KOKAND UNIVERSITY HERALD
SCIENTIFIC E-JOURNAL
ISSN: 2181-1695

QO‘QON UNIVERSITETI XABARNOMASI
KOKAND UNIVERSITY HERALD
ВЕСТНИК КОКАНДСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

OAK: 01-08/1819/6

www.herald.kokanduni.uz

# LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF AI-RELATED INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

**Tulanboev Shokhsuvar,**
1-year doctoral (PhD) student of Andijan state institute of foreign languages
+998 93 213 48 68
tulanvoyevshoxsuvor@gmail.com
**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v18iB.1679

**MAQOLA HAQIDA/ О СТАТЬЕ**

**Qabul qilindi:** 18-may 2026-yil
**Tasdiqlandi:** 21-may 2026-yil
**Jurnal soni:** 18-B
**Maqola raqami:** 21

**KALIT SO‘ZLAR/ КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА**

AI diskursi, o‘quv diskursi, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, imperativlar, direktiv nutq aktlari, terminologiya, prompt, raqamli aloqa, pragmatika

**ANNOTATSIYA/ АННОТАЦИЯ**

Ushbu maqola ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida sun'iy intellekt bilan bog‘liq o‘quv nutqining lingvistik xususiyatlarini o‘rganadi. Sun'iy intellektning jadal rivojlanishi foydalanuvchilarga ko‘rsatmalar, buyruqlar, tavsiyalar, xavfsizlik ogohlantirishlari, interfeys ko‘rsatmalari, algoritmik tushuntirishlar va protsedurali matnlar orqali yo‘l-yo‘riq ko‘rsatiladigan inson-mashina aloqasining yangi shakllarini yaratdi. Shu nuqtai nazardan, o‘quv nutqi endi an'anaviy qo‘llanmalar yoki pedagogik tushuntirishlar bilan cheklanib qolmaydi; u shuningdek, raqamli buyruqlar, ko‘rsatmalar yozish bo‘yicha ko‘rsatmalar, chatbot o‘zaro ta'sir naqshlari, platformaga asoslangan ko‘rsatmalar va sun'iy intellekt tizimi ogohlantirishlarini ham o‘z ichiga oladi. Tadqiqot sun'iy intellekt bilan bog‘liq o‘quv nutqiga protsedurali va direktiv aloqaning ixtisoslashgan shakli sifatida yondashadi. Unda ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi misollar leksik, morfologik, sintaktik, semantik va pragmatik xususiyatlar nuqtai nazaridan taqqoslanadi. Topilmalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ikkala til ham imperativ tuzilmalar, ketma-ket tashkil etish, texnik terminologiya, modal ifodalar va direktiv nutq harakatlariga juda bog‘liq. Biroq, inglizcha sun'iy intellekt ko‘rsatmalari ko‘proq ixcham, fe'l-boshlang‘ich va analitik jihatdan tashkil etilgan bo‘ladi, o‘zbek tilidagi ko‘rsatmalar esa morfologik jihatdan aniqroq, xushmuomalalikka yo‘naltirilgan va ko‘pincha og‘zaki qo‘shimchalar, yordamchi shakllar va tushuntirish komponentlari orqali tuziladi. Maqolada shuningdek, o‘zbek AI diskursi faol qarz olish, transliteratsiya, kalking va ingliz AI atamalarini, masalan, prompt, chatbot, algoritm, mashinani o‘rganish va neyron tarmoqlarini semantik moslashtirish bilan tavsiflanganligi ko‘rsatilgan. Maqolada AI bilan bog‘liq o‘quv diskursi qiyosiy tilshunoslik, terminologiya tadqiqotlari, pragmatika va raqamli diskurs tahlilining yangi sohasini ifodalaydi degan xulosaga kelish mumkin.

**ABOUT THE PAPER**

**Accepted:** 18 may 2026
**Approved:** 21 may 2026
**Volume:** 18-B
**Paper number:** 21

**KEYWORDS**

AI discourse, instructional discourse, English, Uzbek, imperatives, directive speech acts, terminology, prompt, digital communication, pragmatics

**ANNOTATION**

This article investigates the linguistic features of AI-related instructional discourse in English and Uzbek. The rapid development of artificial intelligence has produced new forms of human–machine communication in which users are guided through prompts, commands, recommendations, safety warnings, interface instructions, algorithmic explanations, and procedural texts. In this context, instructional discourse is no longer limited to traditional manuals or pedagogical explanations; it also includes digital commands, prompt-writing guidelines, chatbot interaction patterns, platform-based instructions, and AI system warnings. The study approaches AI-related instructional discourse as a specialized form of procedural and directive communication. It compares English and Uzbek examples in terms of lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features. The findings show that both languages rely heavily on imperative structures, sequential organization, technical terminology, modal expressions, and directive speech acts. However, English AI instructions tend to be more compact, verb-initial, and analytically organized, while Uzbek instructions are more morphologically explicit, politeness-oriented, and frequently constructed through verbal suffixes, auxiliary forms, and explanatory components. The article also demonstrates that Uzbek AI discourse is characterized by active borrowing, transliteration, calquing, and semantic adaptation of English AI terms such as *prompt*, *chatbot*, *algorithm*, *machine learning*, and *neural network*. The paper concludes that AI-related instructional discourse represents an emerging area of comparative linguistics, terminology studies, pragmatics, and digital discourse analysis.

**Introduction.** The emergence of artificial intelligence has significantly transformed the nature of contemporary communication. In digital environments, users increasingly interact with AI systems through commands, prompts, interface buttons, safety notices, tutorials, and automated recommendations. As a result, a new type of instructional discourse has emerged: AI-related instructional discourse. This discourse type includes not only technical manuals and user guides, but also prompt-writing instructions, chatbot usage guidelines, algorithmic explanations, AI platform notifications, troubleshooting messages, and ethical warnings. The OECD defines an AI system as a machine-based system that infers from input how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions; this definition is directly relevant to instructional discourse because AI interaction depends on how users formulate input and interpret output.

In linguistics, instructional discourse may be understood as a communicative form aimed at directing, regulating, or facilitating the addressee’s actions. Its central function is procedural: it tells the user what to do, how to do it, in what order, and under what conditions. Traditional instructional texts include manuals, recipes, guidelines, technical documentation, and educational instructions. In AI-related contexts, however, the procedural function becomes more complex because instructions are directed not only from human to human, but also from human to machine and from machine interface to human user. For example, English instructions such as *Enter your prompt*, *Upload the file*, *Click Generate*, and *Do not include sensitive information* correspond to Uzbek forms such as *So‘rovni kiriting*, *Faylni yuklang*, *Yaratish tugmasini bosing*, and *Maxfiy ma’lumotlarni kiritmang*.

The relevance of this topic is determined by the growing role of English as the dominant language of AI technologies and the increasing need to adapt AI-related terminology and instructions into Uzbek. English functions as the primary source language for many AI terms, while Uzbek receives and adapts these terms through translation, transliteration, calquing, and semantic extension. Therefore, the comparative study of AI instructional discourse in English and Uzbek is important for linguistics, translation studies, terminology, digital literacy, and applied communication.

The theoretical foundation of this study is connected with discourse analysis, genre analysis, speech act theory, pragmatics, and terminology studies. In genre analysis, texts are studied according to their communicative purposes, structural organization, and discourse community conventions. Bhatia’s work on professional genres is especially relevant because AI-related instructional discourse belongs to professional and technical communication: it is produced for a specific user community and performs a clearly defined communicative purpose.

Instructional discourse is also closely related to procedural discourse. Longacre's discourse grammar emphasizes that language should be analyzed in context and that discourse types differ according to their communicative organization. Procedural discourse is characterized by sequentiality, action orientation, and goal-directed structure. In AI-related instructional discourse, these features are visible in step-by-step commands such as *select a model*, *enter a prompt*, *review the output*, *edit the response*, and *save the result*.

Speech act theory provides another important framework for analyzing AI instructional discourse. According to Searle's classification, directive speech acts aim to make the addressee perform an action. Commands, requests, recommendations, warnings, and advice are all directive acts. AI-related instructions are largely directive in nature because they guide users toward specific actions: entering data, selecting options, avoiding unsafe input, generating content, or revising prompts.

**Literature analysis.** In his theory of professional discourse and genre analysis, Bhatia emphasizes the influence of communicative purpose on textual organization. According to the scholar, professional and technical texts are shaped according to the needs of a particular discourse community, and their primary function is to guide the user toward a specific action [2, pp. 13–25]. AI-related instructional discourse demonstrates these characteristics because it provides users with step-by-step guidance on writing prompts, selecting models, editing outputs, and interacting effectively with AI systems. Bhatia also notes that standardization, conciseness, and functional clarity are central features of technical and professional discourse [2, pp. 101–118]. These features are particularly visible in English AI instructions, which are usually short, direct, and action-oriented.

Longacre's theory of procedural discourse explains that discourse organization is fundamentally goal-oriented and sequential [9, pp. 33–47]. He argues that procedural texts guide users through a chain of actions leading to a specific outcome. In AI instructional discourse, this is reflected in sequences such as select a model, enter a prompt, generate output, and review the response. Longacre further highlights the importance of temporal order, cause–effect relations, and conditional structures in procedural communication [9, pp. 115–128]. Similar patterns can also be observed in Uzbek AI instructions through expressions equivalent to "first," "then," "check the result," and "if the answer is inaccurate."

Within speech act theory, Searle defines directive speech acts as utterances intended to make the addressee perform an action [13, pp. 10–16]. Commands, requests, warnings, recommendations, and advice therefore belong to the directive category. AI-related instructional discourse is predominantly directive because its communicative goal is to regulate user behavior during interaction with AI systems. Expressions such as Enter your prompt, Do not share personal data, Review the output carefully, and Refine your request are all examples of directive acts aimed at controlling procedural interaction between user and machine. Searle also emphasizes that directives vary in force and politeness depending on context [13, pp. 20–23], which is especially relevant when comparing English and Uzbek AI instructions.

Brown and Levinson's politeness theory provides another important framework for analyzing AI instructional discourse. The scholars explain that politeness strategies are used to reduce social pressure and protect the interlocutor's "face" during communication [3, pp. 61–68]. In English AI discourse, politeness is often realized through modal verbs and softening devices such as please, you may, make sure, try to, and should. Uzbek, however, tends to encode politeness morphologically through verbal suffixes and formulaic expressions such as kiriting, tanlang, foydalaning, iltimos, and tavsiya etiladi. Brown and Levinson distinguish between positive and negative politeness strategies [3, pp. 101–129], both of which appear in AI instructions where systems attempt to guide users politely while still maintaining procedural clarity.

Grice's theory of conversational implicature is also highly relevant to AI instructional discourse because it explains how meaning extends beyond literal wording [4, pp. 45–47]. Grice argues that successful communication depends on the cooperative principle and the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. In AI interaction, these principles are especially important because vague or ambiguous prompts may lead to inaccurate machine-generated responses. As a result, AI systems often encourage users to provide explicit and contextually rich instructions. Expressions such as Be specific, Provide context, and Describe the task clearly reflect Gricean principles of clarity and informativeness [4, pp. 52–58].

Halliday and Matthiessen's functional grammar also contributes significantly to the understanding of instructional discourse. The scholars view language as a social semiotic system in which grammatical choices reflect communicative functions [5, pp. 24–39]. In AI instructional discourse, the interpersonal metafunction is especially important because instructions establish a relationship between system and user through commands, recommendations, and guidance. The ideational metafunction is reflected in the representation of actions, processes, and technical operations, while the textual metafunction organizes procedural information into coherent and sequential structures [5, pp. 83–95]. Functional grammar therefore helps explain why AI instructions prioritize clarity, cohesion, and action-oriented syntax.

Hyland's research on metadiscourse further demonstrates that technical and instructional texts guide readers not only through information but also through interactional strategies [7, pp. 37–45]. According to Hyland, metadiscourse markers help writers organize discourse, anticipate user needs, and maintain engagement. In AI-related instructions, metadiscourse appears in phrases such as note that, for best results, before you begin, after generating the response, and make sure the prompt is clear. These expressions support user comprehension and reduce the possibility of misunderstanding during interaction with AI systems [7, pp. 126–138].

Herriman's study of English instruction manuals emphasizes that procedural texts require reader-oriented organization and explicit guidance mechanisms [6, pp. 120–127]. The author argues that instructional discourse frequently employs metadiscursive signals to direct readers through specialized information step by step. This observation directly applies to AI-related discourse, where users must follow precise procedural instructions in order to obtain accurate outputs from AI systems. Herriman also notes that technical instructions balance brevity with sufficient explanatory detail [6, pp. 128–132], a feature particularly evident when comparing concise English AI commands with more explanatory Uzbek equivalents.

**Methodology.** This study employs a comparative qualitative approach to analyze the linguistic features of AI-related instructional discourse in English and Uzbek. The research material consists of AI interface instructions, prompt-writing guidelines, chatbot interaction examples, safety notifications, procedural texts, and user-oriented recommendations collected from AI platforms, digital applications, and technical documentation.

The analysis is based on discourse analysis, pragmatics, speech act theory, and comparative linguistics. English and Uzbek instructional examples were compared at lexical, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels. Particular attention was given to imperative constructions, modal expressions, politeness strategies, technical terminology, and directive speech acts.

The study also applies descriptive and contrastive methods in order to identify similarities and differences between the two languages. AI-related terms such as prompt, chatbot, machine learning, neural network, and output were analyzed from the perspective of translation, transliteration, calquing, and semantic adaptation.

In addition, contextual and functional analysis was used to examine how instructional discourse guides user behavior during interaction with artificial intelligence systems. The collected examples were categorized according to communicative function, including commands, recommendations, warnings, procedural instructions, and explanatory guidance. This methodological approach made it possible to reveal both universal and language-specific features of AI instructional discourse in English and Uzbek.

**Results.** Pragmatics is also essential for this topic. Grice's theory of conversational implicature explains how meaning may go beyond what is explicitly stated. In AI instructions, explicitness is particularly important because ambiguous commands may lead to incorrect output. Therefore, AI instructional discourse often prioritizes clarity, specificity, and contextual completeness. OpenAI's prompt engineering guidance, for instance, emphasizes clear and specific prompts, sufficient context, and iterative refinement, which are linguistic principles directly connected with effective instructional communication.

Politeness theory is especially important for comparing English and Uzbek. Brown and Levinson's politeness model explains how speakers manage social distance, face, and imposition in communication. In English AI instructions, politeness is often expressed through modal verbs and softeners such as *please*, *can*, *should*, *make sure*, and *try to*. In Uzbek, politeness is frequently encoded morphologically through verb forms such as *kiriting*, *tanlang*, *yuklang*, *foydalaning*, and through formulaic markers such as *iltimos*, *tavsiya etiladi*, and *maqsadga muvofiq*.

From the perspective of Uzbek grammar, the comparison is particularly interesting because Uzbek is an agglutinative Turkic language. Grammatical meanings such as case, person, number, politeness, and verbal modality are often expressed through suffixes. Sjoberg's *Uzbek Structural Grammar* remains one of the important descriptive sources on Uzbek grammatical structure, and modern typological sources also describe Uzbek as a language with suffix-based morphology and SOV word order.

Recent studies of technical communication show that instruction manuals and procedural texts require effective metadiscourse because they must guide readers through specialized information. Herriman's study of English instruction manuals, for example, highlights the importance of reader guidance and engagement in technical texts. This is directly applicable to AI instructions, where metadiscourse appears in expressions such as *note that*, *make sure*, *for best results*, *before you begin*, *after generating the answer*, and *if the result is inaccurate*.

AI terminology also requires special attention. ISO/IEC 22989:2022 establishes terminology and concepts in the field of artificial intelligence and is intended to support communication among stakeholders. This is relevant for bilingual AI discourse because English terms must be standardized, translated, or adapted into Uzbek in a way that preserves technical accuracy.

AI-related instructional discourse represents a specialized form of digital procedural discourse aimed at guiding users in interacting with artificial intelligence systems effectively, safely, and accurately. Unlike traditional instructional texts, AI instructions regulate a dynamic interaction between user input and machine output. In this process, the user formulates prompts, interprets generated responses, revises instructions, and evaluates the quality of the output. Therefore, AI instructional discourse performs not only technical and procedural functions but also pragmatic, pedagogical, and communicative functions.

In English and Uzbek, AI-related instructional discourse shares several universal features, including imperative structures, sequential organization, technical terminology, modal expressions, safety warnings, and user-oriented guidance. However, these features are realized differently due to the typological and pragmatic differences between the two languages. English instructions are usually concise, analytical, and verb-initial, while Uzbek instructions are more morphologically marked, politeness-oriented, and explanatory.

**Table 1. General features of AI-related instructional discourse**

| Criterion | English | Uzbek | Comperative observation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Discourse type | Digital procedural discourse | Raqamli instruktiv diskurs | Both guide user actions in AI interaction |
| Main function | To regulate user input and system use | Foydalanuvchi harakatini yo‘naltirish | Both are action-oriented |
| Typical structure | Goal – Input – action – result | Maqsad – so‘rov – harakat – natija | Both follow a sequential pattern |
| Style | Concise and direct | Polite and explanatory | Uzbek tends to include more pragmatic clarification |
| User role | Active prompt producer | Faol so‘rov yaratuvchi | In both languages, the user participates in output formation |

As shown in the 1st table, both English and Uzbek AI instructional discourse are built around the principle of procedural guidance. However, English foregrounds brevity and directness, whereas Uzbek gives greater importance to politeness, contextual clarity, and morphological precision.

**Table 2. AI Terminology in English and uzbek**

| English term | Uzbek equivalent | Adaptation type | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Artificial intelligence | Sun’iy intellekt | Translation / calque | Stable equivalent |
| Prompt | so‘rov / matnli topshiriq | Borrowing / semantic adaptation | Context-dependent usage |
| Chatbot | Chatbot | Transliteration | Widely used borrowed form |
| Machine learning | Mashinaviy o‘rganish / mashinali o‘qitish | Translation | Not fully standardized |
| Neural network | Neyron tarmoq | Calque | Common in technical discourse |
| Output | Natija / yaratilgan javob | Semantic adaptation | Depends on user context |
| Token | Token | Transliteration | Mainly used in technical contexts |

English functions as the main source language of AI terminology. Uzbek adapts these terms through translation, transliteration, calquing, and semantic expansion. The term *prompt* is especially problematic because it may be rendered as *prompt*, *so‘rov*, *buyruq*, or *matnli topshiriq*, each carrying a different semantic nuance.

**Table 3. Imperative constructions in AI instructions**

| English instruction | Uzbek equivalent | Linguistic feature |
|---|---|---|
| Enter your prompt | So‘rovingizni kiriting | Possessive form + polite imperative |
| Click Generate | “Yaratish” tugmasini bosing | Object marking + polite imperative |
| Upload the file | Faylni yuklang | Borrowed term + accusative suffix |
| Review the output | Natijani tekshiring | Object + imperative verb |
| Refine your prompt | So‘rovingizni aniqlashtiring | Polite directive form |
| Do not share personal data | Shaxsiy ma’lumotlarni ulashmang | Negative imperative |

The imperative is the central grammatical form of AI instructional discourse in both languages. English imperatives are typically expressed by the base form of the verb, such as *enter*, *click*, *upload*, and *review*. In Uzbek, imperative meaning is expressed through polite verbal forms such as *kiriting*, *bosing*, *yuklang*, and *tekshiring*. Thus, Uzbek instructions grammatically encode politeness more clearly than English.

**Table 4. Modal and recommendation strategies**

| Function | English forms | Uzbek forms | Comperative feature |
|---|---|---|---|
| Recommendation | should, need to | kerak, lozim | Uzbek uses modal words and analytic structures |
| Permission | can, may | mumkin | Both express possibility |
| Obligation | must | shart, zarur | Uzbek often uses stronger evaluative forms |
| Advice | try to, make sure | tavsiya etiladi, ishonch hosil qiling | Uzbek tends to be more explanatory |
| Softening | please, you may | iltimos, maqsadga muvofiq | Politeness is more explicit in Uzbek |

English AI instructions frequently use modal verbs, while Uzbek uses modal words, impersonal constructions, and evaluative expressions. For example, *You should provide context* may be translated as *Kontekst berish tavsiya etiladi* or *Kontekst berish kerak*. This shows that Uzbek often transforms direct recommendation into a more polite and explanatory form.

**Discussion.** The comparative analysis of AI-related instructional discourse in English and Uzbek shows that both languages share a common communicative purpose: to guide users in performing actions within artificial intelligence systems accurately, safely, and effectively. In both languages, this discourse is organized around procedural guidance,

technical terminology, imperative constructions, modal expressions, recommendations, and user-oriented instructions. However, the linguistic realization of these features differs significantly due to the typological, grammatical, and pragmatic characteristics of English and Uzbek.

One of the main findings is that English AI instructional discourse is generally concise, analytical, and verb-centered. Instructions such as *Enter your prompt*, *Click Generate*, *Upload the file*, and *Review the output* demonstrate that English tends to place the action at the beginning of the sentence. This structure makes English instructions direct, compact, and suitable for digital interfaces where brevity and quick comprehension are essential. In contrast, Uzbek AI instructions are more morphologically marked and politeness-oriented. Forms such as *So'rovingizni kiriting*, *"Yaratish" tugmasini bosing*, and *Natijani tekshiring* show that Uzbek relies on object marking, possessive forms, and polite imperative suffixes to produce natural and appropriate instructional discourse.

The analysis also reveals that AI terminology in Uzbek is largely influenced by English. Terms such as *artificial intelligence*, *prompt*, *chatbot*, *machine learning*, *neural network*, *output*, and *token* are transferred into Uzbek through translation, transliteration, calquing, and semantic adaptation. Some terms, such as *sun'iy intellekt* and *neyron tarmoq*, have become relatively stable, while others, especially *prompt*, still have several competing equivalents, including *so'rov*, *matnli topshiriq*, and *prompt*. This indicates that Uzbek AI terminology is still in the process of standardization and requires further linguistic regulation.

Another important result concerns imperative and modal constructions. In English, imperatives are often expressed through the base form of the verb and are perceived as neutral in technical instructions. In Uzbek, however, direct imperatives are usually softened through polite verbal forms such as *kiriting*, *tanlang*, *yuklang*, *bosing*, and *tekshiring*. Similarly, English modal verbs such as *should*, *can*, *must*, and *may* are rendered in Uzbek through modal words and evaluative constructions such as *kerak*, *lozim*, *mumkin*, *zarur*, and *tavsiya etiladi*. This shows that Uzbek instructional discourse tends to transform direct commands and recommendations into more polite, explanatory, and user-friendly forms.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that AI-related instructional discourse in English and Uzbek combines procedural, technical, pragmatic, and pedagogical functions. While English prioritizes brevity, directness, and structural economy, Uzbek emphasizes grammatical explicitness, politeness, contextual clarity, and communicative appropriateness. These differences are especially important in translation, localization, AI interface design, and the development of Uzbek-language digital platforms.

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, AI-related instructional discourse is an emerging form of digital procedural communication that plays an essential role in regulating interaction between users and artificial intelligence systems. It guides users in formulating prompts, entering data, generating outputs, revising instructions, and evaluating results. Therefore, this type of discourse cannot be viewed merely as a set of technical commands; rather, it represents a complex communicative phenomenon that combines linguistic, pragmatic, pedagogical, and technological dimensions.

The comparative study of English and Uzbek AI instructional discourse shows that both languages perform similar communicative functions but employ different linguistic mechanisms. English instructions are typically short, direct, and action-oriented, whereas Uzbek instructions are more morphologically developed, polite, and explanatory. These distinctions reflect the broader typological difference between English as an analytic language and Uzbek as an agglutinative language. They also reveal the importance of pragmatic adaptation when translating or localizing AI-related instructions from English into Uzbek.

**REFERENCES:**


1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Harvard University Press.
2. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. Longman.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
4. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
5. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (4th ed.). Routledge.
6. Herriman, J. (2022). Metadiscourse in English instruction manuals. English for Specific Purposes, 65, 120–132.
7. Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Continuum.
8. ISO/IEC. (2022). ISO/IEC 22989:2022: Artificial Intelligence — Concepts and Terminology.
9. Longacre, R. E. (1996). The Grammar of Discourse (2nd ed.). Springer.
10. National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). U.S. Department of Commerce.
11. OECD. (2024). Explanatory Memorandum on the Updated OECD Definition of an AI System. OECD Publishing.
12. OpenAI. (2026). Prompt Engineering Best Practices for ChatGPT. OpenAI Help Center.
13. Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. Language in Society, 5(1), 1–23.
14. Sjoberg, A. F. (1963). Uzbek Structural Grammar. Indiana University Press.