https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble

Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

G'oyiberdiyev Farog'iddin
Kokand University, Andijan branch
English teacher at Foreign languages department
+998951005153
farokhiddin11@gmail.com

LINGUISTIC PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE PROMPT CONSTRUCTION FOR AI LANGUAGE MODELS

Abstract: Large language models (LLMs) such as GPT, Claude, and Gemini process natural language instructions and generate human-like responses across academic, technical, and creative domains. As these systems become central to research, education, and knowledge production, the ability to construct effective prompts has emerged as an essential literacy skill. While prompt engineering has grown rapidly, its linguistic foundation remains under-examined. This study explores the linguistic principles that support effective prompt construction using a corpus of high-performing academic prompts. Drawing on theories from pragmatics, semantics, discourse analysis, and cognitive linguistics, the study identifies central patterns of clarity, explicit verbs, contextual framing, role-based instruction, structured sequencing, lexical precision, genre cues, metapragmatic guidance, and iterative refinement. These principles demonstrate that prompting functions as a new communicative genre requiring linguistic awareness rather than technical coding skill. The article argues that prompt literacy should be considered part of modern academic writing, digital literacy, and EFL instruction. The findings offer a deeper understanding of how humans can communicate more effectively with AI systems and how linguistic theory continues to apply even in technologically mediated communication.

Key words: prompt construction, linguistic principles, pragmatics, semantics, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, large language models, AI

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

communication, role assignment, contextual framing, metapragmatic instruction, genre signaling, digital literacy, academic writing, EFL pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has reorganized the landscape of communication, learning, and research.[1] Advanced language models—trained on vast textual corpora—can now produce complex explanations, analyses, narratives, and arguments in response to natural language instructions.[2] These instructions, or "prompts," determine the quality, depth, structure, and relevance of the system's output. As a result, prompt construction has become one of the most critical skills for students, researchers, and educators who work with AI.

Despite its rising importance, prompt construction is often treated as a form of trial-and-error or a set of informal tips rather than as a linguistic practice grounded in established principles of communication.[3] Yet prompting is fundamentally a language activity, not a programming activity. It involves clarity of intention, precision of vocabulary, awareness of discourse patterns, and control of tone and register.[4] The success of a prompt depends on how effectively linguistic meaning is encoded.

Unlike human communication, where shared experience, context, and background knowledge fill gaps in meaning, LLMs process only the text they receive.[5] They do not infer intention based on facial expression, cultural norms, or social context. Therefore, prompting requires a higher degree of linguistic explicitness than ordinary conversation. Effective prompts must encode purpose, structure, tone, and constraints within language itself.

[1] Zawacki-Richter, Olaf, et al. "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 6, 2019, p 2.

[2] Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge UP, 2009. p 12.
[3] Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. Cohesion in English. Longman, 1976. p 22.
[4] Hyland, Ken. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Bloomsbury, 2005. p 18.
[5] Levinson, Stephen C. Pragmatics. Cambridge UP, 1983. p 34

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

This difference positions prompting as a new communicative genre: a structured form of instruction addressed to a non-human language processor.[6] Such communication requires clear pragmatics, organized discourse, explicit semantics, and careful framing. Understanding these requirements allows users to shape AI output with far greater control.

This study contributes to linguistic research by examining how established linguistic theories manifest in AI prompting. It also contributes to digital literacy by providing learners and educators with a theory-based framework for constructing effective prompts. The findings are relevant to applied linguistics, EFL/ESL pedagogy, academic writing instruction, digital humanities, communication studies, artificial intelligence education. By framing prompt construction as a linguistic competency, the study supports the integration of prompt literacy into modern curricula.[7]

METHODOLOGY

This methodological section provides a comprehensive description of the techniques and procedures utilized throughout the study.

Corpus Method: A corpus of 450 high-performing prompts was compiled from expert AI users, academic workshops, university researchers, prompt engineering communities, and instructional designers. Prompts were tested across multiple large language models to ensure consistency of performance.[8] A control set of 120 low-performing prompts was collected from beginner users.

Coding and Analysis: The prompts were analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. Five dimensions guided coding:

- Pragmatic force: clarity of instructions, directness, conversational maxims

[6] Swales, John M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge UP, 1990. p41
[7] Zawacki-Richter, Olaf, et al. "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 6, 2019, p 6.
[8] Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide. SAGE, 2021, p 52.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

- Semantic precision: verb specificity, terminology, ambiguity
- Syntactic structure: sentence complexity, imperative clarity
- Discourse organization: sequencing, coherence, hierarchy
- Cognitive framing: task framing, conceptual scaffolding

Themes were identified and refined through iterative reading.

RESULTS

The analysis of high-performing prompts revealed a coherent set of linguistic principles that consistently shape the clarity, depth, and accuracy of AI-generated responses. These principles do not function independently; rather, they operate together to form a linguistic foundation for effective prompting. They reflect the need for explicitness, structure, and conceptual focus when communicating with large language models. The following section synthesizes these principles into a unified academic discussion without enumerated formatting, providing a continuous analysis suitable for scholarly writing.

Effective prompts begin with clarity and the use of explicit action verbs. Directives such as *analyze, define, compare, classify, synthesize,* and *evaluate* guide the AI toward specific discourse patterns and rhetorical structures. These verbs provide clear procedural signals, ensuring that the model interprets not only the topic but also the analytical task required.[9] Vague instructions—for example, "write about"—often lead to generalized or unfocused results. A prompt requesting "Write about the importance of syntax" frequently produces a superficial explanation, while a more precise instruction such as "Write a 250-word explanation analyzing why syntax is essential in determining sentence meaning, using two original examples" consistently yields a detailed and academically

[9] Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation." Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3, Academic Press, 1975, p 47.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

structured response. This difference aligns closely with Grice's maxim of manners, which emphasizes the avoidance of ambiguity in communication.[10]

Role assignment further enhances response quality by activating stylistic, structural, and disciplinary conventions associated with specific social identities.[11] When a prompt begins with "Act as a linguistics professor," "Respond as a legal expert," or "Explain this as a historian," the model is guided toward registers and formats found in its training data. In one corpus example, the prompt "Act as a professor of semantics and explain prototype theory to undergraduate students" elicited a response that adopted an instructive tone, used discipline-appropriate terminology, and demonstrated pedagogical clarity.[12] Role assignment thus functions as a means of anchoring the model's discourse style, audience awareness, and level of technicality.

Contextual framing also plays a critical role in shaping the relevance and precision of AI responses.[13] Because LLMs lack shared situational awareness or experiential background, contextual cues embedded within prompts help constrain interpretation. Indicating that a response is intended for "students in a second-year linguistics course" or "preparing for a conference presentation" directs the model toward specific academic expectations. Such framing influences vocabulary selection, depth of analysis, and overall communicative approach. By situating the task within a defined context, users supply the model with crucial interpretive scaffolding.

Structured sequencing contributes significantly to the organization and coherence of AI-generated text.[14] Prompts that present information in a logical order—whether through bullet points, stepwise instructions, or clear sub-tasks—tend to result in responses that mirror that structure. When a user requests a

[10] Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58
[11] Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge UP, 1990. p 44
[12] Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. Register, Genre, and Style. Cambridge UP, 2009.
[13] Levinson, Stephen C. Pragmatics. Cambridge UP, 1983. p 34
[14] Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. Cohesion in English. Longman, 1976. P 72.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

definition, examples, explanation of causes, and a concluding comparison, the model systematically addresses each component. This reflects the principle that discourse organization tends to replicate input structures. Structured sequencing also reduces the risk of omissions or thematic drift, ensuring that the response remains aligned with user expectations.

Constraints and boundaries—such as word limits, tone requirements, or formatting specifications—enhance the precision of AI output.[15] For example, instructing the model to produce "exactly 150 words in a formal academic tone summarizing two advantages and two limitations of frame semantics" leads to focused and balanced writing. Constraints function as metalinguistic boundaries, reducing the model's tendency toward verbosity or digression. These boundaries are especially important in academic and professional contexts where concision and relevance are valued.

Lexical precision emerged as one of the strongest predictors of high-performing prompts.[16] Technical terms such as *semantic shift*, *prototype theory*, *speech acts*, *morphological typology*, or *cohesion markers* narrow the interpretive space and prevent ambiguous or general responses. Precise terminology activates well-defined semantic frames, facilitating more accurate knowledge retrieval and concept explanation. This aligns with the cognitive linguistic principle that lexical choice shapes conceptual framing.

Metapragmatic instructions — cues that guide the rhetorical and stylistic shape of the response—were also key components of effective prompts. Directives such as "Use clear transitions," "Avoid overly general claims," "Support your explanation with evidence," or "Write in a neutral academic tone" help regulate the communicative quality of the output.[17] These instructions operate at the level of metadiscourse, shaping coherence, clarity, and argumentation.

[15] Hyland, Ken. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Bloomsbury, 2005, p 44.
[16] Fillmore, Charles J. "Frame Semantics." *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Hanshin, 1982, p 115
[17] Hyland, Ken. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Bloomsbury, 2005, p 67.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

Examples, often referred to as few-shot prompting, greatly improved the stylistic fidelity and accuracy of responses. When users provide examples of the style or structure they want replicated, the model uses them as templates. For instance, a prompt instructing the AI to "Rewrite the following sentence in plain academic English, using the style shown in the example" offers the model a concrete pattern to imitate.[18] This technique reduces inferential burden and increases stylistic consistency.

Genre signaling further strengthens the quality of AI outputs. Indicating that the model should "write a literature review," "prepare an abstract," or "draft a policy brief" activates genre-specific structures the model has absorbed during training.[19] Such cues guide the model toward the conventions expected in formal genres, including organization, tone, and communicative purpose.

Finally, iterative refinement instructions contribute to polished and coherent text generation. Prompts that ask the AI to review its work, check for clarity, remove redundancy, or correct inconsistencies lead to more refined responses.[20] This reflects a form of scaffolded self-editing in which the model improves its output through guided revision before presenting the final version.

Together, these linguistic principles demonstrate that effective prompting is grounded in clarity, structure, context, and conceptual precision. They present prompting as a linguistic craft shaped by established patterns of academic, instructional, and professional communication.

DISCUSSION

The findings illustrate that prompting is not a technical shortcut but a complex linguistic process that draws on foundational principles from multiple branches of linguistics. The results reaffirm that clear and effective communication

[18] Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorization." *Cognition and Categorization*, edited by Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978, p 31.
[19] Swales, John M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge UP, 1990, p 58
[20] Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide. SAGE, 2021, p 102.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

with AI models depends on applying the same linguistic skills that guide human-to-human interaction—but with even greater explicitness due to the absence of shared context or inferential capability.

The most salient pattern involves the need for explicitness in directive force. Pragmatically, large language models require detailed, unambiguous instructions because they cannot rely on shared assumptions or contextual enrichment. Human interlocutors infer missing information through tone, relationship, and real-world knowledge. LLMs, by contrast, rely exclusively on linguistic input. The reliance on explicit verbs and clear purpose statements reflects this need for precise pragmatic encoding.[21]

Semantic precision reinforces this pattern. Lexical specificity reduces the interpretive space, helping the model select more relevant and academically accurate information.[22] When a prompt specifies “frame semantics” rather than “meaning,” or “morphological typology” rather than “word structure,” the model retrieves knowledge within a well-defined conceptual field. This aligns with frame semantics, which posits that lexical choices activate structured cognitive frames.

Discourse organization plays a fundamental role as well. Structured sequencing in prompts results in structured reasoning in responses, demonstrating the AI’s tendency to mimic the hierarchical organization of the prompt itself. This pattern confirms Halliday’s view of language as a system for organizing meaning through cohesive and predictable structures.[23] It also reflects the importance of coherence markers and information hierarchy in academic writing.

Contextual framing, another key finding, expands understanding of how AI models interpret tasks. Since these systems cannot access extra-linguistic knowledge or lived experience, they depend on the user's explicit contextual cues

[21] Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP, 1983. 56 p.
[22] Fillmore, Charles J. “Frame Semantics.” *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Hanshin, 1982, pp. 111–138.
[23] Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. Longman, 1976.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

to determine audience, tone, and depth. This aligns with sociolinguistic concepts of register and audience awareness and highlights how prompting serves as a metacommunicative act grounded in situational framing.

Role assignment can be understood within genre theory. When users instruct a model to respond as a professor, analyst, researcher, or teacher, the corresponding discourse patterns shape the response. This demonstrates Swales's assertion that genre knowledge includes shared expectations about structure, tone, and purpose.[24] Role assignment functions as a short linguistic signal that activates these genre expectations within the model's output.

The presence of metapragmatic instructions underscores how prompting engages metadiscourse. Prompts that specify transitions, tone, evidence, or coherence expectations effectively teach the AI how to shape its rhetorical form. This reinforces Hyland's framework, where metadiscourse guides audience engagement and textual coherence.[25] In prompting, metapragmatic guidance compensates for the absence of human intuition.

Few-shot prompting, or providing examples, illustrates how LLMs rely on pattern recognition. Examples serve as immediate templates. Cognitive theories of construction grammar also support this: linguistic constructions are learned inductively, and models replicate patterns when given samples. This makes examples a powerful tool for shaping style, structure, and discourse.

Finally, iterative refinement in prompting demonstrates that AI can simulate revision processes when guided. Prompts that instruct the model to check clarity or reduce redundancy activate revision-oriented discourse patterns, improving final output. This corresponds to the revision stages in human writing processes and indicates that iterative prompting parallels techniques used in writing instruction.

[24] Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge UP, 1990. p 41.
[25] Hyland, Ken. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury, 2005. p 78.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

Taken together, these findings point to a central conclusion: prompting is a linguistic literacy skill. It requires pragmatic clarity, semantic precision, discourse structuring, and conceptual framing. The practice is deeply rooted in linguistic theory, even though users often approach it informally. As AI systems become increasingly integrated into academic and professional environments, there is a growing need to teach prompt construction as part of digital literacy and academic communication.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that effective prompt construction is grounded in linguistic clarity, conceptual precision, and structured organization. Examining a corpus of high-performing prompts through pragmatic, semantic, discourse, and cognitive frameworks demonstrates that prompting represents a new communicative genre requiring explicit meaning-making. While often treated as a technical skill, prompting draws on long-established linguistic principles. High-performing prompts use clear directive verbs, contextual framing, role assignment, structured sequencing, lexical specificity, metapragmatic cues, genre signaling, and iterative refinements to guide large language models toward accurate, coherent, and relevant output.

The results support the argument that prompting should be viewed as a form of applied linguistic competence. It can and should be taught in educational settings, especially in EFL, ESL, academic writing, and digital literacy programs. Integrating prompt literacy into curricula would enhance students' command of academic language and give them greater control in AI-assisted communication. Future research should examine cross-linguistic prompting, cultural variations in directive communication, and the potential for prompt-based pedagogy to support language development.

https://wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/gpble
Qabul qilingan sana: 07.12.2025
Nashr etilgan sana: 27.01.2026

REFERENCES

1. Biber, Douglas, and Susan Conrad. *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge UP, 2009.
2. Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. SAGE, 2021.
3. Fillmore, Charles J. "Frame Semantics." *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*, Hanshin, 1982, pp. 111–138.
4. Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58.
5. Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. Longman, 1976.
6. Hyland, Ken. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury, 2005.
7. Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. U of Chicago P, 1980.
8. Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. U of Chicago P, 1987.
9. Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP, 1983.
10. Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorization." *Cognition and Categorization*, edited by Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1978, pp. 27–48.
11. Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge UP, 1990.
12. Zawacki-Richter, Olaf, et al. "Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 6, 2019, pp. 1–27.