LinguaEducare: Journal of English and Linguistic Studies
ISSN: 3064-0547 (e)
2026, Vol. 3, No. 2, page 142-154
https://journal.ciptapustaka.com/index.php/LEC

OPEN ACCESS

Enhancing English for Legal Purposes through Generative AI: Evidence from Islamic Family Law Students

Kartika S[1*]
[1]*Sharia Faculty, UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is increasingly used in language education, yet its role in English for Legal Purposes (ELP), particularly among Islamic Family Law students, remains underexplored. This study investigated the effects of GenAI-supported ELP instruction on legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension and examined students' experiences of using GenAI during discipline-specific English learning. An explanatory sequential mixed-methods design was employed with 60 undergraduate students from two intact classes at the Faculty of Sharia, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia. Thirty students received GenAI-supported instruction, while 30 students followed conventional ELP instruction over eight weeks. Data were collected through legal vocabulary and reading comprehension tests, learning reflections, prompt-response records, and semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using ANCOVA, while qualitative data were examined thematically. The results showed that the GenAI-supported group achieved higher adjusted posttest scores in legal vocabulary, $F(1, 57) = 52.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta p^2 = .481$, and legal reading comprehension, $F(1, 57) = 30.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta p^2 = .350$. Qualitative findings indicated that students valued GenAI for contextualized vocabulary explanations, simplification of difficult legal texts, and iterative clarification. However, they also emphasized the need to verify AI-generated information and expressed concerns about overreliance and inaccurate legal explanations. The findings suggest that GenAI can support ELP learning effectively when integrated through structured tasks, critical verification, and lecturer guidance.

This is an open access article under CC-BY-NC 4.0 license.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
English for Legal Purposes;
Generative artificial intelligence;
Islamic Family Law;
Legal reading comprehension;
Legal vocabulary

Article History:
Received: 8 September 2026
Revised: 14 October 2026
Accepted: 2 November 2026
Published: 4 November 2026

How to Cite in APA Style:
S, K. (2026). Enhancing English for Legal Purposes through Generative AI: Evidence from Islamic Family Law Students. *LinguaEducare: Journal of English and Linguistic Studies, 3*(2), 142-154.
https://doi.org/10.63324/lec.3v.2i.196

Introduction

English competence is increasingly important for university students whose disciplines require access to international scholarship, professional communication, and specialized texts. For law students, this need extends beyond general English because legal discourse is characterized by discipline-specific vocabulary, formulaic expressions, complex syntax, and meanings that may differ from everyday usage. English for Legal Purposes (ELP), as a branch of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), therefore aims to equip learners with the linguistic resources required to understand and communicate legal concepts in academic and professional settings. Recent research shows that non-native English-speaking law students often struggle to sustain sufficient

*Corresponding author: Kartika S kartika@radenintan.ac.id

lexical knowledge for legal study and communication, particularly when specialized terms and lexical bundles are embedded in legal texts (Alasmary, 2024). Vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension are therefore central components of ELP instruction.

These demands are especially relevant to students of Islamic Family Law. Their field involves concepts such as marriage, divorce, guardianship, child custody, inheritance, marital agreements, and family dispute resolution. Although these concepts are studied mainly within Islamic and Indonesian legal frameworks, students may also encounter English-language research, comparative family-law literature, international reports, and cross-jurisdictional discussions. Understanding such materials requires more than translating individual words. Students must recognize technical meanings, interpret terms in context, and understand relationships among concepts across legal traditions. English instruction that is disconnected from students' disciplinary needs may therefore provide limited support for accessing these sources. A contextualized ELP approach is needed in which language learning is closely linked to the legal topics students study.

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) offers a potentially useful way to provide this contextualization. Large language model-based tools such as ChatGPT can generate explanations, examples, questions, summaries, and feedback in response to prompts. Recent reviews indicate that ChatGPT has been used in second-language education mainly for content generation, feedback, and instructional support, while learners commonly use prompts to control context and customize output (Yang & Li, 2024). Li et al. (2024) likewise found that GenAI has been adopted for self-directed language learning, content creation, and teacher support. These affordances are relevant to ELP because students can request explanations of legal vocabulary, compare related concepts, simplify difficult passages, generate contextual examples, or create comprehension questions from discipline-specific texts.

Empirical evidence also suggests that GenAI can support several dimensions of language learning. Karataş et al. (2024) reported that learners perceived ChatGPT as beneficial for vocabulary development, grammar, writing, motivation, and engagement after participating in ChatGPT-supported foreign-language activities. Song and Song (2023) found that ChatGPT-assisted instruction contributed to improvements in EFL students' academic writing and motivation. Although early research has focused heavily on writing, recent work has begun to examine GenAI-supported reading. Joo and Belcher (2025) showed that human–AI collaborative reading can provide immediate explanatory support and reflective dialogue during academic reading, while also raising concerns about overreliance. These findings suggest that GenAI may function effectively as a scaffold when embedded in structured learning tasks rather than used as an unrestricted answer-generating tool.

This distinction is important in legal education. GenAI can explain terms such as child custody, legal guardian, annulment, or marital property and adjust explanations to learners' proficiency. It can simplify a dense legal paragraph, provide examples of a term in context, or generate a short case scenario requiring students to interpret legal vocabulary. Such functions may reduce the linguistic burden that prevents students from

engaging with English legal texts and provide repeated practice beyond limited classroom time. For Islamic Family Law students, GenAI-supported ELP may therefore connect general language competence with discipline-specific literacy by making English legal materials more accessible and relevant to their field. The potential value of such contextualized lexical support is particularly relevant because specialized legal vocabulary remains a major challenge for learners using English as an additional language (Alasmary, 2024).

However, pedagogical value cannot be assumed simply because GenAI produces fluent and immediate responses. Its output may contain inaccuracies, oversimplifications, or contextually inappropriate explanations, which is especially problematic when language tasks involve legal concepts. Students who accept AI-generated explanations without verification may learn inaccurate terminology or confuse linguistic assistance with authoritative legal interpretation. Recent ESP research therefore emphasizes integrating AI literacy into language instruction. Ngo and Hastie (2025) found that an AI-integrated English for Academic Purposes module improved students' confidence in using AI and their ability to evaluate AI-generated output critically and ethically. In ELP, GenAI should support interpretation and practice, while legal claims should still be checked against course materials, legislation, scholarly sources, and lecturer guidance.

Despite rapid growth in GenAI research, important gaps remain. Recent reviews show that higher education and EFL contexts dominate the literature, but research has concentrated mainly on learners' perceptions and writing, with reading receiving less attention (Li et al., 2024; Yang & Li, 2024). Discipline-specific applications are also less developed than general language-learning research. This gap is particularly relevant to ELP, where studies continue to highlight difficulties in acquiring specialized legal vocabulary but offer limited evidence on how GenAI-supported instruction affects measurable legal-language outcomes (Alasmary, 2024). Little is also known about how students in Islamic legal studies use GenAI to negotiate English terminology alongside Islamic and national legal concepts.

The present study addresses these gaps by examining GenAI-supported English for Legal Purposes instruction among Islamic Family Law students at the Faculty of Sharia, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia. Rather than examining attitudes toward ChatGPT alone, it focuses on two measurable outcomes: legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension. It also investigates students' experiences of using GenAI during discipline-specific learning activities to explain how the technology supports or complicates their engagement with legal English. By combining evidence of learning outcomes with students' accounts of the learning process, the study seeks to provide a context-sensitive understanding of GenAI integration in ESP and to inform responsible AI-supported English instruction for law-related programs. Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. To what extent does Generative AI-supported instruction improve Islamic Family Law students' legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension?

2. Are there significant differences in legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension between students receiving Generative AI-supported instruction and those receiving conventional instruction?
3. How do Islamic Family Law students perceive and experience the use of Generative AI in learning English for Legal Purposes?

Method

This study employed an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design combining a quasi-experimental pretest–posttest comparison with follow-up qualitative interviews. The quantitative phase examined whether Generative AI (GenAI)-supported English for Legal Purposes (ELP) instruction improved students' legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension, while the qualitative phase explored how students experienced the intervention and perceived the benefits and limitations of GenAI. This design was selected because recent language-learning research has demonstrated the value of combining achievement measures with learners' accounts of AI-supported learning processes (Song & Song, 2023; Ngo & Hastie, 2025). The study involved 60 undergraduate students enrolled in the Islamic Family Law program at the Faculty of Sharia, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia. Two intact English classes were used: one experimental group (n = 30) receiving GenAI-supported ELP instruction and one control group (n = 30) receiving conventional ELP instruction. Both groups studied the same topics, received equivalent instructional time, followed the same learning objectives, and were taught by the same lecturer.

The intervention lasted eight weeks, with one instructional session per week. The content focused on legal English related to marriage, marriage contracts, divorce, child custody, guardianship, inheritance, and family dispute resolution. In the experimental group, ChatGPT was used as a structured learning tool. Students worked with teacher-designed prompts to obtain definitions of legal terms, simplified explanations, contextual examples, short legal scenarios, comparisons between related concepts, and comprehension questions based on assigned legal texts. They were required to compare AI-generated responses with course materials and lecturer explanations before accepting the information. This verification component reflected recent recommendations that GenAI integration should include explicit AI literacy, critical evaluation, and ethical guidance (Ngo & Hastie, 2025). The instructional design was also informed by evidence that guided AI-supported activities can facilitate vocabulary learning and engagement (Karataş et al., 2024) and support EFL reading development when pedagogically structured (Alazemi, 2024). The control group covered identical content through lecturer explanations, legal texts, dictionaries, vocabulary exercises, comprehension questions, and classroom discussions without GenAI assistance.

Two achievement measures were administered before and after the intervention. The legal vocabulary test consisted of 40 selected-response items measuring meaning recognition, contextual use, word–definition matching, and sentence completion. The legal reading comprehension test comprised short legal texts followed by 30 items

assessing main ideas, specific information, contextual interpretation of legal terminology, inference, and relationships among legal concepts. Three experts—one in English language teaching/ESP, one in language assessment, and one in Islamic family law—reviewed the instruments for relevance, clarity, disciplinary accuracy, and alignment with the learning objectives. The instruments were subsequently piloted with students from a comparable population who were not included in the main sample. Item difficulty and discrimination were examined, and internal consistency was estimated using KR-20.

Data collection began with vocabulary and reading pretests for both groups. After the eight-week intervention, equivalent posttest forms were administered. Students in the experimental group also completed short learning reflections and retained selected prompt-response records. Twelve students were then purposively selected for semi-structured interviews to represent relatively high, moderate, and low improvement patterns. The interviews examined how students used GenAI, which functions supported their understanding of legal English, how they evaluated AI-generated information, and what difficulties or concerns they encountered. Interviews were conducted in Indonesian, audio-recorded with permission, transcribed verbatim, and translated into English only for reporting excerpts.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs). Separate ANCOVAs were conducted for legal vocabulary and legal reading comprehension, using the relevant posttest score as the dependent variable, instructional group as the fixed factor, and corresponding pretest score as the covariate. Pretest-adjusted comparisons have been used effectively in recent AI-supported EFL intervention studies (Song & Song, 2023; Alazemi, 2024). Assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, linearity, and homogeneity of regression slopes were checked before interpretation. Statistical significance was set at .05, and partial eta squared was reported as the effect-size estimate. Interview transcripts, reflections, and selected interaction records were analyzed thematically through iterative coding, theme development, review, and refinement. The qualitative findings were integrated with the quantitative results to explain the learning patterns observed. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, identities were anonymized, and students were informed that GenAI outputs functioned as learning aids rather than authoritative legal sources.

Results

RQ1. To What Extent Does Generative AI-Supported Instruction Improve Islamic Family Law Students' Legal Vocabulary Mastery and Legal Reading Comprehension?

The first research question examined the extent to which students' legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension changed after the eight-week instructional period. Descriptive statistics for both groups are presented in Table 1. At pretest, the experimental group obtained a mean legal vocabulary score of M = 21.40 (SD = 3.72), while the control group obtained M = 21.03 (SD = 3.58). The small

difference between the two means indicated that the groups entered the study with relatively comparable levels of legal vocabulary knowledge. For legal reading comprehension, the experimental group obtained a pretest mean of M = 16.80 (SD = 3.11), compared with M = 16.53 (SD = 3.06) for the control group. A similar descriptive pattern was therefore observed for both outcome measures.

Following the intervention, the experimental group showed a substantial increase in legal vocabulary performance. Its mean score increased from 21.40 at pretest to 31.60 (SD = 3.19) at posttest, representing a mean gain of 10.20 points. The control group also improved, but to a smaller extent, increasing from 21.03 to 25.83 (SD = 3.54), with a mean gain of 4.80 points. Thus, although both groups demonstrated vocabulary development during the instructional period, the magnitude of improvement was more pronounced among students who participated in GenAI-supported ELP instruction.

A similar pattern emerged for legal reading comprehension. The experimental group improved from M = 16.80 (SD = 3.11) at pretest to M = 23.90 (SD = 2.73) at posttest, corresponding to a gain of 7.10 points. The control group increased from M = 16.53 (SD = 3.06) to M = 19.83 (SD = 3.08), resulting in a gain of 3.30 points. The descriptive findings therefore suggest that the GenAI-supported group experienced greater improvement in both legal vocabulary mastery and comprehension of English legal texts.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for legal vocabulary and legal reading comprehension

Outcome	Group	Pretest M	Pretest SD	Posttest M	Posttest SD	Mean gain
Legal vocabulary	Experimental	21.40	3.72	31.60	3.19	10.20
Legal vocabulary	Control	21.03	3.58	25.83	3.54	4.80
Legal reading comprehension	Experimental	16.80	3.11	23.90	2.73	7.10
Legal reading comprehension	Control	16.53	3.06	19.83	3.08	3.30

Therefore, these descriptive results indicate that students in both instructional conditions improved over the eight-week period, but the gains were consistently larger in the experimental group. The difference was particularly noticeable in legal vocabulary, where the experimental group gained more than twice as many points as the control group.

RQ2. Are There Significant Differences in Legal Vocabulary Mastery and Legal Reading Comprehension Between Students Receiving GenAI-Supported Instruction and Those Receiving Conventional Instruction?

The second research question examined whether the posttest differences between the experimental and control groups remained significant after controlling for their initial performance. Before conducting ANCOVA, the assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, linearity, and homogeneity of regression slopes were examined. No substantial violations were identified. The interaction between instructional group and pretest score was not statistically significant for legal

vocabulary, $F(1, 56) = 0.62$, $p = .435$, or legal reading comprehension, $F(1, 56) = 1.04$, $p = .312$. The homogeneity of regression slopes assumption was therefore satisfied for both analyses.

For legal vocabulary, an ANCOVA was conducted with posttest vocabulary score as the dependent variable, instructional condition as the fixed factor, and pretest vocabulary score as the covariate. After adjustment for pretest performance, the estimated posttest mean was 31.52 (SE = 0.53, 95% CI [30.46, 32.58]) for the experimental group and 25.91 (SE = 0.53, 95% CI [24.85, 26.97]) for the control group. The difference between the groups was statistically significant, $F(1, 57) = 52.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta p^2 = .481$. The effect size indicated that instructional condition accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in adjusted vocabulary posttest scores.

The analysis of legal reading comprehension produced a similar result. After controlling for pretest reading performance, the adjusted posttest mean for the experimental group was 23.84 (SE = 0.48, 95% CI [22.88, 24.80]), compared with 19.89 (SE = 0.48, 95% CI [18.93, 20.85]) for the control group. The group effect was statistically significant, $F(1, 57) = 30.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta p^2 = .350$. This result indicates that students receiving GenAI-supported ELP instruction achieved higher legal reading comprehension scores than those receiving conventional instruction, even after their initial reading performance was taken into account.

Table 2. ANCOVA results for posttest legal vocabulary and legal reading comprehension

Outcome	Adjusted M Experimental	Adjusted M Control	F	p	ηp^2
Legal vocabulary	31.52	25.91	52.84	< .001	.481
Legal reading comprehension	23.84	19.89	30.67	< .001	.350

Overall, the inferential analyses showed that GenAI-supported instruction was associated with significantly higher achievement in both ELP outcomes. The larger effect observed for legal vocabulary suggests that the intervention was particularly beneficial for students' acquisition and contextual understanding of discipline-specific terminology.

RQ3. How Do Islamic Family Law Students Perceive and Experience the Use of Generative AI in Learning English for Legal Purposes?

The qualitative analysis of interview transcripts, learning reflections, and selected prompt-response records generated four themes: contextualized vocabulary support, simplified access to legal texts, critical verification of AI-generated information, and concerns about overreliance and accuracy. These themes helped explain how students interacted with GenAI during the intervention and how they perceived its contribution to learning legal English.

The first theme concerned the role of GenAI in supporting specialized legal vocabulary. Students frequently reported using ChatGPT to obtain definitions, translations, synonyms, and examples of legal terms. Several participants emphasized

that contextual examples were more helpful than dictionary definitions because they demonstrated how a term functioned within a legal situation. One student explained, "When I searched for custody in a dictionary, I understood the translation, but I was still unsure how it was used in family law. ChatGPT gave me a case example, so the meaning became clearer" (Participant 3). Another student similarly stated, "It was easier to remember terms such as guardian, inheritance, and marital property because I could ask for examples related to cases we discussed in class" (Participant 8). Prompt records also showed that students frequently requested simpler explanations when initial responses contained unfamiliar terminology.

The second theme involved GenAI as a scaffold for understanding complex legal texts. Students described using the tool to simplify lengthy sentences, explain unfamiliar expressions, and generate short summaries before returning to the original text. Participant 5 noted, "Some legal paragraphs were too long for me. I asked ChatGPT to explain them in simpler English first, and then I read the original paragraph again. After that, I could understand more of it." Another participant commented, "I did not use it only to translate. Sometimes I asked why a sentence had a particular meaning or which words were important for understanding the legal issue" (Participant 11). These accounts suggest that students perceived GenAI as most useful when it supported rather than replaced engagement with the assigned reading.

The third theme concerned critical verification of AI-generated responses. Students reported becoming increasingly aware that fluent AI responses were not necessarily legally accurate. Several described comparing generated explanations with lecturer explanations, course materials, and legal documents. Participant 2 stated, "At first I thought the answer was always correct because the English sounded convincing. Later, I found one explanation that was different from the material, so I started checking before using it." Participant 9 similarly explained, "For English meaning, it was very helpful, but for Islamic law, I still needed to check because sometimes the explanation was too general." Prompt records further showed instances in which students challenged an initial response and requested clarification based on information from classroom materials.

The fourth theme captured concerns about dependency, oversimplification, and accuracy. Although students generally valued the immediate assistance provided by GenAI, some acknowledged that easy access to answers could reduce their willingness to work through difficult texts independently. Participant 6 reflected, "The problem is that it is very easy to ask again and again. Sometimes I realized I was asking ChatGPT before trying to understand the paragraph myself." Another student observed that "the explanation can sound correct even when it is too simple for a legal concept" (Participant 10). These concerns indicate that students did not perceive GenAI as an unquestioned substitute for instructional materials or lecturer guidance.

Table 3. Qualitative themes related to students' GenAI-supported ELP experiences

Theme	Main focus	Evidence source
Contextualized vocabulary support	Definitions, examples, and discipline-specific use of legal terminology	Interviews, reflections, prompt records
Simplified access to legal texts	Simplification, summarization, and comprehension support	Interviews, reflections, prompt records
Critical verification of AI output	Checking AI responses against reliable instructional and legal sources	Interviews, prompt records
Overreliance and accuracy concerns	Dependency, oversimplification, and potentially inaccurate information	Interviews, reflections

Overall, the qualitative findings complemented the quantitative results by showing that students primarily valued GenAI for contextual vocabulary explanations and scaffolding of difficult legal texts. At the same time, their experiences highlighted the importance of verification and lecturer guidance, particularly when AI-generated explanations involved substantive legal concepts rather than language support alone.

Discussion

The findings indicate that GenAI-supported ELP instruction produced stronger development in legal vocabulary mastery and legal reading comprehension than conventional instruction. The effect was more pronounced for vocabulary, although reading comprehension also improved substantially in the experimental group. Qualitative findings supported these patterns: students valued GenAI for contextualized vocabulary explanations, simplification of difficult legal texts, and follow-up questioning. At the same time, they recognized the need to verify AI-generated information and expressed concerns about dependency and inaccurate legal explanations. Overall, GenAI appeared most useful when it functioned as a guided language scaffold rather than an autonomous source of legal knowledge.

The stronger vocabulary gains can be explained by repeated engagement with discipline-specific terms in meaningful contexts. Instead of receiving a single dictionary equivalent, students could request definitions, translations, examples, and distinctions among related terms such as custody, guardianship, inheritance, and marital property. This is particularly relevant in legal English, where lexical competence requires understanding terms within specialized discourse. Alasmary (2024) emphasizes the importance of subject-specific lexical resources for law students using English as an additional language. The finding also accords with Karataş et al. (2024), who reported that learners perceived ChatGPT as useful for vocabulary development and personalized language support. In the present context, the ability to request multiple explanations and contextual examples may have provided students with greater opportunities to establish connections between unfamiliar English terminology and legal concepts already encountered in their disciplinary studies.

The improvement in legal reading comprehension suggests that GenAI can also reduce linguistic barriers associated with specialized legal texts. Students used GenAI to simplify long sentences, clarify unfamiliar expressions, summarize passages, and generate comprehension questions before returning to the original text. Such support

may have allowed greater attention to meaning and relationships among legal concepts rather than requiring students to concentrate primarily on decoding difficult language. Joo and Belcher (2025) similarly found that human–AI collaborative reading can provide immediate explanatory support and encourage reflective engagement with academic texts. This finding is particularly relevant because recent reviews show that GenAI research in second-language education has concentrated heavily on writing and learner perceptions, with comparatively less attention to reading (Li et al., 2024; Yang & Li, 2024). The present study therefore extends current evidence by demonstrating the potential of GenAI for discipline-specific legal reading.

The qualitative findings provide a more nuanced interpretation of these achievement gains. Students described GenAI as useful when explanations could be adapted to their immediate needs, particularly through simpler English and examples situated in family-law contexts. However, they also learned that fluent AI responses could not automatically be treated as legally authoritative. Their practice of checking responses against course materials and lecturer explanations indicates critical engagement rather than passive acceptance. This pattern is consistent with Ngo and Hastie (2025), whose AI-integrated English for Academic Purposes module strengthened students' confidence in critically evaluating GenAI output. Concerns about overreliance also support broader findings that ChatGPT's benefits coexist with risks related to accuracy and uncritical use (Yang & Li, 2024). These concerns may be especially important in legal education, where linguistically convincing output can still contain inaccurate or overly generalized interpretations.

When the quantitative and qualitative findings are considered together, the mechanism underlying the intervention becomes clearer. The higher vocabulary and reading scores appear to reflect structured interaction with GenAI rather than access to the technology alone. Students requested contextual explanations, reformulated prompts, compared generated responses with instructional materials, and revisited original legal texts after receiving linguistic support. Their interview accounts therefore help explain the larger gains observed in the experimental group. This convergence demonstrates the value of mixed-methods evidence: achievement measures indicate whether learning changed, whereas interviews, reflections, and interaction records illuminate how that change may have occurred. GenAI can thus be viewed as a mediational resource whose educational value depends on task design, verification practices, and lecturer guidance, rather than as an inherently effective instructional technology.

The study contributes by extending GenAI research from general EFL and academic English into English for Legal Purposes within Islamic higher education, a context that remains underrepresented in current GenAI language-learning research. It also highlights an important distinction between linguistic assistance and substantive legal authority. Pedagogically, ELP instructors should integrate GenAI through structured prompts, discipline-specific texts, and explicit verification tasks rather than unrestricted answer generation. Students should be encouraged to compare AI-generated explanations with reliable legal and academic sources, while lecturers remain responsible for clarifying contested, culturally situated, or jurisdiction-specific

concepts. Such an approach combines the responsiveness of GenAI with the disciplinary oversight required in legal education, enabling students to benefit from personalized linguistic support without developing unquestioned dependence on AI-generated content.

Conclusion

This study examined the use of Generative AI-supported English for Legal Purposes instruction among Islamic Family Law students, with particular attention to legal vocabulary mastery, legal reading comprehension, and students' learning experiences. The findings indicate that students receiving GenAI-supported instruction achieved greater gains in both legal vocabulary and reading comprehension than those receiving conventional instruction, with the strongest improvement observed in vocabulary development. The qualitative findings further showed that students valued GenAI for contextualized explanations of legal terminology, simplification of complex legal texts, and opportunities for repeated questioning and clarification. At the same time, students recognized the need to verify AI-generated information and expressed concerns about overreliance and the possibility of inaccurate or overly simplified legal explanations. These findings suggest that GenAI can function effectively as a language-learning scaffold in ELP when its use is structured, critically monitored, and supported by lecturer guidance.

The study has practical implications for English instruction in law-related programs, particularly in Islamic higher education. Lecturers can integrate GenAI through discipline-specific prompts, guided vocabulary practice, legal-text simplification, and verification activities that require students to compare AI-generated output with reliable academic and legal sources. However, the findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations, including the use of two intact classes from a single institution, the relatively short eight-week intervention, and the focus on only two language outcomes. The study also examined one GenAI platform and did not assess whether learning gains were retained over time. Future research should therefore involve larger and more diverse samples, longer intervention periods, delayed posttests, and multiple GenAI tools. Further studies could also examine writing, speaking, legal argumentation, critical AI literacy, and students' ability to evaluate AI-generated legal information across different legal and cultural contexts.

References

Alasmary, A. (2024). Sustaining vocabulary knowledge growth through corpus-generated lists of lexical bundles and keywords in the law of contracts. *Heliyon, 10*(9), e29944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29944

Alazemi, A. F. T. (2024). Formative assessment in artificial integrated instruction: Delving into the effects on reading comprehension progress, online academic enjoyment, personal best goals, and academic mindfulness. *Language Testing in Asia, 14*, Article 44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00319-8

Joo, D., & Belcher, D. (2025). Human-AI collaborative reading in academic contexts: An exploratory case study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 78*, 101571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101571

Karataş, F., Abedi, F. Y., Ozek Gunyel, F., Karadeniz, D., & Kuzgun, Y. (2024). Incorporating AI in foreign language education: An investigation into ChatGPT's effect on foreign language learners. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*, 19343–19366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12574-6

Li, B., Lowell, V. L., Wang, C., & Li, X. (2024). A systematic review of the first year of publications on ChatGPT and language education: Examining research on ChatGPT's use in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100266

Ngo, T. N., & Hastie, D. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Academic Purposes (AIAP): Integrating AI literacy into an EAP module. *English for Specific Purposes, 77*, 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2024.09.001

Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: Assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1260843. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Yang, L., & Li, R. (2024). ChatGPT for L2 learning: Current status and implications. *System, 124*, 103351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103351