

Addressing Challenges in Legal English: Strategies for Non-English Major Law Students

MONTASSER MOHAMED ABDELWAHAB MAHMOUD^{1*}

HUDA HAMAD ALKHENIZAN²

¹English Language Department, Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University, Saudi Arabia

²English Language Department, Imam Mohammad bin Saud University, Saudi Arabia

*Corresponding author email: dr.mmam73@gmail.com

Article information	Abstract
Article history: Received: 23 Jan 2025 Last revised: 18 May 2026 Accepted: 21 May 2026 Available online: 26 May 2026 Keywords: Academic performance Instructional strategies Legal English Non-English major law students Teaching methods	<i>This study examines the challenges faced by non-English major law students in learning Legal English, with a particular focus on how these obstacles affect their academic performance. Conducted at the College of Shariah and Law, Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University (IAU), the research explores the difficulties encountered by students who are required to study Legal English despite limited proficiency in the English language. The study investigates the impact of these challenges on students' understanding of legal concepts and their overall academic achievement. Using a mixed-methods approach, the research integrates both qualitative and quantitative data, gathered through surveys, interviews, and student performance records. Data analysis involved coding qualitative responses from interviews to identify recurring themes and patterns, while quantitative data were analyzed using statistical methods to determine correlations between language proficiency and academic performance. The findings reveal that insufficient exposure to legal terminology significantly hinders students' comprehension of legal texts and impedes their performance in assessments. In response to these findings, the study highlights the importance of providing more comprehensible input, such as simplified explanations, glossaries, and context-rich examples, to bridge the gap between legal terminology and students' current language proficiency. Furthermore, the study underscores the crucial role of instructional strategies and classroom practices in shaping students' learning outcomes. The study concludes with recommendations for enhancing teaching methodologies and materials, emphasizing the need for targeted support to bridge the gap between legal education and English language proficiency.</i>

INTRODUCTION

Legal English is a specialized form of English tailored to legal contexts, characterized by its distinct vocabulary, complex syntax, and specific stylistic conventions (Northcott, 2023). In today's globalized world, proficiency in Legal English has become increasingly essential for legal professionals. As legal practices and global interactions grow, effective communication in Legal English is crucial for lawyers and legal professionals to navigate international cases,

contracts, and negotiations (Anesa, 2019). However, law students, particularly those who are not English majors, face significant challenges in mastering this specialized language. Even English majors, if they have not been trained specifically in the legal field, encounter similar difficulties. These challenges stem from limited exposure to advanced English language skills and the need to grasp specialized legal terminology, with their academic focus primarily on legal concepts rather than language proficiency (Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011; Gane & Huang, 2017; Nhac, 2021). The struggle is further intensified by the intricacies of legal discourse, which requires not just language skills but a deep understanding of legal systems and practices.

At institutions like the College of Shariah and Law at IAU, these challenges are particularly pronounced. Although students are required to take Legal English courses, their main discipline is law, not English, which often leads to a misalignment in their language abilities. This misalignment creates barriers in understanding complex legal terminology and concepts, ultimately affecting academic success. Previous studies, including those by Sierocka (2014) and Zaikina (2023), highlight the negative impact of this misalignment on students' ability to effectively grasp legal language.

The challenges faced by law students in learning Legal English are multifaceted, involving specialized vocabulary, intricate grammatical structures, and the distinct conventions of legal writing (Anesa, 2019; Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011; Davies, 2020; Nhac, 2021). Non-native speakers or students with limited English proficiency face additional difficulties, as the precise communication required in legal contexts further complicates their learning process. Understanding these specific challenges is critical for developing effective educational interventions, instructional strategies, and resources to bridge the gap between legal studies and language proficiency (Nhac, 2021; Sierocka, 2014). Such insights will guide the creation of instructional materials and teaching practices that help students better navigate the complexities of Legal English and improve their academic performance. However, to inform such instructional improvements, it is essential to first understand the nature and scope of the challenges faced by law students—particularly those who do not specialize in English. This leads to the central problem addressed in the present study.

Statement of the problem

Despite the increasing importance of Legal English in the globalized legal environment, there is limited research focusing on the challenges faced by law students who are not majoring in English. This gap in the literature is concerning, particularly as Legal English becomes more integral to effective legal practice and communication. This study aims to address this gap by exploring the unique challenges encountered by law students required to learn Legal English, despite their primary focus being on legal studies rather than language proficiency. The research will assess the influence of classroom practices, instructional strategies, and academic performance on students' mastery of Legal English. The findings will provide valuable insights into how these challenges relate to students' academic achievement and inform the development of targeted interventions to improve Legal English instruction. To guide this inquiry, the study is structured around the following research questions.

Research Questions

To explore these challenges, this study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. What are the primary challenges faced by law students in learning Legal English?
2. How do these challenges impact the overall learning process of law students?
3. In what ways do various instructional strategies and classroom practices influence students' acquisition of Legal English?
4. What is the relationship between students' reported difficulties in learning Legal English and their academic performance on exams?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Key characteristics of Legal English

Legal English is characterized by its specialized vocabulary, which includes a vast array of terms that carry precise meanings within legal contexts, often not immediately understood outside legal settings (Davies, 2020; Tuấn & Ngàn, 2023). This specialized terminology is essential for clear and effective communication in legal environments but presents significant challenges for learners, especially non-native speakers or those unfamiliar with legal practices (Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011; Nhac, 2021). Margolis (2024) emphasizes the cognitive load that legal jargon imposes, noting its impact on comprehension and academic performance. Zaikina (2023) also demonstrates a direct correlation between students' proficiency in legal terminology and their performance in legal courses, highlighting the importance of mastering this specialized language.

Another key feature of Legal English is its complex syntax. Legal texts often contain intricate sentence structures that are designed to ensure precision and avoid ambiguity (Northcott, 2023). These structures typically include long sentences with multiple clauses and embedded phrases, which can complicate comprehension, particularly for learners unaccustomed to such syntactic complexity (Abu-Ssaydeh, 2016). Passive voice, nominalizations, and extended clauses are commonly used in legal drafting, contributing both to the clarity and complexity of legal documents (Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011; Davies, 2020). While this syntactic complexity is necessary to achieve legal clarity, it can present significant barriers for students learning Legal English, particularly non-native speakers (Tuấn & Ngàn, 2023). Margolis (2024) observes that students often struggle with these dense structures, which can negatively affect their academic performance in legal discourse. Abu-Ssaydeh (2016) further explores how difficulties with legal syntax can impact students' legal writing skills and their ability to engage in legal argumentation, revealing how these syntactic challenges can hinder their success in legal settings.

The formal style of Legal English is another defining characteristic that distinguishes it from everyday English. This style, characterized by objectivity and specific conventions, is crucial for maintaining clarity and precision in legal communication (Gane & Huang, 2017). Legal

English often employs passive voice and complex sentence structures to emphasize actions or results rather than the actors involved (Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011). These stylistic conventions necessitate that learners adapt to a formal legal writing style that differs from the simpler, more direct language they may be accustomed to in everyday English (Bhatia & Bhatia, 2011). Margolis (2024) highlights that students often find these formal language conventions challenging, as they require cognitive effort and a shift in writing approach. Sierocka (2014) further emphasizes the need for tailored teaching methods that help students navigate the formal aspects of Legal English, suggesting that educators adopt strategies to address these unique challenges effectively.

Identifying key challenges in teaching and learning Legal English

Research into the challenges of teaching and learning Legal English highlights several key issues that impede students' mastery of the language. A central difficulty is the complexity of legal terminology, with students often struggling to grasp dense and specialized vocabulary. This challenge is compounded by the complex syntactic structures and formal conventions that are unique to Legal English, which may be unfamiliar to non-native speakers or those with limited legal exposure (Nhac, 2021). For example, the use of passive voice, nominalization, and intricate sentence constructions are common in legal texts and can significantly hinder comprehension (Strati & Enesi, 2019). Furthermore, legal language often incorporates idiomatic expressions and culturally specific references that may be challenging for students without prior exposure to legal discourse (Beveridge, 1998). This complexity is further exacerbated for students navigating the differences between the Anglo-American legal system and other legal systems, such as the Saudi legal system. Effective teaching of Legal English therefore requires specialized instructional strategies that address both the linguistic challenges and the cultural complexities inherent in legal discourse (Nhac, 2021). In addition, instructional methods play a crucial role in students' success in acquiring Legal English. Traditional language teaching methods, which primarily focus on general language proficiency, do not meet the specific needs of Legal English learners (Zódi, 2019). These conventional approaches often fail to address the practical applications of Legal English, such as drafting legal documents or engaging in legal argumentation (Vigaru, 2015). Furthermore, many teaching strategies overlook the cultural contexts necessary for understanding Legal English. Without this context, students may struggle to apply their knowledge of the language to real-world legal situations (Jutras, 2001; Northcott, 2023). These instructional gaps highlight the pressing need for more contextually relevant teaching strategies that bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and the practical demands of legal practice.

Challenges in cross-cultural Legal English learning

Cross-cultural differences add an additional layer of complexity to learning Legal English, especially for students from non-English-speaking backgrounds. Law students often face challenges stemming from the differences between legal systems, particularly between the Common Law and Civil Law traditions. These systemic differences complicate the learning process, as students must not only understand the language but also the legal concepts and procedures that underpin it (Davies, 2020). For example, Saudi law students encounter

difficulties reconciling the Common Law system, which heavily influences Legal English, with the Civil Law system to which they are more accustomed (Nhac, 2021). These systemic differences create challenges in understanding legal concepts and terminology that do not have direct counterparts in the Saudi legal system, further complicating their ability to use Legal English effectively. Moreover, differences in legal reasoning and communication styles between legal systems can hinder students' engagement with English-language legal texts (Beveridge, 1998; Nhac, 2021). In addition to linguistic challenges, these cross-cultural differences affect students' comprehension and interpretation of legal concepts, often leading to confusion when encountering legal terms that do not directly translate across systems. To address these complexities, it is essential that instructional strategies consider not only the linguistic elements of Legal English but also the systemic and cultural dimensions that shape students' understanding of the language. Effective teaching of Legal English in cross-cultural contexts requires approaches that bridge these systemic divides and provide students with a deeper understanding of both legal systems and their respective linguistic conventions (Jutras, 2001).

METHODS

Participants

Twenty junior Legal English majors from IAU's College of Shariah and Law participated in this study. Participants were chosen based on their intermediate to upper-intermediate proficiency in English, as evidenced by their completion of two core English Language courses. These students were particularly relevant to the study as they were facing challenges in integrating legal concepts with language acquisition. Purposive sampling was used to select students specifically from this cohort, as they had completed foundational Legal English courses and were experiencing difficulties in mastering legal terminology and concepts. This sampling approach ensured that the participants had relevant experiences to share regarding their learning challenges.

Data collection instruments and procedures

Semi-structured interviews

In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with all 20 participants to explore their experiences and perceptions regarding challenges in learning Legal English. Each interview lasted 45 minutes and followed a guide with 12 open-ended questions designed to elicit responses on the difficulties students faced in understanding legal terminology, the effectiveness of instructional strategies, and their own strategies for overcoming these challenges. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using thematic coding. The coding process was as follows:

- Open coding was applied to identify initial concepts and ideas in the interview transcripts.
- These concepts were grouped into categories based on similarity.

- The categories were then analyzed and organized into themes, reflecting the core challenges students faced. This systematic process helped ensure consistency and validity in the analysis.

Class observations

Classroom observations were conducted during several Legal English lessons to assess the effectiveness of teaching methods and student engagement. A structured checklist was used to document 15 specific criteria, including teaching strategies, student participation, and the integration of legal concepts in lessons. The checklist provided a consistent framework to assess each lesson and compare student engagement and teaching practices across different sessions. Observations were carried out by the primary researcher, who received training to ensure consistency and minimize bias.

Analysis of exam results

The exam results from the students' Legal English courses were analyzed to assess their proficiency in legal terminology and their ability to apply legal concepts. The exams included both multiple-choice and written-response questions. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize overall student performance, and inferential statistics, including correlation analysis, were applied to examine the relationship between students' reported challenges (from interviews) and their actual exam performance, particularly in areas related to legal terminology.

Ethical considerations

Ethical standards were rigorously adhered to throughout the study. Participants provided informed consent before engaging in the interviews and were assured that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain confidential. The use of their exam results was disclosed, and participants were given the option to withdraw from the study at any time. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of IAU to ensure compliance with ethical research guidelines. All data were anonymized to protect participant identity.

Reliability and validity

To ensure the reliability of the data, the interview protocol was reviewed by a panel of Legal English instructors before the study. Additionally, pilot interviews were conducted to refine the interview questions and ensure clarity and consistency. Data triangulation was employed to enhance the study's validity by integrating findings from interviews, classroom observations, and exam results. This approach allowed for a comprehensive analysis of the students' challenges and how instructional strategies influenced their learning outcomes.

Data analysis

The qualitative data from interviews and observations were analyzed using thematic analysis, where transcripts and field notes were coded and categorized into emerging themes. These

themes were then interpreted to offer a detailed understanding of the students' learning challenges. For the quantitative analysis, descriptive statistics were employed to summarize exam performance, while correlation analysis explored the relationship between reported challenges and exam results. The combination of qualitative and quantitative data allowed for a more comprehensive analysis of the challenges students faced in learning Legal English and how instructional strategies influenced their learning outcomes.

RESULTS

Research question 1: What are the primary challenges faced by law students in learning Legal English?

The findings revealed several significant challenges faced by IAU law students in learning Legal English. Data obtained from interviews, classroom observations, and exam analyses consistently showed that students struggled with specialized legal terminology, complex sentence structures, the formal style of Legal English, and insufficient background knowledge in law.

Interview findings demonstrated that many students experienced difficulty understanding and applying legal terminology due to its highly specialized and context-dependent nature. Students indicated that the textbook included unfamiliar legal vocabulary with nuanced meanings that were difficult to comprehend and retain. This finding aligns with previous studies by Beveridge (1998), Davies (2020), and Zódi (2019), which emphasized the cognitive demands associated with acquiring specialized legal vocabulary.

Another major challenge involved the complexity of legal syntax. Students reported difficulty interpreting lengthy, multi-clausal sentences commonly found in legal texts. These findings support previous research by Abu-Ssaydeh (2016), Gane and Huang (2017), and Strati and Enesi (2019), which identified complex legal sentence structures as a major obstacle for EFL learners.

The formal nature of Legal English also emerged as a significant challenge. Students explained that Legal English differs substantially from everyday conversational English because of its rigid conventions, formal tone, passive constructions, and specialized discourse patterns. Similar findings were reported by Beveridge (1998), Bhatia and Bhatia (2011), and Nhac (2021), who argued that the formal style of Legal English often creates barriers to comprehension and communication.

In addition, students with limited prior legal knowledge reported greater difficulty understanding legal texts and concepts. The findings indicated that unfamiliarity with legal principles intensified students' struggles with legal terminology and discourse. This supports previous studies by Sierocka (2014), Vigarú (2015), and Zódi (2019), which emphasized the importance of background legal knowledge in facilitating Legal English acquisition. Table 1 summarizes students' reported satisfaction and challenges in learning Legal English.

Table 1
Student satisfaction and challenges in learning Legal English

Theme	Description	Student Response (Number of Students)
General Satisfaction	Some students expressed satisfaction with the structured approach of the course.	8 students
Difficulty with Legal Terminology	Most students found specialized vocabulary difficult to master.	15 students
Difficulty with Complex Syntax	Students struggled with long, multi-clausal sentences.	14 students
Difficulty with Formal Style	The formal, rigid style of Legal English was challenging to adapt to.	12 students
Inadequate Tailored Support	Many felt the course did not address individual needs, especially for beginners.	10 students

The specific linguistic and conceptual challenges identified by students are further summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Challenges in mastering specialized legal terminology and syntax

Challenge	Number of Students Facing Difficulty	Percentage of Students (%)
Legal Terminology	18 students	90%
Complex Sentence Structures	17 students	85%
Formality of Legal English	16 students	80%
Background Knowledge in Law	14 students	70%

As shown in Table 2, the majority of students experienced difficulties with legal terminology (90%), complex sentence structures (85%), and the formal style of Legal English (80%). These findings indicate that Legal English presents both linguistic and conceptual challenges for EFL law students.

Research Question 2: How do these challenges impact the overall learning process of law students?

The findings indicated that these challenges significantly affected students' learning experiences, engagement, confidence, and academic comprehension. Interview data revealed that students frequently experienced frustration, anxiety, and reduced confidence when dealing with dense legal texts and unfamiliar terminology.

Classroom observations showed that students initially demonstrated hesitation and limited participation in discussions due to unfamiliarity with legal concepts and vocabulary. Many students struggled to maintain engagement during extended legal discussions, particularly when encountering unfamiliar legal jargon or complex legal arguments. These findings correspond with the interview data, where students reported feeling demoralized when they were unable to comprehend legal texts effectively.

The observational findings further demonstrated that the cognitive complexity of legal discourse produced emotional consequences, including frustration and disengagement. Students often hesitated to participate in classroom discussions because they lacked confidence in their understanding of legal terminology and legal reasoning.

Although student engagement improved gradually toward the end of the semester as familiarity with course content increased, difficulties related to terminology, sentence complexity, and legal reasoning persisted. These findings suggest that acquiring Legal English proficiency is a gradual process requiring continuous exposure and instructional support.

The impact of background legal knowledge on comprehension was also substantial. Students with limited understanding of legal principles found it significantly more difficult to comprehend legal texts and apply legal terminology appropriately. These findings were clearly stated in the following table.

Table 3
Impact of background knowledge on learning Legal English

Impact of Background Knowledge	Number of Students	Percentage of Students (%)
Significant Impact on Comprehension	13 students	65%
Moderate Impact	5 students	25%
Minimal Impact	2 students	10%

As shown in Table 3, 65% of students reported that limited legal background knowledge significantly affected their comprehension of Legal English. These findings emphasize the importance of integrating legal content knowledge with language instruction.

Research Question 3: In what ways do various instructional strategies and classroom practices influence students' acquisition of Legal English?

The findings demonstrated that instructional strategies and classroom practices played an important role in influencing students' acquisition of Legal English. While some students appreciated the structured nature of the course, many reported that the instructional approach did not sufficiently address their individual learning needs, particularly those with limited exposure to legal terminology and concepts.

Observational findings suggested that students benefited from gradual exposure to legal language and scaffolded instruction. As students became more familiar with legal terminology and discourse patterns over the semester, their participation and engagement improved. These findings support the recommendations of Sierocka (2014) and Zaikina (2023), who emphasized the importance of scaffolding techniques in Legal English instruction.

The results further indicated that students required more targeted instructional support to manage the cognitive demands of legal texts. Breaking down complex legal texts into manageable sections, providing contextualized vocabulary instruction, and integrating practical exercises appeared necessary to facilitate comprehension and participation.

The findings also highlighted the importance of creating a supportive classroom environment that encourages active participation and reduces students' anxiety. Students responded more positively when instructors provided opportunities for clarification, discussion, and practical application of legal concepts. These findings align with learner-centered approaches advocated in previous research on Legal English pedagogy.

Overall, the findings suggest that effective Legal English instruction should combine language instruction with legal content knowledge while incorporating scaffolded, interactive, and supportive teaching practices.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between students' reported difficulties in learning Legal English and their academic performance on exams?

The findings revealed a strong relationship between students' reported difficulties in learning Legal English and their academic performance on examinations. Exam analyses showed that students who experienced greater difficulties with legal terminology, sentence structures, and legal discourse tended to achieve lower exam scores. The correlation analysis demonstrated strong negative relationships between students' reported difficulties and exam performance as stated in the following table.

Table 4
Correlation between reported difficulties and exam performance

Reported Difficulty	Correlation with Exam Performance (r-value)	Interpretation
Legal Terminology	-0.72	Strong negative correlation: more difficulty correlates with lower performance
Complex Sentence Structures	-0.65	Moderate negative correlation
Formality of Language	-0.60	Moderate negative correlation
Limited Legal Background Knowledge	-0.75	Strong negative correlation: less knowledge correlates with lower performance

As shown in Table 4, students who reported greater difficulty with legal terminology and limited legal background knowledge demonstrated lower academic performance. These findings indicate that linguistic and conceptual challenges significantly affect students' achievement in Legal English courses.

The exam analysis further revealed recurring patterns of errors, including:

1. Misinterpretation of legal terminology.
2. Difficulty applying legal concepts to practical scenarios.
3. Problems organizing coherent responses to legal questions.

These findings support previous studies by Abu-Ssaydeh (2016), Bhatia and Bhatia (2011), Davies (2020), and Strati and Enesi (2019), which emphasized the close relationship between legal language proficiency and academic success in Legal English contexts. The overall performance of both student groups is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Performance summary for group A and group B

Student	Midterm	Assignments & Presentations	Total Before Final Exam	Final Exam Score	Total Score
Group A	53.33	82	76.69	29.29	70
Group B	52	84	72.46	20.6	70.1

Despite relatively high engagement and participation rates, students continued to experience difficulties applying legal concepts, using legal vocabulary accurately, and organizing responses effectively during examinations. These findings suggest that additional instructional support is necessary to improve students' practical application of Legal English in academic contexts.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study align with much of the existing research on the challenges students face in mastering Legal English, particularly regarding complex terminology and intricate syntax. Scholars such as Bhatia and Bhatia (2011), Northcott (2023), and Zaikina (2023) have emphasized the cognitive load associated with specialized legal language, and this study supports these findings. The results also underscore the importance of prior legal knowledge, a theme consistently highlighted in the literature (Margolis, 2024; Strati & Enesi, 2019; Zaikina, 2023). Students with a solid foundation in legal principles are better equipped to manage the complexity of legal language, which further confirms that prior knowledge in law can facilitate the acquisition of Legal English (Sierocka, 2014).

However, the current study introduces a dynamic aspect not often explored in prior literature: the evolution of student engagement over the course of the semester. Initially, students showed hesitation when faced with the challenges of mastering legal terminology and syntax. By the end of the course, engagement levels increased significantly, though fundamental language issues remained. This evolution of student engagement mirrors findings from Bhatia and Bhatia (2011) and Gane and Huang (2017), who observed a similar shift in motivation and participation as students become more familiar with the subject matter. Yet, as this study reveals, engagement alone does not resolve the core challenges related to complex legal language, highlighting the importance of tailored instructional strategies to address these persistent issues.

An important contribution of this study is its focus on formative assessments as a means of early intervention. While previous research, including Bhatia and Bhatia (2011), has advocated for scaffolding and gradual exposure to legal language, the present study goes a step further by exploring how formative assessments can be used specifically to address difficulties in legal terminology and syntax. Formative assessments provide students with regular opportunities to receive feedback, allowing instructors to identify specific areas of difficulty and tailor instruction accordingly. These assessments offer a proactive approach to learning that ensures difficulties are addressed early on, rather than allowing them to affect overall academic performance. By regularly assessing students' understanding and providing targeted

feedback, instructors can help bridge the gap between language proficiency and legal knowledge, thus improving student outcomes in Legal English courses.

Additionally, this study introduces the concept of contextualized learning strategies, which have been suggested in the literature as a way to make learning more relevant and engaging. Contextualized learning refers to teaching that links theoretical knowledge to practical, real-world contexts. In the case of Legal English, this could involve integrating legal cases, practical legal scenarios, or mock trials into the curriculum to make the language more meaningful to students. While this concept has been mentioned in the literature (e.g., Gane & Huang, 2017), it has not been extensively explored in the context of Legal English instruction. The findings of this study suggest that such strategies can enhance student engagement and comprehension by providing more concrete examples of how legal language is used in practice.

Furthermore, the study highlights that legal knowledge plays a central role in overcoming the challenges posed by specialized legal terminology. This aligns with previous research (Strati & Enesi, 2019; Zaikina, 2023), but the study provides a novel perspective by examining how student engagement and background knowledge interact over time to influence language acquisition. Early in the course, students' struggles with legal language were more pronounced, but as their engagement increased, their ability to engage with complex legal texts improved, albeit slowly. This dynamic progression shows that while engagement plays a crucial role in student motivation, legal knowledge is an essential factor in overcoming language barriers.

In conclusion, this study builds on existing literature by confirming well-established challenges in mastering Legal English, while also introducing actionable recommendations for improving instruction. The integration of formative assessments and contextualized learning strategies offers practical solutions for educators seeking to enhance student outcomes. These findings not only extend the understanding of the difficulties students face but also provide concrete suggestions for how teaching strategies can be adapted to better support students in mastering Legal English. By connecting these concepts to existing research, the study offers a holistic view of how instructional approaches can be tailored to address both linguistic and academic challenges, ensuring that students are better prepared for the demands of Legal English.

CONCLUSION

This study sheds light on the significant challenges faced by non-English major law students in mastering Legal English, particularly in the context of IAU. The research identifies key obstacles, including the complexity of legal terminology and syntax, and the varying levels of student engagement, which together impact both learning outcomes and academic performance. By utilizing a mixed-methods approach, the study provides a comprehensive analysis of these challenges and highlights the importance of targeted instructional strategies to address them effectively.

A distinctive contribution of this study is its detailed analysis of how students' performance varied across different types of exam questions. This nuanced examination revealed that

difficulties with precise legal terminology and complex syntactic structures directly affect students' ability to interpret and apply legal concepts, offering new insights into how these challenges manifest in exam performance. The study's focus on error analysis provides actionable recommendations for educators, allowing for the development of focused instructional strategies that specifically address the challenges students face in mastering Legal English. Additionally, the research underscores the pivotal role of student engagement in overcoming language barriers. It demonstrates that varying levels of engagement further complicate students' ability to grasp complex legal language, suggesting that more personalized engagement strategies are necessary to cater to individual learning needs. The study also introduces the concept of a culturally responsive approach to teaching Legal English, emphasizing the importance of contextualizing instruction to reflect students' diverse backgrounds. This approach is critical for making Legal English more accessible and relevant to students, enhancing both their comprehension and academic success.

In conclusion, this study offers valuable insights into the specific challenges non-English major law students encounter when learning Legal English. The findings suggest that integrating contextualized learning strategies, continuous formative assessments, and tailored support can significantly improve learning outcomes. These strategies are essential for developing more effective Legal English education programs and ensuring that students are better equipped to meet the demands of legal practice in a globalized world.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The findings suggest that a multifaceted approach to Legal English education is essential. This should incorporate targeted vocabulary instruction, practical application exercises, and continuous formative assessments. By adopting a culturally responsive and contextually aware teaching methodology, educators can better support students in overcoming the complexities of legal language and improve their overall academic performance. In summary, this study advances our understanding of the obstacles in Legal English education and offers practical recommendations for addressing these challenges. By focusing on tailored instructional strategies, such as contextual learning and continuous assessment, and considering cultural context, the study provides valuable insights that can inform the development of more effective educational programs. These recommendations are critical for preparing students for success in the global legal landscape and enhancing their ability to navigate the complexities of Legal English.

THE AUTHORS

Montasser Mohamed Abdelwahab Mahmoud, PhD, is an assistant professor in applied linguistics with over 25 years of experience at Imam Abdulrahman bin Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. He also authored the "Al-Montasser Arabic-English Dictionary on Islamic Religious Terms" and three other volumes on language, culture, and identity. A reviewer for top journals, he has published 15 research papers in esteemed international journals.

dr.mmam73@gmail.com

Huda Hamad Alkhenizan, PhD, is an assistant professor in English literature at Imam Mohammad bin Saud University, Saudi Arabia who earned her PhD in 2022. She teaches modern drama, American literature, and British novels. Her research focuses on absurd theatre, gender studies, multiethnic literature, language pedagogy, and cultural context and identity.

halkhenizan@imamu.edu.sa

REFERENCES

- Abu-Ssaydeh, A. (2016). Complex sentences in English legislative texts: Patterns and translation strategies. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 16(1), 111–128. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes2000.16.1.6>
- Anesa, P. (2019). Towards a conceptualization of legal English as a lingua franca? *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p14>
- Beveridge, B. J. (1998). *How culture, law, and language are all barriers to effective cross-cultural legal communication, specifically international commercial contracts* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of British Columbia.
- Bhatia, A., & Bhatia, V. K. (2011). Discursive illusions in legislative discourse: A sociopragmatic study. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 24(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-010-9178-5>
- Davies, M. (2020). *The Legal English grammar guide*. <https://www.amazon.com/Legal-English-Grammar-Guide/dp/B087SCDQH3>
- Gane, C., & Huang, R. H. (2017). *Legal education in the global context: Opportunities and challenges*. Routledge.
- Jutras, D. (2001). Two arguments for cross-cultural legal education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 3, Article 2815675. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2815675>
- Kampouri, S. (2022). Tackling the content of a course for academic legal purposes. *ELT Journal*, 76(1), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab057>
- Margolis, E. (2024). Doing less-reflections on cognitive load and hard choices in teaching first-year legal writing. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 68(3), 399–418. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4892160>
- Nhac, H. T. (2021). Challenges in learning legal English from students' perspective at Hanoi Law University. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 3(3), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v3i3.675>
- Northcott, J. (2023). Legal English. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 213–227). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Sierocka, H. (2014). *Curriculum development for Legal English programs*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Strati, E., & Enesi, M. (2019, June). *Syntactic properties of legal language in English and Albanian* [Paper presentation]. The 9th International Conference: The Future of Education, Florence, Italy.
- Tuấn, V. V., & Ngàn, T. T. (2023). Demotivating factors affecting English major students acquiring Legal English at Hanoi Law University. *TNU Journal of Science and Technology*, 228(3), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.34238/tnu-jst.7280>
- Vigaru, R. P. (2015, September). *Challenges in teaching legal English and efficient methods of evaluating Romanian students at the Faculty of Law and Public Administration* [Paper presentation]. 2nd International Conference on Language/Literature in Education and Research, Prague, the Czech Republic. <https://www.slovakedu.com/en/conferences/conferences-2015/>
- Zaikina, L. (2023). Challenges in teaching Legal English for non-lawyer instructors. *Grail of Science*, 34, 223–224. <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.08.12.2023.47>
- Zódi, Z. (2019). The limits of plain Legal language: Understanding the comprehensible style in law. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 15(3), 246–262. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744552319000260>