



**THOMAS WULSTAN CHRISTIANSEN**

University of Salento, Italy

*ORCID iD: 0000-0001-6858-4143*

**JOANNA RADWANOWICZ-WANCZEWSKA**

University of Bialystok, Italy

*ORCID iD: 0000-0002-2244-7546*

**NICOLA FORTUNATO**

University of Bari, Italy

## INTEGRATING GENERATIVE AI INTO LANGUAGE EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS OF LAW AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

## ABSTRACT

*This paper investigates innovative methods to inspire higher education students of language on degree or diploma courses relating to law and public administration through the strategic use of technology, particularly focusing on the transformative potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI). By exploring various technological tools and their integration into language lessons, we aim to show how educators can empower and motivate learners, preparing them for a future where AI will be ubiquitous in both work and study. We examine a wide range of digital resources using generative AI that are revolutionizing education in general and language learning in particular. We highlight the power of AI-driven platforms and chatbots in offering personalized and adaptive learning experiences, contributing to a learner-centric environment that prepares students for workplaces where humans and AI will work together. Ultimately, this paper seeks to provide language teachers working with higher education students of language on degree or diploma courses relating to law and public administration with practical insights and strategies to motivate learners by leveraging the potential of technology and AI in language education in the context of studies in law or public administration.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Generative AI, Language Education, Prompt Engineering, Learner Autonomy, Chatbots*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the rise and integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI, into nearly all aspects of human activity, including education, has been met with a mix of awe, excitement, and concern. In language teaching, AI holds significant potential to transform language learning through personalized, adaptive, and engaging activities and experiences.

Generative AI encompasses a range of techniques that create new data or content, such as images, text, audio, or video, based on the patterns and characteristics of the input data it has been trained on. This raises concerns about the difficulty in distinguishing between human-produced and AI-generated content, and the risk that, without expert oversight, generative AI could produce material that is not only fake and inaccurate but also potentially harmful to humans.

As AI continues to advance, students and other stakeholders are stepping out of their comfort zones, facing questions about the effectiveness, ethics, and both short – and long-term impacts of integrating AI into language learning. Concerns include whether AI-driven tools genuinely improve learning outcomes or if they might detract from the humanistic aspects of education. Educators are also worried about ensuring AI remains a tool for humans rather than replacing human interaction and expertise. As Grobelna (2023) observes, ChatGPT and similar systems can serve as valuable support in language education by generating teaching materials, illustrating the use of grammatical structures, or simulating conversations. However, she stresses that the effectiveness of such tools depends on the critical oversight of the teacher, who steers the interaction and safeguards the learning process against superficiality. Integrating this reflection into the discussion on the role of AI in language education in the context of studies in law or public administration seems indispensable – especially since students must be prepared both to exploit modern tools and to recognize their inherent limitations.

Despite these uncertainties, it is obvious that generative AI offers significant opportunities for language teaching. By wisely using AI-driven digital tools, educators can create dynamic learning environments tailored to the diverse needs and preferences of individual learners. Tools like adaptive tutoring systems, language learning apps, and virtual language assistants, along with future innovations, enable personalized teaching, real-time feedback, and support learning experiences in unprecedented ways.

In this article, we examine various learning scenarios designed to enhance communicative language learning using digital tools and AI within the context of courses on law and public administration. We examine how educators can leverage AI to nurture meaningful communication and improve linguistic competence among learners. By exploring different pedagogical approaches, technological innovations, and best practices, we aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the opportunities and challenges of integrating AI into language teaching.

As we navigate this evolving landscape, it becomes obvious that it is crucial to integrate AI in language teaching with caution, critical reflection, and a commitment to learner autonomy and learner-centred learning.

By embracing AI's potential while being mindful of its limitations and ethical implications, educators can discover new ways to empower learners and equip them with skills relevant to their futures as professionals in the fields of law or public administration.

## 2.0 HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS AND AI

Young people, who form the majority of those in higher education are often called *Digital Natives* (Prensky 2001) because technology has been a fundamental part of their lives for as long as they can remember, and most cannot imagine life without it. Those in higher education institutions studying subjects related to law or public administration are in the eye of the storm regarding the disruption in the workplace caused by the advent of affordable AI like Chat GPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Copilot and, lately, DeepSeek. A 2023 report by Accenture, a company specializing in IT services and consulting, found that around 40% of all working hours could be affected by AI large language models (LLMs) (*Forum Institutional* 2023). According to the World Economic Forum (2023), many clerical or secretarial roles are likely to decline rapidly due to AI, while roles for AI and machine learning specialists, data analysts and scientists, and digital transformation specialists are expected to grow quickly. Accenture concludes that reskilling people to use AI effectively will be crucial for companies to successfully implement the technology. De Cremer and Kasparov (2021) note that human and artificial intelligence capabilities are not the same, and the key to successfully leveraging AI will be integrating what it does well with what humans excel at:

The question of whether AI will replace human workers assumes that AI and humans have the same qualities and abilities – but, in reality, they don't. AI-based machines are fast, more accurate, and consistently rational, but they aren't intuitive, emotional, or culturally sensitive. And, it's exactly these abilities that humans possess and which make us effective.

Maximizing the opportunities created by this new working environment, where humans can learn to work with AI, will be essential for young people to secure good jobs in the future. This realization means that educators today have the responsibility to prepare students for this reality. This involves embracing the challenge of AI and addressing the many dilemmas it presents in a thoughtful and considered manner. It will also require a thorough investigation of both the possibilities and limitations of AI.

Generally, young people have eagerly adopted AI tools, leading to concerns among educators that students in schools and universities are using them to unfairly boost their grades through sophisticated methods that less tech-savvy academic staff may struggle to detect. The impact of widespread AI on exams and assessments has raised alarms due to the possibility of students using AI to generate work they then present as their own, thus receiving higher marks. If such cheating becomes prevalent, it could undermine the principle of merit-based advancement. In July 2023, the Vice-Chancellors of the 24 Russell Group research-intensive universities in the UK established a new code to harness AI's opportunities while safeguarding academic integrity (see Guardian 2023a). While the group also anticipated that new assessment methods would emerge to mitigate the risk of cheating, rather than banning AI chatbots outright, the guidance suggests teaching students to use AI appropriately in their studies, while making them aware of the risks of plagiarism, bias, and inaccuracies in generative AI.

Similar conclusions are drawn by Maziarz (2023), who analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of artificial intelligence in language pedagogy. She points out that AI may foster individualization and personalization of learning on the one hand, but on the other, it risks making students overly dependent on technology, thereby weakening the teacher – student relationship. Her conclusion that AI should be treated as a *cobot* – a partner supporting the teacher rather than replacing them – is particularly significant in the training of future lawyers and civil servants, where social and ethical competencies are as crucial as linguistic proficiency.

Such a pragmatic mind-set also has obvious applications outside the classroom and in the work environment, where professionals and workers may come to rely uncritically on AI or be tempted to pass work generated by AI off as their own. So the challenge of dissuading students from using AI as

a *cheat* or shortcut is something that it is not just an irritation for educators but potentially a larger problem for businesses and institutions employing must such transgressors. In the case of lawyers and public administrators (where the employer is the state itself and the whole community may suffer the consequences) the ramifications could be very serious indeed if nothing is done to make students aware of their responsibility, and coach them towards more sensible and ethical uses of AI. Activities like the ones we will suggest here, are a practical way to do this.

### 3.0 AI, AN UNRELIABLE COLLEAGUE

A key area where AI can fall short is in the quality of the information it presents. AI tools are trained over time by learning from user corrections and feedback, which is known as *learning from data* (or statistical prediction – see Minsky 1961). They are not thus designed to be truthful reporters of facts. Rather than just *imitate*, they *emulate* (see Tomasello 1996) human conversation. Often, chatbots make errors due to alignment problems, misinterpreting user queries or intentions (See Devlin *et al.* 2018). More concerningly, chatbots can produce entirely inaccurate outputs, seemingly invented on their own. For instance, in an example of the professional misconduct alluded to in §2.0, two US lawyers were fined for submitting fake court citations generated by ChatGPT 3.5. The judge noted that while using AI for legal work is not inherently improper, lawyers must ensure their filings are accurate (See Guardian, 2023b). This is one of a set of cases that set the precedent that it is legitimate to use AI for certain tasks, with the proviso that one must take legal responsibility for any adverse consequences as if one had made the mistake oneself. This principle was challenged unsuccessfully in another recent court case where Air Canada was found liable for faulty information given in 2022 to its customers by the chatbot it had installed on its site. The airline somewhat disingenuously claimed that the chatbot was accountable for its own actions, a claim dismissed by the civil-resolutions tribunal (Yagoda 2024). The lesson of such cases is that chatbots and generative tools can be very fast and useful for mundane and repetitive tasks, but they are not entirely reliable

or predictable. Therefore, human users, who are the legally responsible entities, must closely monitor their output.

Factually incorrect outputs from chatbots may seem rare, often due to the complexity of the subject, but mundane examples are common. According to Kasner and Dusek (2024) *80% of the outputs of Open LLM contain a semantic error* (i.e. contain something incorrect, not checkable, misleading, or other). Recent research has concluded that such so-called *hallucination* is inherent to large language models (LLMs) and cannot be entirely eliminated (Xu et al. 2024). Additionally, the accuracy of chatbots tends to increase with more probable or common tasks or inputs, while their output becomes less reliable with unusual tasks (McCoy et al. 2023). The unreliability of chatbot outputs is such that reputable chatbots come with warnings advising users not to unquestioningly trust everything they say.

Sometimes, chatbots can be correct but process information inappropriately. For example, unscrupulous book dealers have used chatbots to generate ebooks on platforms like Amazon. Some of these books contain advice that could be harmful, such as AI-generated guides to foraging for mushrooms, which suggested tasting to distinguish between edible and poisonous varieties (see Guardian 2023c). While this may be technically true in some cases, it is dangerous advice that even a non-expert human would recognize as problematic.

## 4.0 NEW OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY AI

The limitations of AI, as discussed in §3.0, indicate that students should not fear being excluded from the job market by cheaper, faster, and more reliable alternatives. Instead, these limitations highlight a clear path forward, where learners can prepare for 21st-century careers by developing the ability to communicate and interact with chatbots and AI tools, a skill that may become as valuable as interacting with other humans. In legal contexts and in public administration, the digitalisation of society and government, has increased exponentially the amount of data and documents that have to be processed even to deal with the simplest, most mundane legal case or administrative

procedure. AI is contributing to this problem in many ways, but it also offers a way to unburden legal practitioners or civil / public servants.

Furthermore, every technological leap in history has not only reduced the demand for certain jobs but also created entirely new roles and career opportunities. One emerging professional profile is the *prompt engineer*, a specialist in interacting with AI to perform specific tasks. Students of language, and this includes students on all kinds of degree courses where the ability to communicate is a key skill, if only in a first or native language such as law and to a degree public administration, should be encouraged to improve their communication skills and understanding of context, inference, and pragmatics. Chatbots are designed to emulate human interaction, but they lack human knowledge and cultural awareness. Communicating with a chatbot is akin to speaking with someone from a foreign country who, despite being fluent in your language, is unfamiliar with cultural conventions, contextual factors, and conversational nuances (see Grice 1974). This requires accommodation strategies and sensitivity to potential misunderstandings.

A student of whatever academic background, skilled in mediation and intercultural communication may have the foundational knowledge needed to effectively communicate with a device that lacks direct knowledge of the world, human society, or the thought processes involved in human communication.

## 5.0 THE DANGERS OF INTERACTING WITH GENERATIVE AI AND CHATBOTS

Before discussing practical ways to empower learners to interact constructively with AI in the next section (§6), we must first address some of the real dangers associated with this endeavour.

AI has the potential to harm students who use it indiscriminately to cut corners and avoid effort. This highlights the necessity of expert guidance and moderation from teachers, reassuring educators about their crucial role in future classrooms. One particularly concerning issue is the *ELIZA Effect*, named after the 1966 chatbot *ELIZA* developed by MIT's Joseph Weizenbaum. *ELIZA*, using a script called *DOCTOR*, mimicked a Rogerian psychotherapist

by reformulating users' inquiries into further questions. Despite its limited functionality, users often attributed human-like qualities to ELIZA, engaging in meaningful conversations and sharing personal information.

The ELIZA Effect arises from people's tendency to anthropomorphize non-human entities, such as pets, toys, or even basketballs (as seen in the 2000 film *Castaway*). In the context of AI chatbots, this effect is particularly dangerous because chatbots can fuel such make-believe, leading to delusion and irrational behaviour. For instance, to cite just one tragic case, in 2024, a teenage boy in Florida shot himself in the head after discussing suicide with an AI chatbot that he fell in love with (New York Times 2024). However, AI companies, aware of negative public opinion and wary of a political backlash, have been taking steps enhance the ethics and responsibility of their chatbots and AI systems through various means such as: establishing clear ethics guidelines covering fairness, transparency, privacy, accountability, and safety. They are also committed to bias mitigation techniques like careful data selection and robust algorithm development as well as to building diverse teams to incorporate various perspectives, and thus mitigate biases and ethical concerns. Furthermore, they are responding to calls from experts for greater transparency by explaining AI decisions, using techniques like explainable AI (XAI). Users are also being empowered through controls for responsible interaction, such as opt-in/opt-out mechanisms.

Reputable AI companies are also continuously monitoring and evaluating AI systems to address ethical issues post-deployment. There is also a growing awareness that stakeholders should also be involved in development to gather feedback and collaborate on responsible AI practices. Lastly, governments are also calling for AI companies to coordinate and self-regulate, with the threat of new legislation limiting their activities if they do not. Because of this companies like OpenAI, which saw its ChatGPT briefly banned in Italy (March 2023), have to ensure that they comply with regulations related to data protection, consumer rights, and industry standards. The fear remains however that less reputable actors, unscrupulous and greedy influencers, rogue states, or nefarious forces on the dark web may develop AI systems that do not incarnate such a philosophy and purposely do not incorporate such safeguards. This is a risk that cannot be mitigated in the classroom,

but it makes it even more important that students, as citizens, are familiar with AI and the dangers that it can pose.

In a novel approach, and one which is of particular relevance to students on courses related to law or public administration, Anthropic, a small AI company, has innovatively developed Constitutional AI ([www.constitutional.ai](http://www.constitutional.ai)), a system that aligns its behaviour with a *constitution* grounded in human principles like harm avoidance, respect for preferences, and truthfulness. This system, it is claimed, leverages self-supervision and adversarial training to learn these principles without direct human oversight.

## 6.0 PRACTICAL WAYS FOR EMPOWERING LEARNERS WITH AI TOOLS

The key to using chatbots effectively is learning how to write prompts and get them to perform increasingly complex tasks satisfactorily. This is not as easy as it may seem, because although chatbots can communicate naturally, they can misunderstand and fail to grasp the user's intention. For example, when one human asks another, *Do you know the time?* they expect the current time, not an assertion about awareness of the time. Significant progress has been made in Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Natural Language Inference (NLI), reducing alignment problems (see Khurana et al. 2023). However, as mentioned in §5.0, it is still impossible to predict every indirect speech act (Searle 1975) or instil a chatbot with a completely reliable sense of conversational implicature (Grice 1974) or relevance (Sperber and Wilson 1986).

Prompting is a skill best learned through experience and trial and error, achieved by giving learners tasks to complete using a chatbot. Writing effective prompts requires clarity and specificity, using relevant keywords, providing context, using accurate language and punctuation, and reviewing chatbot output to refine prompts for satisfactory results.

For instance, students can be instructed to ask a chatbot (e.g., ChatGPT 3.5, Google Gemini, or Bing) to answer an essay question using a simple prompt such as:

**Example 1.** *Prompt 1 for writing task with Chatbot*

You work in the Podlaskie Voivodeship Office in Białystok dealing in register for temporary residence permit (for foreigners). A colleague from another EU country is coming on an exchange visit. Write them an email arranging a meeting at 9.00 am on the morning after their arrival. Mention:

The location of your office and how they can get to it.

Give a brief outline of the activities that you have lined up for the morning. Write between 100-150 words.

The prompt in Example 1 is simply cut and paste from an exam task. The chatbot in question is incredibly fast and linguistically accurate but will not produce a satisfactory answer the first time:

**Example 2.** *Microsoft Copilot essay output 1*

Subject: Meeting at the Podlaskie Voivodeship Office – Visit Schedule

Dear [Colleague's Name],

I hope your journey to Białystok goes smoothly. I would like to meet you at 9:00 a.m. on the morning after your arrival at the Podlaskie Voivodeship Office, ul. Mickiewicza 3, Białystok. You can take bus lines 2, 3, or 19 from the Kościuszko Square stop in the city centre; the buses run every 10–15 minutes and the stop is right in front of our building.

During the morning, we will begin with a short tour of the office, followed by a presentation of our work on temporary residence permits for foreigners. Afterwards, there will be time for discussion and questions.

Looking forward to meeting you soon.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

Podlaskie Voivodeship Office, Białystok

The answer given in Example 2 is certainly adequate: it contains the information it was prompted to provide and is the relevant length (about 110 words). In addition, the style is generally appropriately neutral and professional while being clear and concise. It could however be improved and it is an interesting

exercises for students either individually, or in groups, to analyse it to see where improvements could be made.

To our minds, the email is, on the whole, good. The register is mostly appropriate and it does include a timetable for the morning so that the recipient has an idea of what they will be doing, when, and what time they will be free. Turning to the negative points, the exclamation marks after the phrases *Welcome to Białystok!* and *Looking forward to meeting you!* may come across as a bit over-excited and juvenile. *Welcome to Białystok* is also a bit premature seeing that the addressee has not arrived yet. Perhaps the chatbot has misunderstood the that part of the prompt which states *Write them an email arranging a meeting at 9.00 am on the morning after their arrival* thinking that the email should be written on the morning after the guest's arrival. It is of course a meeting on the morning after his or her arrival that is being arranged, and as most people would know, to send details about a meeting only at 9.00 am, at the same time as this event that is planned is supposed to start is not very practical would inconvenience the guest greatly, and create a very bad impression of the hosts. This email is good in that it does contain specific details about the number of the bus but the indications to take one from the city centre is somewhat vague. As an afterthought, some idea of frequency of the buses would also be helpful. Consequently, we can try to write a prompt that will instruct the chatbot to make these changes:

**Example 3.** *Prompt 2 for writing task with Chatbot*

Modify that email. Do not start with *Welcome to Białystok!*. Remove the exclamation marks from *Looking forward to meeting you soon!* Indicate where in the centre the addressee can catch the bus and give them some idea of how often the buses run.

**Example 4.** *Microsoft Copilot essay output 1*

This produces the following output:

Subject: Meeting at the Podlaskie Voivodeship Office – Visit Schedule

Dear [Colleague's Name],

I hope your journey to Białystok goes smoothly. I would like to meet you at 9:00 a.m. on the morning after your arrival at the Podlaskie Voivodeship Office, ul. Mickiewicza 3, Białystok. You can take bus lines 2, 3, or 19 from the Kościuszko Square stop in the city centre; the buses run every 10–15 minutes and the stop is right in front of our building.

During the morning, we will begin with a short tour of the office, followed by a presentation of our work on temporary residence permits for foreigners. Afterwards, there will be time for discussion and questions.

Looking forward to meeting you soon.

Best regards,  
[Your Name]  
Podlaskie Voivodeship Office, Białystok

The email has been improved although the agenda given is far from ideal. This could be finally-tuned through further prompts. We will not illustrate this whole process here but suffice to note that good practice such prompting gives students not only in analysing texts but also in thinking about the perlocutionary effects (Austin 1962) that they will have on addressees.

Such a simple exercise teaches learners several things. Regarding AI, it shows that chatbots are fast and accurate, producing language rich in vocabulary. However, general chatbots like Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, Google Gemini or DeepSeek designed for a wide range of tasks, may not know the appropriate language or register for a specific writing task without precise instructions. It also demonstrates that chatbots work best under human supervision, where their output is reviewed and improved through step-by-step prompts. Regarding linguistic competence, although learners' output (i.e., prompts) is less than the chatbot's, their contribution is significant. By learning to prompt chatbots, learners reflect on the linguistic output (especially register and style), indirectly coaching themselves. Finally, in terms of motivation,

learning to interact with and manage a chatbot boosts learners' confidence in using AI and motivates them to explore its wider potential constructively.

## **7.0 USING AI TO INCREASE LEARNER AUTONOMY**

Learner autonomy is central to the communicative approach to language learning, emphasizing the need for learners to take control of their learning process, nurturing independence, self-regulation, and motivation. By taking responsibility for their learning, learners actively engage in setting goals, selecting materials, and monitoring their progress, enhancing their language proficiency. These are of course useful attributes of students outside language learning too and ambitious students preparing to work in law or public administration must equally develop a degrees of professional autonomy and independence.

As noted, there is a risk that AI could make students lazy or apathetic. Some argue that generative AI might make learning additional languages unnecessary in the future—a view expressed by Ostler (2010, p. 261) when AI was less advanced. Christiansen (2015, pp. 150-151) disagrees with Ostler, doubting that people will delegate communication to digital devices as readily as they did with calculators. He counters that, even if technologically possible, it is doubtful that humans will want to rely on digital devices for communication. People value direct, real-time communication to perform various speech acts (see Austin 1962), which often depend on using their own skills to establish relationships.

A notable advantage of AI in terms of language learning is that it will generate material for learners to read and listen to, which they have requested, motivating them to process and react authentically. In Table 1, we summarize activities students learning languages in the context of degree or diploma courses in matters related to law or public administration can engage in with general chatbots like Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, Google Gemini, DeepSeek, and specific ones.

**Table 1.** *Examples of Activities and Relevant Prompts for students learning languages in the context of degree or diploma courses in matters related to law or public administration*

| Skill                                   | Method                                                                                                                                  | Example prompt                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Correction prompt (optional)**                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Topic oriented chat*                    | Holding a short conversation on a specific topic related to Law or Public Administration with a chatbot.                                | <i>Ask me some questions about my job, my typical working day and what my duties are.</i>                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Roleplay*                               | Holding a short conversation with a chatbot, based on a given scenario, specifying different roles for the user and the chatbot.        | <i>Imagine that you are a foreigner living in Białystok and I work in the town hall. Let's have a conversation. Write short answers to my questions. First question: "How may I help you?"</i>                                                                               | <b>Immediate:</b><br><br><i>Point out any errors that I make. Give me suggestions how to improve my English.</i>                                                                            |
| Roleplay interviews*                    | Holding a longer conversation with a chatbot based on a scenario where the user is say a journalist working for a magazine for lawyers. | <i>Let's pretend you are Didier Reynders the EU commissioner for Justice and a journalist and I am going to interview you. You answer as if you were Didier Reynders.</i>                                                                                                    | <b>Delayed (after activity has finished):</b><br><br><i>Point out any errors that I have made in the conversation that we have just had. Give me suggestions how to improve my English.</i> |
| Free chat*                              | Holding a short open conversation with a chatbot, written or spoken.                                                                    | <i>Let's chat in English. Ask me some questions about Public Administration in Poland. I will reply.</i>                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Describing tables / figures / graph* ** | Using a AI image generator to generate tables / figures / diagrams                                                                      | <i>Generate an image matching this description: "In the last year, the number of traffic accidents at the intersection of Legionowa and Marii Skłodowskiej-Curie have gone up by 15%. In January the figure was 7 accidents, while in February the figure rose to 12..."</i> |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Writing tasks                           | Inserting a text written by oneself and asking chatbot to provide feedback                                                              | <i>Correct the English in this text: "I hope this email find you well. I am excited to welcome you to Białystok. We have arrange a meeting at our office at 9:00 am on the morning after your arrival."</i>                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                             |

\*Written (as in a Direct Messaging context) or Spoken using a microphone and speech to text function of the chatbot.

\*\* Special dedicated bots can be used, which require no special prompts, e.g. DALL·E 3 (images, graphics – included with ChatGPT Plus) GenCraft; Canva.

The activities in Table 1 can be elaborated in various ways. For example, a role-play interview can become an integrated skills activity, with the learner using the dialogue for a magazine article. Different learners could interview different chatbots (e.g., ChatGPT 3.5, Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini, DeepSeek) pretending to be the same person, comparing the outputs to find

differences, reminding learners of chatbot fallibility and encouraging verification. Alternatively, learners could interview a chatbot roleplaying a historical figure, for example, James Madison the architect of the US constitution and government, asking *what if* questions, and then verify the answers through research. This highlights the unreliable nature of chatbot accuracy but still offers a novel, interactive way of researching, encouraging learners to seek information actively.

This approach emphasizes the advantages of chatbots over traditional written media, as chatbots respond to user-directed inquiries, similar to having a personal guide in a museum compared to using a guidebook or audio guide.

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

It is too early to definitively assess AI's impact on learning scenarios, as the field is still developing. Regardless of scepticism or concerns, the AI revolution is underway and here to stay, making it essential for students to familiarize themselves with and master it. This is even more true for students on courses related to law and public administration as these will be areas where AI may be most rapidly adopted.

To succeed in this transformative period in education and work, learners and educators in all corners of academia must be wary of AI but also view it as an opportunity rather than a threat. Students, in this case future legal workers and public administration staff need to understand both their own limitations and those of AI to effectively use both in combination, maximizing their productivity and capabilities.

When used wisely and creatively, AI has the potential to provide students with an endless supply of exercises, materials, and courses tailored to their individual needs, enhancing their autonomy – whether this be related to language learning or to training for their chosen careers. Ultimately, the existence of AI within and outside the classroom will require rethinking traditional roles of teachers and students and the concept of communication in a world where language use extends to machines.

In a broader perspective, the report by the Educational Research Institute (Fazlagić, 2022) presents artificial intelligence as a megatrend shaping both education and the labor market. The authors emphasize that AI is gradually permeating various areas of education – from automating bureaucratic tasks to developing adaptive learning systems. They also highlight the necessity of fostering digital skills and critical thinking as the foundation for preparing students for the Industry 4.0 economy. In the context of legal and administrative studies, this means that integrating AI into language pedagogy is not merely a matter of innovation, but rather part of a broader educational strategy aimed at equipping graduates for work in a digitalized state.

Motivation will be crucial. Educators must embrace the challenge and guide their students through this complex and uncertain transition, making it exciting and full of promise.

## REFERENCES

- Austin, John, L. *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1962.
- Benson, Phil. *Teaching and Researching Autonomy in Language Learning* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited. 2011.
- Christiansen, Thomas. *The rise of English as the global lingua franca. Is the world heading towards greater monolingualism or new forms of plurilingualism?* *Lingue e Linguaggi* 15. 2015, pp. 129-154.
- De Cremer, David / Kasparov, Gary. *AI Should Augment Human Intelligence, Not Replace It*, *Harvard Business Review*, 18 March, 2021. Published online at: [https://hbr.org/2021/03/ai-should-augment-human-intelligence-not-replace-it?utm\\_source=thenewstack&utm\\_medium=website&utm\\_content=inline-mention&utm\\_campaign=platform](https://hbr.org/2021/03/ai-should-augment-human-intelligence-not-replace-it?utm_source=thenewstack&utm_medium=website&utm_content=inline-mention&utm_campaign=platform)
- Devin, Jacob / Chang, Ming-Wei / Lee, Kenton / Toutanova, Kristina. *BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding* 2018, arXiv:1810.04805, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1810.04805>
- Fazlagić, Jan. *Wprowadzenie*. In Fazlagić, Jan (ed.) *Sztuczna inteligencja (AI) jako megatrend kształtujący edukację. Jak przygotowywać się na szanse i wyzwania społeczno-gospodarcze związane ze sztuczną inteligencją?*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Edukacyjnych, 2022.
- Forum Institutional *These are the jobs most likely to be lost – and created – because of AI*, *Forum Institutional*, 04/05/2023: [www.weforum.org/stories/2023/05/jobs-lost-created-ai-gpt/](http://www.weforum.org/stories/2023/05/jobs-lost-created-ai-gpt/)
- Grice, H. Paul *Logic and Conversation*. In Cole, Peter / Morgan, Jerry L. (eds) *Syntax and Semantics Vol 3* (Speech Acts). New York, NY: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41-58.
- Grobelna, Barbara. *Sztuczna inteligencja w nauczaniu języka angielskiego. ChatGPT jako narzędzie wspomagające oraz inteligentna pomoc w edukacji językowej*, *Języki Obce w Szkole*, No. 2, 2023, pp. 87-93: <https://doi.org/10.47050/jows.2023.2.87-93>
- The Guardian 2023a. *UK universities draw up guiding principles on generative AI*, *The Guardian*, 04/07/23: [www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jul/04/uk-universities-draw-up-guiding-principles-on-generative-ai](http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jul/04/uk-universities-draw-up-guiding-principles-on-generative-ai)
- The Guardian, 2023b. *Two US lawyers fined for submitting fake court citations from ChatGPT*, *The Guardian*, 23/06/23: [www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/23/two-us-lawyers-fined-submitting-fake-court-citations-chatgpt](http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/23/two-us-lawyers-fined-submitting-fake-court-citations-chatgpt)
- The Guardian, 2023c. *Mushroom pickers urged to avoid foraging books on Amazon that appear to be written by AI*, *The Guardian* 01/09/2023: [www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/sep/01/mushroom-pickers-urged-to-avoid-foraging-books-on-amazon-that-appear-to-be-written-by-ai](http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/sep/01/mushroom-pickers-urged-to-avoid-foraging-books-on-amazon-that-appear-to-be-written-by-ai)
- Holec, Henri. *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1981.
- Khurana, Diksha/ Koli, Aditya/ Khatter, Kiran / Singh, Sukhdev. *Natural language processing: state of the art, current trends and challenges*. *Multimed Tools Appl* 82, 2023, pp. 3713–3744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-13428-4>

- Kasner, Zdeněk / Dusek Ondrej, *Beyond Traditional Benchmarks: Analyzing Behaviors of Open LLMs on Data-to-Text Generation* In Eds. Lun-Wei, Ku / Martins, Andre / Srikumar, Vivek *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Volume 1: Long Papers), Bangkok, Thailand: Association for Computational Linguistics: pp. 12045–12072: <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.651/>
- Maziarz, Magdalena. *Sztuczna inteligencja w dydaktyce języków obcych (perspektywa interdyscyplinarna)*, *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis* No 4172, *Studia Linguistica XLII*, Wrocław 2023, pp. 59-73, <https://doi.org/10.19195/0137-1169.42.3>
- McCoy, Thomas R. / Yao, Shunyu / Friedman, Dan / Hardy, Matthew / Griffiths, Thomas L. *Embers of Autoregression: Understanding Large Language Models Through the Problem They are Trained to Solve*. 2023, arXiv:2309.13638v1. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.13638>
- Minsky, Marvin. *Steps Toward Artificial Intelligence*, in *Proceedings of the IRE*, Vol. 49, No. 1, 1961, pp. 8 – 30
- The New York Times, 2024 *Can A.I. Be Blamed for a Teen's Suicide? The New York Times* 23/10/2024: [www.nytimes.com/2024/10/23/technology/characterai-lawsuit-teen-suicide.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2024/10/23/technology/characterai-lawsuit-teen-suicide.html)
- Ostler, Nicholas. *The Last Lingua Franca: English until the Return of Babel*. London: Penguin. 2010.
- Prensky, Marc. *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants, On the Horizon*. Vol. 9, Issue 5, 2001, pp. 1-6
- Searle, John R. *Indirect speech acts*. In Cole, Peter / Morgan, Jerry L. (eds) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 59-82.
- Sperber, Dan / Wilson, Dierdre. *Relevance, Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1986.
- Tomasello, Michael. *Do apes ape?* In Heyes, Celia M. / Galef, Bennett G., Jr. (eds.). *Social learning in animals: The roots of culture*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press Inc, 1996, pp. 319-346.
- Weizenbaum, Joseph. *ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine* *Communications of the ACM* (Association for Computing Machinery), Vol. 9.1, 1966, pp 36–45 <https://doi.org/10.1145/365153.365168>
- World Economic Forum, *Future of Jobs* Report, 2023, Insights Report, Cologny/Geneva: [https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_Future\\_of\\_Jobs\\_2023.pdf](https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2023.pdf). 2023
- Xu, Ziwei / Jain, Sanjay / Kankanhalli, Mohan. *Hallucination is Inevitable: An Innate Limitation of Large Language Models*. 2024, arXiv:2401.11817v1. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.11817>
- Yugoda, Maria. 2024. *Airline held liable for its chatbot giving passenger bad advice – what this means for travellers* BBC News Online 23 February 2024: <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>