

LINGUOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DISCOURSE IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Habiyaliyeva Madina Xolmurod qizi

Student of Namangan State Pedagogical Institute

E-mail: habiyaliyevamadina1212@gmail.com

Tel: +998943552827

Abstract: *This article examines the linguopragmatic features of artificial intelligence discourse in the Uzbek language. The growing use of AI-related terms such as sun'iy intellekt, neyrotarmoq, chatbot, generativ model, prompt and algoritm demonstrates that digital communication is rapidly changing the lexical, pragmatic and cultural structure of contemporary Uzbek discourse. The aim of the study is to identify the main pragmatic functions of AI discourse units, to describe their role in media, educational and everyday online communication, and to reveal how they influence communicative intention, social evaluation, trust and politeness. The research uses descriptive, discourse-analytical, linguopragmatic and contextual methods. The findings show that Uzbek AI discourse performs informative, persuasive, evaluative, directive, cautionary and identity-building functions. It also reflects code-switching, terminological adaptation, modernization of scientific vocabulary and the formation of new digital etiquette. The article concludes that AI discourse in Uzbek should be studied not only as a technical terminology system, but also as a socially active communicative phenomenon that shapes public attitudes toward technology, knowledge, innovation and linguistic culture.*

Keywords: *artificial intelligence discourse, Uzbek language, linguopragmatics, digital communication, chatbot, prompt, neologism, media language, pragmatic function, speech act.*

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada o'zbek tilida sun'iy intellekt diskursining lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. "Sun'iy intellekt", "neyrotarmoq", "chatbot", "generativ model", "prompt", "algoritm" kabi birliklarning faol qo'llanishi zamonaviy o'zbek diskursida raqamli kommunikatsiyaning leksik, pragmatik va madaniy jihatdan yangilanayotganini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi sun'iy intellektga oid birliklarning pragmatik vazifalarini aniqlash, ularning media, ta'lim va kundalik internet muloqotidagi o'rnini yoritishdan iborat. Maqolada tavsifiy, diskursiv, lingvopragmatik va kontekstual tahlil metodlaridan foydalanildi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, o'zbek tilidagi sun'iy intellekt diskursi informativ, ishontiruvchi, baholovchi, yo'naltiruvchi, ogohlantiruvchi va identifikatsion vazifalarni bajaradi. Shuningdek, u kod almashinuvi, terminologik moslashuv, ilmiy leksikaning zamonaviylashuvi hamda yangi raqamli o'dob shakllanishini aks ettiradi.

Kalit so'zlar: sun'iy intellekt diskursi, o'zbek tili, lingvopragmatika, raqamli kommunikatsiya, chatbot, prompt, neologizm, media tili, pragmatik funktsiya, nutq akti.

Аннотация: В статье анализируются лингвопрагматические особенности дискурса искусственного интеллекта в узбекском языке. Активное употребление таких единиц, как "sun'iy intellekt", "neyrotarmoq", "chatbot", "generativ model", "prompt" и "algoritm", показывает, что современный узбекский дискурс обновляется в лексическом, прагматическом и культурном аспектах под влиянием цифровой коммуникации. Цель исследования заключается в определении прагматических функций единиц дискурса искусственного интеллекта и раскрытии их роли в медиа, образовании и повседневном интернет-общении. В статье

применяются описательный, дискурсивный, лингвопрагматический и контекстуальный методы. Результаты показывают, что дискурс искусственного интеллекта в узбекском языке выполняет информативную, убеждающую, оценочную, директивную, предупредительную и идентификационную функции. Он также отражает кодовое переключение, терминологическую адаптацию и формирование нового цифрового этикета.

***Ключевые слова:** дискурс искусственного интеллекта, узбекский язык, лингвопрагматика, цифровая коммуникация, чатбот, промпт, неологизм, язык СМИ, прагматическая функция, речевой акт.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of artificial intelligence has created a new communicative environment in which human language interacts with algorithms, interfaces, chatbots and automated text-generating systems. This process has changed not only technological practice, but also linguistic behavior. In the Uzbek language, AI-related discourse is becoming visible in media texts, educational materials, social networks, advertising, public discussions and everyday online communication. Terms such as *sun'iy intellekt*, *AI*, *neyrotarmoq*, *chatbot*, *generativ model*, *prompt*, *algoritm*, *avtomatik tarjima* and *raqamli yordamchi* are no longer limited to technical specialists; they increasingly enter public speech and acquire social, evaluative and pragmatic meanings.

The topic is relevant because artificial intelligence discourse in Uzbek is still in the process of formation. Some units are translated into Uzbek, some are borrowed from English or Russian, and some are used in mixed forms. For example, the expressions *prompt yozish*, *AI yordamida matn yaratish*, *chatbotga savol berish* and *neyrotarmoqdan*

foydalanish show that technological terms become part of ordinary speech acts. These expressions do not merely name digital objects; they guide action, create expectations, persuade users and shape attitudes toward innovation.

From a linguopragmatic point of view, AI discourse should be studied through the relation between language form, speaker intention, communicative situation and social effect. The same term may have different pragmatic functions in different contexts. In an educational text, *sun'iy intellekt* may function as a scientific concept; in advertising, it may become a persuasive sign of modernity; in public debate, it may express risk, fear or ethical concern; in everyday online communication, it may serve as a practical tool for asking, writing, translating or checking information.

The emergence of AI discourse also raises cultural questions. Uzbek communicative culture traditionally values politeness, respect, clarity, indirectness and social responsibility. When AI systems communicate in Uzbek, the interface language must not only be grammatically correct, but also culturally appropriate. Forms such as *marhamat*, *iltimos*, *savolingizni kiriting*, *javobni tekshirib ko'ring* and *sizga yordam bera olaman* show how politeness strategies are adapted to digital interaction. Thus, AI discourse is not only a technological phenomenon, but also a cultural and pragmatic one.

The aim of this article is to analyze the linguopragmatic features of artificial intelligence discourse in the Uzbek language. The main objectives are to identify the lexical and discourse units related to AI, classify their pragmatic functions, reveal their role in media and educational communication, and determine how they influence the formation of digital speech etiquette in Uzbek.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

The theoretical basis of the article is formed by pragmatics, discourse analysis, speech act theory and digital linguistics. Pragmatics studies language in relation to context, intention and communicative effect. In this sense, AI discourse can be analyzed not only by its lexical composition, but also by the way it performs actions: informing, advising, warning, persuading, evaluating or directing the user. Austin's speech act theory explains that utterances do not simply describe reality, but may also perform actions (Austin, 1962). Searle further developed this approach by classifying speech acts into assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations (Searle, 1969). These categories are useful for analyzing AI-related Uzbek discourse, because many AI expressions function as directives, recommendations or warnings.

The pragmatic aspect of AI discourse is also connected with politeness and communicative cooperation. Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims show how relevance, clarity and informativeness shape successful communication (Grice, 1975). Leech's politeness principle and Brown and Levinson's theory of face are important for understanding why Uzbek AI interfaces often use respectful and softening forms such as *iltimos*, *marhamat* and *siz* (Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987). These forms reduce communicative distance and make automated interaction closer to human dialogue.

Discourse analysis provides another important framework. According to discourse-oriented approaches, language reflects social relations, power, ideology and cultural change. AI discourse in Uzbek can therefore be treated as a field where technological modernization, public trust, ethical anxiety and linguistic adaptation intersect. Media texts

about AI frequently use evaluative vocabulary such as *zamonaviy*, *tezkor*, *aqli*, *xavfsiz*, *innovatsion* or *xavfli*. These words show that the discourse does not remain neutral: it evaluates AI either as a useful innovation or as a potential risk.

Digital linguistics also contributes to the study. Crystal emphasizes that digital communication changes language forms, genres and interaction patterns (Crystal, 2006). In the case of Uzbek, AI discourse contributes to new forms of code-switching and hybrid terminology. Expressions such as AI assistant, *prompt yozish*, *chatbot servisi*, *machine learning modeli* and *generativ kontent* show the coexistence of Uzbek grammatical patterns with English technological lexemes. This process is not merely lexical borrowing; it creates new pragmatic habits in communication.

International documents also show that AI is not only a technical issue, but a social and ethical one. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence emphasizes human rights, transparency, responsibility and inclusiveness in AI development. The OECD AI Principles also promote trustworthy AI that respects democratic values and human rights. These frameworks are relevant to linguistic research because public understanding of AI depends largely on discourse: how AI is named, explained, evaluated and discussed in society.

The research uses several methods. The descriptive method is used to identify and classify AI-related lexical and discourse units in Uzbek. The linguopragmatic method is applied to determine the functions of these units in communication. The contextual method helps reveal how the meaning of the same unit changes in media, education, advertising and everyday online interaction. The comparative-observational method is used to distinguish translated, borrowed and hybrid forms. The

material of the study consists of typical Uzbek AI-related terms and expressions observed in media discourse, educational communication, social networks and interface language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that AI discourse in the Uzbek language is formed through several interconnected processes: terminological adaptation, borrowing, semantic expansion, pragmatic specialization and cultural accommodation. These processes demonstrate that the Uzbek language actively responds to technological change and develops new means for describing digital reality.

The first important feature is terminological adaptation. The phrase *sun'iy intellekt* is the most stable Uzbek equivalent of artificial intelligence. It is used in scientific, official, educational and media contexts. However, alongside this form, the abbreviation AI is also widely used, especially in online communication and advertising. The coexistence of *sun'iy intellekt* and AI shows a functional difference: the Uzbek term is usually more formal and explanatory, while the English abbreviation is shorter, more global and often associated with innovation and modernity.

The second feature is the spread of hybrid expressions. In Uzbek AI discourse, English technological words are often combined with Uzbek grammatical or lexical elements: *prompt yozish*, *chatbotdan foydalanish*, *AI orqali tarjima qilish*, *generativ model yaratgan matn*, *neyrotarmoq javobi*. Such combinations show that borrowed terms are adapted to Uzbek syntactic patterns. Pragmatically, they make technological actions more understandable for users while preserving the international identity of the term.

The third feature is pragmatic multifunctionality. AI-related units do not only nominate technological objects; they perform communicative tasks. The word chatbot may function as an informative term in a news article, as a persuasive tool in advertising, or as a directive element in an instruction. Similarly, prompt may name an input command, but in educational discourse it becomes a skill-related concept, as in prompt yozish ko‘nikmasi or to‘g‘ri prompt tuzish.

The fourth feature is evaluative polarity. AI discourse in Uzbek includes both positive and negative evaluation. Positive evaluation is expressed through words such as tezkor, qulay, aqlli, innovatsion, samarali, zamonaviy and avtomatlashtirilgan. Negative or cautionary evaluation appears in expressions such as noto‘g‘ri javob, ma’lumotni tekshirish zarur, xavfsizlik muammosi, inson nazorati kerak and sun’iy intellekt xato qilishi mumkin. This polarity reflects the social ambivalence of AI: it is perceived as useful, but also as a source of uncertainty.

Table 1. Main pragmatic functions of AI discourse units in Uzbek

Pragmatic function	Typical Uzbek units	Communicative intention	Example of use
Informative	sun’iy intellekt, algoritm, neyrotarmoq	to explain a concept	Sun’iy intellekt matn yaratish imkoniga ega.

Directive	prompt kiriting, savol bering, tekshiring	to guide user action	Chatbotga aniq savol bering.
Persuasive	aqlli tizim, tezkor yechim, innovatsion xizmat	to attract and convince	AI yordamida ishingizni tezlashtiring.
Evaluative	foydali, xavfli, ishonchli, noaniq	to express attitude	Neyrotarmo q javobi har doim tekshirilishi kerak.
Cautionary	xato qilishi mumkin, inson nazorati zarur	to warn and reduce risk	Sun'iy intellekt javobini manba bilan solishtiring.
Politeness-oriented	iltimos, marhamat, sizga yordam beraman	to make digital interaction respectful	Marhamat, so'rovingizni kiriting.

The table demonstrates that AI discourse in Uzbek has a complex pragmatic structure. It combines the language of science, instruction, advertising, warning and politeness. This multifunctionality is especially visible in media texts and user interfaces, where one short expression may simultaneously inform, direct and persuade the audience.

Informative function is central to AI discourse. Uzbek speakers need clear explanations for new technological concepts. Therefore, media texts often define AI through explanatory constructions: *sun'iy intellekt inson aqliy faoliyatini modellashtiruvchi texnologiya, neyrotarmoq ma'lumotlar asosida o'rganadigan tizim, chatbot foydalanuvchi bilan muloqot qiluvchi dastur*. Such explanations perform an educational function and reduce the distance between specialized terminology and public understanding.

Directive function is also frequent. Digital tools require users to perform certain actions: *savol kiriting, fayl yuklang, prompt yozing, javobni tekshiring, natijani tahrir qiling*. These imperatives are pragmatic signs of interface communication. However, in Uzbek they are often softened by polite forms such as *iltimos* or *marhamat*. This shows that Uzbek digital discourse tends to adapt directive speech acts to national politeness norms.

Persuasive function appears in advertising and promotional discourse. Expressions such as *AI bilan samaradorlikni oshiring, aqlli yordamchi, avtomatik yechim* and *zamonaviy platforma* present AI as a tool of progress and productivity. The pragmatic goal is not merely to describe technology, but to create trust and motivate adoption. In such contexts, AI becomes a symbolic marker of innovation.

Evaluative function is particularly important in public discussions. Media texts and social networks often use AI-related expressions to

express approval, concern or criticism. For example, generativ model imkoniyatlari keng may suggest a positive attitude, while sun'iy intellekt inson mehnatini almashtiradimi? expresses uncertainty and social anxiety. Thus, AI discourse becomes a space where society evaluates the future of work, education and creativity.

Cautionary function reflects ethical and epistemic responsibility. Since AI-generated information may be incomplete or inaccurate, Uzbek discourse increasingly includes warning formulas: ma'lumotni tekshiring, AI xato qilishi mumkin, inson nazorati zarur. These expressions are pragmatically important because they prevent blind trust in automated output. They also indicate the formation of responsible digital literacy.

Another important feature is the formation of AI-related digital etiquette. When an interface says marhamat, savolingizni yozing or sizga qanday yordam bera olaman?, it imitates respectful human communication. In Uzbek culture, the pronoun siz and the politeness marker marhamat are especially significant. Their use in AI discourse gives automated communication a culturally acceptable tone. Therefore, the linguopragmatics of AI discourse must include not only terminology, but also politeness, address forms and user-centered interaction.

Code-switching is one of the most visible features of Uzbek AI discourse. English terms such as AI, prompt, chatbot, machine learning and deep learning often appear without full translation. In some cases, they are adapted phonologically or graphically; in other cases, they remain in English. This situation creates a layered discourse: specialized users may prefer English forms, while broader audiences may need Uzbek equivalents. The coexistence of variants may enrich the language, but it may also create terminological instability.

From the perspective of speech act theory, AI discourse contains assertive, directive, expressive and commissive elements. Assertives appear in definitions and news: *sun'iy intellekt yangi imkoniyatlar yaratmoqda*. Directives appear in instructions: *promptni aniq yozing*. Expressives appear in evaluative comments: *bu juda qulay vosita or xavotirli holat*. Commissive elements appear in promotional texts: *AI sizga tezkor yechim beradi*. The abundance of these speech acts confirms that AI discourse is action-oriented.

The Uzbek language also develops metaphoric representations of AI. Expressions such as *aqli yordamchi*, *raqamli miya*, *virtual ustoz* and *avtomatik maslahatchi* personify technology and bring it closer to human social roles. Such metaphors perform a pragmatic function: they make complex technology understandable and emotionally acceptable. At the same time, they may overstate the capabilities of AI by presenting it as a human-like agent.

In educational discourse, AI-related units acquire a methodological meaning. Students and teachers use expressions such as *AI yordamida tahlil qilish*, *matnni tekshirish*, *avtomatik tarjima*, *taqdimot tayyorlash* and *prompt tuzish*. These expressions show that AI discourse is entering academic communication and changing learning practices. The pragmatic challenge is to distinguish assistance from authorship and to promote ethical use of AI tools.

In media discourse, AI-related headlines often have a strong pragmatic effect. Headlines may emphasize novelty, fear, benefit or competition. For example, expressions like *sun'iy intellekt ta'limni o'zgartiradi*, *AI ish o'rinlariga ta'sir qiladi* or *chatbotlar yangi davrni boshladi* are designed to attract attention. Thus, AI discourse in media is

closely connected with attention management and public opinion formation.

The national-cultural aspect of AI discourse in Uzbek is seen in the adaptation of technological language to local communicative expectations. Uzbek users often expect respectful and clear communication. Therefore, AI systems and media texts that use overly mechanical or foreign forms may sound unnatural. A culturally appropriate Uzbek AI discourse should combine terminological precision with communicative politeness and clarity.

The results of the study allow the classification of Uzbek AI discourse into four main layers: terminological layer, pragmatic-functional layer, evaluative layer and etiquette layer. The terminological layer includes names of technologies; the pragmatic-functional layer includes instructions and speech acts; the evaluative layer includes positive and negative judgments; the etiquette layer includes politeness formulas and culturally adapted interaction models.

Table 2. Structural layers of AI discourse in the Uzbek language

Layer	Content	Linguopragmatic significance
Terminological layer	sun'iy intellekt, chatbot, algoritm, prompt	names of new technological realities
Functional layer	savol bering, prompt yozing, fayl yuklang	organizes user action
Evaluative layer	qulay, xavfli, ishonchli, innovatsion	forms attitudes and social evaluation
Etiquette layer	marhamat, iltimos, sizga yordam beraman	adapts AI interaction to Uzbek politeness norms

This classification shows that AI discourse in Uzbek is a multidimensional phenomenon. It cannot be reduced to a list of borrowed words. It includes communicative strategies, cultural expectations, pragmatic intentions and social evaluations. Therefore, future research should study not only the frequency of AI terms, but also their functions in specific genres: news, advertisements, educational instructions, public debates, chatbot interfaces and social media comments.

The development of Uzbek AI discourse also has implications for language policy and terminology planning. If Uzbek equivalents are clear and actively used, AI-related knowledge becomes more accessible to wider audiences. If terminology remains unstable and excessively dependent on foreign forms, there may be a gap between specialists and general users. From a pragmatic point of view, the successful development of AI discourse requires clarity, consistency, politeness and cultural relevance.

Overall, the findings indicate that artificial intelligence discourse in the Uzbek language performs several major communicative tasks. It introduces new technological concepts, persuades users to adopt digital tools, warns about possible risks, creates evaluative attitudes and forms new norms of human-machine communication. This makes AI discourse one of the most important emerging fields of contemporary Uzbek linguistics.

CONCLUSION

The article has analyzed the linguopragmatic features of artificial intelligence discourse in the Uzbek language. The study has shown that AI-related units are not limited to technical terminology. They function as active communicative means that inform, persuade, evaluate, direct, warn and regulate digital interaction.

The most visible lexical units of Uzbek AI discourse include *sun'iy intellekt*, *AI*, *neyrotarmoq*, *chatbot*, *generativ model*, *prompt*, *algoritim* and *avtomatik tizim*. These units enter Uzbek through translation, borrowing and hybrid formation. Their pragmatic functions depend on context: in media they create public opinion, in education they organize learning activity, in advertising they persuade, and in interfaces they guide the user.

The research has also demonstrated that Uzbek AI discourse reflects national communicative culture. Politeness markers such as *marhamat*, *iltimos* and *siz* are important in making automated communication acceptable and natural for Uzbek users. Therefore, the formation of AI discourse in Uzbek should consider not only technological accuracy, but also cultural appropriateness and speech etiquette.

It can be concluded that AI discourse is a new and promising object of Uzbek linguopragmatics. It reflects the interaction between language, technology, society and culture. Further research may focus on corpus-based analysis of Uzbek AI media texts, chatbot communication in Uzbek, ethical discourse about AI, and comparative studies of AI terminology in Uzbek, English, Russian and Turkic languages.

REFERENCES

1. Austin J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962. – 168 p.
2. Bender E. M., Gebru T., McMillan-Major A., Shmitchell S. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? // *Proceedings of FAccT*. – 2021. – P. 610–623.
3. Brown P., Levinson S. C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.

4. Crystal D. Language and the Internet. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 304 p.
5. Fairclough N. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. – London: Longman, 1995. – 265 p.
6. Floridi L., Chiriatti M. GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences // Minds and Machines. – 2020. – Vol. 30. – P. 681–694.
7. Grice H. P. Logic and Conversation // Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3: Speech Acts. – New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41–58.
8. Jurafsky D., Martin J. H. Speech and Language Processing. – Draft 3rd edition. – Stanford University, 2024.
9. Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. – London: Longman, 1983. – 250 p.
10. Levinson S. C. Pragmatics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 420 p.
11. OECD. OECD AI Principles. – Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2019. – Electronic resource.
12. Searle J. R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
13. UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. – Paris: UNESCO, 2021. – Electronic resource.
14. Yule G. Pragmatics. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 138 p.
15. Маҳмудов Н. Тил ва маданият. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1992. – 96 б.
16. Ҳақимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. – Тошкент: Академнашр, 2013. – 176 б.
17. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2008. – 286 б.