

Redefining Legal Pedagogy: Integrating AI Tools Without Undermining Human Judgment

Shibanee Acharya¹, Ashish Kumar Mishra², Omkar Acharya³

¹Department Research Fellow, PG Department of Law, Fakir Mohan University, Balasore – 756019, Odisha, India

²Advocate, Orissa High Court

³LL.M. Student, PG Department of Law, Fakir Mohan University, Balasore – 756019, Odisha, India

Abstract

There is a growing need to analyze the traditional legal pedagogy due to the increasingly emergence of artificial intelligence into legal research, analysis and education at large. This study explores the incorporation of various tools into the legal education system in enhancing learning while on the verge of preserving and nurturing the essential human skills such as ethical reasoning, critical thinking, and professional judgment. The study further examines upon the existing tension between the structured technology and the expansion of human-centric legal suitability, arguing that legal education must evolve to maintain the balance between the two domains. While combining legal theory alongside educational psychology and technological ethics, the research investigates a multidisciplinary framework upon current legal practices across various schools where AI integration is gaining momentum. This estimates how various tools like legal chatbots, predictive analytics, and AI-powered research engines determine student learning outcomes, classroom dynamics, and the legal perception reasoning. The study employs qualitative methods, including interviews with law faculty and students, alongside case studies of institutions that have piloted AI-enhanced curricula. Various studies reveal that Artificial intelligence make it easier to find legal materials and speed up processes, but relying too much on them might make legal decisions less creative, less analytical, and less morally responsible. The study recommends a concept of "augmented legal pedagogy" that merges AI technology with human-centred teaching techniques to assemble the legal profession to meet the future needs and ensure it to be more ethical by nature. Hence, to conclude, it is suggested to educators, institutions and regulators to ensure that legal training procedure stays up-to-date with the technology and is still essentially human in the age of AI.

Keywords: Pedagogy, Technology, Momentum, Artificial, Structured

1. INTRODUCTION

Legal pedagogy has undergone significant transformation, evolving from ancient, theory-heavy instruction to more practice-oriented, interdisciplinary, and globally responsive models. This shift reflects broader social, technological, and philosophical changes, as well as the ongoing tension between doctrinal knowledge and practical skills in legal education. Legal education traces its roots to ancient civilizations, where legal knowledge was transmitted through apprenticeship and oral traditions in Greece, and later

formalized in Roman institutions, laying the groundwork for Western legal culture.¹ The Middle Ages saw the rise of university-based legal education in Europe, with a divide between the practical, oral training of English Inns of Court and the theoretical, codified approach of Continental universities—though recent research highlights more similarities than previously assumed.

The 19th and 20th centuries introduced the case method and doctrinal teaching, emphasizing "thinking like a lawyer" through Socratic dialogue and analysis of judicial opinions. However, this approach often neglected practical skills and ethical considerations. The late 20th century saw the emergence of clinical legal education, integrating experiential learning and community engagement, and challenging the dominance of abstract reasoning.

Modern legal pedagogy increasingly incorporates digital technologies, interdisciplinary content, and critical pedagogy, especially in response to globalization and the need for practice-ready graduates.² Efforts to decolonize legal education and include indigenous and local knowledge are gaining traction, particularly in the Global South. There is also a growing emphasis on legal socialization, argumentation, and the integration of historical and philosophical perspectives.³

Objectives, Scope, and Significance of the Study

The study aims to-

- identify and analyze the challenges and ethical concerns of AI over-reliance in legal education and practice;
- evaluate the impact of AI on legal skills, fairness, and accountability; and
- propose strategies for responsible AI integration.

The research covers the use of AI in legal education and practice, focusing on ethical, technical, and regulatory dimensions, and includes case studies and comparative analyses across jurisdictions.⁴

By highlighting both the opportunities and risks of AI, the study provides actionable recommendations for educators, policymakers, and legal professionals to ensure that AI enhances rather than undermines justice, professional integrity, and the development of essential legal skills.⁵

Rise of Digital Learning Tools in Legal Education

Legal education is rapidly embracing digital learning tools such as online courses, e-books, legal databases, virtual simulations, and interactive platforms. These innovations increase accessibility, flexibility, and engagement, allowing for immersive and interactive learning experiences that better

¹ Orga-Dumitriu, G. (2025). Legal Education - History, Methods and Paradigms: the Contribution of Antiquity. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*.

² Chaturvedi, N., & Vig, K. (2024). Beyond black-letter law: bridging theory and practice in legal education. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*.

³ Orel, V. (2025). Legal Argumentation in the Process of Studying Disciplines of Legal History: Innovative Approaches in the Training of Future Lawyers in the Context of Legal Education Reform. *Visnik Nacional'noho universitetu «Lvivska politehnika»*. *Seria: Uridicni nauki*.

⁴ Kim, S., Yi, S., & Park, S. (2025). Prioritizing challenges in AI adoption for the legal domain: A systematic review and expert-driven AHP analysis. *PLOS One*, 20.

⁵ G, A., & Nair, V. (2024). Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges. *Law, Technology and Humans*.

prepare students for the demands of modern legal practice.⁶ However, challenges remain, including digital literacy gaps, unequal access, and the need for pedagogical adaptation.

Emergence of AI in Academia and Legal Professions

AI is transforming both legal academia and the profession. In education, AI-powered tools provide personalized learning, automate assessments, and offer intelligent tutoring and simulations, bridging the gap between theory and practice. In legal practice, AI enhances research, document review, case prediction, and contract analysis, making legal work more efficient and data-driven.⁷ The adoption of large language models (LLMs) and generative AI is accelerating, with applications ranging from legal writing support to advanced legal analytics.

Rationale for Integrating AI in Law Teaching

- **Future-readiness:** Prepares students for a tech-driven legal market where AI proficiency is increasingly required.
- **Personalized and Experiential Learning:** AI enables adaptive instruction, real-time feedback, and practical simulations, enhancing critical thinking and practical skills.
- **Bridging Theory and Practice:** AI tools help close the gap between doctrinal knowledge and real-world application, making legal education more relevant.
- **Ethical and Analytical Skills:** Teaching AI literacy and ethics ensures students can responsibly leverage technology and address its limitations.

Challenges and Concerns Regarding Over-Reliance on AI

AI systems can perpetuate or amplify existing biases present in training data, leading to discriminatory outcomes in legal decisions. Notable cases, such as the COMPAS software in the US, have demonstrated racial bias in risk assessments, raising concerns about fairness and equity in judicial processes.⁸ Many AI algorithms operate as "black boxes," making it difficult to understand or challenge their decision-making processes. This lack of transparency undermines accountability and erodes trust in legal outcomes.⁹

AI systems require access to large volumes of sensitive legal data, increasing the risk of data breaches and unauthorized disclosures, which can compromise client confidentiality and legal integrity. Excessive dependence on AI tools may diminish students' critical thinking, legal reasoning, and ethical judgment, as they may rely on AI-generated outputs without sufficient scrutiny. The absence of clear legal frameworks for AI use in law complicates questions of liability and compliance, especially when AI-driven errors occur.

⁶ Gujjeti, P., & Pal, A. (2024). Innovative Integration of Digital Content in Legal Education. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT)*.

⁷ G, A., & Nair, V. (2024). Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges. *Law, Technology and Humans*.

⁸ Zafar, A. (2024). Balancing the scale: navigating ethical and practical challenges of artificial intelligence (AI) integration in legal practices. *Discov. Artif. Intell.*, 4, 27.

⁹ Madaoui, N. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Systems: Challenges and Opportunities. *Problems of legality*.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

AI is reshaping legal education and legal systems, but most scholarship stresses that human judgment, legal reasoning, and ethics must remain central.

- **Bahroun Z., et al (2023)¹⁰** A broader review of AI in education finds that AI supports automated assessment, adaptive content, and intelligent tutoring, but must be governed by guardrails to prevent abuse and safeguard academic integrity. Generative AI reviews similarly highlight opportunities in assessment, feedback and writing support, while warning of plagiarism, systematic errors, bias and fairness concerns that require explicit redesign of assessment and pedagogy, not just tool deployment. Conceptual models such as the AI-TEACH framework emphasize transformative learning, ethical AI practices, collaborative environments, and holistic development as design principles to keep human goals foregrounded.
- **Tubella A., et al (2023)¹¹** Human-centered AI frameworks for higher education stress AI augmentation with continuous human oversight, ethical checkpoints, and user control, as a way to improve efficiency without compromising rigor or academic standards. Critical and creative AI/data literacy pedagogies propose co-designed, reflective learning spaces where students interrogate power, bias, and data justice, using AI tools both as content and as an object of critique. Responsible-AI teaching in higher education similarly calls for transdisciplinary curricula that integrate ethics, law and technical understanding to support “Trustworthy AI” rather than tool-centric skill training.
- **Alsaeed K., et al (2024)¹²** In domains with strong relational and normative dimensions religious education and healthcare—scholars converge that AI can aid personalization and decision support but must not replace relational, value-laden judgment; instead, education should train professionals to understand, question, and ethically govern AI outputs.
- **Nouri, Z., et al (2024)¹³** Teaching should include interrogation of training data, bias, fairness, and institutional deployment of legal AI (e.g., predictive justice, risk tools). Frameworks that embed human oversight, accountability, and data protection into workflows help preserve trust and align AI with legal values.
- **Vargas-Murillo., et al (2024)¹⁴** Reviews of AI in justice systems and predictive justice stress that AI can improve efficiency, consistency, and access, yet risks dehumanization, opacity, bias, and threats to independence and impartiality of adjudication. Work on AI in advocacy practice shows similar tensions: AI enhances research, drafting and outcome prediction, but may erode independence and critical thinking without updated ethical codes and clear accountability frameworks. These findings

¹⁰ Bahroun, Z., Anane, C., Ahmed, V., & Zacca, A. (2023). Transforming Education: A Comprehensive Review of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Educational Settings through Bibliometric and Content Analysis. *Sustainability*.

¹¹ Tubella, A., Mora-Cantalops, M., & Nieves, J. (2023). How to teach responsible AI in Higher Education: challenges and opportunities. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26, 1-14.

¹² Alsaeed, K., Almutairi, M., Almutairi, S., Nawmasi, M., Alharby, N., Alharbi, M., Alazzmi, M., Alsaman, A., Alenazy, F., & Alfalaj, F. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics in Nursing Care: Advancing Decision-Making through Health Information Technology. *Journal of Ecohumanism*.

¹³ Nouri, Z., Salah, W., & Omrane, N. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Administrative Justice: An Analysis of Predictive Justice in France. *Hasanuddin Law Review*.

¹⁴ Vargas-Murillo, A., De La Asuncion Pari-Bedoya, I., Turriate-Guzmán, A., Delgado-Chávez, C., & Sanchez-Paucar, F. (2024). Transforming Justice: Implications of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Systems. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*.

underscore that legal education should prepare students to treat AI as decision-support, not decision-maker, and to interrogate data, models and institutional uses of predictive tools.

- **Darmawan, A., & Soesatyo, B. (2025)¹⁵** AI should handle routine research, feedback and simulation, freeing humans to focus on interpretation, judgment and ethics. Over-reliance on AI risks weakening legal reasoning and professional responsibility; curricula must foreground doctrinal analysis, argumentation, and ethical reflection alongside AI use.
- **Vagyan, D. (2025)¹⁶** In higher legal education, AI is used for personalized learning paths, intelligent grading, and immersive simulations (e.g., moot courts in VR/AR), enhancing engagement and practical skills while raising concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, and over-reliance on automation. A study focused on Indian legal pedagogy argues that AI, VR/AR and adaptive platforms can strengthen critical thinking, statutory interpretation and argumentation if embedded in structured, case-based curricula rather than as shortcuts to answers.

3. EVOLUTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL EDUCATION

AI's journey in law began with early expert systems in the 1980s, advancing to machine learning and, more recently, to large language models (LLMs) and generative AI. Key milestones include the adoption of NLP for legal document analysis, the rise of predictive analytics for case outcomes, and the integration of AI-powered legal research engines. The last decade has seen a surge in scholarly work and practical applications, with LLMs like GPT and specialized models significantly improving legal research, contract review, and case prediction.¹⁷

AI tools streamline legal research, citation, and information extraction, making research more efficient and accessible. Generative AI assists in drafting legal documents, arguments, and summaries, helping students develop practical writing skills.¹⁸ AI-driven simulations and virtual courtrooms provide experiential learning, bridging theory and practice.

Law schools like Yale and Georgetown offer AI-focused courses, integrate AI into research, and allow controlled use of generative AI in assignments. China emphasizes on interdisciplinary “law +” models, cross-college collaboration, and development of Chinese-specific legal LLMs (e.g., Lawformer, DeepLegal-CN).¹⁹ Europe & Australia recognises adoption of blended learning, AI literacy programs, and integration of AI in legal clinics and moot courts. Increasing focus on AI ethics, responsible use, and curriculum reform to ensure students are prepared for AI-driven legal practice.

¹⁵ Darmawan, A., & Soesatyo, B. (2025). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Utilization on Advocacy Practices and Professional Ethics in the Legal Field. *Devotion : Journal of Research and Community Service*.

¹⁶ Vagyan, D. (2025). Redefining Indian Legal Pedagogy to Enhance Critical Thinking in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*.

¹⁷ Siino, M., Falco, M., Croce, D., & Rosso, P. (2025). Exploring LLMs Applications in Law: A Literature Review on Current Legal NLP Approaches. *IEEE Access*, 13, 18253-18276.

¹⁸ Gutowski, N., & Hurley, J. (2023). AI in Legal Education: Drafting Policies for Balancing Innovation and Integrity. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

¹⁹ Guo, S. (2025). DeepLegal-CN: Research and Application of a DeepSeek-Based Large Language Model for the Legal Domain. *2025 IEEE 7th International Conference on Communications, Information System and Computer Engineering (CISCE)*, 944-947.

AI's evolution in legal education is marked by rapid technological advances, diverse applications, and global efforts to integrate these tools responsibly. Law schools worldwide are adapting curricula and pedagogy to prepare future lawyers for an AI-augmented legal landscape.

Benefits of Integrating AI in Legal Pedagogy

AI integration in law schools can enhance access, efficiency and skills development while supporting, not replacing, human teaching and judgment. Key Benefit Areas include-

- **Accessibility and Efficiency in Legal Learning-** AI research tools and analytics speed up case law search, e-discovery, and drafting, allowing students to focus on higher-order reasoning. AI-enabled digital/virtual libraries and chatbots make legal resources more widely accessible and navigable, including asynchronously and remotely. Flipped courses show AI helps students prepare more efficiently and sustain independent learning.²⁰
- **Research, Drafting, Citation, Academic Writing-** AI-assisted platforms improve legal research accuracy and speed, producing better-targeted authorities and arguments. Machine-learning formative feedback systems significantly improve the structure and persuasiveness of students' legal writing and exam performance, while boosting self-efficacy and self-regulated learning.²¹ Generative tools and AI language support reduce drafting barriers and help non-native English speakers produce clearer academic and legal texts, when used under integrity guidelines.
- **Personalized and Adaptive Learning-** AI-powered personalized learning systems tailor materials, pacing, and practice to individual weaknesses and styles, increasing engagement and practical readiness. Adaptive systems in international law courses improved measured performance and employability, suggesting more efficient use of teaching resources. AI-driven ESP/Legal English tools give targeted vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation support.²²
- **Gamification, Simulations, and Experiential Learning-** AI-based moot courts, virtual clinics, and scenario-based games increase motivation, knowledge retention, and application of legal rules compared with traditional lectures. Reviews of gamification in legal studies show robust gains in engagement, comprehension, and skill retention, especially for complex, practice-oriented task.²³
- **Support for Teachers: Design, Feedback, Assessment-** AI assists in curriculum modernization (e.g., AI-law modules, legal tech courses) and provides data-driven insight into where students struggle, informing redesign of materials and assessments. Automated or semi-automated feedback and grading scale formative assessment to large cohorts without fully automating teacher judgment. Institutional AI "hubs" and policies help staff experiment safely and align AI use with pedagogy and ethics.²⁴

²⁰ Hyttinen, M., & Isomöttönen, V. (2025). Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Support Students' Independent Learning in Flipped Law Courses. *International Journal of Technology in Education*.

²¹ Weber, F., Wambsganss, T., & Söllner, M. (2024). Enhancing legal writing skills: The impact of formative feedback in a hybrid intelligence learning environment. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 56, 650-677.

²² G, A., & Nair, V. (2024). Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges. *Law, Technology and Humans*. <https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.3640>.

²³ Farber, S. (2024). Harmonizing AI and human instruction in legal education: a case study from Israel on training future legal professionals. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 31, 349 - 363.

²⁴ Ignjatović, G. (2025). AI technologies in legal education: Milestones and signposts for AI integration. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta Nis*. <https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpf1-56986>.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR LEGAL PEDAGOGY AND AI INTEGRATION

A coherent framework links traditional legal methods, the centrality of critical thinking, and modern learning theories that justify AI-enhanced pedagogy.

Modern law schools combine lecture, Socratic dialogue, case method, problem-based learning, and clinical/experiential models. The Saudi case shows overreliance on lectures produces doctrinal knowledge but weak critical thinking and practice-readiness, leading authors to advocate a mixed model.²⁵ The case method asks students to extract principles from appellate decisions, usually via Socratic questioning, to “learn to think like a lawyer”. Experiential learning clinics, moot courts, simulations, internships develops reasoning, problem-solving and professional skills in authentic contexts.

Critical thinking is framed as a central or ultimate goal of academic legal education, involving analysis, evaluation and reflective judgment rather than rote application. Studies of legal and digital tools show that technology-enhanced simulations and online activities can significantly improve law students’ critical thinking compared to traditional methods, if designed to trigger reasoning and reflection, not passive consumption. Legal systems that emphasize only theoretical knowledge (e.g., Vietnam, Saudi Arabia) under-develop adaptive, critical capacities for unpredictable practice contexts.²⁶

Constructivist theory underpins AI-enabled “court debate” courses: virtual courts, collaborative platforms and intelligent assistants create rich contexts where students must autonomously analyze, reason and argue, while AI offers “limited intelligent assistance” aligned with “guiding rather than replacing” learners.²⁷ More broadly, AI’s adaptivity and interactivity are seen as a technical pathway to constructivist, active learning.

Experiential and blended learning includes VR-based mock courts, hybrid “online + offline” moot trials, and AI-supported clinics enact experiential learning cycles by immersing students in realistic disputes and iterative reflection. Blended learning frameworks explicitly combine AI tools with face-to-face Socratic and experiential activities within human-centered, competency-based, pedagogy-driven design.

Cognitive scaffolding / hybrid intelligence ensures AI-driven feedback systems in legal writing function as cognitive scaffolds, diagnosing individual errors and prompting revision; this improves structure, persuasiveness, exam performance, and self-regulated learning, illustrating a hybrid human–AI model rather than automation. Knowledge-graph-based assistants that surface authorities in real time but require students to complete the reasoning process operationalize scaffolding without undermining autonomy.²⁸

Human Judgment in an AI-Enabled Legal World

²⁵ Alanzi, A. (2020). The Models of Legal Education: Implication for Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.73.235.241>.

²⁶ Giang, V. (2022). Critical thinking in training bachelor of law in Vietnam under the influence of the process of internationalization of higher education and the fourth industrial revolution. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*.

²⁷ Mao, C. (2025). Innovative Pathways for Digital-Intelligent Technology Empowerment in Law Practice Education: A Case Study of the Court Debate Course. *Journal of Research in Vocational Education*.

²⁸ Wang, Y., & Yang, S. (2024). Constructing and Testing AI International Legal Education Coupling-Enabling Model. *Sustainability*.

Work across law, AI, and legal education converges on a core view: human judgment, ethics, and contextual reasoning must remain primary, with AI positioned as decision-support, not decision-maker.

Legal decisions involve moral, contextual, and person-specific assessments that cannot be reduced to data points. Concepts like individual justice require each case to be judged on its own merits, through discretionary human reasoning rather than pre-fixed algorithmic rules. Virtue-based accounts of legal reasoning stress perception, character, and affect as essential to sound judgment.²⁹ Empirical work on lawyers' moral decision-making shows how situational, contextual, and bodily factors shape choices, underscoring the embodied nature of legal judgment.

AI generates recommendations, but humans retain authority and responsibility. Designs inspired by appellate review place humans at the appeal stage to correct AI, add moral/legal reasoning, and handle rare “broken-leg” cues AI misses. Legal scholarship stresses clear standards for human oversight, role definition, training, and liability in hybrid systems.

Examples of AI Failure Without Adequate Oversight

- Hospital readmission algorithm under-allocated resources to Black patients due to cost-based proxy, a fairness error better spotted by human reviewers.
- Broad literature shows risk of entrenched bias, opacity, and black-box decision-making that threatens rule-of-law values of transparency and explainability.
- Reviews of AI in courts highlight risks of over-reliance, degraded skills, and impersonal justice without robust monitoring and audits.

AI reduces people to correlated data points, missing moral salience, cultural meaning, and lived experience. Studies on empathy and emotional competence show they are central to lawyer client trust, communication, and ethical practice, not “soft extras”. Research on legal ethics education argues that ethical judgment blending expertise, experience, values, and emotional intelligence remains irreducibly human and must be explicitly cultivated in future lawyers.³⁰

Critical legal pedagogy urges moving beyond rote doctrine to deconstructing law, questioning power, and engaging alternative theories so students can reinterpret and challenge legal rules, not merely apply them. AI-rich legal education that centres critical thinking, reflection, literature-informed empathy, and self-reflection on ethical choices is proposed as the way to produce lawyers “better than a bot”.

5. AI IN INDIAN LEGAL EDUCATION VS GLOBAL PRACTICE

AI use in Indian legal education is emergent but patchy, with limited regulation and infrastructure, compared to more structured, policy-driven adoption in the US, UK, Singapore and EU.

Status in India & BCI / Regulatory Landscape

²⁹ Binns, R. (2020). Human Judgment in algorithmic loops: Individual justice and automated decision-making. Regulation & Governance. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12358>.

³⁰ Amaya, A. (2023). Reasoning in Character: Virtue, Legal Argumentation, and Judicial Ethics. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 28, 359 - 378. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-023-10414-z>.

Empirical work from Gujarat shows low but growing familiarity and use of AI tools among Indian students, teachers and professionals; respondents strongly support curriculum integration to improve research and practice skills.³¹ Indian law schools are experimenting with GenAI and legal tech, but often without coordinated institutional policy or national standards. India's broader legal-system debate stresses that no comprehensive statutory framework yet governs AI in courts or legal research, and calls for a specialized "AI and Law Commission" and inclusive consultations involving the Bar Council of India (BCI) and judiciary. Scholarship on Indian legal pedagogy argues that BCI and universities need structured policies on digital/AI-enabled learning that still preserve doctrinal rigor and critical thinking.

Challenges Unique to Indian Law Schools are-

- Digital divide and infrastructure gaps, especially beyond elite NLUs.
- Limited faculty training in AI and instructional design; risk of uncritical tool use.
- Need to align AI with exam-centric curricula and BCI's traditional focus on black-letter law and advocacy skills.
- Concerns over ethics, bias, and plagiarism in resource-constrained environments.

Comparative study with US, UK, Singapore, EU

US/UK law schools commonly have: explicit AI policies, research labs, AI sandboxes, specialist LLMs, and courses on legal tech, ethics and algorithmic accountability. Singapore integrates AI-enhanced databases and predictive analytics early so tech-fluency becomes core to training. EU institutions frame AI in law around GDPR and "trustworthy AI" principles, embedding fairness, transparency and data protection into teaching. These systems illustrate a shift to AI literacy, blended learning and ethics-by-design, offering templates India can adapt while addressing its own infrastructural and regulatory gaps.³²

6. EMPIRICAL AND CASE STUDY EVIDENCE ON AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION

Research provides concrete data from surveys, pilots, and structured courses showing how AI is reshaping learning, with mixed but generally positive impacts on outcomes and perceptions.

Surveys of Students and Teachers

A pilot survey in Bhubaneswar (India) of 76 law-related respondents found strong support for integrating AI into curricula: 71% selected "all of the above" when asked how AI can improve legal education (enhanced learning, better access to information, and preparing students for technological change). Ethical concerns and resistance to change were each identified as the top challenges (25% each).

A survey of 500 law students using AI for Legal English showed significant gains in vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and writing, alongside notable worries about data security and ethics, with statistically significant differences in privacy perceptions. A global survey of law students' perspectives on AI use in

³¹ Patel, K., & Gandhi, A. (2023). Analysing the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Legal Research and Legal Education. *International Journal of Legal Developments & Allied Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.55662/ijldai.2023.9501>.

³² Migliorini, S., & Moreira, J. (2024). The Case for Nurturing AI Literacy in Law Schools. *Asian Journal of Legal Education*, 12, 7 - 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220058241265613>.

law found lower AI engagement and enthusiasm among students than among practicing lawyers, and highlighted demand for AI clubs and dedicated courses.

Pilot Projects and AI-Enabled Classrooms

A flipped “Essentials of Business Law” course allowed unrestricted AI use to support pre-class study. Surveyed students reported quicker access to information, more efficient independent learning, and personalized help, but also a tension between reliance on AI and developing critical reflection, leading the authors to urge careful task design and teacher-led demonstrative use cases.

An Israeli criminal law course integrated AI tools (interactive modules, automated assessment, simulations). Comparing cohorts with and without AI, surveys showed modest but clear improvements in understanding, engagement and user experience, while also revealing unfamiliarity with AI and the need for better training and more interactive content.

An AI–empowered “coupling” model for international law used knowledge mapping, neural networks and adaptive support. The experimental class showed significantly higher engagement, course satisfaction, and a reported employment rate jump from 75% to 100%, attributed to personalized recommendations and offloading repetitive teacher tasks.

A hybrid-intelligence writing environment, where students received machine-learning-based formative feedback on legal texts, led to significantly better exam-time legal writing quality, higher grades, and self-reports of improved self-efficacy and self-regulated learning compared to traditional feedback.

Best Practices and Impact on Outcomes & Perception

Comparative work identifies best-practice elements in leading schools (US/UK etc.): explicit AI policies, sandboxes, AI literacy training, staged “education about/for/with AI”, and evidence-based evaluation of tools. Across studies, common positive impacts include:

- Improved engagement and satisfaction
- Better independent learning and efficiency
- Enhanced writing quality and exam performance
- Strong student demand for AI literacy and curricular integration

7. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Suggestions–

Research converges on a vision where AI becomes a pervasive but human-supervised partner in legal learning, emphasizing ethics, explainability, and practice-readiness.

- **Next-Generation AI Tools in Legal Pedagogy-** AI-powered personalized learning platforms, intelligent tutoring systems, and analytics can tailor content, detect struggling students, and deliver data-driven feedback.
- Immersive tools like VR/AR courtrooms and simulations support advocacy training, negotiation, and courtroom demeanour in realistic environments.
Matrices of AI tools now map concrete solutions (research, drafting, document comparison, evidence analysis) to specific professional lawyering tasks, directly embedding practice tech into training.³³
- **Emerging Fields-** Scholars stress explainability and accountability as core design requirements; opaque systems and biased data make human oversight non-negotiable.
- Dedicated AI ethics and deepfake modules are proposed to cover privacy, bias, misinformation, and professional responsibility.³⁴ Virtual courts and online dispute environments, supported by AI case analytics and remote evidence handling, are framed as key contexts students must understand normatively and technically.
- **Preparing Future Lawyers for AI-Augmented Practice-** Future-ready lawyers need three enduring human strengths: innovation, judgment, accountability paired with GenAI system and ethics knowledge.³⁵ Recommended curricula combine:
 - a) AI literacy plus hands-on use of legal tech.
 - b) Interdisciplinary “law + computer science” or “legal tech” courses.
 - c) Continuous upskilling for judges and practitioners.
- **Sustainable Human–AI Collaborative Learning-** Across studies, the long-term vision is human-AI co-agency: AI handles routine analysis, personalization, and simulation, while humans lead in normative reasoning, client care, and value choices.³⁶ This demands ethical governance, equitable access, and assessment designs that cultivate independent, critical, and creative lawyers in an AI-saturated legal ecosystem.

Conclusion

The present study has shown that integrating AI tools into legal pedagogy offers significant pedagogical benefits—enhanced access to information, personalised learning, improved research and drafting support, and innovative simulations—while simultaneously generating serious concerns about over-reliance, opacity, bias, and erosion of core legal reasoning skills. Across theoretical, empirical, and comparative

³³ Sysoyev, P., Gavrilov, M., & Bulochnikov, S. (2025). Matrix of technical solutions based on artificial intelligence in the professional training of future lawyers. *Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.20310/1810-0201-2025-30-2-336-351>.

³⁴ Mong, D., & Thanh, H. (2024). Relationship between artificial intelligence and legal education: A bibliometric analysis. *Knowledge and Performance Management*. [https://doi.org/10.21511/kpm.08\(2\).2024.02](https://doi.org/10.21511/kpm.08(2).2024.02).

³⁵ Kemp, D. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Lawyers and Law Students: Crutch, Craft, or Catalyst?. *Seton Hall Journal of Legislation and Public Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.60095/lmdv2597>.

³⁶ G, A., & Nair, V. (2024). Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges. *Law, Technology and Humans*. <https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.3640>.

perspectives, a common theme emerges: AI is a powerful pedagogical aid, not a replacement for the human processes of interpretation, judgment, and ethical deliberation that define legal practice.

A balanced model of integration is therefore essential. This requires designing curricula where AI is explicitly framed as a supplementary tool; embedding critical AI literacy, ethics, and explainability into legal training; developing assessment methods that can distinguish a student's own reasoning from AI-assisted outputs; and adopting institutional guidelines that preserve academic integrity and professional responsibility while still encouraging innovation.

Ultimately, the challenge is not whether AI should enter the law classroom, but on whose terms. Protecting the primacy of human judgment means ensuring that students continue to grapple with ambiguity, argumentation, and values, even as they learn to leverage AI for efficiency and insight. If legal education can cultivate reflective, critically aware users of technology rather than passive recipients of AI outputs, then human and machine capabilities can be brought into a genuinely complementary relationship. In such a model, technological advancement strengthens rather than supplants the role of the human lawyer as interpreter, advocate, and guardian of justice.

Acknowledgments

The authors express sincere gratitude to Prof. (Dr) Santosh Kumar Tripathy, Vice-Chancellor, Fakir Mohan University, Balasore; Prof. (Dr) Amulya Kumar Acharya, Coordinator, PG. Department of Law, Fakir Mohan University, Balasore; Prof. (Dr) Binay Kumar Das, Dean, PG. Department of Law, Fakir Mohan University, Balasore; the esteemed Judges, senior advocates and junior fellow advocates of Orissa High Court for their invaluable support.