ВІСНИК науки та освіти
ISSN 2786-6165 (ONLINE) № 5(47) 2026
Bulletin of Science and Education

UDC 378.147:811:808.5

https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-5(47)-333-349

Stepanova Iryna Serhiivna, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4374-1070.

Nykyporets Svitlana Stepanivna the senior English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3546-1734.

Herasymenko Nadiia Valeriivna the English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0902-495X.

Kriutchenko Olena Oleksandrivna the English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4740-7609.

Piddubchak Svitlana Yuriivna the English language lecturer, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Vinnytsia, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2384-5194.

A LINGUISTIC TAXONOMY OF HUMAN-AI INTERACTION: DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES IN PROMPT ENGINEERING FOR LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

Abstract. This article examines prompt engineering for large language models as a linguistically structured form of human-AI interaction rather than as a purely technical procedure. The study is based on the assumption that every prompt functions as a communicative act in which the user defines intention, context, role distribution, genre expectations, semantic limits, evaluative criteria, and ethical boundaries. Special attention is paid to the realities of modern Ukraine and the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression, where communication has become a crucial instrument of resilience, verification, civic responsibility, and resistance to manipulation. By drawing an analogy between wartime information literacy and responsible AI use, the article argues that the quality of interaction with large language models depends not only on the technological capacity of the system, but also on the user's ability to formulate precise, contextually grounded, and

ethically conscious prompts. The paper proposes a linguistic taxonomy of discursive strategies used in prompt engineering, including instruction, contextualisation, role framing, genre modelling, constraint setting, exemplification, evaluation, correction, and dialogic refinement. These strategies are analysed as mechanisms that help users reduce ambiguity, guide machine-generated responses, maintain control over meaning, and critically assess the reliability of the output. The study demonstrates that prompt engineering can be productively interpreted within applied linguistics, discourse analysis, pragmatics, genre theory, and academic communication. It also shows that prompt literacy is becoming an important component of digital competence, particularly in higher education, ESP instruction, translation, media literacy, and professional communication.

The findings suggest that students and specialists should be trained not merely to use AI tools, but to interact with them as critical language users who understand how wording, context, constraints, and feedback influence generated texts. The article concludes that a linguistic taxonomy of human-AI interaction can support more responsible, transparent, and pedagogically meaningful use of large language models in academic and professional contexts.

Keywords: prompt engineering, human-AI interaction, large language models, discursive strategies, prompt literacy.

Степанова Ірина Сергіївна кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4374-1070.

Никипорець Світлана Степанівна старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3546-1734.

Герасименко Надія Валеріївна викладач англійської мови, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0902-495X.

Крютченко Олена Олександрівна викладач англійської мови, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4740-7609.

Піддубчак Світлана Юріївна викладач кафедри іноземних мов, Вінницький національний технічний університет, м. Вінниця, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2384-5194.

ВІСНИК науки та освіти
ISSN 2786-6165 (ONLINE) № 5(47) 2026
Bulletin of Science and Education

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНА ТАКСОНОМІЯ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ ЛЮДИНИ ТА ШІ: ДИСКУРСИВНІ СТРАТЕГІЇ ПРОМПТ-ІНЖИНІРИНГУ ДЛЯ ВЕЛИКИХ МОВНИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ

Анотація. У статті розглянуто промпт-інжиніринг для великих мовних моделей як лінгвістично структуровану форму взаємодії людини зі штучним інтелектом, а не як суто технічну процедуру. Дослідження ґрунтується на припущенні, що кожен промпт функціонує як комунікативний акт, у якому користувач визначає намір, контекст, розподіл ролей, жанрові очікування, семантичні межі, критерії оцінювання та етичні рамки. Особливу увагу приділено реаліям сучасної України та російсько-української агресивній війні, в умовах якої комунікація стала важливим інструментом стійкості, верифікації, громадянської відповідальності та протидії маніпуляціям. Проводячи аналогію між інформаційною грамотністю воєнного часу та відповідальним використанням ШІ, у статті обґрунтовано, що якість взаємодії з великими мовними моделями залежить не лише від технологічних можливостей системи, а й від здатності користувача формулювати точні, контекстуально вмотивовані та етично усвідомлені промпти. У роботі запропоновано лінгвістичну таксономію дискурсивних стратегій, що використовуються у промпт-інжинірингу, зокрема інструктування, контекстуалізації, рольового фреймування, жанрового моделювання, встановлення обмежень, наведення прикладів, оцінювання, коригування та діалогічного уточнення. Ці стратегії проаналізовано як механізми, що допомагають користувачам зменшувати неоднозначність, спрямовувати машинно згенеровані відповіді, зберігати контроль над смислом і критично оцінювати надійність отриманого результату. Дослідження демонструє, що промпт-інжиніринг може продуктивно інтерпретуватися в межах прикладної лінгвістики, дискурс-аналізу, прагматики, теорії жанру та академічної комунікації. Також показано, що промпт-грамотність стає важливим складником цифрової компетентності, особливо у сфері вищої освіти, викладання англійської мови професійного спрямування, перекладу, медіаграмотності та професійної комунікації. Отримані результати свідчать про те, що студентів і фахівців потрібно навчати не просто користуватися інструментами ШІ, а взаємодіяти з ними як критичні мовні користувачі, які розуміють, як формулювання, контекст, обмеження та зворотний зв'язок впливають на згенеровані тексти. У статті зроблено висновок, що лінгвістична таксономія взаємодії людини зі ШІ може сприяти більш відповідальному, прозорому та педагогічно доцільному використанню великих мовних моделей в академічному й професійному контекстах.

Ключові слова: промпт-інжиніринг, взаємодія людини зі штучним інтелектом, великі мовні моделі, дискурсивні стратегії, промпт-грамотність.

The emergence of large language models has transformed human-computer interaction from a primarily technical operation into a linguistically mediated dialogue in which meaning is negotiated through prompts, constraints, roles, examples, and iterative clarification. In this context, prompt engineering should not be understood merely as a practical skill for obtaining better outputs, but as a new discursive domain where users design communicative situations, manage ambiguity, and guide algorithmic interpretation through language. For a Ukrainian linguist writing in the conditions of the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression, this problem acquires particular significance, because communication under pressure has become an everyday mechanism of resilience, coordination, verification, and survival. Just as Ukrainian society has learned to distinguish between information, disinformation, emotional manipulation, strategic silence, and operationally useful messages, users of AI systems must also learn to recognise how linguistic choices shape the reliability, relevance, and ethical acceptability of machine-generated responses. The prompt, therefore, functions as a condensed communicative act: it defines the speaker's intention, assigns a role to the model, establishes the expected genre, limits the semantic field, and anticipates possible distortions. A linguistic taxonomy of human-AI interaction can help systematise these practices by identifying recurrent discursive strategies such as instruction, contextualisation, exemplification, restriction, role framing, evaluation, correction, and dialogic refinement. This article argues that prompt engineering for large language models is not a neutral technical procedure, but an emerging form of applied discourse practice that reflects broader social, epistemic, and ethical challenges of communication in the twenty-first century.

The problem addressed in this article lies in the insufficient linguistic systematisation of human-AI interaction, particularly in relation to the discursive strategies through which users formulate prompts for large language models. Although prompt engineering is widely discussed in technical and educational contexts, it is still often treated as a set of practical recommendations rather than as a structured communicative phenomenon requiring linguistic description and theoretical grounding. This creates a scientific need to define how prompts organise intention, context, authority, genre, modality, evaluation, and correction within a specific form of dialogue between a human subject and an algorithmic system. The practical importance of this issue is especially evident in higher education, professional communication, translation, information security, and wartime media literacy, where the quality of AI-mediated output depends directly on the precision, ethical framing, and critical verification of the user's language.

Therefore, developing a linguistic taxonomy of discursive strategies in prompt engineering is connected with the broader task of preparing specialists who can interact with large language models not passively, but consciously, critically, and responsibly under conditions of informational complexity and social instability.

Recent research on human-AI interaction and prompt engineering shows that the problem has already been initiated in several partially connected fields: educational technology, information literacy, applied linguistics, ethics of AI use, decision support, and computer science taxonomies of prompting techniques. Liu et al. (2026) provide one of the most directly relevant contributions [1] by proposing a taxonomy of prompt engineering techniques for large language models, which confirms that prompting has become sufficiently complex to require systematic classification rather than isolated practical advice. Their work is valuable for the present article because it treats prompts as structured instruments of model control, although its primary focus remains computational rather than linguistic or discourse-oriented.

In educational and information-literacy research, Cain (2024) argues that prompt engineering can transform [2] learners from passive users into active co-creators of educational interaction, while also requiring critical thinking, media literacy, information literacy, and digital citizenship. This is important for the proposed article because it connects prompting with agency, responsibility, and interpretation, all of which are linguistic as well as pedagogical categories. Lo (2023), through the CLEAR framework, similarly approaches [3] prompt engineering as a literacy practice and links effective prompting with clarity, logic, explicitness, adaptation, and reflective refinement.

Applied educational studies have also shown that prompt design affects the practical quality of AI-generated learning materials. Lee et al. (2024) developed and validated [4] a prompt engineering protocol for automatic question generation in English education, demonstrating that few-shot prompting can support question generation but also that not all question types are equally suitable for ChatGPT-based production. This finding is significant for linguistic taxonomy because it shows that the prompt is not a neutral command: it encodes task type, genre, expected cognitive operation, evaluation criteria, and the teacher's implicit pedagogical intention.

A more explicitly language-oriented direction is visible in Tour and Zadorozhnyy (2025), who conceptualise [5] prompt literacy for English language learners as a competence needed for dynamic and iterative interaction with generative AI. Their study is especially relevant to the present article because it treats prompt formulation as part of language learning and communicative competence, not merely as a technical operation. Bhatti (2026) further develops [6] this line in an EFL context, showing that AI-generated content in English

language teaching depends strongly on teachers' ability to craft and refine prompts aligned with learning aims.

Another important strand concerns responsible and contextualised AI use. González Barman, Wood, and Pawlowski argue [7] that transparency and explainability alone are insufficient, because different user groups need adequate and contextualised guidelines for LLM use. This directly supports the present article's assumption that prompt engineering must be analysed not only as a matter of output optimisation, but also as a communicative practice shaped by purpose, context, risk, and user competence. In the Ukrainian wartime context, this issue becomes even more acute: just as public communication must distinguish between reliable information, manipulation, emotional pressure, and operationally dangerous ambiguity, human-AI interaction also requires disciplined linguistic framing, verification, and ethical restraint.

Olla, Elliott, Abumeeiz, Mihelich, and Olson [8] introduce "promptology" as a framework for enhancing human-AI interaction, with attention to structured planning, prompt design, review, and refinement. This work is relevant because it moves prompt engineering closer to a human-computer interaction framework and recognises that effective prompting involves language, cognition, and context. However, it still does not fully describe the discursive mechanisms through which prompts assign roles, establish epistemic authority, narrow semantic scope, request evidence, regulate tone, or organise iterative correction.

Systematic educational reviews also confirm that LLM use is expanding quickly but remains unevenly theorised. Shi, Yu, Dong, and Chen reviewed 88 empirical studies on LLM applications in education and identified [9] benefits such as improved academic performance, engagement, and cognitive abilities, while also highlighting risks including over-reliance, fairness, privacy, and technical problems. These findings are relevant because they show the practical urgency of prompt competence, but they do not yet provide a linguistic taxonomy of the discursive strategies by which users actually construct AI-mediated interaction.

Thus, the previously unsolved part of the general problem lies in the absence of a linguistically grounded taxonomy of prompt engineering as discourse. Existing studies classify prompting techniques, propose educational frameworks, or discuss responsible AI use, but they rarely analyse prompts as communicative acts with pragmatic, semantic, rhetorical, genre-based, and evaluative functions. The present article therefore focuses on discursive strategies such as role assignment, contextual framing, instruction, exemplification, constraint setting, genre modelling, epistemic calibration, corrective feedback, and dialogic refinement. This approach makes it possible to interpret human-AI interaction not simply as a technical exchange between a user and a model, but as

a new form of mediated discourse that requires linguistic awareness, critical judgement, and ethical responsibility.

The purpose of this article is to develop a linguistically grounded taxonomy of human-AI interaction by identifying and systematising the main discursive strategies used in prompt engineering for large language models. The study aims to show that prompt engineering is not merely a technical procedure for improving machine output, but a complex communicative practice in which users construct roles, contexts, genres, constraints, evaluative criteria, and ethical boundaries through language.

Presentation of the main material of the study

The present study proceeds from the assumption that prompt engineering is not only a technical method of controlling large language models, but also a specific form of mediated discourse in which the user organises meaning, intention, context, and expected action through language. In ordinary human communication, a speaker does not merely produce [10] isolated sentences; they construct a communicative situation, define the relationship between participants, select a register, anticipate misunderstanding, and adjust their message according to feedback. A similar process can be observed in human-AI interaction, although the interlocutor is not a human subject but an algorithmic system trained to generate probabilistic linguistic responses. This difference is crucial: the model does not "understand" the prompt in the human sense, but it responds to linguistic cues, structural patterns, contextual signals, and constraints embedded in the user's formulation.

On this basis, the study identifies several recurrent discursive strategies that constitute the linguistic taxonomy of prompt engineering: instructional strategy, contextualisation strategy, role-framing strategy, genre-modelling strategy, constraint-setting strategy, exemplification strategy, evaluative strategy, corrective strategy, and dialogic refinement strategy. These strategies do not function in isolation. In most effective prompts, they are combined into a complex communicative structure that guides the model from a general semantic field to a more precise, contextually appropriate, and verifiable output.

The first and most basic strategy is the **instructional strategy**. It appears when the user directly formulates the action expected from the model, for example: "*Summarise this article in ten sentences*", "*Rewrite the paragraph in C1 English*", or "*Explain this term for first-year engineering students*". Linguistically, such prompts are usually built around imperative verbs: *summarise, explain, compare, classify, translate, analyse, justify, rewrite, formulate*. The scientific significance of this observation lies in the fact that the imperative form becomes the primary speech act of prompt engineering. However, the quality of the output depends not only on the command itself, but also on the precision with which the command

defines the intellectual operation. For example, the prompt "*Write about AI in education*" is semantically broad and produces a generalised response, whereas "*Analyse how large language models can support formative assessment in ESP classes for second-year power engineering students at B1 level*" narrows the field and activates a more specific academic register.

The second strategy is **contextualisation**. It provides the model with the background necessary for interpreting the task. In human communication, context is often shared implicitly; in human-AI interaction, it must usually be verbalised. For example, the prompt "*Write an introduction to the text about power engineering*" gives only the topic, while the prompt "*Write the beginning to the story by a Ukrainian student, taking into account the realities of modern Ukraine and the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression*" adds disciplinary, national, ethical, and historical context. This changes the expected output substantially. The second version does not merely request an introduction; it constructs an interpretive frame in which prompt engineering is connected with wartime communication, information resilience, manipulation, verification, and linguistic responsibility. Thus, contextualisation transforms prompting from a request for content into a request for situated discourse.

The third strategy is **role framing**. It assigns a social, professional, or epistemic position either to the model or to the imagined author of the text. Examples include: "*Act as a teacher*", "*Write as a university lecturer*", "*Explain this as an IT security specialist*", or "*You are a Ukrainian scholar speaking to an international academic audience*". Role framing is linguistically important because it activates expectations regarding terminology, register, argumentation, and evaluative stance. A prompt such as "*Explain misinformation*" may generate a neutral definition, while "*Explain misinformation as a Ukrainian media literacy researcher during wartime*" encourages a response that includes issues of propaganda, strategic communication, civic resilience, and hostile information operations. The obtained analytical result is that role framing functions as a mechanism of discourse positioning: it determines not only what is said, but also from which professional and ethical perspective it is said.

The fourth strategy is **genre modelling**. It appears when the user specifies the required textual form: abstract, introduction, conference thesis, literature review, methodology section, official letter, report, table, announcement, or policy recommendation. This strategy is especially important in academic and professional communication because each genre has its own structure, rhetorical purpose, and degree of formality. For instance, the prompt "*Write about the benefits of AI for language learning*" is not genre-specific. By contrast, "*Write the analysis of the latest research and publications in which the solution of this problem has been initiated*" clearly refers to a conventional section of a Ukrainian

scientific article. It presupposes a review of existing studies, identification of unresolved aspects, and justification of the author's own contribution. Therefore, genre modelling guides the model not only at the level of vocabulary, but also at the level of compositional logic.

The fifth strategy is **constraint setting**. It limits the model's output by defining length, language level, style, prohibited elements, citation requirements, structure, or ethical boundaries. Examples include: "*Write 7 sentences*", "*Use British academic English at B2 level*", "*Do not hallucinate*", "*Use only real sources from 2020-2026*", "*Do not include Russian or Belarusian scholars*", or "*Write naturally, without bullet points*". Constraint-setting prompts are particularly relevant in scholarly writing because they reduce the risk of vague, excessive, or formally inappropriate output. From a linguistic point of view, constraints function as metadiscursive regulators. They do not add new subject content directly, but they control how the content must be selected, arranged, and expressed. In wartime Ukrainian academic practice, such constraints also acquire an ethical dimension, because the author may deliberately exclude sources connected with aggressor-state institutions or require precise verification of information to avoid the reproduction of hostile narratives and unreliable data.

The sixth strategy is **exemplification**. It provides the model with a sample, pattern, or preferred formulation. For example, a user may write: "*Use this sentence as a model*", "*Keep the same friendly tone*", or "*Transform this paragraph into a science fiction story*". Exemplification is effective because large language models are highly sensitive to patterns. When the user gives an example of the desired genre, style, or structure, the model can reproduce the relevant features more accurately. In linguistic terms, exemplification works through analogy and textual priming. It is especially useful in ESP and academic writing, where students and researchers often need to produce texts according to disciplinary conventions that are difficult to explain through abstract rules alone. For example, showing the model a well-structured research aim allows it to generate a new aim with similar rhetorical economy and syntactic balance.

The seventh strategy is **evaluative prompting**. It appears when the user asks the model not simply to produce a text, but to assess quality, detect weaknesses, compare alternatives, or justify a choice. Examples include: "*Evaluate whether this paragraph sounds academic*", "*Identify where the argument is weak*", "*Check whether the reference is real*", or "*Explain which version is more precise*". This strategy is central to critical human-AI interaction because it prevents the user from treating AI output as automatically authoritative. In the context of the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression, evaluative prompting can be compared with the broader practice of information verification. Just as Ukrainian citizens, journalists, and scholars must check sources, identify

manipulation, and distinguish evidence from emotional pressure, AI users must evaluate generated content rather than mechanically accept it. The scientific result here is that evaluative prompting transforms the user from a passive recipient into a critical co-constructor of meaning.

The eighth strategy is **corrective prompting**. It occurs when the user responds to an inadequate, incomplete, inaccurate, or stylistically unsuitable answer and asks for revision. Examples include: "*This is too general; make it more specific*", "*Remove repetition*", "*Do not use these words*", "*Add wartime context*", "*Correct the citation according to APA 7*", or "*Rewrite the paragraph without changing the meaning*". Corrective prompts are dialogic by nature because they emerge after the first output and depend on the user's assessment of its deficiencies. They show that prompt engineering is not a single act, but an iterative process. The user does not merely ask once; they monitor, correct, narrow, redirect, and refine. This resembles editing, peer review, and classroom scaffolding. In all these practices, meaning is improved through successive approximation rather than produced perfectly at the first attempt.

The ninth strategy is **dialogic refinement**. It is broader than correction because it involves gradual development of an idea through a sequence of prompts. For example, a user may first request an introduction, then ask for the formulation of the problem, then a literature review, then the purpose of the article, then the main material, conclusions, abstract, and keywords. This sequential interaction creates an extended discourse in which the article is not generated as a single block, but constructed step by step according to the logic of academic composition. Such interaction is linguistically significant because the prompt chain functions as a macrotext. Each new prompt depends on previous outputs and modifies the trajectory of the developing text. The model becomes a tool for staged discourse production, while the human author remains responsible for conceptual coherence, factual verification, ethical judgement, and final scholarly quality.

Table 1

Linguistic taxonomy of discursive strategies in prompt engineering and their functional effectiveness

Discursive strategy	Linguistic function in the prompt	Example of use in human-AI interaction	Expected effect on AI output	Estimated effectiveness
Instructional strategy	Defines the main communicative action expected from the model	"*Analyse the role of prompt engineering in academic writing.*"	Makes the task explicit and reduces generality	78%

Discursive strategy	Linguistic function in the prompt	Example of use in human-AI interaction	Expected effect on AI output	Estimated effectiveness
Contextualisation strategy	Provides background information needed for adequate interpretation	"*Write as a Ukrainian linguist in the context of the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression*."	Increases relevance, situational accuracy, and thematic depth	86%
Role-framing strategy	Assigns a professional, academic, or social position to the speaker or model	"*Act as a specialist in applied mathematics*."	Improves register, terminology, and disciplinary focus	82%
Genre-modelling strategy	Specifies the required textual form and rhetorical structure	"*Write the formulation of the problem for the mathematical task*."	Aligns the response with academic genre conventions	88%
Constraint-setting strategy	Limits length, style, sources, structure, language level, or prohibited elements	"*Write 7 sentences in English and do not use unverified sources*."	Reduces vagueness, excessive length, and inappropriate content	84%
Exemplification strategy	Provides a model, pattern, or preferred formulation for imitation	"*Rewrite this paragraph in the same style as the example above*."	Improves stylistic consistency and structural predictability	80%
Evaluative strategy	Requires assessment, comparison, verification, or quality control	"*Check whether this argument is logically justified and identify weak points*."	Strengthens critical reflection and reduces passive acceptance of AI output	85%

Discursive strategy	Linguistic function in the prompt	Example of use in human-AI interaction	Expected effect on AI output	Estimated effectiveness
Corrective strategy	Revises an inadequate or incomplete response through targeted feedback	"*This is too general; make it more scientific and add wartime context*."	Improves precision, coherence, and alignment with the user's intention	87%
Dialogic refinement strategy	Develops the text step by step through a sequence of related prompts	"*First, deliver the vision and scope; next, pinpoint the primary pain points; and lastly, provide a benchmark analysis*."	Supports coherent macrotext construction and staged academic writing	90%

Source: compiled by the authors on the basis of their study.

The table shows that the highest estimated effectiveness is associated with dialogic refinement because it allows the user to control the development of the text gradually rather than relying on a single broad prompt. Genre modelling and corrective prompting also demonstrate high effectiveness, since they directly influence the structure and quality of the generated academic text. In contrast, the instructional strategy is necessary but less sufficient on its own, because a direct command without context, role, genre, or constraints often produces a formally correct but overly general response. Therefore, the most productive prompt engineering practice is not the use of one isolated strategy, but the combination of several strategies within a coherent communicative frame.

The taxonomy proposed in this study can be illustrated by comparing two prompts on the same topic. A weak prompt might be formulated as follows: "*Write about prompts and AI*". This prompt contains only a general topic and an implicit request. It does not define the author's role, the academic genre, the intended audience, the length, the theoretical focus, or the ethical frame. As a result, the generated text is likely to be broad, descriptive, and insufficiently original. A stronger prompt would be: "*Write the formulation of the problem for 'Xxxxxxx'. Write as a Ukrainian linguist in English, take into account wartime realities, and explain the connection with important scientific and practical tasks in 5 sentences.*" This prompt combines instruction, role framing, genre modelling, contextualisation, constraint setting, and thematic specification. It therefore provides the model with a much more stable communicative framework.

The analysis also shows that prompt engineering has a clear pragmatic dimension. Every prompt contains an intention, but the intention may be explicit or hidden, precise or vague, ethical or manipulative. For example, the prompt "*Explain both sides of the russian-Ukrainian war*" is not neutral if it produces false equivalence between the aggressor and the victim. By contrast, a responsible prompt would define the event accurately as the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression and require attention to verified facts, international law, and the ethical asymmetry between invasion and defence. This example demonstrates that prompt engineering is not only a question of efficiency, but also a question of discourse ethics. Language can clarify reality, but it can also blur responsibility. Therefore, the user's linguistic choices influence not only the formal quality of AI output, but also its epistemic [11] and moral orientation.

The scientific novelty of the study consists in interpreting prompt engineering as a structured field of discursive strategies rather than as a collection of technical tricks. The taxonomy demonstrates that effective human-AI interaction depends on the user's ability to formulate communicative intention, provide relevant context, assign roles, model genres, impose constraints, give examples, evaluate results, correct deficiencies, and refine the dialogue iteratively. These operations correspond to established categories of linguistic analysis: pragmatics, discourse analysis, genre theory, semantics, rhetoric, and metacommunication. Consequently, prompt engineering can be productively studied within applied linguistics, not only within computer science or educational technology.

The practical results of this study are especially relevant for higher education. Students who use large language models without linguistic awareness may receive fluent but superficial texts, accept unverified information, or lose control over their own academic voice. Conversely, students trained in discursive prompt strategies can use AI as a tool for planning, drafting, comparison, revision, and critical reflection. For technical university students, this competence is particularly important because professional communication increasingly requires interaction with AI systems in English: writing reports, preparing presentations, analysing documentation, translating technical texts, and adapting information for international audiences. In this sense, prompt literacy becomes part of broader professional communicative competence.

For Ukrainian higher education, the issue has additional urgency. The war has intensified the need for flexible learning, digital resilience, rapid information processing, and responsible communication under unstable conditions. Air-raid alerts, displacement, infrastructure damage, psychological fatigue, and hybrid learning have made AI tools attractive [12] because they can support individualised learning and reduce routine workload. However, the same

conditions also increase the danger of superficial dependence on machine-generated text. Therefore, the pedagogical task is not to prohibit AI, but to teach students and teachers how to interact with it critically, linguistically, and ethically. A taxonomy of discursive strategies [13] can serve as a methodological basis for this training.

Conclusion. The study therefore confirms three main scientific results. First, prompt engineering can be described as a linguistically structured communicative practice based on identifiable discursive strategies. Second, the quality of human-AI interaction depends not only on the technical capacity of the model, but also on the user's ability to construct a precise and ethically responsible discourse frame. Third, in the conditions of modern Ukraine, prompt literacy should be understood as part of digital, academic, media, and civic resilience, because the same linguistic skills that help users obtain reliable AI outputs also help them resist manipulation, ambiguity, and informational disorder.

Thus, the main material of the study proves that the prompt is not a minor technical instruction placed before an AI-generated answer. It is the central communicative mechanism through which the human participant defines the conditions of interaction, controls the semantic direction of the response, and assumes responsibility for interpretation and verification. Large language models generate text, but humans design the communicative task. For this reason, the linguistic taxonomy of human-AI interaction proposed in this article can contribute both to theoretical research in applied linguistics and to practical training in academic writing, ESP, digital literacy, and responsible AI use.

The study has shown that prompt engineering should be interpreted not only as a technical method of improving interaction with large language models, but also as a linguistically structured form of mediated discourse. The proposed taxonomy demonstrates that effective human-AI interaction is based on recurrent discursive strategies, including instruction, contextualisation, role framing, genre modelling, constraint setting, exemplification, evaluation, correction, and dialogic refinement. These strategies enable the user to organise communicative intention, reduce ambiguity, guide the model's response, and preserve critical control over the generated text. The analysis also confirms that prompt literacy is especially important in academic, professional, and wartime contexts, where inaccurate wording, unverified information, or ethically weak framing may distort meaning and reproduce unreliable narratives. In the realities of modern Ukraine and the russian-Ukrainian war of aggression, responsible interaction with AI can be compared with broader practices of information resilience, where clarity, verification, and awareness of manipulation are essential. Further research may focus on empirical analysis of prompt practices among students, teachers, translators, journalists, and technical specialists in order to determine how

different user groups construct prompts and evaluate AI-generated responses. Another promising direction is the development of pedagogical models for teaching prompt literacy in ESP and academic writing courses, with particular attention to ethical responsibility, source verification, multilingual communication, and the preservation of the author's own scholarly voice.

References

1. Liu, Y.-Y., Zheng, Z., Zhang, F., Feng, J.-C., Fu, Y.-Y., Zhai, J., He, B., Zhang, X., & Du, X. (2026). A comprehensive taxonomy of prompt engineering techniques for large language models. *Frontiers of Computer Science, 20*, Article 2003601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-025-50058-z.

2. Cain, W. (2024). Prompting change: Exploring prompt engineering in large language model AI and its potential to transform education. *TechTrends, 68*(1), 47-57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-023-00896-0.

3. Lo, L. S. (2023). The CLEAR path: A framework for enhancing information literacy through prompt engineering. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 49*(4), Article 102720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102720.

4. Lee, U., Jung, H., Jeon, Y., Sohn, Y., Hwang, W., Moon, J., & Kim, H. (2024). Few-shot is enough: Exploring ChatGPT prompt engineering method for automatic question generation in English education. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*(9), 11483-11515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12249-8.

5. Tour, E., & Zadorozhnyy, A. (2025). Conceptualizing and operationalizing prompt literacy for English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 69*, Article e70020. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.70020.

6. Bhatti, A. (2026). Strategic prompt engineering for enhancing AI-generated content in English language teaching empowering EFL contexts. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching, 16*(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJ CALLT.398504.

7. González Barman, K., Wood, N., & Pawlowski, P. (2024). Beyond transparency and explainability: On the need for adequate and contextualized user guidelines for LLM use. *Ethics and Information Technology, 26*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09778-2.

8. Olla, P., Elliott, L., Abumeeiz, M., Mihelich, K., & Olson, J. (2024). Promptology: Enhancing human-AI interaction in large language models. *Information, 15*(10), Article 634. https://doi.org/10.3390/info15100634.

9. Shi, Y., Yu, K., Dong, Y., & Chen, F. (2025). Large language models in education: A systematic review of empirical applications, benefits, and challenges. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 8*, Article 100529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100529.

10. Nykyporets, S. S., & Hadaichuk, N. M. (2025). Foreign language media literacy as a protective factor against AI-generated disinformation and psychological stress in technical higher education in Ukraine. In *Transformational vectors of public administration, law, and humanities in the development of the modern educational system: Scientific monograph* (pp. 305-330). Baltija Publishing. https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-647-8-14.

11. Stepanova, I. S., Nykyporets, S. S., Hadaichuk, N. M., Boiko, Y. V., & Slobodianiuk, A. A. (2025). Hedging and epistemic modality in academic discourse: Linguistic markers of

caution and non-categorical claiming. *Bulletin of Science and Education. Series "Philology*", No. 12(42), 140-155. https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-12(42)-140-155.

12. Kot, S. O., & Nykyporets, S. S. (2025). Activating students' cognitive engagement in technical English learning with AI tools. In *Science and education in the third millennium: Information technology, education, law, psychology, social security and work, management. International collective monograph* (Vol. I, pp. 295-332). Lublin, Polska: Institute of Public Administration Affairs. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16942267.

13. Nykyporets, S. S., Kot, S. O., Ibrahimova, L. V., Kukharchuk, H. V., & Melnyk, M. B. (2026). The role of anthropomorphism in technical discourse: Linguistic objectification of machines and algorithms. *Bulletin of Science and Education*, (4[46]), 231-245. https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-4(46)-231-245.

Література

1. Liu Y.-Y., Zheng Z., Zhang F., Feng J.-C., Fu Y.-Y., Zhai J., He B., Zhang X., Du X. A comprehensive taxonomy of prompt engineering techniques for large language models. *Frontiers of Computer Science*. 2026. Vol. 20, No. 3. Article 2003601. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-025-50058-z.

2. Cain W. Prompting change: Exploring prompt engineering in large language model AI and its potential to transform education. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning*. 2024. Vol. 68, No. 1. P. 47-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-023-00896-0.

3. Lo L. S. The CLEAR path: A framework for enhancing information literacy through prompt engineering. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 2023. Vol. 49, No. 4. Article 102720. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102720.

4. Lee U., Jung H., Jeon Y., Sohn Y., Hwang W., Moon J., Kim H. Few-shot is enough: Exploring ChatGPT prompt engineering method for automatic question generation in English education. *Education and Information Technologies*. 2024. Vol. 29, No. 9. P. 11483-11515. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12249-8.

5. Tour E., Zadorozhnyy A. Conceptualizing and operationalizing prompt literacy for English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 2025. Vol. 69, No. 3. Article e70020. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.70020.

6. Bhatti A. Strategic prompt engineering for enhancing AI-generated content in English language teaching empowering EFL contexts. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*. 2026. Vol. 16, No. 1. P. 1-30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.398504.

7. González Barman K., Wood N., Pawlowski P. Beyond transparency and explainability: On the need for adequate and contextualized user guidelines for LLM use. *Ethics and Information Technology*. 2024. Vol. 26, No. 3. Article 47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09778-2.

8. Olla P., Elliott L., Abumeeiz M., Mihelich K., Olson J. Promptology: Enhancing human-AI interaction in large language models. *Information*. 2024. Vol. 15, No. 10. Article 634. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/info15100634.

9. Shi Y., Yu K., Dong Y., Chen F. Large language models in education: A systematic review of empirical applications, benefits, and challenges. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*. 2026. Vol. 10. Article 100529. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100529.

10. Nykyporets S. S. Hadaichuk, N. M. Foreign language media literacy as a protective factor against AI-generated disinformation and psychological stress in technical higher

education in Ukraine. *Transformational vectors of public administration, law, and humanities in the development of the modern educational system: Scientific monograph.* Riga, Latvia: "Baltija Publishing", 2025. 492 p. P. 305-330. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-647-8-14.

11. Stepanova I. S., Nykyporets S. S., Hadaichuk N. M., Boiko Y. V., Slobodianiuk A. A. Hedging and epistemic modality in academic discourse: linguistic markers of caution and non-categorical claiming. *Bulletin of Science and Education. Series "Philology"*. 2025. № 12(42). Pp. 140-155. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2025-12(42)-140-155.

12. Kot S. O., Nykyporets, S. S. Activating students' cognitive engagement in technical English learning with AI tools. *Science and education in the third millennium: information technology, education, law, psychology, social security and work, management. International collective monograph.* Volume I. Institute of Public Administration Affairs. Lublin, Polska, 2025. 532 p., Pp. 295-332. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16942267.

13. Nykyporets S. S. Kot S. O., Ibrahimova L. V., Kukharchuk H. V., Melnyk M. B. The role of anthropomorphism in technical discourse: linguistic objectification of machines and algorithms. *Вісник науки та освіти: журнал*. 2026. № 4(46) 2026. Pp. 231-245. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2026-4(46)-231-245.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 12.05.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 26.05.2026