

УДК 340.12:378.016:81'276.6:004.8

DOI 10.33244/2617-4154.2(23).2026.197-205

O. V. Khmyzova,

*Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Legal Linguistics Department,
State Tax University*

О. В. Хмизова,

*кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри правничої лінгвістики,
Державний податковий університет
email: o.v.khmyzova@dpu.edu.ua*

ORCID 0000-0002-8671-3727

LEGAL, LINGUISTIC, AND ETHICAL ASPECTS OF INTEGRATING GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS INTO PROFESSIONAL LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR LAW STUDENTS

ЮРИДИЧНІ, ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ ТА ЕТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ІНТЕГРАЦІЇ ІНСТРУМЕНТІВ ГЕНЕРАТИВНОГО ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУ В ПРОФЕСІЙНУ МОВНУ ПІДГОТОВКУ СТУДЕНТІВ-ПРАВНИКІВ

This study identifies and analyses the legal, linguistic, and ethical aspects arising from the deployment of generative artificial intelligence tools in professional legal language training; proposes the governance framework adequate to these dimensions. The study employs a combined doctrinal and empirical methodology. The doctrinal component applies comparative legal analysis to five legislative instruments – CMU Resolution No. 1556-p (2020), Law of Ukraine No. 4742-IX (2025) on Academic Integrity, Law No. 2811-IX (2022) on Copyright and Related Rights, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (EU AI Act), and Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR) – examining the institutional obligations each imposes on law faculty language curricula and comparing Ukrainian norms against applicable EU standards under Ukraine's harmonization obligations. The empirical component analyses and synthesizes sixteen sources spanning legislation, empirical research, professional governance models, and ISO 18587:2017. The analysis of the applicable legislative instruments establishes that Ukrainian and EU law impose a coherent and binding normative framework on educational AI governance.



Ця робота ліцензується відповідно до [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

© Khmyzova O. V., 2026

The study proposes a three-pillar governance framework: institutional compliance policy, legal language curricula with AI literacy, and the ethical reflection for professional identity formation. Each pillar primarily targets one dimension while structurally reinforcing the others. Generative AI raises rather than diminishes the standard required of legal language training: the lawyer who deploys AI tools effectively and responsibly must command greater terminological precision, more refined critical capacity, and a more robust ethical judgement. The integrated governance framework may constitute the institutional response adequate to the current normative and pedagogical environment.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, higher legal education, a three-pillar governance framework, normative compliance, AI literacy, ethical reflection, professional competencies.

У статті виокремлено й проаналізовано юридичні, лінгвістичні та етичні аспекти впровадження інструментів генеративного штучного інтелекту (далі – ШІ) у професійну мовну підготовку майбутніх правників, а також запропоновано відповідну цим вимірам модель управління. Застосовано комплексну методологію, доктринальна складова якої містить порівняльно-правовий аналіз п'яти нормативно-правових актів: розпорядження КМУ № 1556-р (2020), Закону України № 4742-IX (2025) «Про академічну доброчесність», Закону України № 2811-IX (2022) «Про авторське право і суміжні права», Регламенту ЄС 2024/1689 (Закону про ШІ) та Регламенту ЄС 2016/679 (Загального регламенту про захист даних). Досліджено інституційні зобов'язання, які ці акти накладають на програми професійної мовної підготовки правників; здійснено порівняльний аналіз вітчизняних норм правового регулювання ШІ та європейських стандартів у контексті євроінтеграційних зобов'язань України. Емпірична складова охоплює аналіз і тематичний синтез даних із шістнадцяти релевантних джерел, зокрема правової бази, емпіричних наукових досліджень, моделей професійного управління та стандарту ISO 18587:2017. Встановлено, що норми українського законодавства та права ЄС синергетично утворюють цілісну й імперативну нормативно-правову основу для регулювання використання ШІ в освітньому просторі. Запропоновано трикомпонентну модель управління, яка охоплює інституційну політику, розробку навчальних програм з правничої мови, що містять формування грамотності у сфері ШІ, та етичну рефлексію для розвитку професійної ідентичності. Використання інструментів ШІ в юридичній практиці не знижує, а, навпаки, підвищує вимоги до мовної підготовки правників. Запропонована модель управління може стати дієвою інституційною відповіддю на виклики сучасного нормативного й педагогічного середовища.

Ключові слова: штучний інтелект, вища правнича освіта, трикомпонентна модель управління, нормативна відповідність, грамотність у сфері ШІ, етична рефлексія, професійні компетентності.

Problem Statement. Legal competence is constitutively linguistic. From statutory drafting to appellate advocacy, every dimension of professional legal practice is exercised through language, making legal register mastery an epistemic core of the profession rather than a peripheral skill. The proliferation of LLM-based generative AI tools – ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, LIGA360, Eulaw.ai, Lexis, Westlaw, and Harvey – constitutes a structural

transformation of this linguistic environment that neither legal practice nor legal education has yet adequately governed [1]. These systems may produce legally-formatted text with a surface fluency that closely resembles genuine legal expertise, creating an acute pedagogical temptation: law students may replace the cognitive effort of mastering legal register with the mechanical act of prompting and lightly editing AI output – a substitution that the Law of Ukraine on Academic Integrity (No. 4742-IX, 2025) now designates as a statutory violation [2]. Therefore, the primary challenge of integrating AI tools into professional language training for law students resides in three inseparable aspects: legal, linguistic, and ethical.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. The scholarly literature at the intersection of AI and legal language training has expanded substantially over the period 2020–2025, yet it remains characterized by disciplinary fragmentation: normative governance scholarship, empirical language education research, and legislative analysis have largely developed in parallel rather than in dialogue. The analytical base of this study comprises sixteen sources spanning Ukrainian legislation, European regulatory instruments, empirical studies, professional governance models, ethical and competency frameworks, and the applicable translation quality standard.

In the legal dimension, a converging body of Ukrainian [2–4] and European legislation [5; 6] imposes normative obligations on law faculty AI deployment. In the linguistic aspect, hallucinations, terminological drift, and jurisdictional register distortion in AI outputs present structural risks to legal language competence regardless of platform architecture [7; 8]. In the ethical dimension, algorithmic bias, academic integrity requirements, and the principle of non-delegable human oversight [9–15] demand institutional responses that prohibition alone cannot supply. To the authors' knowledge, no published governance framework has addressed all three dimensions simultaneously. The scientific novelty of this study resides in the unified normative and pedagogical treatment of all three aspects as an integrated governance problem, and in the application of ISO 18587:2017 [16] post-editing standards as a legal language skills development instrument.

Research Purpose. This study pursues two objectives: 1) to identify and analyze the legal, linguistic, and ethical aspects arising from AI deployment in professional legal language training; and 2) to propose a governance framework adequate to those dimensions.

Research Methods. The study employs a combined doctrinal and empirical methodology. The doctrinal component applies comparative legal analysis to five legislative instruments: CMU Resolution No. 1556-p (2020) [3]; Law No. 4742-IX (2025) [2]; Law No. 2811-IX (2022) [4]; Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 [5]; and Regulation (EU) 2016/679 [6]. Each instrument is examined for the specific institutional obligations it imposes on law faculty language programs, with Ukrainian norms compared against EU standards applicable through Ukraine's harmonization obligations. The empirical component draws on three published datasets: Xatamova and Ashurov's (2024) survey of 500 law students in AI-assisted ESP education [7]; Stanford HAI's (2024) platform-specific hallucination benchmarking providing fabricated authority rates for Lexis+ AI and Westlaw [8]; and Khaydarova's (2024) systematic mapping study across four databases [10]. The thematic synthesis incorporates peer-reviewed literature selected on criteria of disciplinary relevance, methodological quality, and recency, mapped to the proposed governance pillars. The framework's scope is explicitly limited to pre-service legal language training.

Results. The most immediate legal concern in legal language training is data exposure. When students use cloud-based AI platforms to draft hypothetical contracts, simulate client communications, or analyze case facts, they routinely input information approximating privileged legal communications in both structure and sensitivity. GDPR Articles 5, 15, and 22 impose principles of purpose limitation, data minimization, and restrictions on automated decision-making on any controller processing personal data [6]. Ukrainian law does not implement the GDPR as binding domestic legislation – the applicable instrument is the Law of Ukraine on Personal Data Protection – but institutional engagement with EU-jurisdiction cloud platforms engages GDPR compliance in practice, and GDPR-aligned data governance constitutes a requirement of Ukraine’s EU accession harmonization obligations. Warraich et al. (2025) confirm that existing professional responsibility rules provide only retrospective, ad hoc responses to AI-induced confidentiality breaches; students who routinely submit client-sensitive hypotheticals to commercial AI platforms acquire professional habits constituting privilege violations in practice [9].

The Law of Ukraine on Copyright and Related Rights (No. 2811-IX) classifies AI-generated text as a non-original object to which personal non-property rights cannot attach, excluding it from student authorship in the copyright sense [4]. The Law of Ukraine on Academic Integrity (No. 4742-IX) resolves the consequent institutional uncertainty with a named statutory violation: the dishonest use of AI-generated results, defined as publication of AI-generated content as one’s own academic work without disclosure [2]. Read conjunctively, these provisions create a coherent legal framework: undisclosed AI-assisted submissions constitute simultaneously a statutory violation and a submission lacking genuine intellectual contribution, and the institutional disciplinary response is legally mandated. Law faculties that have not incorporated both provisions into their academic integrity policies are in non-compliance with current Ukrainian law.

At the European level, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 classifies AI systems used in education and vocational training as high-risk applications under Articles 5 and 14, requiring mandatory conformity assessments, transparency obligations, and human oversight mechanisms [5]. CMU Resolution No. 1556-p (2020) provides the domestic counterpart, establishing six binding principles – rule of law conformity, data protection, transparency, robustness, accountability, and inclusive access – applicable to all institutional AI deployments, including educational ones, and supplying domestic normative authority for AI ethics integration into legal language curricula [3]. Khaydarova (2024) confirms that the AI-law normative order is rapidly developing, with ePrivacy regulation constituting its second most active research domain [10].

Stanford HAI’s 2024 benchmarking establishes that Lexis+AI produces fabricated legal authorities in approximately 17 % of complex queries and Westlaw’s AI research tool in approximately 34 % – rates that persist in retrieval-augmented generation architectures [8]. Warraich et al. (2025) document the professional consequences: by mid-2025, at least 58 instances of AI-generated phantom precedents had appeared in attorney filings; in *Mata v. Avianca* (2023), counsel was sanctioned for submitting ChatGPT-fabricated citations [9]. The educational risk is structurally distinct from the professional one: a student at the formative stage of legal language acquisition lacks the substantive knowledge to identify hallucinated terminology or

invented doctrinal references, making internalization of incorrect usage probable and subsequent correction difficult. This risk is an inherent property of the technology category, not a correctable feature of individual platforms.

Xatamova and Ashurov's survey (2024) of 500 law students reveals a structural divergence between students' communicative and epistemic experience of AI tools. Positive perceptions of vocabulary development and feedback timeliness contrast sharply with negative assessments of their satisfaction with privacy and AI data security [7]. This divergence demonstrates that students possess experiential awareness of AI's epistemic limitations not yet converted into systematic critical evaluation competence – the precise competency that professional practice demands and that curriculum design must therefore prioritize.

LLMs trained predominantly on Anglo-American legal corpora systematically apply common-law formulations in civil-law contexts, substitute approximate synonyms for terms of art, and render Ukrainian legal concepts through English filters that distort doctrinal content [11]. For Ukrainian law students navigating simultaneous civil-law and EU-harmonization requirements, exposure to AI-generated legal English calibrated to common-law conventions may produce professional language habits misaligned with their actual normative environment. Where AI tools are used in translation exercises, ISO 18587:2017 [16] establishes that only full post-editing by a subject-matter expert – as distinct from light post-editing for basic intelligibility – meets the precision requirements of legal language. Incorporating this standard frames post-editing as the primary pedagogical activity, functions as a professional formation instrument, and equips students with a certification-aligned quality benchmark applicable in legal translation practice.

Generative AI systems are not value-neutral. Their outputs reflect the statistical properties and embedded biases of their training corpora. Azman and Tumkaya (2025) argue that systems trained on non-representative datasets generate discriminatory outcomes independently of developer intent [12]. In legal language training, this manifests as the systematic embedding of adversarial procedural logic, individual rights framing, and common-law interpretive methodology in AI-generated legal discourse – a conceptual distortion that students whose primary exposure to legal English is AI-mediated may internalize as normatively neutral professional convention, operating below the threshold of standard quality assurance detection.

Baadzhy (2023) identifies the foundational governance paradox: AI has passed multiple professional legal examinations while detection tools cannot reliably identify AI-generated legal text, and generative AI becomes most pervasive precisely when formally prohibited, establishing that prohibition without pedagogical engagement is not a viable governance strategy [1]. Law No. 4742-IX (2025) resolves this at the normative level by prohibiting misrepresentation of AI-generated content as the student's own work rather than prohibiting AI use as such [2]. This distinction is legally precise and pedagogically productive: it creates space for supervised, disclosed, and critically evaluated AI use while establishing a statutory boundary students can internalize as preparation for the professional responsibility norms they will face in practice. Khaydarova (2024) confirms that AI integration in legal practice is irreversible; the relevant question is whether lawyers will deploy AI tools with appropriate critical oversight [10].

Warraich et al.'s governance model (2025) identifies the human-in-the-loop principle as the essential professional safeguard against AI-induced error in legal practice, operationalized through mandatory citation verification, provenance logging, and periodic third-party audit [9]. This principle is codified in Article 14 of the EU AI Act, which requires that operators of high-risk AI systems implement human oversight measures capable of detecting and correcting inaccuracies [5]. The pedagogical implication is direct: if AI tools are permitted to automate the linguistic dimension of legal work without commensurate investment in students' critical evaluation capacities, the result is a form of professional deskilling – practitioners who nominally supervise AI outputs they lack the competence to evaluate, a condition incompatible with both professional responsibility norms and the CMU AI governance framework [3].

Discussion. The three analytical dimensions examined above generate a unified governance imperative addressed by the following three-pillar framework, each pillar primarily targeting one dimension while structurally reinforcing the others.

Pillar 1: institutional policy and legal compliance (legal dimension). Law faculties should develop binding AI-use policies implementing five legislative obligations: CMU Resolution No. 1556-p principles of transparency, accountability, and data protection [3]; Law No. 4742-IX prohibition on undisclosed AI-generated content [2]; Law No. 2811-IX authorship framework [4]; EU AI Act high-risk classification and human oversight requirements [5]; and GDPR data minimization and purpose limitation [6]. Policies should require mandatory disclosure in assessed work, define the boundary between permissible augmentation and impermissible substitution, prohibit input of privileged information into commercial platforms, and incorporate the human-in-the-loop principle as a non-negotiable requirement for AI-assisted legal drafting.

Pillar 2: language curriculum design with critical AI literacy (linguistic dimension). Legal language curricula must integrate critical evaluation of AI outputs as a formally assessed competency: identifying hallucinated citations against authoritative legal databases; recognizing terminological and register distortions between AI-generated and authenticated legal texts; and applying full post-editing to AI-assisted translations per ISO 18587:2017 [16]. AI literacy objectives may be implemented through the taxonomy of competencies [14] and benchmarked against EU DigComp 2.2 [15], ensuring measurability, cross-institutional comparability, and alignment with Ukraine's EU harmonization obligations.

Pillar 3: ethical reflection and professional identity formation (ethical dimension). Legal language training serves a formative function extending beyond linguistic competence to the cultivation of professional identity and personal accountability. AI integration requires structured ethical reflection: academic integrity requirements; seminars on algorithmic bias [12]; analysis of related judicial sanctions grounding professional responsibility in documented consequences [9]; and engagement with the paradoxes of generative AI [1] to develop critical thinking reflexivity. The CMU Concept's six principles [3] and the EU Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI [13] provide the normative reference framework for this instruction.

The three pillars are mutually necessary. Normative policy without critical thinking and linguistic training produces students who know the prohibition but cannot identify violations. Critical thinking and language skills training without ethical formation produces technically proficient AI users lacking professional judgment. Ethical formation without institutional policy leaves students without operational guidance for applying values in conformity with statutory requirements. Only their integration constitutes an adequate governance response.

Conclusions. In the legal aspect, the analysis of five applicable legislative instruments establishes that Ukrainian and EU law imposes a coherent and binding normative framework on educational AI governance. Law No. 4742-IX renders explicit institutional AI-use policy legally required, not merely advisable. The authorship exclusion in Law No. 2811-IX creates a framework in which undisclosed AI-assisted submissions simultaneously constitute a statutory violation and an absent intellectual contribution. The EU AI Act's high-risk classification and the GDPR's data governance obligations impose transparency and human oversight standards. The CMU Resolution No. 1556-p principles of accountability and transparency supply a domestic normative anchor whose direct pedagogical implications remain inadequately operationalized. Institutions that have not aligned their academic integrity policies with this body of legislation are in demonstrable non-compliance.

In the linguistic dimension, the synthesis of hallucination benchmarking, student survey evidence, and terminological analysis establishes that the risks of AI deployment in legal language instruction are structural rather than incidental. Fabricated authority rates confirm that hallucination is a property of the technology category rather than a correctable platform feature. Civil-law terminological distortions arising from Anglo-American training corpora are particularly consequential given Ukraine's EU harmonization obligations. ISO 18587:2017 full post-editing provides both the professional quality benchmark and a professional formation instrument for AI-assisted translation exercises.

In the ethical aspect, documented algorithmic bias, the statutory prohibition architecture, and the human-in-the-loop principle establish governance stakes extending to the institutional formation of legal professionals as a whole. Generative AI raises rather than diminishes the standard required of legal language training: the lawyer who deploys AI tools effectively and responsibly must command greater terminological precision, more refined critical capacity, and a more robust ethical judgement.

The tripartite governance framework proposed in this study – institutional compliance policy, legal language curricula with critical AI literacy grounded in established international competency taxonomies, and structured ethical reflection for professional identity formation – addresses these findings in an integrated manner. Each pillar is individually necessary; none is individually sufficient. Together, they constitute the modern institutional response adequate to this normative environment.

Longitudinal empirical research evaluating sustained professional language proficiency outcomes of generative AI-integrated legal language instruction across diverse institutional and jurisdictional contexts remains the principal outstanding need in this field.

REFERENCES

1. Baadzhy N. P. The latest tools of legal education in the age of artificial intelligence. *Юридичний науковий електронний журнал*. 2023. № 12. С. 233–239. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0374/2023-12/57>
2. Про академічну доброчесність : Закон України від 18 груд. 2025 р. № 4742-IX. URL : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4742-20#Text> (дата звернення: 10.04.2026).

3. Про затвердження Концепції розвитку штучного інтелекту в Україні : розпорядження Кабінету Міністрів України від 02 груд. 2020 р. № 1556-р. URL : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-2020-%D1%80#n8> (дата звернення: 12.04.2026).
4. Про авторське право і суміжні права : Закон України від 01 груд. 2022 р. № 2811-IX. URL : <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2811-20> (дата звернення: 12.04.2026).
5. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act). URL : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng> (дата звернення: 11.04.2026).
6. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data (General Data Protection Regulation). URL : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj> (дата звернення: 11.04.2026).
7. Xatamova N., Ashurov J. The Future of Legal English Learning: Integrating AI into ESP Education. *SPAST Reports*. 2024. Vol. 1, № 7. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.69848/sreports.v1i7.5081>
8. AI on trial: Legal models hallucinate in 1 out of 6 (or more) benchmarking queries / Stanford HAI. 2024. URL : <https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-trial-legal-models-hallucinate-1-out-6-or-more-benchmarking-queries> (дата звернення: 12.04.2026).
9. Warraich M. K. S., Usman H., Zakir S., Mehboob M. Ethical governance of artificial intelligence hallucinations in legal practice. *Social Sciences Spectrum*. 2025. Vol. 4, № 2. P. 603–615. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.71085/sss.04.02.297>
10. Khaydarova U. P. A systematic mapping study of applying artificial intelligence and data analytics in law and jurisdiction: legal ontologies based on technology. *SPAST Reports*. 2024. Vol. 1, № 7. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.69848/sreports.v1i7.5082>
11. Quteishat E. M. A., Qtaishat A., Quteishat A. M. A. Exploring the role of AI in modern legal practice: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical implications. *Journal of Electrical Systems*. 2024. Vol. 20, № 6s. P. 3040–3050. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3320>
12. Azman O., Tumkaya S. Navigating the ethical landscape of AI integration in education: Balancing innovation and responsibility. *F1000Research*. 2025. Vol. 14. P. 299. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.160011.1>
13. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI / European Commission. 2019. URL : <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai> (дата звернення: 11.04.2026).
14. Long D., Magerko B. What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. 2020. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727>
15. DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens / European Commission ; Publications Office of the European Union. 2022. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.2760/115376>

16. ISO 18587:2017. Translation services. Post-editing of machine translation output. Requirements / International Organization for Standardization. Geneva : ISO, 2017. URL : <https://www.iso.org/standard/62970.html> (дата звернення: 12.04.2026).

Дата надходження 15.04.2026

Дата прийняття 30.04.2026

Дата рекомендації 28.05.2026

Дата публікації 30.06.2026