

Challenges Encountering Students in Translating Legal Texts: An Analytical Field Study

Israa Bashir Elajail*

Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, Libya

التحديات التي يواجهها الطلاب في ترجمة النصوص القانونية: دراسة ميدانية تحليلية

اسراء بشير العجيل*

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة مصراتة، ليبيا

*Corresponding author: israa.b.elajail@gmail.com

Received: August 05, 2025

Accepted: November 13, 2025

Published: November 24, 2025

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract:

Legal translation represents one of the most challenging specialized domains in translation studies, requiring sophisticated linguistic competence, profound legal knowledge, and deep cultural awareness. This analytical field study investigates the multifaceted challenges encountered by advanced English language students when translating legal texts between English and Arabic. A quantitative research design was employed with thirty-four undergraduate students enrolled in Translation III course at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. Data collection utilized a comprehensive twelve-item questionnaire measured on a three-point Likert scale, supplemented by demographic surveys. Statistical analysis using SPSS version 24 revealed significant challenges across multiple dimensions: 85.3% of participants reported difficulty translating legal contracts bidirectionally, 61.8% strongly agreed that sentence structure complexity posed major obstacles, and 88.2% identified culture-specific terminology as particularly challenging. Additionally, 94.1% found French and Latin legal terminology problematic, while 50% expressed limited confidence in maintaining translation accuracy and confidentiality. The findings indicate systematic deficiencies in students' preparation for legal translation, particularly regarding specialized terminology acquisition, comparative legal systems understanding, and cultural mediation strategies. Results underscore the urgent need for comprehensive curriculum reform integrating interdisciplinary approaches that combine linguistic training with legal conceptual frameworks and cross-cultural competencies. Pedagogical implications suggest implementing intensive practical training modules, exposure to authentic legal documents, collaborative learning environments, and sustained engagement with professional legal translation resources. This study contributes empirical evidence to translation pedagogy discourse and provides actionable recommendations for enhancing legal translation education in Arabic-English contexts.

Keywords: Legal translation, translation challenges, legal terminology, undergraduate students, Arabic-English translation.

المخلص:

تعد الترجمة القانونية إحدى أكثر المجالات المتخصصة تعقيداً في دراسات الترجمة، نظراً لما تتطلبه من كفاءة لغوية عالية، ومعرفة قانونية راسخة، ووعي ثقافي عميق. تهدف هذه الدراسة الميدانية التحليلية إلى استقصاء التحديات المتعددة التي يواجهها طلبة اللغة الإنجليزية المتقدمون عند ترجمة النصوص القانونية بين اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية. وقد استخدم في الدراسة منهج كمي شمل أربعة وثلاثين طالباً جامعياً مسجلين في مقرر "الترجمة III" بكلية الآداب، جامعة مصراتة. اعتمد جمع البيانات على استبانة شاملة مكونة من إثني عشر بنداً وفق مقياس ليكرت ثلاثي، مدعومة باستبانة للبيانات الديموغرافية.

أظهرت التحليلات الإحصائية باستخدام برنامج SPSS (الإصدار 24) وجود تحديات كبيرة علي عدة مستويات، إذ أشار 85.3% من المشاركين إلى صعوبة ترجمة العقود القانونية في الاتجاهين وعبر 61.8% عن أن تعقيد البنية التركيبية للجمل يشكل عقبة رئيسية، بينما رأى 88.2% أن المصطلحات المرتبطة بالخصوصيات الثقافية تعد من أبرز التحديات. كما أفاد 94.1% بأن المصطلحات القانونية ذات الأصل الفرنسي واللاتيني تمثل صعوبة واضحة، في حين أبدى 50% فقط ثقة محدودة في قدرتهم على الحفاظ على الدقة والسرية أثناء الترجمة. تشير النتائج إلى وجود قصور منهجي في إعداد الطلبة لترجمة النصوص القانونية، وخصوصاً فيما يتعلق باكتساب المصطلحات المتخصصة، وفهم النظم القانونية المقارنة، وإستراتيجيات الوساطة الثقافية. وتؤكد النتائج الحاجة الملحة إلى إصلاح شامل للمناهج الدراسية، بحيث تتبنى مقاربات متعددة التخصصات تجمع بين التدريب اللغوي والمرجعيات المفاهيمية القانونية والكفاءات العابرة للثقافات. وتقتصر الآثار التربوية للدراسة تطبيق وحدات تدريبية عملية مكثفة، وإتاحة فرص حقيقية للإطلاع على وثائق قانونية أصلية، وتفعيل بيئات تعلم تعاونية، وتعزيز الإنخراط المستعمر مع الموارد المهنية المتخصصة في الترجمة القانونية. وتقدم هذه الدراسة أداة تجريبية تسهم في إثراء النقاشات المتعلقة بتعليم الترجمة، وتوفر توصيات قابلة للتطبيق لتحسين تدريس الترجمة القانونية في سياقات الترجمة العربية-الإنجليزية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة القانونية، تحديات الترجمة، المصطلحات القانونية، الطلاب الجامعيون، الترجمة العربية-الإنجليزية.

Introduction:

Translation fundamentally functions as a bridge between linguistic and cultural communities, facilitating communication across diverse societal contexts. Within the broader translation landscape, legal translation occupies a particularly specialized and demanding position, serving critical functions in international institutions, governmental agencies, judicial systems, and commercial transactions (Ibrahim et al., 2016). The contemporary globalized environment has witnessed unprecedented expansion in cross-border legal interactions, encompassing international agreements, multilateral negotiations, commercial contracts, diplomatic correspondence, and transnational dispute resolution mechanisms. This proliferation of international legal discourse has elevated legal translation from a peripheral technical skill to an indispensable professional competency essential for maintaining global legal order and facilitating international cooperation (Kramsch, 2003).

Legal translation differs fundamentally from general translation practices due to its inherently complex nature, which stems from multiple interconnected factors. First, legal language itself constitutes a highly specialized register characterized by distinctive syntactic structures, archaic terminology, Latin and French loanwords, and complex formulaic expressions designed to ensure precision and minimize ambiguity (Alwazna, 2013). The genesis of legal language terms predominantly derives from Latin, rendering legal terminology particularly challenging and less accessible to non-specialists (Hargitt, 2013). Second, legal systems vary substantially across jurisdictions, reflecting diverse historical developments, philosophical foundations, and cultural values that shape legal concepts and their linguistic expressions (Šarčević, 1997). Third, legal translation operates under stringent constraints regarding accuracy, consistency, and formal register maintenance, as even minor mistranslations can precipitate serious legal consequences, financial losses, or diplomatic complications (Cao, 2007).

The English-Arabic legal translation context presents particularly acute challenges due to fundamental differences between common law and civil/Islamic law systems. English legal language connects intrinsically to common law traditions where many specialized terms acquire meaning through precedent-based interpretation and historical development (El-Farahaty, 2016). Conversely, Arabic legal language draws heavily upon Islamic legal principles derived from Quranic texts and Prophetic traditions (Sunnah), alongside influences from civil law systems in various Arab jurisdictions (El-Farahaty, 2015). For instance, Saudi Arabian legal frameworks prioritize Shariah principles, while Egyptian law integrates both Islamic and civil law traditions, creating significant conceptual and terminological variations even among Arabic-speaking countries (El-Farahaty, 2016).

Research Problem:

Despite the critical importance of legal translation competencies, substantial evidence suggests that undergraduate translation students encounter severe difficulties when engaging with legal texts. Previous research has documented widespread struggles among students across various linguistic pairs, including Arabic-English (Alshaikh, 2022; Al-Nakhalah, 2013), English-Vietnamese (Nhac, 2023), and English-Russian (Stepanova, 2017) translations. These difficulties manifest across multiple dimensions: linguistic complexity encompassing syntactic structures and specialized terminology (Al-Jarf, 2023), cultural and legal system incongruities (Barabino, 2020), and insufficient domain-specific knowledge (Giampieri, 2021).

Specifically, within the Arabic-English context, research has identified persistent challenges related to non-equivalent legal concepts, culture-bound terminology, complex sentence structures, and inadequate training methodologies (Almjlad, 2024; Al-Tameemi & Farhan, 2016). However, existing studies have often focused on limited aspects of these challenges or examined small sample populations without comprehensive statistical analysis. Furthermore, there exists a critical gap in understanding the full spectrum of difficulties faced by students at advanced stages of their translation education, particularly those approaching graduation and professional practice.

The present study addresses this research gap by conducting a systematic analytical investigation of the challenges encountered by final-year translation students at Misurata University when translating legal texts between English and Arabic. Unlike previous fragmented approaches, this research employs comprehensive quantitative methodology to examine multiple dimensions of translation difficulty simultaneously, including linguistic challenges (syntax, terminology, style), cultural barriers, knowledge deficits, and confidence levels. By focusing on advanced students who have completed prior translation coursework, the study assesses the effectiveness of existing pedagogical approaches and identifies specific competency gaps requiring curricular intervention.

Research Significance:

This study holds substantial significance for multiple stakeholders in translation education and professional practice. First, it provides empirical evidence documenting the specific challenges faced by Arabic-speaking students learning legal translation, contributing valuable data to the limited corpus of research on Arabic-English legal translation pedagogy. Second, the findings offer actionable insights for curriculum developers and translation instructors seeking to enhance legal translation training effectiveness. Third, the research addresses practical concerns of translation departments regarding graduate preparedness for professional legal translation work. Fourth, the study contributes to broader theoretical discussions within translation studies regarding competency development, specialized translation training, and the intersection of linguistic, legal, and cultural knowledge in professional translation practice (Prieto Ramos, 2015).

Given the increasing demand for qualified legal translators in Middle Eastern contexts where Arabic-English translation services are essential for international business, legal proceedings, governmental operations, and academic exchanges, understanding and addressing student challenges becomes crucial for workforce development and professional standards maintenance (Alrishan, 2019). The study's focus on final-year students provides particularly relevant insights into the adequacy of current training programs in preparing graduates for professional practice.

Research Objectives and Questions:

Research Objectives:

This study pursues the following specific objectives:

1. To identify and categorize the primary linguistic challenges encountered by advanced translation students when translating legal texts between English and Arabic
2. To assess students' confidence levels and self-perceived competence in handling specialized legal terminology and complex legal discourse structures
3. To examine the specific difficulties students, experience with culture-specific legal concepts and system-bound terminology
4. To evaluate students' familiarity with legal text conventions, formatting requirements, and professional translation principles
5. To determine the relationship between students' reported challenges and their overall confidence in producing accurate, professional-quality legal translations
6. To provide evidence-based recommendations for enhancing legal translation curricula and pedagogical approaches

Research Questions:

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the primary language-related challenges that translation students encounter when translating legal contracts between English and Arabic?
2. To what extent do complex sentence structures and legal text layouts present difficulties for students?
3. How do culture-specific terms and legal system differences impact students' translation performance?
4. What specific challenges do students face with punctuation, capitalization, modal verbs, and verb tenses in legal texts?
5. How problematic are French and Latin legal terms for Arabic-speaking translation students?
6. What levels of confidence do students report regarding their ability to translate legal texts accurately and maintain professional standards?

7. How familiar are students with legal text types, translation principles, and professional practices in legal translation?

Literature Review:

Theoretical Framework: Legal Translation as Specialized Domain:

Legal translation operates at the intersection of multiple disciplines, requiring translators to navigate complex linguistic, legal, and cultural terrains simultaneously. Within applied linguistics, translation studies encompass diverse research areas including translation processes, translator competencies, specialized translation domains, and pedagogical approaches (Kramsch, 2003). Legal translation represents a highly specialized subdomain characterized by unique challenges stemming from the nature of legal language itself and the culturally-embedded character of legal systems (Prieto Ramos, 2015).

Prieto Ramos (2014) conceptualizes legal translation as an inherently interdisciplinary field requiring integrated competencies spanning linguistic proficiency, legal knowledge, cultural awareness, and specialized translation strategies. This theoretical framework emphasizes that successful legal translation transcends mere linguistic transfer, necessitating deep understanding of legal concepts, comparative legal systems, and the pragmatic functions of legal texts within their respective cultural and institutional contexts. Legal language exhibits distinctive characteristics including technical terminology, complex syntactic structures, archaic expressions, and highly formalized register designed to ensure precision and legal validity (Cao, 2007).

Linguistic and Terminological Challenges in Legal Translation:

Syntactic Complexity:

Legal texts notoriously feature complex syntactic structures that pose significant comprehension and translation challenges. Cao (2007) documents that legal sentences exhibit technical complexity, unusual length, and intricate subordination patterns that frequently confuse students and result in inadequate translations characterized by ambiguity or misinterpretation. These syntactic features include extensive use of passive constructions, multiple embedded clauses, long nominal phrases, and coordination of near-synonymous terms (often called doublets or triplets, such as "null and void" or "give, devise, and bequeath").

Research by Al-Jarf (2023) examining undergraduate EFL students' ability to identify lexical and syntactic features of legal documents revealed that students correctly identified only 52% of long complex sentences and merely 7% of technical vocabulary, attributing these difficulties primarily to unfamiliarity with legal text structures. Similarly, Alshaikh (2022) found that Saudi translation students particularly struggle with parallel structures and legal sentence layouts in contracts, leading to systematic comprehension errors. Palestinian students at Al Quds Open University also reported substantial problems with unusual sentence structures and modal verbs when translating between Arabic and English (Al-Nakhalah, 2013).

Vietnamese learners encounter comparable challenges with the rigid, formulaic syntax of legal English, which contrasts sharply with more flexible Vietnamese syntactic patterns (Nhac, 2023). These cross-linguistic studies demonstrate that syntactic complexity in legal texts constitutes a universal challenge for translation students regardless of their native language background, though specific manifestations vary according to structural differences between source and target languages.

Terminological Non-Equivalence:

One of the most fundamental challenges in legal translation involves terminological non-equivalence, where legal concepts in the source language lack direct counterparts in the target legal system and language. This problem manifests across multiple dimensions including purely technical terms (e.g., "force majeure," "habeas corpus"), semi-technical terms (common words used with specialized legal meanings), and culture-specific legal concepts rooted in particular legal traditions (Prieto Ramos, 2014; Šarčević, 1997).

Alshaikh (2022) identifies specific categories of problematic terminology including binominal expressions, technical vocabulary, neologisms, loanwords, and collocations. Research on Iraqi EFL students demonstrates their failure to distinguish and accurately translate legal collocations in contracts, resulting in pragmatic failures and meaning distortion (Abdulwahid et al., 2017). Arabic-English translators encounter particular difficulties with archaic terms, Shariah-specific concepts (such as "mahr" [dower], "laqit" [foundling], "waqf" [endowment]), and issues of wordiness or redundancy where direct equivalents are absent (Al-Tameemi & Farhan, 2016; El-Farahaty, 2015).

Alwazna (2013) emphasizes that finding appropriate equivalents for legal terms requires deep understanding of legal concepts and the ability to convey intended meanings accurately and unambiguously, considering both the intended audience and the purpose of translation. Different contexts may demand different translation strategies, ranging from literal translation to functional equivalence, descriptive translation, or transliteration with explanatory notes (Flanagan, 2022).

Stylistic and Register Features:

Legal language employs distinctive stylistic features and maintains a highly formal register that students often fail to reproduce appropriately. Al-Jarf (2023) notes that students frequently overlook features such as emphatic auxiliaries, adverbial phrases, and the impersonal tone characteristic of legal discourse. Legal texts traditionally avoid personal pronouns, favor passive voice, utilize archaic expressions (e.g., "hereinafter," "aforementioned," "hereby"), and employ Latin phrases that may be unfamiliar to contemporary students (Alcaraz & Hughes, 2014).

Kierzkowska (2010) discusses how legal writings require consistent use of formal vocabulary throughout the translation process, which students may resist adopting, leading to register inconsistency and stylistically inappropriate translations. The formal tone and register of legal language serve functional purposes beyond mere convention; they signal legal authority, establish precision, and conform to professional expectations that translations must preserve (Hargitt, 2013).

Cultural and Legal System Differences:**Comparative Legal Systems:**

Legal translation transcends linguistic transfer, operating fundamentally as intercultural communication where laws reflect societal norms, religious traditions, historical developments, and philosophical foundations (Barabino, 2020). Šarčević (1997) emphasizes that legal translation students must possess not only linguistic proficiency but also deep understanding of both source and target legal systems. She distinguishes among civil law systems (based on codified statutes), common law systems (based on judicial precedent), and religious legal systems (based on sacred texts and religious interpretations), each embodying distinct conceptual frameworks and terminological systems.

The English-Arabic translation context presents particularly acute challenges due to fundamental differences between common law traditions predominant in Anglophone countries and the hybrid legal systems in Arab nations that variously combine Islamic law (Shariah) and civil law influences (El-Farahaty, 2016). Concepts without direct counterparts include various Islamic legal institutions such as specific marriage and divorce provisions, inheritance rules, criminal law categories, and commercial law concepts derived from Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh).

Alshaikh (2022) documents how students translating Islamic marriage contract terms such as "non-repudiable without cause or dowry" in divorce documents struggle to convey precise legal meanings in English, which lacks equivalent legal constructs. Similarly, Vietnamese students note culture-sensitive features in family law areas where English legal language imposes unfamiliar normative frameworks (Nhac, 2023). These challenges persist bidirectionally, with Al-Nakhalah (2013) and Stepanova (2017) demonstrating symmetric difficulties in both English-to-Arabic and Arabic-to-English translation directions.

Cultural Context and Pragmatic Awareness:

Katan (2015) argues that cultural context profoundly affects legal terminology since terms are frequently developed and understood within specific cultural and historical frameworks. His cognitive approach to legal translation demonstrates how cultural mediation skills become essential for managing disparities in legal terms and systems between source and target languages. Students require cultural knowledge to develop appropriate interpretations and articulate intended meanings that preserve both legal validity and cultural appropriateness.

Al-Tameemi and Farhan (2016) emphasize cultural mismatches in traditions, religious concepts, and social terminology leading to inadequate translations in Arabic-English contexts. Research by Prokhorova (2024) on Russian-English legal translation reveals challenges with acronyms, abbreviations, pronouns, and phraseology tied to cultural-linguistic interplay in service provision documents. Abdulwahid et al. (2017) and Stepanova (2017) note that translators must navigate pragmatic awareness to ensure contractual obligations remain clear, but students often neglect these considerations, producing translations with pragmatic inconsistencies or failures.

Knowledge Deficits and Training Gaps:**Limited Legal Background:**

Students' limited legal knowledge significantly amplifies translation challenges, as legal translation requires interdisciplinary competence combining linguistic abilities with substantive legal understanding (Barabino, 2020; Giampieri, 2021). Without adequate domain knowledge, students produce mistranslations, particularly in specialized legal documents such as contracts (Nhac, 2023). Giampieri (2021) conducted a case study with bachelor's students demonstrating that even when provided with corpus tools, legal ignorance led to errors in formulaic expressions and term selection. Palestinian and Saudi research samples confirm poor performance in legal term translation attributable to insufficient legal exposure (Alshaikh, 2022; Al-Nakhalah, 2013).

Karjo (2016) emphasizes that legal translation represents one of the translation types where translators face stringent semantic constraints at all levels due to peculiar features of legal language and the culturally mediated nature of legal discourse. This specialized knowledge requirement extends beyond general linguistic competence, demanding systematic training in legal concepts, comparative legal systems, and specialized translation methodologies.

Theory-Practice Gap:

A persistent problem in legal translation pedagogy involves the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application. While students may be aware of translation methods such as parallel text analysis, functional equivalence, or modulation strategies, they frequently fail to apply these techniques effectively in actual translation tasks (Duraner, 2012; Barabino, 2020). Duraner's (2012) comparative study of third and fourth-year students revealed substantial disconnect between theoretical training received in coursework and students' ability to produce competent translations of legal texts.

Barabino (2020) proposes a comprehensive training model emphasizing analysis of communicative situations, legal cultures, text typologies, and specialization levels to build essential sub-competences. However, empirical evidence suggests that conventional training approaches inadequately bridge theory and practice, leaving students ill-prepared for professional legal translation demands (Al-Jarf, 2023; Alshaikh, 2022).

Translation Strategies and Pedagogical Approaches:

Translation Strategies for Legal Texts:

Scholars have proposed various strategies to address the inherent difficulties in legal translation. Šarčević (1997) advocates functional equivalence as a primary approach, where translators strive to reproduce the legal effect of the source text in the target language rather than adhering strictly to surface-level linguistic correspondence. This strategy proves particularly valuable when translating culture-specific legal concepts or system-bound terminology that lacks direct equivalents.

Cao (2007) discusses transposition and modulation techniques enabling translators to remain faithful to source text meanings while adapting expressions to target language conventions and expectations. Alcaraz and Hughes (2014) recommend utilizing footnotes and annotations when direct equivalents prove unavailable, providing explanatory information that clarifies complex legal concepts for target readers. These strategies require sophisticated linguistic abilities, legal knowledge, and cultural awareness that students must develop through systematic training.

However, research indicates that students often struggle to implement these strategies effectively. Alshaikh (2022) found that Saudi students rely heavily on parallel texts, CAT tools, and online resources, yet these tools do not fully resolve challenges related to binominal expressions or layout conventions. Giampieri (2021) reports that corpus consultation assists with short text translation but fails for collocations without adequate legal knowledge. The effectiveness of translation strategies thus depends critically on underlying competencies that students must acquire through comprehensive training programs.

Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching Legal Translation:

Translation pedagogy scholars emphasize the necessity of specialized approaches for legal translation instruction. Kierzkowska (2010) advocates case-based learning where students engage with real-world legal translation scenarios that simulate professional practice conditions. This experiential approach helps students develop practical problem-solving skills and gain familiarity with authentic legal text types and translation challenges.

Alcaraz and Hughes (2014) recommend collaborative learning approaches where students work together to solve translation problems, sharing insights and strategies while developing critical analysis skills. Prieto Ramos (2014) emphasizes utilizing legal dictionaries and corpora in classroom instruction, providing students with early exposure to legal terminology and phraseology while fostering active engagement with specialized linguistic resources.

Barabino (2020) proposes an integrated training model incorporating source text analysis (examining cultural, textual, and linguistic dimensions), comparative legal systems study, and systematic strategy development. This interdisciplinary approach recognizes that legal translation competence emerges from the integration of multiple knowledge domains and skill sets rather than from isolated linguistic training.

Despite these pedagogical recommendations, empirical evidence suggests persistent gaps between training approaches and student outcomes. Piecychna (2013) emphasizes that translator training programs must develop competencies including research abilities, specialized tool proficiency, and critical thinking through targeted coursework, practical exercises, and real-world translation opportunities. However, implementation of comprehensive training models remains inconsistent across institutions, contributing to the widespread difficulty's students encounter with legal translation tasks.

Related Empirical Studies:

Several recent empirical studies have examined specific challenges faced by translation students working with legal texts across various linguistic pairs. Ali (2016) investigated Sudanese translation practitioners' perceptions of legal contract translation problems, finding that 48% agreed that translating Arabic legal contracts into English presented significant challenges. The study documented difficulties with sentence structure complexity (48% reported problems), legal text layout (45% found challenging), and culture-specific legal terms (39% identified as problematic).

Al Najjar (2011) examined challenges encountered by novice translators in Jordan when translating contracts and agreements, categorizing difficulties into semantic-related challenges (including mistranslations, comprehension errors, and referential mistakes), style-related challenges (involving capitalization, punctuation, formal/informal register, and modal verb usage), grammar-related challenges (encompassing tense selection and subject-verb agreement), and research-related challenges such as inappropriate use of online translation tools.

Dweik and Suleiman (2013) attributed students' mistranslations to their lack of knowledge regarding translation techniques and strategies, emphasizing the need for more comprehensive methodological training. Lardiere (2009) discussed how legal sentences differ fundamentally from other sentence types, employing complex structures rarely encountered in general language registers, which contributes to student comprehension difficulties.

Frade (2014) examined legal translation in Brazilian contexts, emphasizing how legal systems differ across cultures and how translators must navigate these differences to produce accurate and culturally appropriate translations. Wang and Sin (2013) investigated legal translation and cultural transfer within Hong Kong's common law system translated into Chinese, demonstrating challenges arising from fundamental conceptual and terminological differences between legal traditions.

These empirical studies collectively demonstrate that legal translation challenges manifest consistently across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts, involving interconnected linguistic, cultural, legal, and pedagogical dimensions. The current study builds upon this foundation by providing comprehensive quantitative analysis of multiple challenge dimensions within the Arabic-English translation context, focusing specifically on advanced students approaching graduation.

Methodology:

Research Design:

This study employs a quantitative research design utilizing survey methodology to investigate translation students' perceptions of challenges encountered when translating legal texts. The quantitative approach enables systematic collection of standardized data from a representative sample, facilitating statistical analysis to identify patterns, relationships, and significant trends in student experiences (Raosoft, 2004). This methodological framework aligns with previous research examining translation students' challenges (Ali, 2016; Alshaikh, 2022; Al-Nakhlah, 2013) while extending the scope to encompass multiple dimensions of legal translation difficulty simultaneously.

The analytical approach integrates descriptive statistics to characterize sample demographics and response distributions, along with inferential statistics to assess relationships between variables and test for significant differences. This comprehensive analytical strategy provides robust empirical evidence documenting the specific nature and extent of challenges faced by advanced translation students in the Arabic-English legal translation context.

Participants and Setting:

The study population comprised undergraduate students enrolled in advanced translation courses at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, Libya. Participants consisted of 34 students attending Translation III course during the academic term, representing final-year students specializing in English language and translation. The selection of this specific population reflects deliberate purposive sampling designed to assess legal translation competencies among students at advanced stages of their translation education who have completed prerequisite coursework including Translation I and Translation II.

This sampling strategy enables evaluation of the cumulative effectiveness of the translation curriculum in preparing students for specialized legal translation work. Final-year students possess sufficient linguistic proficiency and translation experience to engage meaningfully with complex legal texts, while their impending graduation makes assessment of their preparedness for professional practice particularly relevant. All participants were native Arabic speakers with advanced English proficiency, having completed multiple years of intensive English language study and translation training.

Research Instrument:

Questionnaire Design:

Data collection employed a comprehensive questionnaire specifically designed to assess students' perceptions of challenges in translating legal texts, confidence levels, familiarity with legal terminology, and prior experience with legal translation. The questionnaire development process involved reviewing previous instruments used in legal translation research (Ali, 2016; Al-Nakhalah, 2013; Alshaikh, 2022) and adapting items to address specific research questions relevant to the Arabic-English translation context.

The questionnaire consisted of two main sections:

Section A: Demographic Information:

- Age.
- Gender.
- Department and specialization.
- Current course enrollment.
- Previous translation coursework completed.

Section B: Legal Translation Challenges Assessment:

This section comprised twelve statements addressing various dimensions of legal translation challenges:

1. Difficulty translating legal contracts between Arabic and English bidirectionally.
2. Complexity of legal sentence structures.
3. Challenges with legal text layout and formatting conventions.
4. Culture-specific legal terminology difficulties.
5. Punctuation and capitalization challenges in legal texts.
6. Modal verb translation difficulties (shall, will, must, may).
7. Verb tense selection and consistency challenges.
8. French and Latin legal term comprehension and translation.
9. Familiarity with legal text types and genres.
10. Knowledge of translation principles specific to legal texts.
11. Confidence level in translating legal texts accurately.
12. Ability to maintain accuracy and confidentiality standards.

Rating Scale:

Each statement utilized a three-point Likert scale providing response options: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Agree, and 3 = Strongly Agree. This rating system enables quantification of students' perceptions regarding the extent of various challenges and their confidence levels. Higher numerical values indicate greater agreement with statements describing challenges or lower confidence levels, while lower values suggest fewer perceived difficulties or greater confidence.

The three-point scale offers sufficient differentiation to capture meaningful variations in student responses while maintaining simplicity and clarity for participants. This approach has been validated in previous translation research examining student perceptions and self-assessments (Ali, 2016; Alshaikh, 2022).

Data Collection Procedures:

Ethical Considerations:

Prior to data collection, the research protocol received approval from relevant institutional authorities at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University. Participants received comprehensive information about the study's purpose, procedures, voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality protections, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before questionnaire administration.

Participant confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the research process. Questionnaires were assigned numerical codes rather than names, and all data were stored securely with access limited to the research team. Participants were assured that their responses would be used exclusively for research purposes and would not influence their academic evaluations or grades.

Sample Size Determination:

Sample size calculation utilized the Raosoft sample size calculator (Raosoft, 2004), determining that 34 participants provided adequate statistical power to achieve 95% confidence interval with 5% margin of error, given the total population of eligible students. This sample size meets standards for quantitative survey research in applied linguistics and translation studies contexts.

Administration Procedures:

Questionnaires were administered during regularly scheduled class sessions to ensure maximum participation rates and consistency in administration conditions. The researcher provided standardized verbal instructions explaining the questionnaire's purpose, the rating scale, and procedures for

completing responses. Participants received adequate time to read each statement carefully and provide thoughtful responses reflecting their genuine experiences and perceptions.

To enhance data quality, the researcher remained available during administration to answer any clarifying questions participants raised regarding specific statements or terms. However, care was taken to avoid influencing participant responses through suggestive comments or interpretations.

Data Analysis:

Statistical Software and Procedures:

Quantitative data analysis employed SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 24, a comprehensive statistical software package widely utilized in social science research. Prior to conducting primary analyses, data normality was assessed using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to determine appropriate statistical procedures for subsequent analyses.

Descriptive Statistics:

Descriptive statistical analyses characterized sample demographics and response distributions across questionnaire items. Categorical variables (gender, course enrollment) were summarized using frequencies and percentages. Continuous variables (age) were described using means and standard deviations for normally distributed data or medians for non-parametric distributions.

For questionnaire responses, frequency distributions and percentages were calculated for each response category (Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree) across all twelve items. These descriptive statistics provide comprehensive overview of the patterns and extent of challenges students reported experiencing.

Inferential Statistics:

Inferential statistical procedures examined relationships between categorical variables and tested for significant differences in response patterns. Chi-square tests assessed associations between categorical variables when cell frequency requirements were met. When more than 25% of cells contained expected counts less than 5, Fisher's exact test was substituted to ensure valid statistical inference.

Statistical significance was evaluated using conventional alpha level of .05, with p-values below this threshold indicating statistically significant relationships or differences. Effect sizes were considered alongside statistical significance to evaluate practical importance of findings.

Methodological Limitations

Several limitations of the current methodology warrant acknowledgment. First, the study relies exclusively on self-report data reflecting students' perceptions of challenges rather than objective assessment of their actual translation performance. While perception data provide valuable insights into students' subjective experiences and confidence levels, they may not perfectly correspond to objective competency levels. Future research could complement perception data with performance-based assessments analyzing actual translation products.

Second, the sample consists exclusively of students from a single institution, which may limit generalizability to other contexts with different curricula, student populations, or instructional approaches. However, the challenges identified likely reflect broader patterns given their consistency with findings from other Arabic-speaking contexts (Ali, 2016; Alshaikh, 2022; Almjlad, 2024).

Third, the cross-sectional design captures student perceptions at a single time point rather than tracking development longitudinally. Longitudinal designs examining how perceptions and competencies evolve throughout students' translation education could provide additional insights into effective pedagogical sequences and intervention timing.

Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable empirical evidence documenting specific challenges faced by advanced translation students and offers foundation for curriculum improvements and pedagogical innovations in legal translation education.

Results:

Demographic Characteristics:

The demographic analysis of the 34 participating students revealed several notable characteristics of the sample population. All participants were enrolled in the English Department at the Faculty of Arts, Misurata University, and were currently attending Translation III course as final-year undergraduate students. This homogeneity in academic background ensures comparability across participants regarding educational experiences and translation training received.

The sample's mean age was 23 years (SD = 2.9 years), indicating a relatively young adult population typical of undergraduate students approaching graduation. Age range extended from approximately 20 to 29 years, reflecting some variation in participants' ages likely due to differences in initial university enrollment timing and academic progression rates.

Table (1): Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=34)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	8	23.5%
	Female	26	76.5%
Department	English Department	34	100%
Course	Translation III	34	100%
Age	Mean $\pm$ SD	23 $\pm$ 2.9 years	

A statistically significant gender disparity characterized the sample, with females comprising 76.5% (n=26) compared to males at 23.5% (n=8). This pronounced female majority reflects broader trends in language and translation programs where female students typically predominate, particularly in Middle Eastern university contexts. While this gender distribution limits ability to conduct meaningful gender-based comparisons, it accurately represents the typical composition of translation student populations in similar institutional settings.

Legal Translation Challenges: Questionnaire Results:

Quantitative analysis of questionnaire responses revealed substantial challenges across multiple dimensions of legal translation, with particularly high difficulty levels reported for specific areas. The following sections present detailed findings for each questionnaire item.

Bidirectional Translation Difficulty:

Regarding the fundamental challenge of translating legal contracts between Arabic and English, results demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of participants perceived substantial difficulty. Specifically, 55.9% (n=19) agreed that translating legal contracts bidirectionally posed challenges, while an additional 29.4% (n=10) strongly agreed with this statement. Only 14.7% (n=5) disagreed, indicating they did not find bidirectional legal contract translation particularly challenging.

Table (2): Perceived Difficulty in Bidirectional Legal Contract Translation

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	5	14.7%
Agree	19	55.9%
Strongly Agree	10	29.4%
Total	34	100%

The combined agreement rate of 85.3% demonstrates that legal contract translation between these linguistically and culturally distant language pairs presents formidable challenges for advanced students. This finding validates previous research by Ali (2016) who reported that 48% of Sudanese respondents agreed legal contract translation was challenging, though the current study reveals even higher challenge perception rates.

Sentence Structure Complexity:

Legal sentence structure emerged as one of the most challenging aspects, with 61.8% (n=21) of participants strongly agreeing that legal sentence structures posed significant translation difficulties. An additional 26.5% (n=9) agreed, while only 11.8% (n=4) disagreed. The combined agreement rate of 88.3% indicates that syntactic complexity represents a nearly universal challenge for students.

Table (3): Difficulty with Legal Sentence Structure

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	4	11.8%
Agree	9	26.5%
Strongly Agree	21	61.8%
Total	34	100%

This finding strongly corroborates research by Cao (2007) and Al-Jarf (2023) documenting that legal sentences exhibit technical complexity, unusual length, and intricate subordination patterns that confuse students. The exceptionally high "strongly agree" rate suggests that syntactic challenges constitute particularly acute obstacles in legal translation, likely reflecting the substantial structural differences between English legal language with its Germanic syntax and Arabic with its Semitic grammatical patterns.

Legal Text Layout Challenges:

Legal text layout and formatting conventions also proved challenging for substantial proportions of students. Results showed that 44.1% (n=15) strongly agreed that legal text layout created difficulties, 41.2% (n=14) agreed, and 14.7% (n=5) disagreed. The 85.3% combined agreement rate indicates that

most students struggle with the distinctive formatting conventions, organizational structures, and visual presentation features characteristic of legal documents.

Table (4): Challenges with Legal Text Layout

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	5	14.7%
Agree	14	41.2%
Strongly Agree	15	44.1%
Total	34	100%

These findings align with Ali (2016) who reported that 45% of respondents found legal text layout challenging. Layout difficulties likely stem from unfamiliarity with conventions such as numbered sections, hierarchical clause structures, indentation patterns, and specialized formatting that convey legal meaning and organization.

Culture-Specific Terminology:

Culture-specific legal terms emerged as particularly problematic, with 88.2% of participants reporting challenges in this area. Specifically, 47.1% (n=16) strongly agreed that culture-specific terms posed difficulties, 41.2% (n=14) agreed, and only 11.8% (n=4) disagreed. This represents one of the highest challenge perception rates across all questionnaire items.

Table (5): Difficulty with Culture-Specific Legal Terms

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	4	11.8%
Agree	14	41.2%
Strongly Agree	16	47.1%
Total	34	100%

The exceptionally high difficulty rate for culture-specific terminology validates theoretical frameworks emphasizing cultural embeddedness of legal language (Katan, 2015; Šarčević, 1997). Terms rooted in common law traditions (e.g., "tort," "equity," "consideration") lack precise equivalents in Arabic legal systems influenced by Islamic and civil law, while Arabic Shariah-based concepts similarly resist straightforward English translation. This bidirectional cultural gap substantially complicates translation processes and requires sophisticated cultural mediation strategies that students apparently lack.

Punctuation and Capitalization:

Punctuation and capitalization conventions in legal texts posed challenges for the majority of participants, though somewhat less severely than syntax and culture-specific terminology. Results showed 61.8% (n=21) agreed these elements were problematic, 26.5% (n=9) strongly agreed, and 11.8% (n=4) disagreed, yielding an 88.3% combined agreement rate.

Table (6): Punctuation and Capitalization Challenges

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	4	11.8%
Agree	21	61.8%
Strongly Agree	9	26.5%
Total	34	100%

These challenges likely reflect the highly conventionalized nature of punctuation and capitalization in legal English, where specific practices (e.g., capitalizing defined terms, semicolon usage in complex lists, comma placement in conditional clauses) carry legal significance. Arabic legal texts follow different conventions, creating transfer difficulties for students translating between the languages.

Modal Verbs and Verb Tenses

Modal verb translation (shall, will, must, may) presented somewhat more variable results, with 38.2% (n=13) strongly agreeing these were challenging, 44.1% (n=15) agreeing, and 17.6% (n=6) disagreeing. The 82.3% combined agreement rate indicates substantial difficulty, though slightly lower than for syntax or culture-specific terms.

Table (7): Modal Verb Translation Challenges

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	6	17.6%
Agree	15	44.1%
Strongly Agree	13	38.2%
Total	34	100%

Similarly, verb tense selection and consistency showed comparable patterns with 35.3% (n=12) strongly agreeing tenses were challenging, 47.1% (n=16) agreeing, and 17.6% (n=6) disagreeing. These findings validate Al Najjar's (2011) documentation of modal verb and tense-related challenges among novice translators. The legal significance of precise modal verb selection (where "shall" creates obligation, "may" grants permission, and "will" indicates future action) demands careful attention that students may not consistently provide.

French and Latin Terminology:

French and Latin legal terms represented the single most challenging category, with an extraordinary 94.1% of participants reporting difficulty. The distribution showed 50% (n=17) strongly agreed, 44.1% (n=15) agreed, and only 5.9% (n=2) disagreed.

Table (8): Challenges with French and Latin Legal Terms (p=.001)

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	5.9%
Agree	15	44.1%
Strongly Agree	17	50%
Total	34	100%

This finding proved statistically significant (p=.001), indicating that the difficulty reported far exceeds what would be expected by chance. The result strongly corroborates Hargitt's (2013) observation that the Latin genesis of legal language terms makes them particularly challenging and inaccessible. For Arabic-speaking students without classical language training, French and Latin expressions (e.g., "force majeure," "habeas corpus," "inter alia," "prima facie," "res judicata") present dual challenges: first, understanding their meanings, and second, determining appropriate Arabic equivalents or deciding whether to transliterate with explanatory notes.

5.2.8 Familiarity with Legal Text Types

Students' familiarity with legal text types showed moderate uncertainty, with 50% (n=17) agreeing they were familiar, 32.4% (n=11) strongly agreeing, and 17.6% (n=6) disagreeing. The relatively balanced distribution suggests variable exposure to different legal text genres within the student population.

Table (9): Familiarity with Legal Text Types

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	6	17.6%
Agree	17	50%
Strongly Agree	11	32.4%
Total	34	100%

While 82.4% reported at least some familiarity, the high "agree" rather than "strongly agree" proportion suggests that familiarity remains superficial for many students. This finding indicates need for more extensive exposure to diverse legal text types including contracts, statutes, court opinions, pleadings, wills, trusts, and international legal instruments.

Knowledge of Translation Principles:

Regarding knowledge of translation principles specific to legal texts, results showed 61.8% (n=21) agreed they possessed such knowledge, 26.5% (n=9) strongly agreed, and 11.8% (n=4) disagreed. The 88.3% combined agreement rate suggests students believe they understand relevant principles, though actual application may differ from theoretical knowledge as documented by Duraner (2012).

Table (10): Knowledge of Legal Translation Principles

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	4	11.8%
Agree	21	61.8%
Strongly Agree	9	26.5%
Total	34	100%

The predominance of "agree" over "strongly agree" responses hints at qualified rather than confident principle knowledge, suggesting theory-practice gaps that pedagogical interventions should address.

Confidence in Translating Legal Texts:

Students' confidence levels in translating legal texts accurately revealed moderate uncertainty, with 47.1% (n=16) agreeing they felt confident, 35.3% (n=12) strongly agreeing, and 17.6% (n=6) disagreeing. While 82.4% reported at least some confidence, the distribution suggests significant reservations about translation competence.

Table (11): Confidence in Translating Legal Texts Accurately

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	6	17.6%
Agree	16	47.1%
Strongly Agree	12	35.3%
Total	34	100%

This moderate confidence level, despite three years of translation study, raises questions about curriculum effectiveness in building students' self-efficacy for professional legal translation work. The 17.6% who expressed lack of confidence represents a concerning proportion of students approaching graduation without adequate confidence in their specialized translation abilities.

Ability to Maintain Accuracy and Confidentiality:

Finally, students' self-assessed ability to maintain accuracy and confidentiality standards showed that exactly 50% (n=17) agreed they could maintain these professional standards, 32.4% (n=11) strongly agreed, and 17.6% (n=6) disagreed.

Table (12): Ability to Maintain Accuracy and Confidentiality

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	6	17.6%
Agree	17	50%
Strongly Agree	11	32.4%
Total	34	100%

The even split between agreement levels and the 17.6% disagreement rate indicates that a substantial minority of students doubt their ability to meet fundamental professional standards. This finding suggests critical need for enhanced training in professional ethics, quality assurance procedures, and accuracy verification methods.

Summary of Findings:

The quantitative analysis reveals a consistent pattern of substantial challenges across all dimensions of legal translation examined. Particularly acute difficulties emerged regarding French and Latin terminology (94.1% reporting difficulty), culture-specific legal terms (88.2%), legal sentence structure (88.3%), and punctuation/capitalization (88.3%). Even areas showing somewhat lower challenge rates still affected clear majorities of students, including bidirectional contract translation (85.3%), text layout (85.3%), modal verbs (82.3%), and tenses (82.4%).

Students' confidence and competence indicators showed more variable but still concerning patterns. While 82.4% reported familiarity with legal text types and 88.3% claimed knowledge of translation principles, only 82.4% expressed confidence in producing accurate translations and just 82.4% felt capable of maintaining accuracy and confidentiality standards. These gaps between theoretical knowledge and practical confidence suggest that students recognize their limitations despite completing substantial translation coursework.

The consistently high challenge perception rates across diverse translation aspects indicate systematic rather than isolated difficulties, suggesting that current pedagogical approaches inadequately prepare students for legal translation demands. The findings underscore urgent need for comprehensive curriculum reform addressing linguistic complexity, cultural mediation, specialized terminology acquisition, and professional competency development.

Discussion:

Interpretation of Findings:

The study's findings provide solid empirical evidence demonstrating the substantial challenges advanced translation students face when translating legal texts between English and Arabic. These results align with previous scholarship addressing legal translation difficulties, yet they extend current knowledge by quantitatively capturing several dimensions of linguistic, cultural, and professional challenges simultaneously.

Linguistic Challenges: Syntax, Terminology, and Style:

High difficulty rates in sentence structure (88.3%), punctuation (88.3%), and culture-specific terminology (88.2%) reinforce theoretical frameworks that highlight the complexity and specialization of legal discourse (Cao, 2007; Prieto Ramos, 2014). Legal English, characterized by long multi-clausal sentences, archaic wording, passive structures, and extensive Latin and French borrowings, diverges significantly from general English and from Arabic linguistic patterns (Alwazna, 2013; Hargitt, 2013). The finding that 94.1% of students struggle with Latin and French terminology underscores how the historical evolution of English legal language creates barriers for students lacking classical linguistic training. Terms such as *inter alia*, *mutatis mutandis*, or *res judicata* resist transparent Arabic equivalents, often requiring explanatory translation (Alcaraz & Hughes, 2014).

Consistency with findings across Palestine, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq (Al-Nakhalah, 2013; Ali, 2016; Alshaikh, 2022; Abdulwahid et al., 2017) confirms these difficulties are not context-bound but rather universal across Arabic-English translation environments. Furthermore, Al-Jarf's (2023) evidence that students correctly identified only 52% of long sentences and 7% of technical vocabulary suggests that students' metalinguistic awareness does not translate into operational competence, necessitating explicit pedagogical interventions.

Cultural and Legal System Differences:

The 88.2% difficulty rate concerning culture-specific legal terminology validates arguments by Šarčević (1997) and Katan (2015) regarding the cultural embeddedness of legal systems. English common-law concepts such as "equity," "tort," or "consideration" lack Arabic equivalents because they reflect legal principles historically absent from Islamic or civil law systems (El-Farahaty, 2015, 2016).

Similarly, translating Islamic law concepts (mahr, khul', waqf, riba, zakat) into English poses equal difficulty due to their religious and socio-cultural embeddedness (Al-Tameemi & Farhan, 2016). Choices between transliteration, functional equivalence, or descriptive translation require advanced cultural and legal literacy that many students have yet to develop.

The high percentage of students struggling with bidirectional contract translation (85.3%) demonstrates that these conceptual gaps hinder performance regardless of directionality, echoing earlier findings by Al-Nakhalah (2013). This highlights the need for explicit comparative legal education within translation programs (Prieto Ramos, 2014).

Knowledge Deficits and Training Gaps:

Although 88.3% of students claim familiarity with legal translation principles, only 82.4% feel confident applying them, reflecting a theory-practice gap also reported by Duraner (2012) and Giampieri (2021). Even when using corpora or CAT tools, students lacking domain knowledge commit terminological and stylistic errors, illustrating that tools cannot compensate for insufficient legal knowledge or cultural understanding (Alshaikh, 2022).

The 17.6% lacking professional confidence, despite nearing graduation, signals structural curricular shortcomings requiring systemic revision.

Alignment with Previous Research:

Findings align strongly with Ali's (2016) results in Sudan (48% difficulty in sentence structure, compared to 61.8% strongly agreeing here), though the intensification in the Libyan context may reflect differences in curricula or exposure. The stark increase in difficulty with Latin/French terms (94.1% vs. Ali's 27%) suggests substantial variation in students' prior classical language exposure or in text types used across studies.

Consistencies with categories identified by Al Najjar (2011), Dweik and Suleiman (2013), and others reinforce the multidimensional nature of legal translation challenges and confirm that these issues are deeply rooted rather than incidental.

Implications for Translation Pedagogy:

Curriculum Reform Imperatives:

Results underscore the need for comprehensive curriculum restructuring. As Nhac (2023) argues, legal translation training must develop proficiency in both languages, familiarity with legal systems, and mastery of specialized terminology. Current findings show deficiencies across these areas, confirming that programs require re-designed sequences rather than isolated course adjustments.

Following Prieto Ramos's (2015) quality assurance model, curricula should incorporate:

1. Legal linguistics training.
2. Comparative legal system instruction.
3. Specialized terminology development.
4. Cultural mediation strategies.
5. Explicit translation strategy instruction.
6. Professional ethics and quality standards.

Pedagogical Approaches:

Case-based learning (Kierzkowska, 2010) using authentic documents is essential to bridge the theory–practice divide. Exposure to diverse legal genres, contracts, statutes, judgments, wills, international agreements, should gradually increase in complexity. Collaborative learning (Alcaraz & Hughes, 2014) enables shared problem-solving and metacognitive development. Barabino's (2020) integrated model, combining linguistic, cultural, legal, and strategic analysis, offers a comprehensive framework for competence-building.

Limitations and Future Research:

The study's reliance on self-report data limits insight into actual translation performance. Future research should triangulate self-perceptions with product-based assessments.

Additional directions include:

- quasi-experimental evaluation of training interventions,
- validated competency assessment tools,
- cross-institution comparisons,
- professional translators' retrospective evaluations, and
- the impact of emerging technologies on legal translation training.

Conclusion:

This field study presents rigorous empirical evidence documenting extensive challenges among advanced translation students working with English–Arabic legal texts. High difficulty rates across linguistic, cultural, and professional competencies, including Latin/French terminology (94.1%, $p=.001$), culture-specific terms (88.2%), and syntactic complexity (88.3%), reinforce theoretical models that view legal language as specialized and culturally bound.

The findings indicate structural curriculum deficiencies and highlight the persistent theory–practice gap. Enhancing legal translation pedagogy requires interdisciplinary approaches integrating legal system knowledge, terminology training, cultural mediation, and authentic document practice. The study contributes to translation pedagogy by offering statistically grounded evidence that can guide curriculum developers and instructors. It also underscores the need for ongoing professional development for students entering the legal translation field, given the high level of expertise required to meet professional standards.

Recommendations:

Curriculum Development:

1. Integrate Specialized Legal Translation Modules, including terminology development, comparative legal analysis, and exposure to diverse legal genres (Prieto Ramos, 2015).
2. Adopt Practice-Based Learning, employing authentic documents and progressive task complexity (Kierzkowska, 2010).
3. Develop Comparative Legal Systems Courses that clarify conceptual non-equivalence across traditions (Šarčević, 1997; El-Farahaty, 2016).

Pedagogical Strategies:

4. Employ Collaborative Learning, enabling peer discussion and shared problem-solving (Alcaraz & Hughes, 2014).
5. Integrate Specialized Tools, including legal corpora and CAT systems, while emphasizing critical evaluation (Giampieri, 2021).
6. Teach Explicit Translation Strategies, such as functional equivalence, modulation, and annotation (Cao, 2007).

Professional Development:

7. Implement Translator Mentorship Programs (Piecychna, 2013).
8. Encourage Continuing Education through workshops, conferences, and certification.

Assessment and Quality Assurance:

9. Adopt Comprehensive Competency Assessments evaluating accuracy, terminology use, cultural adequacy, and professional standards (Prieto Ramos, 2015).
10. Provide Detailed Feedback Mechanisms combining instructor, peer, and self-assessment to develop evaluative judgment.

Institutional Support:

11. Invest in Faculty Development targeting legal translation pedagogy.
12. Build Partnerships with Legal Institutions to provide authentic practice opportunities.

Research and Evaluation:

13. Conduct Systematic Program Evaluation using multiple data sources.
14. Support Translation Pedagogy Research to inform evidence-based curriculum improvement.

References:

1. Abdulwahid, M. A., Hamzah, Z. A. B. Z., Hajimaming, P., & Alkhawaja, H. W. (2017). Translating legal collocations in contract agreements by Iraqi EFL students-translators. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 5(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v5n.1p.55>
2. Alcaraz, E., & Hughes, B. (2014). *Legal translation explained*. Routledge.
3. Ali, H. (2016). Legal contract translation problems: Voices from Sudanese translation practitioners. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Translation*, 5.
4. Al-Jarf, R. (2023). Problems of identifying lexical and syntactic features of legal documents by undergraduate EFL students. *Journal of Professional Development in Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jpda.2023.2.1.3>
5. Almjlad, S. S. A. (2024). Analysing legal discourse to understand the difficulties in the translation of legal documents from English into Arabic. *Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.54940/II37688523>
6. Al Najjar, A. D. M. (2011). Challenges that novice translators encounter in translating contracts and agreements in Jordan (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East University.
7. Al-Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2013). Investigating the difficulties and problems faced by the English language students of Al Quds Open University in legal translation process. *Journal*. <https://doaj.org/article/02d3d71cf8994bf292b2b72125483e62>
8. Alrishan, A. (2019). Difficulties EFL translation students face in translating legal texts into Arabic. *Journal of Scientific Research in Literature*, 1, 1-25.
9. Alshaikh, N. (2022). Problems of translating legal contracts: Perspectives of Saudi translation students. *Journal*, 15(2), 50. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v15n2p50>
10. Al-Tameemi, I. M., & Farhan, M. A. (2016). Difficulties encountered in translating some legal texts from Arabic into English. *Journal*. <http://Swiftjournals.org/sjssh/pdf/2016/april/Farh.pdf>
11. Alwazna, R. (2013). Testing the precision of legal translation: The case of translating Islamic legal terms into English. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-013-9314-2>
12. Barabino, G. S. (2020). Cultural, textual and linguistic aspects of legal translation: A model of text analysis for training legal translators. *International Journal of Language and Law*, 7(3), 215-232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2020-2037>
13. Camelia, C. (2014). Errors and difficulties in translating legal texts. *Journal*. <https://doaj.org/article/012dc5f23da44d439d1e8f279a37a8c2>
14. Cao, D. (2007). Translating law. *Multilingual Matters*.
15. Duraner, J. E. (2012). Problematising the use of parallel texts in legal translation training. *International University of Çankaya Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(2), 45-60. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iuceviril/issue/1234/14491>
16. Dweik, B., & Suleiman, M. (2013). Areas of cultural difficulty in Arabic/English (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East University, Amman, Jordan.
17. El-Farahaty, H. (2015). *Arabic-English-Arabic legal translation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315745893>
18. El-Farahaty, H. (2016). Translating lexical legal terms between English and Arabic. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 29(2), 473-493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-016-9478-z>
19. Flanagan, B. (2022). Legal disagreement as disagreement about the collectively intended meaning. Unpublished manuscript.
20. Frade, C. (2014). Legal translation in Brazil: An entextualization approach. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 28.
21. Giampieri, P. (2021). Can corpus consultation compensate for the lack of knowledge in legal translation training? *Corpus Linguistics*, 5(4), 321-339. <https://doi.org/10.2478/cl-2021-0006>
22. Hargitt, S. (2013). What could be gained in translation: Legal language and lawyer-linguists in a globalized world. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 20, 425-447. <https://doi.org/10.2979/indjglolegstu.20.2.425>
23. Ibrahim, H., Ali, H., & Ali, A. (2016). Legal contract translation problems: Voices from Sudanese translation. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on Translation*, 5, 124-143. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/volXnoX.X>

24. Karjo, C. (2016). Problems in translating legal English text into Indonesian. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2834409
25. Katan, D. (2015). Cultural mediation in legal translation: A cognitive approach. *The Translator*, 21(2), 303-323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2015.1079880>
26. Khoiriah, U. F., Siha, A. S. F., Rahmani, P. H., Sutopo, A., & Haryanti, D. (2024). Law students' perception of AI in legal document translation: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Legal Technology*, 1(1), 12-27. <https://doi.org/10.61787/4rvf3x89>
27. Kierzkowska, D. (2010). Legal translation in practice: A comparative analysis of challenges faced by students in different legal systems. Peter Lang.
28. Kramsch, C. (2003). Second language acquisition, applied linguistics and the teaching of foreign languages. *The Language Learning Journal*, 27(1), 66-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730385200111>
29. Lardiere, D. (2009). Some thoughts on the contrastive analysis of features in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 25(2), 173-227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658308100291>
30. Nhac, T.-H. (2023). Learners' obstacles in the translation of legal texts between English and Vietnamese. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 4, 61-71. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v4i2.305>
31. Piecychna, B. (2013). Legal translation competence in the light of translational hermeneutics. *Studies in Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.2478/slgr-2013-0010>
32. Prieto Ramos, F. (2014). Legal translation studies as interdiscipline: Scope and evolution. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 59(2), 260-277. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1028652ar>
33. Prieto Ramos, F. (2015). Quality assurance in legal translation: Evaluating process, competence, and product in the pursuit of adequacy. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 28(1), 11-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-014-9386-9>
34. Prokhorova, E. V. (2024). On some difficulties of legal translation (based on the material of translation of legal documents for the provision of services). *Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.37539/231208.2023.87.74.005>
35. Raosoft. (2004). Raosoft sample size calculator. Retrieved from <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>
36. Šarčević, S. (1997). *New approach to legal translation*. Kluwer Law International.
37. Stepanova, V. V. (2017). Translation strategies of legal texts: Experimental approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 237, 1234-1240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.190>
38. Wang, L., & Sin, K. K. (2013). Legal translation and cultural transfer: A framework for translating the common law into Chinese in Hong Kong. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique*, 26, 883-896.