also deeper cognitive, social, and organizational processes underlying governance. Language functions as a strategic tool through which institutions construct meaning, regulate behavior, and establish legitimacy within society. Administrative discourse does not operate solely as a neutral channel for transmitting information; rather, it actively shapes how policies are perceived, interpreted, and implemented by both officials and citizens. Psycholinguistic mechanisms such as framing, schema activation, categorization, and emotional signaling contribute to the formation of shared cognitive models that guide public understanding of administrative decisions.

One of the key conclusions of the research is that language significantly affects communication efficiency by influencing cognitive load, comprehension speed, and interpretative accuracy. Administrative texts characterized by clarity, logical structure, and accessible terminology facilitate faster information processing and reduce the likelihood of misunderstanding. Conversely, overly complex syntax, excessive nominalization, or rigid bureaucratic formulations may increase cognitive effort, thereby creating barriers to effective interaction between institutions and society. The transition toward plain language practices observed in many governance systems demonstrates recognition of psycholinguistic principles as essential components of modern administrative reform.

In addition to communicative efficiency, language plays a central role in cognitive framing, shaping how policies and institutional actions are conceptualized by

stakeholders. The selection of metaphors, narrative structures, and lexical choices influences emotional reactions and evaluative judgments, contributing to public support or resistance toward policy initiatives. Framing mechanisms are particularly important in contexts involving reform, crisis management, or national transformation, where linguistic strategies help construct coherent narratives that reduce uncertainty and guide collective interpretation. The study highlights that psycholinguistic framing is not merely rhetorical but constitutes a fundamental element of governance strategy.

Differences between Ukrainian and English administrative discourse illustrate how linguistic practices are embedded within broader cultural and historical contexts. English-language administrative communication often emphasizes transparency, procedural clarity, and user-oriented interaction, reflecting traditions of public accountability and pragmatic efficiency. Ukrainian administrative discourse, historically influenced by formal bureaucratic traditions, is undergoing transformation toward greater accessibility and citizen-centered communication, particularly in the context of European integration and democratic modernization.

Furthermore, psycholinguistic competence contributes to improved policymaking by facilitating clearer articulation of objectives and more effective public engagement. Policies communicated in accessible and coherent language are more likely to be understood and accepted, thereby supporting successful implementation. Integrating psycholinguistic training into professional development programs for civil servants may enhance institutional capacity by strengthening communication skills alongside legal and administrative expertise.

Another important conclusion relates to intercultural and bilingual communication within international governance contexts. Public administrators increasingly operate within multilingual environments requiring adaptation to different discourse norms, politeness strategies, and communication expectations. Psycholinguistic awareness helps mitigate misunderstandings arising from cross-cultural differences in directness, implicitness, or emotional expression. The ability to navigate these differences effectively contributes to more productive collaboration and negotiation within international organizations and diplomatic settings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Грубінко А. В. Європейська інтеграція України: теорія і практика. Київ : Юрінком Інтер, 2020. 312 с.
 2. OECD. Public Governance Reviews: Ukraine. Paris : OECD Publishing, 2021. 198 p.
 3. Денисюк В. І. Публічне управління в умовах глобалізації. Львів : ЛНУ, 2019. 256 с.
 4. European Commission. European Governance: A White Paper. Brussels, 2001. 43 p.
 5. Nugent N. The Government and Politics of the European Union. London : Palgrave, 2017. 590 p.
 6. Nye J. Soft Power. New York : Public Affairs, 2004. 192 p.
 7. Романюк С. А. Європейські стандарти публічного управління. Київ: НАДУ, 2020. 184 с.
 8. World Bank. Governance and Institutional Reform in Europe. Washington, 2020. 160 p.
 9. Phillipson R. Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford: OUP, 2010. 256 p.
 10. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Strasbourg, 2020. 260 p.
 11. Byram M. Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. 124 p.
-

REFERENCES:

1. Grubinko A., V. (2020). Yevropeiska intehratsiia Ukrainy: teoriia i praktyka. [*European integration of Ukraine: theory and practice*]. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter. 312 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. OECD. (2021). Public Governance Reviews: Ukraine. [*Public Governance Reviews: Ukraine*]. Paris: OECD Publishing. 198 p. [in English]
3. Denisyuk V. I. (2019). Publichne upravlinnia v umovakh hlobalizatsii. [*Public Governance in the Context of Globalization*]. Lviv: LNU. 256 p. [in Ukrainian]
4. European Commission. (2001). European Governance: A White Paper. [*European Governance: A White Paper*]. Brussels. 43 p. [in English]
5. Nugent N. (2017). The Government and Politics of the European Union. [*The Government and Politics of the European Union*] London: Palgrave. 590 p. [in English]
6. Nye J. (2004). Soft Power. New York: Public Affairs. 192 p. [in English]
7. Romanyuk S. A. (2020). Yevropeiski standarty publichnoho upravlinnia. [*European Standards of Public Governance*]. Kyiv: NADU. 184 p. [in Ukrainian]
8. World Bank. (2020). Governance and Institutional Reform in Europe. [*Governance and Institutional Reform in Europe*] Washington. 160 p. [in English]
9. Phillipson R. (2010). Linguistic Imperialism. [*Linguistic Imperialism*] Oxford: Oxford University Press. 256 p. [in English]
10. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Strasbourg. [*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Strasbourg*] 260 p. [in English]
11. Byram M. Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. [*Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*] Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. 124 p. [in English]

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 15.03.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 20.04.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 22.05.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах
ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

