



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES IN HUMAN–ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNICATION: BASED ON MATERIALS FROM ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Turopova Marhabo Sadullayevna

English Language Teacher at the Specialized School of Oltinsoy District

E-mail: marhabosadullayevna5@gmail.com

ORCID ID 0009-0008-3591-7317

Abstract

The article comparatively examines discursive strategies in human–artificial intelligence communication using materials from English and Uzbek. It analyzes communicative intention, directiveness, politeness, contextual specificity, forms of address, and pragmatic adaptation. The findings reveal shared and language-specific patterns in AI-mediated interaction, demonstrating how linguistic and cultural factors shape user prompts, interactional choices and interpretations within human–AI discourse. This approach clarifies patterns in contemporary digital discourse.

Keywords: human–AI communication, discursive strategies, English, Uzbek, pragmatics, politeness, directiveness.

Introduction

The rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies is bringing significant changes to the content and forms of communicative interaction between humans and digital systems. In particular, with the widespread use of large language models and generative artificial intelligence systems, human–AI communication conducted through natural language is becoming an independent



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

object of linguistic research. In such communication, users express their communicative intentions through questions, tasks, commands, requests, recommendations, or comments, while artificial intelligence processes these linguistic signals and generates a particular discursive response. Therefore, human–AI communication should be studied not merely as a technological process but also as a distinctive linguistic and pragmatic phenomenon.

In communication between humans and artificial intelligence, the clear expression of communicative goals, contextualization, the selection of forms of address, the use of directive constructions, the management of politeness levels, and the specification of the expected response give rise to important discursive strategies.

Contemporary studies have also demonstrated that the linguistic structure of a prompt can influence the content, accuracy, and communicative orientation of an AI-generated response. Mohammed examines the syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic characteristics of prompts in human–AI discourse on the basis of empirical material and draws attention to the relationship between linguistic form and AI-generated responses.

A comparison of materials from English and Uzbek makes it possible to identify the linguacultural dimensions of this process. Existing studies indicate that AI instructions in English are more frequently expressed through concise, direct, and verb-initial constructions, whereas communicative units in Uzbek tend to demonstrate more active use of morphological specification, contextual elaboration, and politeness devices. From this perspective, a comparative discourse analysis of human–AI communication in English and Uzbek is of considerable scholarly importance for identifying both the universal and national characteristics of contemporary digital communication.



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Literature Review

Research into discursive strategies in human–AI communication is developing at the intersection of computational linguistics, pragmalinguistics, discourse analysis, and digital communication. Studies in computational linguistics provide a theoretical foundation for explaining how natural language units are processed in technological environments. With the emergence of generative AI, this approach has increasingly come to encompass the interpretation of linguistic units created by humans by language models and their subsequent transformation into new textual forms.

Research on prompt engineering is particularly important for understanding the communicative mechanisms of human–AI interaction. Reynolds and McDonell consider the prompt as a means of directing the operation of a large language model through natural language. Liu and co-authors systematize prompting methods and examine the role of natural-language instructions in controlling the functioning of language models. These studies provide a basis for regarding the prompt as an initial unit of the communicative process.

Contemporary linguistic research increasingly focuses not only on the prompt itself but also on the pragmatic and discursive characteristics of human–AI communication. Mohammed examines the syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic characteristics of prompts and analyzes their influence on the quality, relevance, and coherence of AI-generated responses. This approach makes it possible to conceptualize a person's address to AI as a discursive unit implementing a particular communicative strategy.

Recent studies of English and Uzbek demonstrate that this field is acquiring an increasingly comparative character. Tulanboev compares AI-related instructional discourse materials in English and Uzbek from lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives. The study notes that imperative



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

constructions, modal units, technical terminology, and directive speech acts occupy an important position in both languages. At the same time, English instructions are described as more concise and analytical, whereas Uzbek units are morphologically more detailed and more strongly oriented toward politeness. Studies examining the general pragmatic characteristics of digital communication have likewise identified differences in the manifestation of communicative intention, indirectness, politeness, and identification strategies in English and Uzbek communication. Research devoted to interaction with generative AI has identified a wide range of user communicative behaviors, extending from highly polite forms to extremely concise and task-oriented styles. These perspectives demonstrate that discursive strategies in human–AI communication should not be limited to the formal structure of prompts; rather, the user's communicative purpose, sociocultural experience, and interactional context should also be taken into consideration.

Studies devoted to the linguapragmatic characteristics of AI discourse in Uzbek also demonstrate the emergence of this field of research. The active use of AI-related terms such as prompt, chatbot, and algorithm, along with other related lexical units, is creating new lexical and pragmatic layers of digital discourse. Nevertheless, a unified comparative model of discursive strategies used in human–AI communication in English and Uzbek has not yet been fully developed. In particular, the interaction among communicative purpose, directiveness, politeness, contextualization, address, and response-management strategies in the two languages requires further investigation.

Analysis and results

The analysis of discursive strategies in human–artificial intelligence communication demonstrates that this type of communication differs from traditional interpersonal communication in several respects. In human-to-human



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

communication, an addresser normally selects a speech strategy by taking into account the addressee's social status, age, experience, cultural environment, and situational context. In communication with AI, however, users tend to express their communicative intentions in a form that can be clearly processed and interpreted by the model. Consequently, communicative strategy takes into account not only social relations but also the way in which the system is likely to interpret the task. This constitutes one of the principal distinctive characteristics of human–AI discourse.

Communicative purpose lies at the center of discursive strategy. Users assign a specific communicative task to an AI system through constructions such as “provide information,” “analyze,” “compare,” “rewrite,” “give examples,” and “draw a conclusion.” Although these units differ formally, their common function is to direct the operation of the model toward a particular objective. In this respect, the directive strategy assumes particular importance in human–AI communication. Mohammed's study of the syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of prompts likewise demonstrates the relationship between prompt form and communicative purpose.

In English-language AI communication, directive strategies are often expressed through concise and direct constructions. In expressions such as “Analyze the text,” “Compare these approaches,” “Explain the concept,” and “Rewrite the paragraph,” the communicative task is directly expressed through the verb. Such constructions serve to establish the boundaries of the task quickly and clearly. In Uzbek, the same meanings may be expressed as “Matnni tahlil qiling,” “Ushbu yondashuvlarni taqqoslab bering,” “Mazkur tushunchani izohlab bering,” and “Paragrafni qayta yozib bering.” Uzbek expressions may involve grammatical and lexical devices of respect and politeness more actively. Similar differences



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

have also been identified in comparative research on AI instructional discourse in English and Uzbek.

The politeness strategy deserves particular attention in human–AI communication. Initially, a user's polite address to an AI system may be regarded as a feature that is not technically necessary. In actual communication, however, users may address AI through expressions such as “please,” “could you,” “would you,” “iltimos,” “marhamat qilib,” and “... bering.” These expressions do not merely facilitate the performance of a task; they also establish the social and pragmatic tone of the interaction. Corpus research involving generative-AI users has identified styles ranging from highly explicit expressions of politeness to extremely concise forms oriented toward efficiency.

In Uzbek communication, politeness is often realized through verb forms, auxiliary units, and explanatory components. For example, although the forms “tushuntir” and “tushuntirib bering” express the same general task, their pragmatic tones are not identical. In English, the distinction between “Explain this” and “Could you explain this?” is realized through the use of a modal form and the indirect formulation of the request. Thus, although the communicative task is common to both languages, the means of expressing it differ grammatically and pragmatically. This difference may also influence the linguistic form of the response generated by AI.

The contextualization strategy represents another important characteristic of human–AI communication. A user may formulate a task merely as a short command or may supplement it with information concerning the topic, audience, purpose, style, length, and format. There is a difference in the degree of communicative precision between a general prompt such as “Write an article” and a contextually rich prompt such as “Write the introduction to a research article on pedagogy in an academic style and in 250 words.” Therefore, the



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

strategy of expanding context functions as a means of specifying the expected response in communication with AI.

The contextualization strategy may be realized differently in English and Uzbek. In English, users may frequently provide the task, role, constraints, and output format in a concise sequence. In Uzbek, users may be more likely to explain the context, describe the situation, and elaborate on the communicative purpose. However, such a difference should not be interpreted as an absolute national characteristic; it may also depend on the user's literacy, the complexity of the task, experience with the platform, and communicative purpose. Therefore, comparative research should control for situational and user-related factors in addition to linguistic factors.

The address strategy is also a distinctive feature of human–AI discourse. Users may address AI through names such as “ChatGPT,” “assistant,” “AI,” “ustoz,” “teacher,” or “expert,” or they may assign it a particular role. Constructions such as “You are an experienced linguist” or “Siz tajribali tilshunos sifatida...” establish a communicative role for the AI system. Unlike a simple request for information, such a strategy functions as a discursive means of predefining the content and style of the response. The role-assignment strategy enables users to artificially model the communicative situation in human–AI interaction.

Alongside directiveness and role assignment, the strategy of imposing constraints is also important. Users may specify the length, language, style, audience, or structural organization of the response: “Do not exceed 200 words,” “Use only an academic style,” “Write in Uzbek,” or “Provide the sources in GOST format.” Such constructions regulate not only the content but also the formal parameters of an AI-generated response. In this sense, constraints constitute a distinct component of communicative strategy because they encode the user's expectations concerning the desired outcome.



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Comparative differences between English and Uzbek also emerge at the terminological level. Since English occupies a central position in the development and international circulation of major technological terms in the field of AI, units such as “prompt,” “chatbot,” “machine learning,” “neural network,” and “reasoning” are widely used in their English forms. In Uzbek AI discourse, processes of borrowing, transliteration, calquing, and semantic adaptation can be observed. Comparative research on AI instructional discourse likewise notes the active incorporation of English AI terminology into Uzbek.

Another important indicator of discursive strategies is response clarification and redirection. Human–AI communication often does not end with a single question and answer. Users evaluate the initial response, clarify particular aspects, introduce new requirements, or refer back to previous context. Requests such as “Explain this idea in more detail,” “Provide examples only in Uzbek,” and “Rewrite the previous response in an academic style” maintain the continuity of dialogic discourse. Thus, interaction with AI can be understood as an iterative communicative process rather than a static exchange.

Comparative analysis makes it possible to distinguish universal and linguacultural components within human–AI communication strategies. Strategies such as expressing communicative purpose, assigning tasks, creating context, imposing constraints, and clarifying responses occur in both languages. Their formal realization, however, may differ according to the grammatical structure, pragmatic norms, and communicative culture of each language. Studies of English and Uzbek online communication have likewise documented differences in the manifestation of directness, indirectness, respect, and identification strategies.

Research on AI-generated texts also explains the other side of this process. Studies of AI-generated academic texts demonstrate the presence of



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

communicative strategies, modal units, and argumentative structures; differences between English and Uzbek texts have been identified in terms of pragmatic adaptation and linguistic standardization. These findings demonstrate that discursive strategies in prompts affect not only the user's address but also the style and communicative organization of the subsequent AI response.

On this basis, the communicative model of human–AI discourse can be represented as an interconnected process: the user establishes a communicative purpose, encodes it in a particular linguistic form, introduces context and constraints, and the AI interprets these units and generates a response. The response is then evaluated by the user, and, when necessary, the interaction is continued through a new prompt. Thus, a discursive strategy manifests itself not merely in the internal structure of a prompt but throughout the entire communicative cycle.

The analysis demonstrates that strategies such as communicative-purpose management, directiveness, politeness, contextualization, role assignment, constraint setting, terminological adaptation, and iterative clarification play an important role in human–AI communication. Their realization in English and Uzbek preserves a common communicative function while employing different grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic means. At the same time, existing research indicates that all differences cannot be explained solely by language or culture; task type, user experience, communicative purpose, and the characteristics of the AI platform also affect the outcome. Therefore, constructing a comparative model of human–AI discourse on the basis of a multifactorial approach is scientifically appropriate.



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Conclusion

Discursive strategies in human–artificial intelligence communication constitute a complex communicative phenomenon formed through the interaction of natural language, pragmatic purpose, and digital technology. Analysis of materials from English and Uzbek demonstrates that strategies such as communicative purpose, directiveness, politeness, contextualization, role assignment, constraint setting, and clarification have common characteristics, although their linguistic realization differs according to the grammatical and pragmatic resources of each language.

A comparative study of human–AI discourse provides an important theoretical basis for describing new forms of digital communication, identifying the pragmatic potential of the Uzbek language within AI-mediated environments, and improving the linguistic model of human–artificial intelligence interaction.

References

1. Fayziyeva A.S. O‘zbek tilida sun’iy intellekt terminlarining shakllanish manbalari va usullari // Qo‘qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar jurnali. — 2026. — Vol. 8, № 6. — B. 84–90. — DOI: 10.70728/b.series.fil.v08.i06.010.
2. Odilova S.T. O‘zbek tilida sun’iy intellekt yordamida yaratilgan matnlarning lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari // Yangi Renessansda ilm-fan taraqqiyoti. — 2026. — Vol. 2, № 1.
3. Xolmanova Z.T. Kompyuter lingvistikasi: darslik. — Toshkent: Mehr-nuri, 2024. — 232 b. — ISBN 978-9910-8801-8-6.
4. Abdurahmonova N. Kompyuter lingvistikasi: darslik. — Toshkent: Nodirabegim, 2021. — 394 b. — ISBN 978-9943-6941-2-5.



International Conference on Education, Psychology and Humanities

Hosted Online from Moscow, Russia

Date: 28th September, 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

5. Mohammed G.M.S. A linguistic inquiry into prompt engineering in AI-human communication // Discover Education. — 2026. — Vol. 5. — Article 733. — DOI: 10.1007/s44217-026-01575-x.
6. Reynolds L., McDonell K. Prompt Programming for Large Language Models: Beyond the Few-Shot Paradigm // Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. — New York: ACM, 2021. — P. 1–7. — DOI: 10.1145/3411763.3451760.
7. Liu P., Yuan W., Fu J., Jiang Z., Hayashi H., Neubig G. Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing // ACM Computing Surveys. — 2023. — Vol. 55, No. 9. — P. 1–35.