

From regulation to instruction: Embedding legal English in Indonesian law schools through ESP

Ani Susanti^{a, 1, *}, Uni Tsulasi Putri^{a, 2}

^a Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

¹ ani.susanti@pbsi.uad.ac.id; ² uni.putri@law.uad.ac.id

* Correspondent author

Received: July 28, 2025

Revised: October 11, 2025

Accepted: October 17, 2025

KEYWORDS

English for
Specific Purposes
Globalization
Language
Pedagogy
Legal Education
Legal English

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the integration of Legal English into Indonesian law schools, emphasizing the persistent gap between national language policy and pedagogical implementation. Although Indonesian regulations, such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, recognize the use of English in legal communication, its curricular application remains fragmented and discretionary. Adopting an interdisciplinary mixed approach that combines doctrinal legal analysis, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) literature review, and questionnaire-based inquiry involving law students and lecturers, this study examines how policy mandates are interpreted in classroom practice. Findings reveal a clear policy-practice misalignment: Legal English is often treated as an elective subject, lecturers lack institutional support and ESP training, and students report limited opportunities for structured instruction despite acknowledging its importance for professional competence. The paper uniquely bridges regulatory and pedagogical perspectives by demonstrating how doctrinal frameworks can inform curriculum reform through Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Task-Based Learning (TBL), and mediation-oriented pedagogy. By aligning regulatory obligations with evidence-based ESP principles, the study proposes practical strategies for curriculum design, faculty development, and institutional policy to strengthen Legal English as a core component of legal education in Indonesia.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) license.



Introduction

The legal profession is undergoing significant transformation in response to globalization, which continues to reshape how legal systems, institutions, and professionals engage with cross-border issues (Buchan et al., 2009). Legal interactions increasingly transcend national boundaries, encompassing areas such as transnational dispute resolution, international commerce, comparative constitutionalism, and digital governance (Koos, 2022). These developments demand not only substantive legal knowledge but also communicative competence that enables lawyers to operate effectively across jurisdictions (Labudová & Jánošová, 2021; Silverstein, 2003). In this context, English has emerged as the *lingua franca* (Jenkins, 2009) of international law and global legal practice, serving as the primary medium for arbitration, commercial contracting, and multilateral negotiations (Ghasemi, 2010).

However, despite this global linguistic shift, Indonesian legal education has yet to respond adequately to the growing demand for bilingual legal competence. Although national regulations, such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, explicitly recognize the use of English in legal documents and international agreements, Legal English remains peripheral within most

law school curricula. This persistent gap between regulatory endorsement and classroom implementation represents a critical problem that this study seeks to address. Legal English, as a specialized branch of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), encompasses not only vocabulary and syntax but also discourse genres and pragmatic conventions essential for legal reasoning and argumentation (Bykonja et al., 2020). In Indonesia, however, Legal English is often taught in isolation from doctrinal courses, offered merely as an elective subject, and seldom supported by institutional policy or faculty training. Such disconnection undermines the development of communicative legal competence and limits the global readiness of Indonesian law graduates.

To respond to this challenge, this study adopts an interdisciplinary approach that integrates doctrinal legal analysis with ESP pedagogy. This dual perspective allows the research to move beyond descriptive evaluation toward an explanatory understanding of how regulatory mandates can inform pedagogical reform. By combining normative legal interpretation with empirical classroom data, the study aims to bridge the policy–practice divide and provide a model for embedding Legal English into legal education through Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and mediation-oriented strategies.

The scholarly literature underscores the need for a more systematic and interdisciplinary approach to Legal English instruction. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Content-Based Instruction (CBI), and mediation-oriented strategies have been proposed as effective methods for fostering legal communicative competence (Sierocka, 2023; Yu & Xiao, 2013). Yet, empirical data on how these frameworks are being applied in the Indonesian legal education context remains scarce. Given this paucity of empirical evidence, the present study contributes both conceptually and practically by examining how regulatory frameworks intersect with pedagogical realities in Indonesian law schools.

Accordingly, this study aims to answer three key research questions:

1. To what extent is Legal English integrated into the curriculum of Indonesian law schools, and how is this reflected in institutional policies and classroom practices?
2. What are the perceptions of students and lecturers regarding the adequacy, challenges, and pedagogical strategies associated with Legal English instruction?
3. How well do existing national regulations on language use in legal contexts (e.g., Law No. 24/2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13/2018) align with actual pedagogical practices in Legal English instruction?

By addressing these questions, the study highlights the novelty of combining legal doctrinal inquiry with educational analysis and contributes to the growing discourse on policy–practice alignment in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) education.

Method

This study employed a qualitative interdisciplinary design, combining normative legal analysis with educational inquiry to examine the regulatory framework and pedagogical implementation of Legal English instruction in Indonesian legal education. By integrating doctrinal legal research, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) literature, and empirical classroom insights, the study aimed to offer a comprehensive and practice-oriented understanding of how Legal English is regulated and taught. Data sources included statutory instruments, scholarly literature, and mixed-format questionnaires distributed to students and lecturers.

Normative Legal Analysis

A doctrinal legal method was used to examine Indonesia's statutory basis for the use of English in legal contexts. The primary legal instruments analyzed were Law No. 24 of 2009, particularly Article 31 on the permissible use of foreign languages in legal agreements, and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018 on the standards for translating legal documents. These sources were reviewed to identify legal recognition of bilingual practices in law, particularly for international agreements and legal translation. Secondary legal sources, including scholarly commentary and policy analysis, were consulted to interpret the implications of these regulations in the context of globalization, legal harmonization, and bilingual legal practice. The doctrinal phase served as the foundation for identifying the normative expectations of bilingual competence within Indonesia's legal system, which were later compared with the empirical realities of classroom instruction. This step established the analytical baseline for exploring the policy–practice misalignment highlighted in the study's objectives.

Educational Inquiry

Parallel to the legal analysis, an educational inquiry was conducted using insights from English for Specific Purposes (ESP) literature, particularly as it relates to Legal English pedagogy. Fourteen peer-reviewed articles were selected for review, with seven identified as directly relevant to law-focused ESP

contexts. These studies offered theoretical and empirical insights into course design, task-based learning, genre awareness, lexical development, mediation, and the use of L1 support in ESP instruction. This component employed an interpretive qualitative paradigm, rooted in applied linguistics and second language acquisition (SLA). The review emphasized pedagogical approaches such as Content-Based Instruction (CBI), the SIOP model (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), simulation-based learning, mediation tasks, lexical bundles, and teacher action research. The insights from these works were thematically analyzed to identify best practices and inform curriculum reform suitable for Indonesian legal education. The literature analysis was guided by thematic synthesis, in which core pedagogical frameworks (e.g., Content-Based Instruction, SIOP, mediation, task-based learning) were coded according to their relevance to legal English classroom realities. This analytical coding ensured that educational insights were systematically aligned with doctrinal findings.

Questionnaire-Based Inquiry

To complement the doctrinal and literature-based findings, the study administered mixed-format questionnaires to two participant groups: law students and lecturers of regular program (not International program). A total of 32 law students and 2 law lecturers from a private university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, participated in this research. The student participants represented diverse academic levels and reported varying degrees of proficiency in general English and Legal English. The lecturers contributed perspectives based on their experience teaching Legal English or doctrinal subjects that integrate English legal terminology.

Given the exploratory nature of this research, the sample size was purposively determined to capture representative classroom perspectives while maintaining depth of qualitative analysis. Although small, this sample reflects the typical structure of Indonesian private law schools and thus offers valuable contextual insights rather than statistical generalization.

The student questionnaire included both closed-ended and open-ended items. It gathered data on students' demographic profiles, self-assessed language proficiency, exposure to Legal English, perceptions of the current curriculum, and learning preferences. Likert-scale items measured student attitudes toward simulation, mediation, and digital tools, while open-ended questions captured perceived instructional gaps and recommendations.

The lecturer questionnaire, consisting of open-ended questions, explored curriculum design, instructional strategies, regulatory awareness, and perceptions of student readiness. It also investigated how institutional constraints and national policies influence the delivery of Legal English instruction. Responses were analyzed using thematic coding, combining inductive and deductive techniques to identify recurring pedagogical themes and institutional barriers. This allowed the study to triangulate between legal norms, educational theory, and classroom practice.

All responses were analyzed using a hybrid coding approach combining inductive and deductive reasoning. Inductive coding allowed new themes to emerge from the data, while deductive categories were derived from existing ESP frameworks (CBI, TBLT, mediation). To ensure analytic rigor, the coding process underwent intercoder verification: both authors independently reviewed the initial codes and reconciled any differences through discussion, enhancing the credibility and dependability of findings.

Analytical Framework

A dual reasoning model was adopted to guide analysis:

Deductive reasoning was applied in the interpretation of legal texts and policy instruments to determine statutory obligations and regulatory trends. Inductive reasoning was used to analyze the ESP literature and participant responses, enabling the identification of emergent pedagogical insights and curriculum reform strategies. This dual approach ensured that the study addressed both the prescriptive dimensions of language policy and the adaptive realities of legal education. Triangulation was applied at three levels, (1) legal texts, (2) ESP literature, and (3) empirical questionnaire data, to ensure the convergence of findings across normative, theoretical, and practical domains. This multi-layered analysis enhanced both the internal validity and interpretive coherence of the study.

Ethical Considerations and Technical Support

This research involved no intervention, experimental manipulation, or collection of sensitive personal data. All responses were gathered anonymously and voluntarily, and participants were informed of the study's academic purpose prior to participation. Given the nature of the research, formal ethics approval was not required. To support language clarity and consistency, AI-based tools such as ChatGPT and Grammarly were employed for non-substantive tasks, including formatting and proofreading. All academic content, interpretation, and argumentation were developed independently by the authors in accordance with principles of academic integrity. To ensure linguistic accuracy and transparency, AI-based

tools such as ChatGPT and Grammarly were used solely for mechanical editing, citation consistency, and language clarity, while all analytical interpretation and argumentation were independently produced by the authors. This approach maintained methodological integrity and compliance with academic ethics.

Results and Discussion

This section presents an integrated discussion of findings drawn from doctrinal legal analysis, a review of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) literature, and empirical data collected through student and lecturer questionnaires. In response to the two guiding research questions, namely, the extent to which Legal English is supported and regulated within Indonesia's legal and educational frameworks, and the pedagogical needs, challenges, and strategies for developing Legal English competence among law students, the discussion is structured around four key themes as shown in Table 1: (1) regulatory and institutional foundations for Legal English, (2) pedagogical implications based on ESP principles and learner needs, (3) curriculum development strategies informed by both literature and stakeholder responses, and (4) the alignment and gaps between regulatory frameworks and educational practices in Indonesian legal education.

Table 1. Key Findings on Legal English Integration

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Focus</i>	<i>Source of Evidence</i>
1. Regulatory and Institutional Foundations	Legal mandates such as Law No. 24/2009 (Article 31) and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13/2018 support the use of English in international legal agreements and official translations, providing a normative basis for Legal English inclusion in legal education.	Doctrinal legal analysis; national legal instruments
2. Pedagogical Implications from ESP	Students and lecturers favor interactive, practice-oriented methods, although implementation varies. ESP literature and empirical data suggest that effective Legal English instruction involves mediation, task-based learning (TBL), simulations (e.g., moot court), and authentic legal texts.	Student and lecturer questionnaire data; ESP literature
3. Curriculum Development Strategies	Legal English should be integrated into doctrinal law subjects with the support of needs analysis, lexical bundle instruction, and multimodal resources. Scaffolding and progressive exposure are essential to build student proficiency.	Student and lecturer responses regarding curriculum content and delivery
4. Alignment between Policy and Practice	Although legal norms endorse Legal English, many students report limited classroom exposure and a lack of structured instruction. This reflects a disconnect between regulatory intent and actual practice.	Comparative analysis of legal texts and empirical survey results

Regulatory Foundation for Legal English

Indonesia's legal framework provides a formal basis for the use of English in legal communication, especially in international and cross-border legal matters. Law No. 24 of 2009 establishes Bahasa Indonesia as the primary language for legal, governmental, and state communication. However, Article 31 introduces a critical exception, permitting the use of foreign languages, particularly English, in agreements involving international or foreign entities. This provision effectively legitimizes bilingual legal practice and acknowledges English as an auxiliary language of legal legitimacy in transnational contexts. It reflects the growing need for multilingual competencies in fields such as international arbitration, trade law, and cross-border dispute resolution (Silverstein, 2003; Stupnikova, 2017). From a sociolinguistic perspective, this bilingual allowance situates Indonesia within a global regime of "legal semiotic pluralism," where language functions not only as a communicative tool but also as a marker of international credibility and compliance.

Further specificity is provided by Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, which institutionalizes English as the standard for translating legal documents. Unlike the permissive tone of Article 31, this regulation adopts a prescriptive stance, mandating accuracy and consistency in bilingual legal drafting. It affirms English as an integral part of Indonesia's legal infrastructure, especially in terms of legal harmonization with international standards (De Ly, 2005). Thus, the legal foundation for Legal English is both normatively legitimate and pragmatically necessary, grounded in the state's aspiration to integrate domestic law into global legal systems.

However, findings from this study, particularly from the lecturer questionnaire, indicate that the incorporation of Legal English in legal education remains limited and fragmented. Legal English is typically offered as an elective, detached from doctrinal subjects, and rarely anchored in regulatory mandates. This illustrates a recurring phenomenon in Indonesian higher education, what policy scholars term “symbolic compliance,” where the existence of regulation is acknowledged rhetorically but not translated into enforceable practice. The absence of curriculum-level integration reveals a policy–practice gap: while national laws endorse the legitimacy of English in legal affairs, higher education institutions have yet to operationalize these norms through structured learning outcomes, standardized syllabi, or faculty training mechanisms. Regulatory mandates, therefore, exist in declarative form but lack the procedural instruments necessary for pedagogical execution.

Such disjunction reflects a broader structural issue in Indonesian legal education: the system remains doctrine-centered and text-oriented, emphasizing legal positivism over communicative competence. This epistemic orientation privileges statutory interpretation and case analysis while marginalizing linguistic and rhetorical literacy as “soft skills.” As a result, bilingual proficiency is treated as an auxiliary capacity rather than a professional requirement, even though regulatory frameworks explicitly demand its presence. The persistence of this positivist paradigm underscores how epistemological traditions shape curricular inertia, where the mastery of content is valued above the capacity to articulate it across languages and audiences. This finding is consistent with international observations (Yu & Xiao, 2013) that in many non-Anglophone jurisdictions, the lack of coordination between language policy and curriculum planning leads to “declarative bilingualism,” where bilingual ability is mandated at the policy level but unsupported at the institutional level. In Indonesia, this problem is intensified by bureaucratic compartmentalization—law faculties and language education faculties operate in parallel silos, rarely collaborating on ESP-based curriculum design or lecturer training. Consequently, Legal English instruction depends largely on individual initiative rather than institutional commitment, producing uneven quality and perpetuating inequities among students.

Addressing this disjuncture requires a functional model of policy translation, a framework through which universities reinterpret national mandates into operational curriculum policy. To close the implementation gap, law faculties must integrate Legal English into core courses such as Contract Law, International Law, and Arbitration, not as linguistic supplementation but as part of legal reasoning pedagogy. Institutional mandates for ESP training, interdisciplinary collaboration, and assessment reform would bridge the normative–pragmatic divide between law and language. Only through such structural embedding can the regulatory foundation of Legal English evolve from symbolic recognition to performative implementation, ensuring that bilingual legal competence becomes an integral dimension of professional formation rather than a peripheral aspiration.

Pedagogical Implications: ESP in Legal Education

To gain insight into how Indonesian law students perceive the role and effectiveness of Legal English in their academic training, a structured questionnaire was administered using a Likert-scale format. The items were designed to assess students’ self-reported confidence, learning preferences, and perceived relevance of Legal English instruction to their future legal careers. Table 2 summarizes the percentage distribution of student responses across five key statements, offering a snapshot of how well current instructional practices align with learner needs and expectations. The results reveal both promising trends and areas requiring targeted pedagogical intervention.

The student questionnaire revealed critical insights into the perceived adequacy of Legal English instruction within the law school curriculum. On the first item, whether the curriculum provides sufficient Legal English training, an overwhelming 93.3% of students either agreed (30%) or strongly agreed (63.3%). This indicates that students generally feel their programs offer some structured exposure to legal English discourse, even if such exposure may not be formalized as a standalone course. The absence of neutral responses and minimal disagreement (6.7%) further underscores this positive perception. However, the small margin of disagreement may reflect institutional inconsistencies, such as limited faculty expertise, varying access to instructional materials, or the lack of formalized curricular mandates. This finding echoes the previous analysis that emphasized that although legal policy frameworks in Indonesia encourage English integration, implementation often remains fragmented and depends heavily on individual faculty initiative (Shanty, 2016). In other words, students’ optimism may stem more from sporadic exposure than from a stable curricular structure, a perception shaped by isolated efforts rather than systemic design.

On the second item, student confidence in reading legal documents in English, 90% expressed positive affirmation, with 56.7% strongly agreeing and 33.3% agreeing. While this suggests that most students feel relatively confident engaging with English legal texts, a closer examination reveals a subtler issue: 10% of

respondents either disagreed or remained neutral, indicating that a segment of students still struggles with complex legal syntax and specialized vocabulary. This aligns with reports noting that students often overestimate their legal language competence due to general English familiarity, underestimating the challenges posed by formal legal genres (Bykonja et al., 2020). Lecturer responses further support this finding, highlighting the need for mediation strategies where instructors explicitly explain or scaffold legal terms and contexts. Mediation is not merely linguistic translation but a cognitive act of rendering specialized content comprehensible, a key strategy in ESP classrooms (Chovancová, 2016). This pattern reveals what ESP scholars describe as a “fluency illusion,” in which learners mistake conversational or general proficiency for disciplinary expertise. In Indonesian law schools, where summative assessment privileges receptive comprehension over productive or performative ability, this illusion is likely reinforced structurally. As a result, what appears as confidence may mask an underlying deficit in discourse awareness, argument construction, and pragmatic fluency.

The third item addressed student preferences for simulation-based learning methods, such as moot courts or mock trials, and revealed the widest variance in opinion. Only 23.3% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they preferred such methods, while 43.3% chose a neutral stance and 33.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This ambivalence underscores cultural learning dynamics: Indonesian classrooms traditionally prioritize teacher authority and text memorization, leading students to perceive simulations as performative and risky rather than authentic learning. High power-distance relationships and exam-oriented cultures foster caution, where speaking spontaneously in public may be associated with social exposure or academic risk. Such socio-cultural patterns temper the adoption of active learning despite its proven pedagogical value (Nhac, 2023). The high proportion of neutral responses therefore indicates not rejection but uncertainty, suggesting a lack of prior exposure and scaffolding. This points to an opportunity: with structured preparation, pre-task vocabulary, modeling, and reflective debriefing, simulation activities could become powerful instruments for building legal confidence and rhetorical competence.

Taken together, these findings reveal a paradox: students recognize Legal English as relevant and beneficial, yet their learning experiences remain shaped by traditional expectations of authority, correctness, and textual mastery. While surface-level satisfaction appears high, the underlying pedagogical engagement is shallow, reflecting both systemic and cultural constraints. Institutions must move beyond elective or informal approaches and commit to embedding Legal English instruction within doctrinal courses, supported by policy mandates such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018.

Table 2. Student Perceptions of Legal English Instruction

<i>Survey Item</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Neutral (%)</i>	<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Strongly Agree (%)</i>	<i>Description</i>
The curriculum equips me with sufficient Legal English skills	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	30.0%	63.3%	Most students perceive the curriculum as supportive in building Legal English competence.
I feel confident reading English-language legal documents	0.0%	6.7%	3.3%	33.3%	56.7%	Students generally express high confidence, though some uncertainty remains.
I prefer simulations (e.g., moot court) as part of Legal English instruction	13.3%	20.0%	43.3%	10.0%	13.3%	Opinions on simulation-based learning are mixed, with many students unsure or resistant.

In summary, Table 2 demonstrates encouraging awareness but limited transformation. Students perceive Legal English instruction as valuable, yet their preferences and self-assessments reveal misalignments between confidence and competence, participation and comfort. Strengthening this alignment requires intentional curricular design, assessment reform, and pedagogical scaffolding that promote authentic communication and reduce performance anxiety. Legal education institutions must therefore adopt a more nuanced and evidence-based approach to curriculum development that balances regulatory expectations, pedagogical strategies, and student realities. These findings extend ESP theory by

situating student attitudes within Indonesia's cultural-institutional context, showing how macro-level policies interact with micro-level classroom behaviors to shape the evolving identity of Legal English education.

While Table 2 captures student perspectives on the accessibility and effectiveness of Legal English instruction, a comprehensive understanding of instructional dynamics requires examining the views of those responsible for curriculum delivery, namely, the lecturers. Table 3 presents the findings from the lecturer questionnaire, highlighting perceived institutional challenges, pedagogical constraints, and opportunities for improving Legal English integration. By comparing student expectations with lecturer experiences, a clearer picture emerges of the systemic misalignments and collaborative opportunities within Indonesian legal education.

Table 3. Summary of Lecturer Perspectives on Legal English Instruction

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Curricular Integration	Legal English is not formally integrated; currently incidental or lecturer-driven without institutional curriculum support.
Instructional Challenges	Students struggle with complex legal texts in English due to limited proficiency and lack of scaffolding.
Student Response	One lecturer observed interest and curiosity from students; the other was unsure due to minimal feedback or classroom interaction.
Adaptation in Teaching	Only one lecturer has adapted instruction (e.g., bilingual tasks); the other has not due to resource or time constraints.
Preferred Curriculum Model	Both support integration of Legal English into doctrinal courses rather than as a standalone subject to promote contextual legal learning.
Policy Impact	Mixed views: one sees little impact from Law No. 24/2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13/2018; the other finds them conceptually helpful but poorly implemented.
Suggestions for Improvement	Use Legal English in task-based activities (e.g., legal writing, mediation), offer more resources, and promote lecturer training and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Lecturers unanimously reported that Legal English has not yet been formally institutionalized within the law curriculum. Its presence remains ad hoc, introduced by individual lecturer initiative or embedded incidentally through bilingual materials, without the support of a dedicated syllabus, assessment scheme, or structured course policy. This fragmented delivery reveals not only curricular neglect but also a broader absence of institutional policy translation, where national mandates fail to cascade into operational frameworks at the faculty level. The reliance on lecturer discretion results in varied learning outcomes, disadvantaging students who lack exposure to instructors with sufficient linguistic or pedagogical competence. This situation illustrates the “pedagogical lottery” phenomenon, in which educational quality depends on individual initiative rather than institutional guarantees. These findings underline the need for structured curricular reform that treats Legal English as an assessed and scaffolded component within core doctrinal subjects, particularly in high-demand areas such as contract law, international law, and arbitration.

Instructional challenges further confirm this need. Both lecturers described students' difficulties when engaging with English legal texts, citing dense vocabulary, abstract phrasing, and unfamiliar stylistic features as key barriers. These observations align with insights that emphasized the necessity of explicit instruction in legal genres, lexical bundles, and pragmatic conventions in ESP contexts (Tomankova, 2016). Beyond linguistic complexity, such difficulties also reflect the cognitive gap between general English proficiency and specialized legal discourse competence, an issue that remains under-addressed in Indonesian law curricula. Without guided reading strategies or exposure to legal corpora, students struggle to decode authentic legal texts, limiting their participation in both academic and professional settings. The lecturers' recognition of these challenges suggests latent pedagogical readiness: a willingness to innovate that could be harnessed through systematic faculty development and peer collaboration, provided institutional backing exists.

Student engagement with Legal English appeared mixed. While one lecturer observed that global law topics sparked interest and curiosity, highlighting the motivational impact of authentic, high-stakes content, the other reported low levels of interaction and feedback (Potocka & Sierocka, 2013). This divergence reflects not merely individual classroom variation but the influence of culturally rooted learning habits in Indonesia, where teacher-centered norms and exam-oriented assessment limit student agency. Although students recognize the importance of Legal English, the instructional design may not yet foster meaningful participation. Integrating dialogic pedagogies, such as bilingual group discussions, mediation tasks, and

learner journals, could help overcome these socio-cultural barriers by positioning students as co-constructors of meaning rather than passive recipients of knowledge.

Pedagogical adaptation was limited. One lecturer described incorporating bilingual terminology explanations and translation tasks, while the other did not modify teaching methods due to constraints in time, training, and resources. This is consistent with findings that noted that ESP reform requires systemic support, including faculty development, collaborative team teaching, and institutional recognition of interdisciplinary teaching practices (Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022). The persistence of these constraints underscores how policy rhetoric around bilingual legal competence remains disconnected from the material and professional realities of the classroom. In the absence of structural incentives, even committed educators face “innovation fatigue,” where enthusiasm for reform is eroded by institutional inertia.

Notably, both lecturers advocated for a Content-Based Instruction (CBI) approach, embedding Legal English within doctrinal instruction instead of isolating it in elective or skills-based courses. Their convergence on this model signals a bottom-up consensus that mirrors global ESP trends, where disciplinary integration has proven key to sustaining student motivation and relevance. This echoes prior findings that CBI promotes contextualized language learning and reinforces legal reasoning through authentic materials (Yu & Xiao, 2013). Rather than treating English as a supplemental skill, a CBI-oriented curriculum would recognize Legal English as an epistemic tool, a means of participating in legal reasoning and global professional discourse, not merely a linguistic ornament.

Finally, the lecturers’ reflections revealed a persistent policy–practice disconnect. Despite the existence of Law No. 24 of 2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, which legally mandate English for certain legal documents and transactions, these policies exert minimal influence on classroom practice. This gap exemplifies what (Carneiro, 2021) terms “policy drift”: the phenomenon where legislative intent dissipates during institutional implementation due to lack of operationalization, monitoring, and incentives. One lecturer admitted that while aware of the regulation, its lack of practical clarity rendered it ineffective in shaping curriculum decisions. This underscores the necessity of regulatory contextualization, translating broad policy aims into actionable curriculum design, accreditation criteria, and teaching standards. Without this alignment, the legal basis for bilingual competence remains normative rather than performative.

In conclusion, Table 3 shows that sustainable improvement in Legal English instruction relies on systemic alignment rather than individual effort. Institutional capacity-building, curriculum formalization, and coherent policy implementation must replace fragmented initiatives. Although lecturers display awareness and innovation, their practices are limited by structural and resource barriers. Reform should therefore integrate national policy, faculty governance, and ESP pedagogy to ensure Legal English becomes an equitable and standardized part of legal education in Indonesia.

Table 4. Selected ESP Articles Focused on Legal English

<i>Article</i>	<i>Focus</i>	<i>Main Contribution</i>	<i>Relevance to Legal English Instruction</i>
Article 1 (Chovancová, 2024)	Mediation in ESP for legal professionals	Promotes mediation and reformulation as essential skills in legal communication	Supports use of role-play and client-focused communication tasks in Legal English
Article 2 (Glušac et al., 2023)	L1 use in Legal ESP in Serbia	Shows strategic use of the mother tongue for understanding legal texts	Justifies transitional bilingual strategies in Indonesian Legal English instruction
Article 3 (Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022)	SIOP model for legal content delivery	Demonstrates use of structured scaffolding in Legal English for multilingual learners	Validates scaffolded instruction for complex legal materials
Article 4 (Stupnikova, 2017)	Genre analysis in Legal English	Identifies structural features of courtroom, legislative, and contract language	Foundation for genre-based Legal English curriculum
Article 5 (Chovancová, 2016)	Professional discourse and mediation in law	Links ESP activities to legal soft skills such as explanation and client interaction	Reinforces mediation tasks and plain language training in Legal English courses
Article 6 (Sierocka, 2016)	Task-based learning in legal ESP	Advocates for simulations like moot court and negotiation in Legal English	Empirical support for interactive, authentic tasks in law classrooms
Article 7 (Yu & Xiao, 2013)	CBI for Legal English in Chinese law schools	Presents a model of integrating Legal English into doctrinal subjects	Suggests model for curriculum integration in Indonesian legal education

Table 4 synthesizes seven key ESP studies that directly inform Legal English instruction within law education contexts. These articles collectively illuminate the distinct linguistic, cognitive, and pedagogical demands that separate Legal English from both General English and other ESP domains. One of the most salient themes is the need for contextualized and task-based instruction. This highlights a fundamental pedagogical shift, from language instruction that is decontextualized and grammar-oriented toward approaches rooted in authentic legal practice. Such perspectives strongly support the use of real-world legal simulations, such as moot courts and contract negotiations, to foster legal discourse competence (Nhac, 2023; Sierocka, 2023). This approach resonates with student preferences identified in this study, where simulation-based learning, though variably received, was valued for its capacity to replicate authentic communicative dynamics found in legal settings.

The reviewed studies also emphasize scaffolding mechanisms tailored for learners in non-native, multilingual environments (Glušac et al., 2023; Tomankova, 2016). In particular, Glušac et al. (2023) demonstrate the cognitive and metalinguistic benefits of translanguaging, a finding highly relevant to Indonesian learners who must navigate legal content in both Bahasa Indonesia and English. Translanguaging enables learners to connect doctrinal reasoning in their first language with legal terminology in English, reinforcing conceptual clarity and bilingual legal thinking. Similarly, Tomankova, (2016) highlights the pedagogical value of integrating bilingual legal corpora and digital tools, an approach that aligns with students' expressed needs in this study for templates, glossaries, and online multimedia resources. Together, these findings underscore the importance of linguistically responsive and digitally supported learning environments that accommodate the realities of bilingual legal education.

Curriculum integration also emerged as a pressing concern. Yu and Xiao (2013) outline the adoption of a Content-Based Instruction (CBI) model in Chinese legal education, where English is embedded within doctrinal teaching. This model holds particular promise for Indonesia, where Legal English is still often marginalized as an elective subject rather than a curricular requirement. The findings from Indonesian lecturers in this study reinforce the relevance of this model, as many advocate for moving Legal English from the periphery into the core legal curriculum. Such integration is essential not only for developing communicative competence but also for aligning legal education with the regulatory expectation that lawyers engage in bilingual documentation and negotiation.

From the student perspective (Table 2), the majority reported intermediate to advanced general English proficiency but rated their Legal English capabilities, particularly in writing and oral communication, as limited. Legal English operates as a specialized register requiring mastery of legal genres such as case briefs, statutory interpretation, and argumentative writing (Bykonja et al., 2020). The clear disparity between general language fluency and specialized legal discourse ability reveals a structural gap in pedagogy: students can understand texts but struggle to produce legal reasoning in English. Hence, the literature calls for a pivot toward genre-based and discourse-centered instruction, which emphasizes the use of authentic legal texts and rhetorical conventions (Potocka & Sierocka, 2013).

While simulation-based learning emerged as a promising approach, student responses displayed ambivalence, with 43.3% remaining neutral. This ambivalence likely reflects deep-rooted cultural learning orientations: Indonesian students, accustomed to teacher-centered and text-based learning, may perceive performance-based tasks as intimidating or outside academic norms. As Nhac (2023) suggests, structured scaffolding is essential to overcome this barrier, through pre-task vocabulary, role familiarization, and reflective debriefing that transforms simulations from performative acts into meaningful experiential learning.

Lecturer feedback further highlighted institutional and structural barriers to pedagogical innovation. One lecturer reported incorporating bilingual glossaries and translating legal terms into Indonesian to support comprehension, while another noted constraints such as limited instructional hours, insufficient teaching materials, and lack of institutional support. These findings mirror the broader ESP challenge identified by Albeshir (2023) many Legal English instructors possess expertise in either language or law, but not both, resulting in pedagogical gaps that require interdisciplinary collaboration. Developing professional training modules or co-teaching schemes between law and language faculties would directly address this constraint.

Digital literacy and multimodal access also play a pivotal role in student engagement. Many respondents requested digital support tools, aligning with the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) model that integrates graphic organizers, visual aids, and targeted vocabulary instruction within content-based frameworks (Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022). These digital scaffolds enhance accessibility and promote learner autonomy, especially in hybrid or asynchronous learning environments (Tomankova, 2016). Institutionalizing such tools could democratize access to high-quality Legal English resources across universities with uneven teaching capacities.

Finally, the use of Bahasa Indonesia (L1) emerged as a significant pedagogical strategy. While traditional ESP pedagogy often discourages mother tongue use, recent studies advocate for its strategic and limited deployment, particularly to explain abstract legal principles, interpret Latin-based terminology, and clarify culturally embedded legal concepts (Glušac et al., 2023). This translanguaging perspective aligns with Indonesia's linguistic reality, where lawyers must navigate between domestic and international frameworks. When consciously designed, the selective use of L1 can enhance comprehension and metalinguistic awareness without compromising immersion or long-term communicative proficiency.

In conclusion, Table 4 reveals that both the literature and empirical findings converge on the necessity for a reconceptualization of Legal English instruction in Indonesia. A cohesive framework integrating Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Task-Based Learning (TBL), digital scaffolding, mediation, and strategic bilingualism offers a viable path toward bridging the gap between policy expectations and classroom realities. Such an approach not only aligns with the broader goals of ESP scholarship but also contextualizes them within Indonesia's socio-cultural and institutional landscape, where hierarchical learning traditions, regulatory ambiguity, and limited lecturer training continue to constrain innovation. Moving forward, coordinated curriculum reform, interdisciplinary faculty development, and the incorporation of digital and bilingual learning resources will be essential to realize a policy-practice alignment that genuinely prepares Indonesian law graduates for participation in multilingual, transnational legal environments.

Curriculum Development Strategies

To bridge the gap between regulatory mandates and classroom practices, this study integrates doctrinal analysis, empirical findings, and insights from English for Specific Purposes (ESP) literature. Table 5 synthesizes seven selected ESP studies that specifically address Legal English instruction, highlighting core components essential for curriculum reform in Indonesian law schools. These components include integrated course design, task-based learning, scaffolded instruction, and strategic use of the mother tongue. Each article provides both theoretical grounding and practical recommendations, offering a framework for embedding Legal English into legal education in a systematic, sustainable, and context-sensitive manner.

Table 5. Summary of Curriculum Development for Legal English

<i>Curricular Component</i>	<i>Evidence Source</i>	<i>Key Recommendations</i>
Integrated Curriculum Design	(Stupnikova, 2017; Yu & Xiao, 2013)	Embed Legal English into doctrinal law subjects through content-based instruction and genre-based discourse.
Lexical Bundle Instruction	(Stupnikova, 2017)	Focus on teaching formulaic legal expressions and pragmatic markers found in authentic legal texts.
Simulation and Task-Based Learning	(Sierocka, 2016; Yu & Xiao, 2013)	Integrate mock trials, moot courts, and contract drafting as core Legal English learning activities.
Mediation as Pedagogical Strategy	(Chovancová, 2016, 2024)	Use mediation activities (paraphrasing, reformulation) to build critical legal communication skills.
Scaffolded Instruction (SIOP)	(Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022)	Apply structured input strategies (visual aids, vocabulary support, guided practice) to enhance comprehension.
Strategic L1 Use	(Glušac et al., 2023)	Use Bahasa Indonesia selectively to explain legal concepts and facilitate transition into Legal English.

The pedagogical recommendations outlined in Table 5 underscore a shift from traditional, language-isolated approaches to an integrated and context-sensitive model of Legal English instruction. One of the most significant contrasts lies in curriculum design. While many Indonesian law schools still treat Legal English as an elective or extracurricular skill, the literature advocates for its systematic integration into doctrinal courses through Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and genre-based pedagogy, enabling simultaneous acquisition of legal concepts and linguistic competencies (Galdia, 2023; Stupnikova, 2017; Yu & Xiao, 2013). This model situates language learning within the epistemic culture of the law itself—an essential step for ensuring that linguistic competence supports legal reasoning rather than existing apart from it. This stands in contrast to conventional language teaching models that prioritize grammatical accuracy over functional legal communication.

A similar divergence is observed in approaches to lexical instruction. Traditional vocabulary teaching often focuses on isolated terms, yet scholars recommend a focus on lexical bundles, frequently occurring, pragmatically meaningful word combinations common in legal discourse. These bundles support fluency and coherence in legal writing and speech, particularly in high-stakes contexts such as courtroom advocacy or contract negotiation (Stupnikova, 2017). In the Indonesian legal classroom, adopting this approach

would help students move from memorizing definitions to mastering the linguistic structures through which legal arguments are constructed and negotiated.

Differences are also evident in the use of experiential learning methods. While current practices in many Indonesian classrooms remain limited to lecture-based formats, the literature strongly endorses simulation and task-based learning, including moot courts, mock trials, and contract redrafting exercises—as effective means to build legal argumentation, negotiation, and drafting skills (Sierocka, 2016; Yu & Xiao, 2013). These simulations contrast with passive language learning models by fostering active engagement and exposing students to the procedural and rhetorical features of legal communication. However, in the Indonesian context, cultural learning styles and institutional traditions often create resistance to such performative methods. High power-distance relations in classrooms may discourage students from speaking spontaneously, while assessment systems that privilege written tests over performance-based evaluation reinforce this conservatism. Addressing this requires scaffolding, reflective feedback, and gradual exposure to experiential learning so that students can internalize active participation as a legitimate mode of learning.

The implementation of CBI in Indonesian law schools would allow Legal English to evolve from a supplementary course into a core competency aligned with the doctrinal logic of the legal curriculum. For example, International Contract Law could be delivered through bilingual materials where students learn both the legal principles and the rhetorical structures of drafting clauses in English. In this way, Legal English becomes a vehicle for conceptual understanding, enabling law students to articulate legal reasoning bilingually and to recognize how linguistic framing affects interpretation and argumentation. Such integration transforms Legal English into a mode of learning rather than a mere language subject, bridging doctrinal substance with communicative function.

The skill of mediation further illustrates this contrast. In traditional pedagogy, there is minimal emphasis on the need to reformulate complex legal concepts for diverse audiences. However, ESP-oriented instruction views mediation, the ability to paraphrase, summarize, and adapt legal content, as essential for multilingual professional contexts where lawyers must communicate with clients, peers, or judges of varying linguistic backgrounds (Chovancová, 2016, 2024). Within Indonesia's bilingual legal environment, where statutes, contracts, and international documents often coexist in both English and Bahasa Indonesia, mediation is not merely a classroom exercise but a professional necessity. Embedding mediation tasks in Legal English courses would help students practice the interpretive flexibility required to navigate bilingual legal drafting and cross-linguistic dispute resolution.

In terms of instructional design, conventional classrooms rarely offer structured language support. The SIOP model addresses this gap by offering a scaffolded approach that includes pre-teaching vocabulary, visual aids, guided practice, and explicit learning objectives, enabling students to access dense legal content with greater confidence (Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022). Compared to unstructured or one-size-fits-all instruction, SIOP facilitates differentiated learning and supports students with varying levels of English proficiency. Implementing SIOP principles in law faculties could institutionalize scaffolding practices, allowing lecturers to progress systematically from comprehension to production and from receptive to productive legal communication.

Finally, the use of Bahasa Indonesia (L1) marks another area of pedagogical divergence. Traditional language policies often discourage L1 use in English classrooms. Yet, recent findings suggest that strategic, limited use of L1, particularly to explain abstract legal terms or difficult concepts, can enhance learner comprehension and reduce cognitive overload, especially in early stages of Legal English development (Glušac et al., 2023). Translanguaging, when designed systematically rather than used ad hoc, enables students to connect doctrinal reasoning in Bahasa Indonesia with its English legal equivalents, reinforcing conceptual precision. This approach aligns with Indonesia's linguistic realities, where lawyers routinely mediate between two legal-linguistic systems. Hence, institutional recognition of translanguaging pedagogy would elevate bilingual proficiency from a coping mechanism to a deliberate learning strategy.

In summary, the strategies synthesized in Table 5 not only describe pedagogical best practices but also expose the structural and cultural conditions that shape their adoption in Indonesia. They collectively challenge the dominance of teacher-centered, text-heavy instruction by advocating integrated, scaffolded, and context-responsive pedagogy. Moving toward this model requires not only curriculum redesign but also institutional policy reform, faculty training, and a shift in assessment paradigms toward performance-based evaluation. By aligning these innovations with national legal mandates such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Regulation No. 13 of 2018, Indonesian law faculties can transform Legal English instruction from a peripheral activity into a strategic platform for bilingual legal modernization. This integrated, culturally informed approach offers both a theoretical contribution, through the application of ESP, mediation, and translanguaging frameworks, and a practical pathway for realizing policy-practice coherence in Indonesia's legal education system.

Alignment Between Policy and Practice

The alignment between regulatory policy and instructional practice is a critical benchmark in evaluating the success of Legal English integration within legal education. In the Indonesian context, national language and education policies, such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, signal an institutional recognition of the importance of English in legal communication, particularly in cross-border or bilingual contexts. However, this policy intent does not automatically translate into coherent, classroom-level practice. As this study reveals through questionnaire responses and literature triangulation, there is a persistent disconnect between macro-level regulatory mandates and meso-level curriculum planning and pedagogy. This section presents a thematic synthesis of policy-practice alignment, highlighting gaps, partial implementations, and areas of institutional inertia as summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Alignment Between Policy and Institutional Practice in Legal English Education

<i>Policy Directive</i>	<i>Institutional Practice (Observed)</i>	<i>Degree of Alignment</i>	<i>Source of Evidence</i>
Law No. 24 of 2009 Article 31 permits use of English in legal documents involving foreign entities.	Legal English is taught minimally, often as an elective or not embedded into doctrinal courses.	Partial Alignment	National Law; Lecturer Response
Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13/2018 mandates translation of legal documents into English.	Translation is rarely emphasized systematically in coursework; minimal practice with bilingual drafting.	Misaligned	National Regulation; Student Response
ESP principles suggest embedding English instruction into content courses (CBI approach).	Legal English instruction is often isolated from core legal subjects.	Misaligned	(Stupnikova, 2017) (Yu & Xiao, 2013) Lecturer Response
ESP pedagogy encourages use of simulation (e.g., moot courts, negotiation tasks).	Simulations are requested by students but not systematically implemented in Legal English instruction.	Partial Alignment	(Yu & Xiao, 2013) (Sierocka, 2016) Student Response
Students must be prepared to paraphrase and reformulate legal texts (mediation skills).	Mediation activities are rarely incorporated despite being relevant to legal reasoning and client communication.	Misaligned	(Chovancová, 2024) (Chovancová, 2016) Lecturer & Student Response
Teachers should be trained in ESP methodology for legal settings.	Limited interdisciplinary collaboration; few law faculty trained in ESP approaches.	Misaligned	Lecturer Response
Instruction should be scaffolded and multimodal for legal text comprehension.	Limited use of structured scaffolds (visuals, legal corpora, glossaries) in legal language instruction.	Misaligned	(Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022) Student Response
Strategic use of L1 (Bahasa Indonesia) is recommended to aid understanding.	Lecturers and students acknowledge the value of bilingual tools, but no institutional guidelines exist.	Partial Alignment	(Glušac et al., 2023) Student & Lecturer Response

The findings illustrated in Table 6 clearly demonstrate a significant misalignment between national policy directives and actual instructional practices concerning Legal English in Indonesian legal education. While Law No. 24 of 2009 along with Law and Human Rights Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018 provides a clear regulatory foundation for the use of English in cross-border legal transactions and requires the translation of legal documents, their influence on curriculum design and classroom implementation remains largely superficial. Legal English is frequently positioned as a peripheral or elective component rather than a core element of legal training. This limited institutionalization suggests that regulatory intent has not been effectively translated into academic structures or pedagogical obligations. Such a condition mirrors the challenges identified in other non-Anglophone jurisdictions, including Chinese legal education, where Legal English continues to be treated as an ancillary skill rather than a foundational competence (Yu & Xiao, 2013).

Pedagogically, the degree of alignment with ESP best practices is equally uneven. Although student questionnaire data reflect strong interest in simulation-based learning, particularly moot courts and mock trials, these experiential methods are seldom implemented in a systematic or sustained manner.

Simulations provide essential opportunities for contextualized, pragmatic language use; however, their successful integration depends on institutional infrastructure, adequate instructional time, and faculty readiness, conditions that remain insufficient in most Indonesian law schools (Sierocka, 2023; Yu & Xiao, 2013). This limited adoption of experiential learning contributes to a fragmented instructional experience and reduces students' preparedness for authentic legal communication tasks.

Equally concerning is the marginalization of mediation techniques in classroom practice. Mediation is a key communicative function in legal contexts, enabling law professionals to reformulate complex legal discourse for clients, peers, or judges (Chovanová, 2016, 2024). Despite its recognized pedagogical value, mediation-based activities are largely absent from Legal English syllabi in Indonesia. This omission represents a missed pedagogical opportunity to connect classroom exercises with the communicative realities of professional legal work.

The most critical discrepancy, however, lies in faculty preparedness and instructional design. Few law lecturers have formal training in ESP pedagogy or opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration with English language specialists. Effective implementation of task-based and content-integrated learning requires sustained professional development, institutional incentives, and access to context-appropriate teaching materials, resources that remain scarce across Indonesian institutions (Sierocka, 2016; Yu & Xiao, 2013). In the absence of these supports, structured models such as the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), which scaffold comprehension through explicit vocabulary instruction, visual organizers, and progressive guidance (Kareva & Bytyqi, 2022) cannot be meaningfully adopted. While some lecturers report using bilingual approaches or legal templates, such practices are applied inconsistently and without policy reinforcement, leaving the quality of Legal English instruction dependent on individual initiative rather than systemic design.

Furthermore, although the strategic use of students' first language (L1) has been validated by recent ESP scholarship (Glušac et al., 2023) as a cognitive support mechanism in legal education, Indonesian law schools have not yet formalized translanguaging as an intentional pedagogical framework. The reliance on spontaneous or ad hoc bilingual explanations, without institutional guidance or teacher training, limits the pedagogical coherence and scalability of this otherwise effective approach.

In summary, the evidence presented in Table 6 underscores the urgent need for a coherent and policy-aligned framework for Legal English instruction in Indonesia. Closing the gap between regulatory recognition and classroom realities demands not only curriculum reform but also faculty empowerment and governance mechanisms that institutionalize interdisciplinary collaboration. By translating national legal mandates into enforceable curricular structures and evidence-based pedagogical models, Indonesian law schools can transform Legal English from a peripheral elective into a strategic component of professional legal competence. Ultimately, aligning practice with both regulatory frameworks and proven ESP methodologies will enable graduates to meet the communicative and ethical demands of multilingual legal practice in a globalized world.

Limitation of the Study

While this study offers valuable insights into the regulatory and pedagogical dimensions of Legal English instruction in Indonesian legal education, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted within a single private university in Yogyakarta, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other institutions, particularly public universities or those with distinct curricular structures and resource allocations. The contextual specificity of institutional policies, faculty training, and student demographics may yield different outcomes in broader national or regional samples.

Second, although the study employed triangulation through normative legal analysis, literature review, and questionnaire data, the empirical component relied on a relatively small sample, 32 law students and 2 lecturers. This small-scale sample limits representativeness and prevents quantitative generalization, yet it remains appropriate for an exploratory qualitative design intended to identify patterns and generate hypotheses for future inquiry. The findings therefore should be interpreted as indicative rather than conclusive, offering a conceptual rather than statistical contribution to the discourse on Legal English education.

Third, the qualitative analysis of the questionnaire responses was dependent on self-reported data, which may be subject to bias, such as social desirability or overestimation of language proficiency. Although coding verification and triangulation were applied to enhance reliability, the absence of direct classroom observation or performance-based assessment constrains the ability to validate self-perceived competence against observable communicative performance. Future studies incorporating classroom ethnography or learner corpus analysis could strengthen empirical validity.

Fourth, the study focused primarily on ESP literature and regulatory texts, without examining institutional policy documents (e.g., curriculum blueprints, accreditation reports, or internal guidelines)

that might reveal deeper administrative constraints or priorities. Including such materials in future research would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how national mandates are interpreted and operationalized at the institutional and departmental levels. Finally, the study's interdisciplinary framework, while innovative, remains exploratory in scope. Future work could extend this dual doctrinal-pedagogical model through comparative studies across multiple universities or Southeast Asian jurisdictions to test the transferability of the policy-practice alignment framework proposed here.

Despite these limitations, the study contributes a valuable foundation for understanding how regulatory structures, pedagogical strategies, and institutional realities intersect in shaping Legal English instruction. Its insights invite further empirical and comparative exploration aimed at developing a coherent, context-sensitive model for bilingual legal education in Indonesia.

Conclusion

Legal English proficiency is no longer a peripheral asset but a core competence for law graduates facing the demands of an increasingly globalized and multilingual legal ecosystem. As Indonesia's regulatory frameworks, such as Law No. 24 of 2009 and Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2018, endorse the use of English in legal translation and international agreements, embedding Legal English in legal education becomes a regulatory necessity. However, this study reveals that despite supportive policies, the institutionalization of Legal English remains fragmented; questionnaires from students and lecturers show a gap between curricular implementation and regulatory intent, with Legal English often treated as an elective rather than an integrated component of doctrinal instruction. Many students, though proficient in general English, report limited skills in legal writing, speaking, and document interpretation, confirming a persistent policy-practice misalignment. By combining doctrinal legal analysis with ESP pedagogy, this study explains how regulatory recognition fails to generate classroom implementation without institutional mediation and argues for a pedagogical shift toward Content-Based Instruction (CBI), Task-Based Learning (TBL), mediation, and scaffolded bilingualism to develop linguistic, analytical, and intercultural competence. At the policy level, systemic reform is required—universities must establish clear curricular mandates, promote interdisciplinary co-teaching between law and language departments, and institutionalize ESP-based faculty training. Although limited by its small, localized sample, this exploratory study provides a conceptual framework for broader replication across Indonesia's legal education landscape and suggests future expansion through multi-site sampling, classroom observation, or corpus-based analysis. Ultimately, Legal English education is not merely a linguistic initiative but a project of legal modernization that bridges regulation and pedagogy, enabling Indonesian law faculties to produce graduates who are both legally literate and linguistically agile in navigating national and transnational legal discourse.

Declarations

- Author contribution** : Ani Susanti conceptualized the study, conducted educational analysis, and prepared the manuscript. Uni Tsulasi Putri contributed to the legal analysis, reviewed, and revised the manuscript.
- Funding statement** : This research was funded by Universitas Ahmad Dahlan through its internal research grant scheme.
- Conflict of interest** : The authors declare no conflict of interest.
- Ethics Approval** : Not applicable, as the study involves the analysis of secondary data and voluntary participation of adults without any intervention or sensitive personal information.
- Additional information** : No additional information is available for this paper.

References

- Albeshar, K. B. (2023). Inclusion of English for specific purposes in high school tracks: A Saudi context. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 12(4), 342–357. <https://doi.org/10.55493/5019.v12i4.4904>
- Buchan, N. R., Grimalda, G., Wilson, R., Brewer, M., Fatas, E., & Foddy, M. (2009). Globalization and human cooperation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106(11), 4138–4142. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0809522106>
- Bykonina, O. P., Borysenko, I. V., Gruba, T. L., Mosenkis, I. L., & Chystiak, D. O. (2020). Main approaches of business English teaching to future lawyers: A case study of Ukrainian higher institutions.

- International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(6), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.6.3>
- Carneiro, A. S. R. (2021). Constructing a common language-in-education policy? Portuguese, Brazilian and Timorese collaboration in the reintroduction of Portuguese in Timor-Leste. *Language Policy*, 20(1), 53–75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-020-09562-0>
- Chovancová, B. (2016). Mediation in legal English teaching. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 45(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/slgr-2016-0013>
- . (2024). Training legal skills in the ESP classroom: Mediation activities and student self-reflection. *Hermes: Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 64, 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.vi64.147478>
- De Ly, F. (2005). Sources of international sales law: An eclectic model. *Journal of Law and Commerce*, 25(1), 1–12. www.hcch.nex/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=31
- Galdia, M. (2023). Problems in English-Chinese and Chinese-English legal translation: with a case study of mistranslations. *Comparative Legilinguistics*, 55, 118–146. <https://doi.org/10.14746/cl.55.2023.8>
- Ghasemi, H. (2010). Globalization and international relations: Actors move from non-cooperative to cooperative games. *Jurnal Global Dan Strategis*, 4(1), 1–13.
- Glušac, T., Milić, M., & Gak, D. (2023). The use of the mother tongue in ESP teaching and learning from the students' perspective: The case of Serbian. *ESP Today*, 11(1), 96–118. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2023.11.1.5>
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x>
- Kareva, V., & Bytyqi, B. (2022). Facilitating legal English teaching and learning through SIOP Model (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol). *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 10(3), 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2203471K>
- Koos, S. (2022). Digital globalization and law. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 6(1), 33–68. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lesrev.v6i1.55092>
- Labudová, L., & Jánošová, D. (2021). Globalization and its impacts on communication in self-government. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 92, 08012. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20219208012>
- Nhac, T. H. (2023). Enhancing legal English skills for law students through simulation-based activities. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 22(9), 533–549. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.9.29>
- Potocka, D., & Sierocka, H. (2013). The esp teacher as researcher. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 34(47), 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.2478/slgr-2013-0029>
- Shanty, W. Y. (2016). Analisis terhadap fungsi Bahasa Indonesia hukum dalam mewujudkan kepastian hukum. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 7(2), 268–280. <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v7i2.1917>
- Sierocka, H. (2016). Action research in designing and implementing courses of English for Legal Purposes. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 45(1), 225–251. <https://doi.org/10.1515/slgr-2016-0026>
- . (2023). Issues in Translating, Interpreting and Teaching Legal Languages and Legal Communication. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 36(4), 1629–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10029-8>
- Silverstein, G. (2003). Globalization and the rule of law: “A machine that runs of itself?” *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1(3), 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/1.3.427>
- Stupnikova, L. V. (2017). Teaching commercial lawyers language aspects of drafting contracts in English. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 49(1), 175–193. <https://doi.org/10.1515/slgr-2017-0011>
- Tomankova, V. (2016). Lexical bundles in legal texts corpora—selection, classification and pedagogical implications. *Discourse and Interaction*, 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2016-2-75>
- Yu, X., & Xiao, Y. (2013). A course design guideline for legal english teaching in Chinese tertiary education: From the perspective of content-based instruction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(7), 1123–1128. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.7.1123-1128>