

BRIDGING CIVIC EDUCATION AND LEGAL ENGLISH THROUGH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

Nicoleta Aurelia MARCU*

ABSTRACT: *This article analyses the convergence of civic education and Legal English instruction through Artificial Intelligence (AI). Drawing on interdisciplinary frameworks, it proposes a novel pedagogical model where civic values - such as justice, tolerance, and human dignity - are incorporated in AI-supported language training. AI tools, such as automated writing assistants or simulation platforms, can provide interactive and personalized learning environments where students can engage with authentic legal texts while reflecting on civic issues. By doing so, Legal English classrooms can become laboratories for democratic engagement, where professional skills and civic values mutually reinforce one another. Based on empirical evidence from surveys, this study explores how AI-assisted Legal English instruction enhances both linguistic proficiency and democratic awareness.*

KEYWORDS: *Legal English; civic education; AI; content-based instruction; democratic competences*

JEL Code: *K00*

DOI: 10.62838/cjjc-2024-0058

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid transformations in the digital era put pressure both on educators and learners as they require pedagogical approaches that should closely follow the latest developments in technology. The same is valid for legal education that should bridge linguistic, civic, and technological competences. In an age marked by democratic backsliding, disinformation, and increasing dependence on international legal frameworks, law students can no longer acquire legal terminology in isolation. They must be equipped with both the linguistic skills required by the globalized legal systems and the civic competences if they want to be active members of a democratic society. When coupled with AI's dynamic capabilities, these two approaches can be integrated into a unified pedagogical model that offers a potent avenue for interdisciplinary learning. AI tools, such as automated writing assistants or simulation platforms, can provide learning environments where students have

* Senior Lecturer PhD. G.E.Palade UMPHST of Targu Mures, ROMANIA.

the chance of engaging with authentic legal texts while reflecting on civic challenges. By doing so, the Legal English classroom becomes a venue that promotes democratic engagement, a place where Legal English skills and civic values mutually reinforce one another.

As the lingua franca of international law, diplomacy, and global business, Legal English provides students with access not only to terminology and the related communicative strategies but also to the values and principles contained in the legal discourse. Civic education highlights the importance of nurturing democratic competences - respect for human rights, intercultural understanding, critical thinking, and civic engagement - that are fundamental for preserving open societies (Council of Europe, 2018). Legal professionals require a good command of Legal English as a functional medium for international legal practice (Mattila, 2013), but they must also cultivate civic literacy - the ability to engage meaningfully and ethically in democratic societies (Hoskins & Kerr, 2012). Traditional language pedagogy often treats linguistic skills independently from social and civic values. However, Content-Based Instruction (CBI) - which teaches language by following a thematic content - shows that by incorporating social issues such as leadership, human rights, environmental protection, digital literacy, both the linguistic and civic development are achieved (Marcu, 2022).

Drawing on empirical evidence from surveys and classroom applications, this study explores how AI-assisted Legal English instruction enhances students' linguistic proficiency and confidence when using the specialized terminology, as well as their democratic knowledge. The article refers to previous studies that address the connection between language education and democratic competences (Rus, 2025; Ban & Moica, 2025; Byram, 2008). It also draws on the *Didaktik*-model proposed by Marks and Eilks (2009), which emphasizes that "mimicking authentic societal practices of communication and decision-making is an essential part of SSI-based (socio-scientific issues) science lessons with different pedagogies that make the learner skilful for self-determination, participation, and solidarity" (Marks et al., 2014). Applied to the context of Legal English, this approach underlines the importance of creating classroom practices that simulate genuine democratic and legal processes - such as debates, mock trials, negotiations, and policy discussions. By integrating civic education into AI-supported Legal English instruction, the students are not only developing their linguistic skills but also fostering the democratic competences necessary for their effective participation in both civic life and legal practice.

The article is divided into two main parts. Section 1 provides a theoretical framework that supports the integration of civic education, Legal English and Artificial Intelligence into a pedagogical model. Section 2 presents empirical findings from surveys, highlighting student perceptions and interpretation of outcomes. Section 3 proposes a pedagogical model that accommodates challenge-based learning, gamification, and AI into an interdisciplinary framework, while also suggesting some classroom activities that promote this model. The article concludes by highlighting the implications of this approach for legal education and democratic resilience in an increasingly interconnected, yet so polarized world.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The interdisciplinary integration of civic education, Legal English, and Artificial Intelligence (AI) follows several interrelated theoretical traditions. To develop a robust pedagogical model, it is necessary to examine the foundations of each domain, as well as the points at which they converge. This section reviews the relevant literature in four key areas: (1) civic education and democratic competences, (2) Legal English as both linguistic and civic practice, (3) AI in language and legal education, and (4) the educational model of *Didaktik*.

2.1. Civic Education and Democratic Competences

Civic education lays the foundation of democratic societies. Its primary aim is to cultivate citizens who are not only knowledgeable about institutions and rights but also capable of active and responsible participation in democratic life (Hoskins et al., 2015). In recent years, the Council of Europe's *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture* (RFCDC, 2018) has provided a systematic model for teaching, learning, and assessing democratic competences. The framework identifies 20 competences that are classified into four main groups: values (e.g., human rights, cultural diversity), attitudes (openness, responsibility, participation), skills (critical thinking, communication, empathy), and knowledge and critical understanding (of law, politics, history). For language education, the RFCDC highlights the central role of intercultural dialogue and communication in fostering mutual understanding and respect: "The goal is to enable learners to engage in respectful, appropriate and effective democratic and intercultural behaviour in real-world situations that they encounter in everyday life. Crucially, as a competence-based approach to citizenship education, it specifies what learners are expected to *do* rather than what they are expected to *know*." (Barrett, 2020, p.1)

RFCDC also offers a systematic approach to strengthening learners' resilience against radicalization. The aim is to equip students with the skills necessary for recognizing and resisting extremist or terrorist propaganda. This involves analytical and critical thinking, as well as knowledge and critical understanding of media, which are essential for navigating online environments where radicalizing narratives circulate. Notably, the RFCDC does not prescribe a one-size-fits-all model. Instead, it provides open-ended guidance that allows for adaptation to different national and cultural contexts: "the guidance identifies the various options that may be used to implement the RFCDC and outlines the pros and cons of each option. The user is then invited to consider the relevant issues and to make their own decisions in light of those considerations." (Barrett, 2020, p.12) This decentralization of decision-making is deliberate: by empowering local actors, the framework respects cultural diversity while maintaining fidelity to universal democratic values.

As Rus (2020) argues in her study on integrating democracy into language teaching, classrooms can function as laboratories for democratic culture, where learners practice critical engagement with authentic texts while reflecting on social and political issues. This approach resonates with Byram's (2008) intercultural citizenship theory, which emphasizes the dual function of language learning: developing communicative competence and nurturing civic responsibility. Thus, civic education provides both the

content and the mindset that can be integrated into Legal English instruction. By situating legal language learning within real world civic challenges - such as freedom of expression, migration, or environmental justice - educators enable students to connect linguistic competence with democratic engagement.

Moreover, the systematic review of Donbavand and Hoskins (2021) highlights that citizenship education is most effective when it employs participatory methods, adopts whole-school approaches, and equips teachers with appropriate training. In contrast, approaches focused only on factual knowledge acquisition or simple digital engagement were found to have limited impact on students' real-world political participation. This insight resonates strongly with our proposal for bridging civic education and Legal English through AI, since both domains require more than surface-level familiarity - they demand active, authentic, and reflective engagement.

2.2 Legal English: Beyond Technical Competence

Legal English, as a branch of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), has traditionally been understood as the acquisition of specialized vocabulary, syntax, and pragmatic conventions used in legal contexts (Charrow & Erhardt, 1982). It covers genres such as contracts, statutes, judicial opinions, and advocacy, each with its own drafting norms. However, recent studies have emphasized that Legal English is not merely technical but also deeply cultural and civic in nature (Mattila, 2013). Mattila's work underlines the complexity of legal language as a domain-specific system that blends archaic forms with increasingly globalized terminology. Therefore, in the context of our study, AI should not merely simplify legal text, but help students understand underlying communicative functions, cultural legal framing, and historical layers. Conversely, students need to be aware that AI literal translation may miss legal nuance. The comparative legal linguistics approach of Mattila's book supports interdisciplinary methods by cultivating awareness that legal concepts - even if expressed in English - are rooted in specific legal cultures.

At the same time, legal texts encompass values, norms and philosophical concepts, reflecting the legal traditions in which they arise. For example, the language of human rights treaties embodies universal ideals of dignity and equality, while contract drafting reflects principles of consent and self-determination. Therefore, as Kramsch (1993) argued, language learning involves negotiating both linguistic sense and cultural sense. Applied to Legal English, this suggests that learning legal terminology is inseparable from comprehending the civic and ethical principles embedded within it. One can state that Legal English functions not only as a professional tool but also as a civic instrument for participation in transnational legal and democratic discourse. The challenge, therefore, is to design pedagogy that links these dimensions-legal practice technical precision and democratic competence- in an AI-enhanced instruction environment, a pedagogy that is to produce effective educational outcomes.

2.3 Artificial Intelligence in Language and Legal Education

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into education has accelerated in recent years, offering new possibilities for adaptive learning, automated feedback, and interactive simulations. (UNESCO, 2023) In legal education, AI has been applied to areas such as legal research, predictive analytics, and case simulations (Surden, 2019). More recently, attention has turned to the pedagogical potential of AI for legal language training. For

instance, AI-driven platforms can generate mock trial scenarios, facilitate debate exercises, and provide real-time feedback on legal writing. When integrated with civic education, such tools enable students to explore democratic dilemmas (e.g., balancing freedom of expression with protection from hate speech) while refining their Legal English skills.

However, scholars caution against uncritical adoption of AI. Concerns include the accuracy of legal terminology in machine-generated outputs, data privacy risks, as well as the dangers of over-reliance on automated systems. As Zhai argues, “students’ over-reliance on AI dialogue systems, particularly those embedded with generative models for academic research and learning, affects their critical cognitive capabilities including decision-making, critical thinking, and analytical reasoning.” (Zhai et al., 2024) For these reasons, AI should be viewed as a pedagogical support system, not a substitute for human educators. The teacher cannot and should not completely be replaced by the machine as he/she must facilitate a heuristic approach in education that promotes genuine critical reflection, ethical reasoning, and democratic dialogue.

The over-reliance on AI dialogue systems can erode students’ critical cognitive skills due to “ethical challenges such as misinformation, algorithmic biases, plagiarism, privacy breaches, and transparency issues.” (Zhai, 2024). If we take the scenario of a judge who decides relying entirely on AI dialogue systems, the outcome may hide algorithmic biases that have been perpetuated by the machine. More than that, “the inner workings of these systems are sometimes opaque, making it difficult to understand why they produced the results or text that they did. This lack of transparency and interpretability can raise concerns about accountability and trust in legal decision-making.” (Surden, 2024, p.1970)

Students need to be educated to be sceptic and embrace the challenge of “explainable AI.” They should understand that they are key factors in ensuring that AI solutions adhere to the principles of fairness, of justice. They should not view AI as a blockage, and they should understand that their critical input can lead to a more transparent and accountable system. Therefore, they must learn the basics of AI; they must get familiarized with “concepts like machine learning, deep learning, and natural language processing[...], ethical concerns such as data privacy and algorithmic biases. Education demystifies AI, empowering [them] to better interpret and explain AI to clients, colleagues, regulators, and the public.” (Mack, 2023)

Even though legal generative AI models produce less errors than general-purpose AI like GPT-4, they still ‘hallucinate’ (see the already classical case of *Mata v. Avianca*). According to a study from 2024, Lexis+ AI system generated incorrect information more than 17% of the time, Westlaw’s AI-Assisted Research and Ask Practical Law AI hallucinated more than 33% of the time. (Magesh, 2025) Educators are responsible for signalling these issues to the students and they have to instil in their education the ethical principles that must be applied also in their use of AI tools. The students must know that it is their duty to check the AI output and for this reason they must possess a certain level of information literacy.

According to UNESCO’s IFAP (Information for All Programme), information literacy refers to competencies and skills that enable people to seek, access, evaluate, use, and create information safely and in an ethical manner thereby empowering them to effectively participate in knowledge societies. Hence the central role of educators. The educators need to train the students to efficiently and ethically use AI tools because the firms will soon expect that their employees come with at least a baseline of how AI operates, as well as a

certain level of information literacy. Information literacy is crucial because once equipped with it, law students as future legal professionals will be able to interpret and explain also AI-supported output both to their clients, colleagues or regulators and they will know how to use it safely and ethically. After all, liability lies with the human, whether assisted by the machine or not and so far, the machine has not been made accountable for any faulty decisions.

In line with the UNESCO GEM Report's caution against uncritical technological adoption, Legal English instruction should focus on pedagogical purpose, equity, and learner-centred design rather than privileging efficiency or novelty for their own sake. Educators should adapt technology to educational purposes, not vice versa. They must train students not only to use AI tools, but they also must give feedback on students' outputs critically, highlighting any cases of bias or privacy, thus teaching them how to act in future similar scenarios. Moreover, they must embed AI-enhanced practices into broader pedagogical methods, ensuring that technology serves democratic, inclusive educational purposes rather than being deployed in isolation. In this way, integrating AI into Legal English and wider law curricula can strike a balance between technological innovation and the values of professional responsibility, collaboration, and equity.

2.4 Didaktik and Interdisciplinary Pedagogy

According to Duit (2015, p. 325) *Didaktik* "stands for a multifaceted view of planning and performing instruction. It is based on the German concept of *Bildung* [... and it] concerns the analytical process of transposing (and transforming) human knowledge (the cultural heritage) into knowledge for schooling that contributes to *Bildung*." The educational philosophy of *Bildung*, developed by Humboldt, Herder, and later Klafki, provides a broader conceptual framework for the interdisciplinary approach of our study. *Bildung* views education as a process of personal growth, self-reflection, and social responsibility, rather than mere vocational training (Klafki, 2000). Its purpose is to cultivate autonomous individuals capable of contributing to society through critical engagement and ethical action.

The three fundamental *Didaktik*-questions: why? (intentions-aims and objectives), what? (topic of instruction-content), and how? (methods of instruction and media used) applied to Legal English and civic education, suggest that instruction should not focus solely on producing technically competent professionals but also on forming reflective, responsible citizens. This aligns with the dual role of Legal English as both a technical and civic discipline, as well as with the goals of civic education as outlined in the RFCDC. Workshops such as "*Say No to Violence*" or "*Leadership and Human Rights*" (Marcu, 2022) embody these principles by combining language acquisition with democratic reflection.

Marks and Eilks's (2009) *Didaktik*-model emphasizes that learners must 'mimic authentic societal practices of communication and decision-making' to build competences in self-determination, participation, and solidarity (Marks et al., 2014). In practice, this means designing Legal English classes not as isolated language drills, but as microcosms of democratic life, such as the above-mentioned workshops, spaces where students debate, negotiate, deliberate, and make decisions on socio-legal issues. Moreover, integrating AI into Legal English pedagogy creates spaces for learners to practice not only specialized terminology but also the values and competences necessary for democratic participation.

The findings from our students' questionnaires confirm this trajectory. Learners are already experimenting with AI for translation, comprehension, and summarization tasks, but their use remains surface-level, focused on vocabulary and plain-English explanations rather than advanced legal drafting or structured civic reasoning. Much like the findings in Donbavand & Hoskins's review, knowledge alone does not guarantee engagement. Without participatory scaffolding, students risk treating AI as a short-cut to acquiring and producing information and rather than as a tool for deeper democratic and legal competence.

Thus, by combining the lessons of citizenship education with the *Didaktik* approach, we argue for an interdisciplinary model where AI facilitates authentic, participatory tasks: AI-supported mock trials, constitutional debates, and gamified civic dilemmas. These activities go beyond language learning, preparing students for active participation in both legal practice and democratic society. The integration of AI into Legal English is not merely a matter of modernizing teaching methods. It is an opportunity to design a curriculum where language, law, and civic participation intersect, ensuring that future legal professionals are not only proficient in English but also prepared for the ethical, communicative, and democratic demands of their profession.

The pedagogical model we propose is three-folded: it requires AI literacy, Legal English proficiency and civic and democratic engagement. Thus, the students need to be trained to design effective prompts, critically assess AI outputs, and recognize its limitations (biases, hallucinations, plagiarism risks). This can be achieved by organizing workshops (with specialists in both IT and legal field) on prompt engineering, analysing AI-generated case summaries or comparing AI-generated vs. authentic legal texts. For the development of Legal Language, educators can use AI-supported drafting of contracts and memos, grammar/style corrections, translation of legal terms (with debates on the accuracy of the legal translation), and oral preparation with simulated hearings. Regarding civic and democratic engagement, one can resort to embed democratic practices and civic dilemmas into Legal English instruction, aligning with Marks & Eilks's idea of mimicking authentic societal practices. Thus, the Legal English educator can organize AI-supported mock trials (e.g., environmental law, freedom of expression versus hate speech), parliamentary debates on constitutional issues, or gamified dilemmas where students must negotiate rights versus security.

This interdisciplinary approach ensures that students are not only developing linguistic skills but also exercising critical democratic judgment and professional legal competence. In this way, AI becomes a transformative educational tool, supporting both the self-formation of students and their preparation for being active and responsible members of a democratic society.

3. SURVEY FINDINGS: STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND OUTCOME INTERPRETATIONS

AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or DeepL can provide learners with real-time language support, interactive explanations of legal concepts, and opportunities for drafting and revising texts. Yet their true potential emerges when they are embedded in civic learning tasks, where students are required to critically engage with democratic principles while simultaneously refining their legal language skills.

To assess learners' baseline civic knowledge, a questionnaire on democracy was administered. The results reveal that students possess a strong grasp of democratic principles but encounter difficulties in differentiating institutional structures and in resisting subtle authoritarian assumptions. For example, 92.3% correctly identified democracy as *rule by the people through representation and participation*, and 100% affirmed the role of constitutional limits on governmental power. Similarly, large majorities recognized the importance of separation of powers (92.3%), judicial independence (92.3%), and the rule of law (84.6%). These findings suggest that the normative ideals of democracy-rights, accountability, and freedoms-are well internalized.

However, significant weaknesses emerged in understanding systemic variations. Only 23.1% of respondents correctly distinguished the accountability of the executive in parliamentary systems, while nearly half confused direct democracy with representative democracy. Furthermore, 23.1% associated democracy with indefinite leadership, and 15.4% justified government actions outside the law in emergencies, reflecting lingering authoritarian conceptions. These findings indicate that while students can articulate democracy's core values, they struggle to situate these within the complex institutional frameworks that sustain them in practice.

AI tools can play a decisive role in facilitating this process. For example, mock trials on environmental law, gamified civic dilemmas, or AI-assisted debates on constitutional principles allow students to practice Legal English in authentic democratic scenarios. These activities foster both linguistic accuracy and civic imagination, encouraging learners to critically assess how legal discourse operates within democratic societies. In doing so, they simultaneously strengthen their proficiency in Legal English and their formation as autonomous, critically engaged citizens.

Thus, the findings support the claim that combining civic literacy with Legal English training through AI-based pedagogy, students are equipped not only with professional language skills but also with the intellectual and ethical capacities required for efficient participation in democratic and legal contexts.

The results of the questionnaire entitled "The Role of AI in Learning Legal English" provide a nuanced picture of how students currently engage with Artificial Intelligence in the context of Legal English learning. The data show both enthusiasm and critical awareness: AI is widely used as a supplementary tool for comprehension, but its application to advanced legal reasoning remains limited.

Most respondents reported a functional familiarity with AI tools, with 46% identifying as "moderately familiar" and 37% as "very familiar." Only one respondent described themselves as an expert, while none indicated complete unfamiliarity. This suggests that students already integrate AI into their learning, but advanced prompting and specialized use are rare. When asked about using AI for legal texts, 55% reported using it "occasionally," while 36% employed it only for specific tasks, and just 9% reported frequent use. This indicates that AI is primarily supplementary rather than a daily necessity. Tool preference is also telling: ChatGPT dominates overwhelmingly (98%), while only a minority experimented with Lexis+ AI, Grammarly, DeepL, or Bing Copilot. Students are therefore relying on general-purpose AI rather than legal-specific platforms, which may limit the precision of their outputs.

The tasks most frequently performed include translating legal terms (80%) and explaining legal concepts in plain English (61%). More advanced applications, such as contract drafting (7%) or comparative law (26%), remain relatively rare. In terms of frequency, 44% use AI a few times per month, 22% once a month, and 13% once a week. None reported daily use, reinforcing the idea that AI is currently an occasional support rather than a habitual tool.

Students generally view AI as helpful or very helpful: 48% found it moderately helpful, and 39% very helpful, particularly in clarifying complex legal concepts. However, AI appears underutilized for Latin expressions and legal jargon—only 13% reported frequent use, while 26% admitted they had not considered this application. Similarly, AI is most often used for summarizing dense or complex texts (53%), rather than as a routine practice.

Perceptions of accuracy reflect healthy scepticism. While 43% rated AI-generated outputs as “sometimes inaccurate,” 33% judged them “generally accurate but lacking references,” and another 33% found them “mostly accurate.” Only a small minority considered AI “very accurate.” This critical stance is mirrored in writing practices: while 37% use AI outputs as inspiration and 33% for grammar/style checks, only 4% admitted to copying and adapting texts directly. AI thus functions more as a drafting assistant than as a substitute for independent writing.

Prompting practices remain relatively simple. The most common requests are to “explain in plain English” (54%) and to “translate Romanian–English legal concepts” (46%). Few respondents experiment with more complex prompts, such as contract drafting (9%). Follow-up prompts are used “sometimes” (44%) or “often” (24%), but rarely “always,” suggesting that students are aware of prompting, yet they do not systematically apply it.

When asked about language features, respondents focused on style (48%), grammar (39%), and clarity (39%), while only 9% used AI for citations and 7% for passive voice conventions. Confidence in prompt design is moderate: 48% are “moderately confident,” 37% “confident,” and only 2 respondents “very confident.” Most prompts begin with definitional or translation tasks, rather than reasoning-based or argumentative requests.

AI seems to encourage reflective writing practices. Nearly half (48%) reported revising more carefully, and 41% indicated improved argument structuring. Only a small minority claimed no impact. At the same time, students expressed serious concerns: 57% worried about inaccuracies, 48% about plagiarism risks, and 44% about lack of citation. Many also feared dependency (37%) or reduced opportunities for practicing authentic legal writing (22%).

When asked about AI in the curriculum, responses reflected interest but also caution. While 44% supported integration “depending on student needs,” 39% preferred optional workshops, and only 20% advocated for making AI training mandatory. Just 11% opposed integration outright. Current proficiency levels reinforce this need for flexibility: 54% identified as intermediate, 37% as advanced, and 9% as beginners, suggesting varied readiness for AI-enhanced Legal English. Importantly, 78% expressed willingness to attend a workshop or course, particularly if it is practical and hands-on.

The results of the questionnaire indicate several key trends:

1. AI is already integrated in Legal English learning, with ChatGPT serving as the dominant tool.

2. Usage remains surface-level, focusing on comprehension and translation rather than advanced drafting, reasoning, or referencing.

3. Students value AI's support, particularly for clarifying difficult concepts and improving clarity in writing but remain aware of its risks.

4. A skill gap persists: while students are moderately confident in prompt design, they lack training in advanced strategies such as legal referencing, structured argumentation, and citation norms.

From the perspective of *Bildung/ Didaktik*, these findings suggest that AI should not simply be treated as a technical aid but as a medium for self-formative practice. Integrating AI into Legal English courses offers an opportunity to cultivate not only language skills but also critical judgment, ethical responsibility, and civic awareness. To achieve this, teaching must move beyond translation and definition exercises, guiding students toward reflective, and critical uses of AI, such as summarizing judgments, drafting contracts with legal accuracy, or preparing oral arguments.

The survey findings highlight both the opportunities and challenges of integrating AI into Legal English education. Students already engage actively with AI for comprehension tasks, yet their use remains mostly surface-level and exploratory rather than advanced or discipline-specific. At the same time, students' express awareness of risks such as inaccuracies, plagiarism, and dependency, demonstrating a critical stance that is consistent with the competences outlined in the *RFCDL*.

4. PARTICIPATORY MODEL FOR AI-DRIVEN LEGAL ENGLISH AND CIVIC EDUCATION

4.1. Towards a Pedagogical Model

The integration of civic education and Legal English through Artificial Intelligence requires a structured pedagogical model that balances linguistic proficiency, democratic competences, and technological innovation. Drawing on interdisciplinary pedagogy, it deliberately intertwines language, law, civic values, and technology into a unified approach. The proposed model rests on three interconnected pillars that bring together language learning, civic education, and AI: CBL, gamification and AI-support.

First, *challenge-based learning (CBL)* positions students at the centre of real-world civic and legal dilemmas, such as digital privacy, migration, or environmental law, framed through authentic texts like case law or regulations. This approach fosters problem-solving, critical reflection, and intercultural dialogue, ensuring that legal vocabulary is acquired in real-life contexts that mirror democratic practice. Second, *gamification and simulation* motivate learners through role-play and competitive tasks. Activities such as AI-powered mock trials, negotiation games, or debate simulations allow students to adopt professional roles, such as judges, lawyers, policymakers, while exploring civic values in English. In this way, legal reasoning and democratic engagement reinforce one another. Finally, *AI-enhanced scaffolding* provides adaptive support. Through chatbots, automated writing feedback, and dynamic glossaries, AI tailors task complexity to student proficiency while reinforcing accuracy and information literacy. Importantly, AI functions not as a replacement for the teacher, but as an instrument that extends the educator's capacity to guide and assess learners.

4.2. Classroom Applications

The integration of civic education and Legal English through AI can be achieved through participatory practices that link language learning with democratic engagement. For example, in an *AI-supported mock trial* on environmental liability, students use AI-generated briefs which they must fact-check and adapt. This way, they will develop Legal English proficiency while also reasoning about civic issues such as sustainability and justice. Likewise, *constitutional debate simulations* engage students in drafting and analyzing critically AI-prepared arguments on dilemmas like free speech versus hate speech, combining persuasive legal language with reflection on democratic values. An *AI translation challenge* further sharpens linguistic precision by having students compare AI-rendered translations of Romanian legal texts with authentic English versions, discussing both errors and civic implications of legal miscommunication.

Gamified tasks enhance these opportunities by immersing students in interactive, AI-supported legal and civic challenges. In an AI-driven civic dilemma game, students negotiate policy briefs on issues such as privacy versus surveillance, applying both legal terminology and democratic decision-making. Similarly, in a legislation lab challenge, teams draft new laws based on AI-generated scenarios, such as regulating drones or data privacy, then debate amendments and vote, practicing legal drafting and civic negotiation. A judicial reasoning quest engages students as judges analysing anonymized AI case summaries and justifying their verdicts in Legal English, while a debate on rights versus responsibilities has them defend or critique AI-generated citizen petitions, exploring civil liberties and obligations. A fact-checking hackathon promotes accuracy and clarity as teams compete in verifying AI-generated legal summaries against authentic texts, while a courtroom strategy puzzle challenges students to analyse and select evidence, witness testimony, and legal arguments under time pressure, thus developing legal reasoning, communication, and critical thinking skills. *AI fact-check workshops* (verifying AI summaries against real judgments) and *civic essays with AI-assisted revision* (also discussing ethical issues) reinforce information literacy and critical engagement with technology. Together, these activities exemplify how interdisciplinary pedagogy can transform Legal English classrooms into laboratories for democratic participation, where linguistic accuracy, civic responsibility, and technological literacy modulate each other.

5. CONCLUSION

Integrating civic education, Legal English, and Artificial Intelligence creates a powerful interdisciplinary pedagogy. Survey findings confirm that students are eager and critically aware but lack depth in applying AI to advanced legal reasoning and civic dilemmas. By embedding AI into participatory practices such as mock trials, debates, and simulations, educators can transform Legal English classrooms into venues of cultivating democratic values. This approach aligns with the principles of RFCDC, and *Didaktik* by promoting not only legal language proficiency but also ethical responsibility and democratic resilience. Finally, AI-enhanced Legal English instruction can produce future legal professionals who are linguistically, technologically, and civically skilled.

Looking ahead, the integration of civic education and Legal English through AI offers promising avenues for research and practice. Future studies might explore comparative implementations across different jurisdictions, long-term impacts on professional and civic

competences, and the ethical dimensions of AI in legal pedagogy. What emerges clearly, however, is that language education, civic responsibility, and digital innovation are no longer separate domains. Their convergence represents not only an educational innovation but also a democratic necessity.

REFERENCES

- Barrett, M. (2020). *The Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture: Policy context, content and impact*. London Review of Education 18(1):1-18. DOI:10.18546/LRE.18.1.01
- Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Multilingual Matters. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292258421>
- Charrow, V.R. & Erhardt, R. (1982). *Clear and Effective Legal Writing*. Little, Brown and Co.
- Council of Europe. (2018). *Reference framework of competences for democratic culture*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/rfcdc-guidance-document-for-higher-education/1680a08ee0>
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion Volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>
- Donbavand, S.; Hoskins, B. *Citizenship Education for Political Engagement: A Systematic Review of Controlled Trials*. Soc. Sci. 2021, 10, 151. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10050151>
- Duit, R. (2015). 'Didaktik'. In R. Gunstone (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of science education* (pp. 325–327). Dordrecht: Springer
- Han, B.; Moica, S. (2025). *Digital Language Learning for Democratic Citizenship: a Cross-national Analysis of Learners Perspectives from the ENLACED Project* Acta Philologia, 7
- Hoskins, B., & Kerr, D. (2012). *Participatory citizenship in the European Union: Final study summary and policy recommendations*. European Commission.
- Hoskins, B., Janmaat, J.G., & Villalba, E. (2015). "Learning Citizenship through Social Participation outside and inside School." *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(6), 940–965.
- Klafki, W. (2000). "The significance of classical theories of Bildung for a contemporary concept of Allgemeinbildung." In I. Westbury, S. Hopmann, & K. Riquarts (Eds.), *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition* (pp. 85–107). Routledge.
- Klafki, W. (2007). *Didactic Analysis as the Core of Preparation of Instruction*. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33(3), 345–367.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Mack, V.O. (2023) *Demystifying Black Box AI: 7 Tips for Lawyers to Promote Explainable AI*. <https://abovethelaw.com/2023/08/demystifying-black-box-ai-7-tips-for-lawyers-to-promote-explainable-ai/>

- Magesh, V., Surani, F., Dahl, M., Suzgun, M., D. Manning, D.C., Ho, E.D. (April, 2025). *Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools*, Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, vol. 22, issue 2. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jels.12413>
- Marks, R & Eilks, I. (2009). *Promoting Scientific Literacy Using a Socio-critical and Problem-Oriented Approach to Chemistry Teaching: Concept, Examples, Experiences*. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education. Vol. 4, No. 3, July 2009, 231-245
- Marks, R., Stuckey, M., Belova, N., Eilks, I. (2014). 'The Societal Dimension in German Science Education – From Tradition towards Selected Cases and Recent Developments. In *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 10(4), 285-296. <https://www.ejmste.com/download/the-societal-dimension-in-german-science-education-from-tradition-towards-selected-cases-and-4314.pdf>
- Marcu, N. A. (2022). Content-based instruction--a method of developing language and social competences. *Acta Marisiensis. Philologia*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.2478/amph-2022-0072>
- Mattila, H. E. S. (2013). *Comparative legal linguistics: Language of law, Latin and modern lingua francas*. Routledge.
- Rus, D. (2020). *Integrating Language, Democracy, and Digital Innovation*. *Acta Philologia*, 4(14), 89–98.
- Surden, H. (2019). "Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview." *Georgia State University Law Review*, 35(4), 1305–1344.
- Surden, H. (2024) *ChatGPT, Artificial Intelligence (AI) Large Language Models, and Law* (March 31, 2024). *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 92, 2024, U of Colorado Law Legal Studies Research Paper No. 24-15, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4779694>
- UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232993>
- UNESCO. (2023) Information for All Programme. <https://www.unesco.org/en/ifap/information-literacy>
- UNESCO (2024). *AI and the Futures of Education*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/ai-future-learning>
- UNESCO (2025) GEM Report <https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en>
- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S. & Li, L.D. *The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review*. *Smart Learning Environments*. 11, 28 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>