ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DISCOURSE AS A NEW OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF LINGUODIDACTIC TERMINOLOGY

Bahronova Maftuna Farhodovna
Teacher of Uzswlu
0009-0009-1680-5827
bahronovamaftuna95.08@gmail.com

Abstract: The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has introduced new forms of human–machine communication and created a rapidly expanding linguistic environment in which natural language, computational processing, educational practices, and specialized terminology intersect. This article examines GenAI discourse as an emerging object of linguistic research, with particular attention to the formation and functioning of linguodidactic terminology. The study aims to establish a theoretical framework for analyzing terminology associated with language teaching and learning in generative AI-mediated communication. A qualitative conceptual approach was employed, combining discourse analysis, terminology studies, semantic analysis, and comparative linguistic perspectives. The article argues that linguodidactic terminology in GenAI discourse should be studied not as an isolated lexical inventory but as a dynamic relationship between term, concept, context, discourse function, and communicative purpose. The findings provide a theoretical basis for further English–Uzbek comparative research into the lexical-semantic structure, terminological derivation, and equivalence of emerging GenAI related linguodidactic terminology.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, GenAI discourse, linguodidactic terminology, terminology, discourse analysis, large language models, AI literacy, English–Uzbek terminology, semantic transformation, language education.

Introduction

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence has significantly changed the technological conditions under which language is produced, interpreted, and circulated. Unlike earlier digital technologies that primarily supported information retrieval, automated translation, or rule-based language processing, contemporary generative systems can produce extended texts, answer questions, summarize documents, translate between languages, generate educational materials, provide feedback, imitate genres, and participate in multi-turn conversations. The public release of ChatGPT in November 2022 represented an important stage in this development because it made conversational interaction with a large language model accessible to a broad population of users. OpenAI described the system as a model designed to interact conversationally and respond to follow-up questions, thereby emphasizing interaction as a central feature of the technology. The growing presence of generative AI in language education has consequently created a new research environment for linguistics and applied linguistics. Recent systematic reviews demonstrate the speed with which this field has developed. A 2024 systematic review of research published during the first year following the emergence of ChatGPT identified 36 studies on ChatGPT and language education and noted the interdisciplinary character of the research, involving education, linguistics, psychology, computer science, and related fields. A subsequent systematic review of empirical research published during 2023–2024 examined 144 peer-reviewed studies and identified major research areas including perceptions and attitudes, teaching and learning strategies, language-skill development, writing and feedback, and technological implementation. These studies demonstrate

the growing importance of GenAI in language education, but they also reveal a significant conceptual gap. Much of the existing literature focuses on pedagogical effectiveness, learner attitudes, writing performance, feedback, academic integrity, and classroom implementation. Comparatively less attention has been devoted to the linguistic and terminological structure of the discourse itself, particularly to the specialized vocabulary that has emerged at the intersection of artificial intelligence and language education. This perspective becomes especially significant in GenAI communication. In conventional human-to-human discourse, participants are generally treated as intentional communicators with social identities, experiential knowledge, and communicative goals.

MAIIN BODY

A response may become the context for a subsequent prompt, and a terminology-related question may develop from a general definition into a request for an academic definition, translation, comparison, or contextual application. Fairclough's conception of discourse as social practice provides another important theoretical perspective. From this viewpoint, language does not merely reflect social practices; it participates in their construction and reproduction. Applied to GenAI, this means that AI-generated texts may reproduce existing scientific, educational, and technological discourses while simultaneously contributing to the circulation and stabilization of emerging terminology. Foucault's concept of discourse offers a further theoretical dimension. His analysis of discursive formations focuses on the rules and regularities through which objects, concepts, statements, and fields of knowledge become organized. Classical terminology theory is strongly associated with Eugen Wüster, whose work contributed to the development of systematic terminology and emphasized the relationship between concepts and their linguistic designations. Wüster's 1979 work became an important foundation for what is commonly described as the General The classical concept-oriented approach remains valuable for identifying specialized concepts and organizing terminology into systematic fields. However, contemporary technological discourse demonstrates that terms cannot always be treated as isolated labels corresponding to fixed and context-independent concepts. Cabré's communicative approach is particularly useful in this respect. Her terminology theory considers terminology in relation to linguistics, cognition, communication, documentation, and computer science. From this perspective, a terminological unit can be examined according to its conceptual, linguistic, and communicative dimensions. This approach is particularly appropriate for GenAI terminology. Consider the term *prompt*. In general English, *prompt* has meanings associated with stimulating, initiating, or encouraging an action. Within AI discourse, however, it has developed a specialized meaning referring to an instruction or input provided to a generative model. Similarly, *hallucination* has an established medical and psychological meaning but has acquired a specialized technological sense referring to cases where a generative system produces inaccurate or unsupported information in a seemingly coherent manner. These examples illustrate a broader process of semantic specialization. Existing lexical material enters a new technological environment and becomes associated with a new conceptual structure. Consequently, the study of GenAI terminology requires attention not only to lexical form but also to contextual meaning and discourse function.

Semantic Transformation and Terminological Metaphor. One of the most significant findings is the role of semantic transformation. Several high-frequency AI terms originated outside computer science. The term *hallucination* provides an illustrative case. Its conventional meaning belongs to medical and psychological discourse, whereas in GenAI discourse it describes a specific type of erroneous model output. The new meaning does not completely erase the original semantic structure; instead, it uses a conceptual analogy between an apparently convincing perception without corresponding external reality and a generated statement without adequate factual grounding. Similar processes can be observed in *memory*, *attention*, *learning*, and *agent*. These terms are associated with human cognition, psychology, or social action, but they are used

metaphorically or technically to describe computational processes. First, the discourse is characterized by distributed communicative agency.

Generative AI discourse is characterized by algorithmic text generation, interactional continuity, contextual adaptation, multimodality, and rapid terminological development. These characteristics distinguish it from conventional written and spoken discourse while simultaneously preserving many structural, semantic, pragmatic, and functional properties of natural language. The analysis also indicates that the emergence of Generative AI has created conditions for the formation of a new terminological layer at the intersection of artificial intelligence and language education. Terms such as *AI-assisted language learning*, *AI-generated feedback*, *AI literacy*, *prompt-based learning*, and *human-AI interaction* demonstrate that established concepts of language teaching and learning are increasingly being conceptualized through AI-related frameworks. Consequently, the terminology of this emerging discourse should be viewed as dynamic rather than static. Its development involves terminological composition, abbreviation, borrowing, semantic specialization, metaphorical extension, and the integration of technological and pedagogical components. The theoretical perspectives of discourse studies and terminology research provide complementary foundations for examining this phenomenon. A discourse-oriented approach makes it possible to account for the interaction between users, AI systems, prompts, generated responses, and communicative contexts, whereas communicative approaches to terminology emphasize that specialized terms acquire their functional significance through actual contexts of use.

CONCLUSION

Generative AI discourse represents a rapidly developing interdisciplinary field at the intersection of linguistics, terminology, discourse studies, digital linguistics, corpus linguistics, and language education. Its terminological system reflects ongoing changes in the conceptualization of language learning and teaching in the digital era. Further research should therefore focus on the systematic classification of GenAI-related lingvodidactic terms, their lexical-semantic and structural properties, mechanisms of terminologization, discourse functions, and patterns of English–Uzbek adaptation. Such research can contribute to the development of a more systematic bilingual terminology and provide a linguistic framework for understanding how Generative AI is reshaping contemporary educational discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922
2. Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, methods and applications*. John Benjamins.https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.1
3. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
4. Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. Pantheon Books.
5. Li, B., Tan, Y. L., Wang, C., & Lowell, V. (2025). Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 9*, 100445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100445