DOI:10.59787/2413-5488-2025-51-3-106-113

Zhalgas Temirbekov
Maqsut Narikbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan

AI AS A TOOL FOR TEACHING LEGAL ARGUMENTATION IN LAW SCHOOLS

Abstract. The use of artificial intelligence in the study of law offers an opportunity for creative applications in the teaching of legal argumentation and legal reasoning skills. This paper explores the potential of AI as a learning resource for law schools, including the prospect of advanced systems, such as automatic legal reasoners, simulation programs, and chatbots, being used to teach argumentative generation. By reviewing the literature and examining practices, the study anticipates the potential of AI technology according to which students will be able to write legal documents with the use of an AI in a virtual context, be involved in an argumentation of legal reasoning in real time, and have a technology respond to their arguments. While AI is in no possible certain position to replace the role of a lecturer in teaching the skill of critical analysis, it could certainly be viewed as a technology that enhances the learning experience, cultivates more student interaction, and connects theory to practice. The paper also recognises a range of challenges, including ethics, data security, and increasing reliance on technology-based resources in a professional preparation capacity.

Keywords: pedagogical tools**,** educational technology, legal education, law students, argumentation skills, legal reasoning, artificial intelligence

Introduction

In the educational process, artificial intelligence technologies are expected to find increasing use, as they enhance efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and save valuable time (Temirbekov, 2021). Legal argumentation, or the skill of crafting compelling and logically tenable legal arguments in both written and oral communication, is a primary skill for law students. Conventionally, education in the area involves a range of composition drills, including the composition of complaints or legal memos, as well as mock trial work, moot court activities, and in-class debating. However, traditional pedagogical methods offer certain shortcomings. Namely, students are often provided with limited opportunities to receive individualised commentary and real-world practice before exposure to real-world legal settings. Artificial intelligence, generated by computers, has recently become a practical resource to improve legal education with various new methods of engaging students in active argumentation skills and competencies. For example, chatbot systems can reproduce some elements of the technique in which lawyers argue a case and offer opportunities for immediate practice – debate opportunities that can be utilised for formative commentary. This is manifested by a growing inclusion of AI in law school curricula. In fact, a recent study by the American Bar Association showed that 55% of law schools currently offer law-focused courses on AI, while 83% offer opportunities for students with legal AI tool experience (*How Law Students Are Using AI to Improve Legal Skills*, n.d.). The purpose of the paper is to explore how AI could be applied as a pedagogical tool in legal argumentation. It has been examined how conversational robots (including chatbots) and smart tutoring systems can support law students in legal document preparation practices (such as pleadings or legal memoranda) and argumentative exercises (such as legal debates or moot court), and summarise recent evidence on their effectiveness. Through a discussion of existing literature and foreign experiences, there is an attempt to shed light on both the pedagogical potential benefits and pitfalls of AI application in legal argumentation pedagogy.

Materials and Methods

This study employs a literature review, complemented by an examination of experiences with AI-enabled legal pedagogy. The literature relating to recent research on applying AI and chatbots to argumentation teaching has been examined, comprising peer-reviewed research, conference papers, and academic debates. Secondly, it has been reviewed case studies and reports from some countries to consider how law schools and teachers were implementing it in practice. The overview included reported tools (projects) in the USA (such as AI-powered negotiating simulators and moot court judges), and citations of deployments outside (chatbot-based writing tutors and adaptive learning environments). By mapping research study findings to cases of AI deployment in legal training initiatives, the discourse around prevailing themes has been organised. The results are constructed to react to: (1) AI-assisted legal writing and argumentation draft, (2) AI-aided simulations for oral arguments and debate, (3) observed growth in student learning (any skill or motivation improvement included), and (4) potential problems and constraints.

Results and Discussion

AI-Assisted Legal Writing and Argument Drafting

Perhaps the most obvious application of AI in law school is as a writing assistant to aid students in drafting and editing legal documents. Generative models of AI – like large language model chatbots like ChatGPT – can produce readable text from a prompt, and this is what law students are using to produce first drafts of memos, briefs, or even statements of claim. This has truly changed the draft process for the majority of students (*How Law Students Are Using AI to Improve Legal Skills*, n.d.). Instead of staring blankly at a page, a student can type in an assignment (e.g., 'draft a legal text for a motion to dismiss in a contract dispute on these facts') and receive a draft from the AI that is sloppy but coherent. This is a good beginning, with clean paragraphs and sentences that the student can then refine and improve upon. Legal writing teachers have noted that writing generated by artificial intelligence will not necessarily replace original thought. Still, it can imitate effective sentence structure and paragraphing, providing students with examples of clear language (Guo et al., 2022). The pedagogical emphasis, therefore, shifts toward higher-order editing skills: students must analyse the AI's output, verify the legal accuracy of assertions, insert or correct references, and refine the argument's persuasiveness. Educators note that this process can strengthen a student's critical eye – the key is that students are not simply submitting AI-written work, but learning to identify weaknesses or errors in it and improve upon it (*How Law Students Are Using AI to Improve Legal Skills*, n.d.).

Recent studies confirm the pedagogical effectiveness of AI-supported writing when used in this way. For instance, Guo et al. (2022) designed a chatbot system to support students' argumentative writing. They found that law students who used AI comments made improved arguments and received better revisions than those relying only on peer feedback. AI would engage in a conversational exchange about the student's draft, posing questions for further consideration and suggesting changes based on aspects such as clarity of argument, use of evidence, countering other arguments, and overall organisation. Such immediate and iterative feedback is difficult to provide within the usually short time available in a traditional face-to-face class, but it certainly supports learning by allowing for the scaffolding that encourages reflection and revision of thinking that students undertake. For instance, in one study, when seeded with specific writing goals that it could act upon, AI-initiated feedback was equally effective as teacher feedback in improving argumentative writing (Guo et al., 2022). These findings indicate that well-designed AI systems can be employed as a scalable adjunct to human feedback so that each student will receive individualised suggestions regarding their writing. It is essential to note, nonetheless, that the quality of the results depends on how one interacts with the AI. Best practices to arise from initial trials are to train students in creating

targeted prompts (e.g., having the AI perform as an expert legal editor about logical coherence or omitted counterarguments) and teaching them to fact-check the AI content against sources (as AI text generators can occasionally generate inaccurate legal citations or hallucinate facts). In total, AI writing assistants can serve as unbending tutors of legal argumentation: they provide frameworks and ideas with the click of a button, which students can then analyse and refine, thereby improving their legal thinking and writing skills in the process.

Chatbot Tutors and the Socratic Method

Another use of AI in legal argumentation teaching is through intelligent tutoring systems and chatbots that simulate the question-and-answer approach of a human instructor or the Socratic method. AI-powered tutors have been introduced in law schools, engaging students in discussions on legal topics by asking questions that stimulate critical thinking. These AI tutors typically consist of chat windows where the student's input is analysed and responded to by the system. Interestingly, some AI tutors are actually modelled to emulate the Socratic method, a hallmark of legal education in which the 'teacher' responds to a student's answer with more questions. For example, an AI law tutor can ask a student to state the rule for a scenario, then query 'But what if we change this fact? Would the outcome differ?', thereby encouraging the student to critically consider the application of the rule. According to recent studies, the current intelligent tutoring chatbots in law can even 'answer legal inquiries, clarify complex concepts, and even imitate the Socratic method by asking probing questions that encourage students to think critically and build their legal arguments' (Adegbite & Suleiman, 2025). This type of on-demand dialogue enables students to practice framing arguments and responding to hypothetical scenarios in a low-pressure environment outside of class. It also helps students identify areas where they have gaps in their understanding. If the AI's questions reveal confusion or weak reasoning, the student can recognise those issues and address them (either through further study or by asking a human lecturer). While AI tutors and different types of software that enhance learning will not replace the nuanced feedback of a professor, these tools provide additive practice that may support learning and improve understanding. Significantly, these systems can be made available 24/7. For example, at 1 a.m., a student could engage in an interactive Q&A about cases or get clarification on legal principles. Early perspectives from users suggest that when these tools are appropriately situated in the context of course material, students value the immediate feedback as well as the chance to practice argument building repeatedly. By simulating a tireless "devil's advocate," AI tutors help students internalise the habit of challenging and justifying their legal arguments incessantly – a fundamental skill for any lawyer.

AI Simulations for Debates and Oral Arguments

AI is also used to simulate interactive oral argument contexts, such as debates, negotiations, and court argumentation. Chatbot use falls under one of the active activities that include impersonating an opposing debater or a judge, where students can use live argumentation. The chatbot could provide a counterargument to a student's position and expose them to potential counterarguments, allowing students to practice refuting them (Huang et al., 2025). Essentially, the AI serves as a plug-and-play replacement for a debate opponent. Empirical results of such experiments have been positive. The introduction of a chatbot into classroom debates led to observable improvements in students' argumentation skills – task motivation was improved, which they expressed by getting more involved in the interactive challenge (Guo et al., 2022). It applies very well in legal education since moot debating on burning issues forms a regular exercise. Hence, a chatbot throws piercing questioning or reasoning to the law student, making the student think on his feet, justify his reasoning, and even sharpen his arguments – similar to what he might be required to do against a live opponent in court or before a judge.

In moot court and oral advocacy, new AI tools are emerging that enable students to rehearse arguing in front of a virtual judge. For instance, at Suffolk University Law School (US), the Legal Practice Skills program piloted a customised ChatGPT-based tool that mimics a moot court judge (*AI for Oral Advocacy*, n.d.). Students upload their case files (briefs, the record, etc.) into the system, and the AI – preloaded with the facts and law of the case – acts as a judge. The student then rehearses an oral argument: the AI judge asks questions about the student's case, pinches pennies on doubtful points, and even quizzes them on hypotheticals. This allows the student to road-test their arguments in an authentic conversation. According to reports from the faculty, the 1L students who utilised the AI judge tool responded very well (*AI for Oral Advocacy*, n.d.). They reported that the experience relieved them of anxiety and made them better prepared, as they were able to practice responding to challenging questions before the actual graded moot court exercise. The AI is not necessarily simulating the full physicality of a courtroom, but is maintaining the intellectual exchange aspect of oral advocacy. The added advantage is that students can rehearse on it more than once: each session may present various questions from the AI, exposing the student to a range of potential issues. Other law teachers have created such tools. For example, legal tech instructor David Colarusso built an AI robot called 'Moot a Case' that enables students to 'play the part of an attorney arguing one side of a case before an AI-simulated judge' (Colarusso, n.d.). These kinds of AI simulations are essentially virtual practice – they fill in for the sparse opportunities students have historically had to plead before experts.

Law schools are also turning to AI to help prepare for negotiation and dispute resolution training. Negotiation is a critical lawyering skill that involves argument, persuasion, and strategy; yet, students traditionally have had few opportunities to practice with feedback. In 2025, Suffolk Law School launched an experimental website that allows students (and the general public) to practice negotiating with an AI bot (*Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators - Suffolk University*, n.d.). Unlike simple chatbots that might always concede, these AI negotiators are programmed to behave like seasoned lawyers – employing various ploys, sometimes soft and sometimes hard, depending on the circumstances (*Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators - Suffolk University*, n.d.). In one case on the site, a land disagreement exists between a mining company and an owner, where the AI will negotiate aggressively on core issues, such as rights to land and compensation (*Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators - Suffolk University*, n.d.). Students will need to adjust their approach on the fly, feeling what it's like to negotiate with an opponent who will not just give in. This is a realistic test that simulates real-life legal negotiations, including the need to balance legal argumentation with pragmatic interests. As Professor Dwight Golann, the initiator of the project, noted, instruments like these present important questions about the future of AI in law, while providing students with practical experience in different bargaining styles (*Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators - Suffolk University*, n.d.). Initial experiences suggest that students learn by watching how – through stylistic adjustments (e.g., through more cooperative vs. competitive bidding) – they bring about different reactions from the AI. Essentially, the AI is a virtual adversarial attorney played as often as the student desires until they feel they have developed the best approach. Skills and confidence accrue through such repeated practice. It is worth noting that the AI simulation does not completely replace human role-plays, but rather supplements conventional training. By integrating AI scenarios and live role-play practice, educators can offer more diverse practice scenarios – ensuring that students are subjected to both the uncertainty of human players and the predictability (and unlimited availability) of AI players.

Benefits for Student Learning

The incorporation of AI in legal argumentation training has several self-evident benefits that have been witnessed through these applications. To start with, AI technology bridges the theory-to-practice gap by subjecting students to animated, realistic simulations. Instead of learning argumentation in the abstract, students who use AI simulations have the opportunity to apply legal doctrine to concrete problems – such as drafting actual court filings, arguing a case (albeit virtually), or negotiating a contract – that reinforces their understanding and retention of the material (Adegbite & Suleiman, 2025). Experiential learning is essential in law, where hands-on experience complements doctrine-based education. Second, AI offers a level of personalised and timely feedback that is difficult to replicate in traditional classroom teaching. A chatbot tutor can give immediate replies 24/7, and generative AI can give personalised advice on a student's written argument almost as soon as it has been written. It keeps the learners engaged by allowing them to learn from their mistakes in real-time. The use of AI practice increases learners' confidence and motivation because, since the systems are non-judgmental and never running low on patience, it provides a learning environment where learners feel at liberty to try out their wings or ask 'dumb' questions. For instance, research based on chatbot-assisted discussion found not only better competence in argumentation but higher motivation towards the task because students were challenged interactively and felt they were themselves more responsible for their learning process (Guo et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2025). Similarly, the Suffolk moot court project found that participants experienced decreased anxiety, indicating that working with an AI judge prepared them better to be confident when dealing with actual judges (*AI for Oral Advocacy*, n.d.). Another related advantage is the uniformity and diversity AI can provide. Consistency in the form that an AI is perpetually prepared with a challenge (never going to cancel office hours or become fatigued with giving feedback), and variety in the form that AI can be programmed to present various styles or levels of difficulty. For instance, an AI negotiation bot can switch between cooperative and assertive strategies, introducing students to a variety of negotiation approaches in a manner that one human role-play partner might not (*Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators - Suffolk University*, n.d.). These advantages enable students to develop critical thinking skills. In struggling to refute the arguments generated by AI and complex hypotheticals, students engage in thinking on their feet about issues from multiple sides and honing their positions, which enriches their analysis. A well-designed AI learning environment can encourage students to identify salient legal issues and construct sound arguments by exposing them to the kinds of multifaceted problems they will encounter in real-world practice (Adegbite & Suleiman, 2025).

Above all, AI is most effective as a pedagogical tool when it is integrated intelligently into a broader educational plan. Implemented well, as the literature describes, are hybrid models of learning – using AI to augment, not replace, human instruction. For example, learners compose an argument from inception with the help of AI and turn it in for either a peer review or faculty feedback. By this time, the AI would have completed much of the preliminary heavy lifting and iteration that typically falls on the instructor to provide basic write exercises rather than higher-order feedback. Others have used a 'flipped' model wherein students use AI tools to prepare (research, outline, or practice) before class and use class time for further discussion and mentoring. AI can provide pre-class preparation (e.g., quizzes or simulated scenarios) and post-class practice for reinforcement (Adegbite & Suleiman, 2025). The net effect is often an overall richer learning experience. Students get more repetitions of core skills than they might otherwise, and instructors can concentrate their teaching in those areas where human expertise and judgment cannot be replicated – such as advanced legal analysis, ethical reflection, and professional ethics.

Challenges and Ethical Considerations

The hope that AI will teach legal argument is exciting but comes with some challenges and dire warnings. Implementing AI in education about the law also 'brings ethical, practical, and access-related challenges that must be addressed to ensure equitable implementation and effective educational outcomes' (Adegbite & Suleiman, 2025). In a list of concerns, is the credibility and accuracy of AI-generated content. Large language models can sometimes produce inaccurate information or create citations with high confidence. Students, if not wary, may accept AI output or get used to accepting answers without confirming them. This shows a need for educators to encourage students to fact-check the facts in an AI-generated response and treat its suggestions as ideas rather than as truth. A similar concern is overdependence: if students are overly reliant on AI to do their thinking for them, they can short-circuit the process of learning to think critically. For example, a chatbot can generate a persuasive argument, but if the student simply accepts it, they may not be learning to create persuasive arguments independently. Some law professors have noted concern that tools like ChatGPT could become a crutch, doing the 'easy' work of writing and thus leading students to skip the struggle that results in more meaningful learning (Guo et al., 2022). To avoid this situation, assignments can be designed so that students have to defend or explain any AI-generated content. As a result, students will have to engage with the content more critically.

Moreover, privacy and ethics emerge. Legal arguments often include confidential or sensitive information. Disclosing client facts or case details to a third-party AI service may breach privacy obligations or honour codes in academia. Law schools must teach students what is appropriate to reveal to AI systems and possibly utilise self-hosted or privacy-compliant AI tools for particular exercises. And then there is the larger ethical issue of unauthorised practice of law: AI can produce legal arguments, but students could incorrectly assume AI advice to be accurate legal advice. Teachers must stress the limitations of AI – it lacks actual understanding or responsibility, and its 'legal advice' is not screened for accuracy or ethics. As part of professional training, students should be educated that AI is a tool in the lawyer's control and that the lawyer has the ultimate responsibility for the work product.

From a practical standpoint, implementing AI into the classroom requires resources and training for faculty. Not all schools have equal access to these technologies, which raises issues of accessibility and equity. A law school with greater funding can design their own AI platform (this is the case with Suffolk) and provide students with subscriptions to a top-tier AI service, while another law school would fall behind. If this is not managed, this will exacerbate the skills disparity. Additionally, current faculty need to receive training in AI competencies in order to be able to apply them, which involves training and modifications to the curriculum. Resistance will arise from faculty who are sceptical or who feel AI diminishes traditional teaching; in order to mitigate this, it may be useful to have transparent and open discussions along with demonstrations of effectiveness. Last, the human element of legal education cannot be replicated. AI is not able to truly replicate mentorship, moral judgment, or the interpersonal aspects of lawyering (e.g., empathy and persuasion) (*A Chat with ChatGPT: The Uniquely Human Aspects of Lawyering – Holloran Center Professional Identity Implementation Blog*, n.d.). A great balance has to be found where AI assumes some repetitive or simulative tasks, but professors continue to guide the formation of judgment, ethics, and professional identity in students. As one researcher has put it, the greater utilisation of AI in law means that future lawyers must be great at the uniquely human aspects of lawyering – empathy, creativity, ethical judgment – precisely because the technical and repetitive aspects will be heavily assisted by AI (*A Chat with ChatGPT: The Uniquely Human Aspects of Lawyering – Holloran Center Professional Identity Implementation Blog*, n.d.). With this in mind, the majority of legal educators recommend using AI to augment learning (by providing additional practice and feedback) but not to replace the fundamental teaching of legal reasoning. Overall, the potential

of integrating AI into legal argument instruction is clear. Nonetheless, supervision and regulations must accompany its integration, and critical thinking should frame the discussion of whether it ultimately enhances student learning.

Conclusions

AI is rapidly redefining how legal argumentation is taught, providing state-of-the-art tools that augment traditional methods of teaching law. In their study, the researchers discovered that chatbots and AI systems could serve as meaningful pedagogical partners for law students by aiding in the writing and revising of written arguments; playing the role of opponents in debates and negotiations; and offering personalised feedback and questioning, which helps to nurture critical thinking. These technologies have been found to increase the extent to which students get involved, provide more practice opportunities, and even boost measurable skills, such as argument quality and learning task motivation. By bridging the divide between the classroom theory and the practice of the real world, AI technologies allow students to learn by doing – writing briefs with the assistance of AI, arguing in front of an AI judge, or negotiating against an AI adversary all mimic aspects of legal practice within a limited, reproducible environment. While this provides students with experience and confidence in real-world skills, it also allows students to experience scenarios that would be difficult to arrange otherwise.

However, the introduction of AI as a mode of teaching and learning must be done carefully. Teachers, as well as law schools, must consider a range of concerns related to the validation of AI-generated content, over-reliance (which compromises actual skill development), ethical considerations (including confidentiality and honesty), and the equitable availability of these technologies to everyone. AI must be framed as a help – an 'intelligent assistant' that can learn the drudgery and provide instant feedback – not a clever shortcut to avoid the toil of legal analysis. When students use AI to generate an argument, they should be directed to critically evaluate it, rather than blindly adopting it. When they practice with AI simulations, human instructors can follow up with reflection and debriefing to consolidate the lessons. The instructor's role remains significant in formulating AI-integrated assignments, as well as in imparting meta-skills such as judgment, ethics, and empathy that AI cannot teach.

Generally speaking, AI as a tool of education in the aspect of legal argumentation helps to teach future lawyers who are technically sound and, at the same time, reasoning-oriented. The international experiences being considered show that if properly utilised, AI can be advantageous to legal education by improving aspects of engagement, personalisation, and making the practice relevant. Those law schools that take advantage of these technologies, together with sound professional values, are likely to better prepare their students for a legal environment where collaboration with AI will be the norm. Finally, the addition of AI to legal argument training is not a matter of surrendering the art of lawyering to machines; it's a matter of using smart systems to train better lawyers – lawyers who can leverage technology for efficiency and perspective, yet continue to practice uniquely human creativity that the practice of law will constantly require.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest regarding the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

References

A Chat with ChatGPT: The Uniquely Human Aspects of Lawyering – Holloran Center Professional Identity Implementation Blog. (n.d.). Retrieved 9 September 2025, from

https://blogs.stthomas.edu/holloran-center/a-chat-with-chatgpt-the-uniquely-human-aspects-of-lawyering/

Adegbite, A., & Suleiman, S. (2025). AI-powered personalized learning in legal education: A tool for developing future-ready lawyers. International Journal of Law, Justice and Jurisprudence, 5(1), 323–327. https://doi.org/10.22271/2790-0673.2025.v5.i1d.192

AI for Oral Advocacy. (n.d.). Retrieved 8 September 2025, from https://sites.suffolk.edu/legalwritingmatters/2025/05/12/ai-for-oral-advocacy/

Colarusso, D. (n.d.). Artificial Intelligence and the Law. Law and Technology Resources for Legal Professionals. Retrieved 9 September 2025, from https://www.llrx.com/2024/08/artificial-intelligence-and-the-law

Digital Dealmakers: Suffolk Law's New AI Platform Challenges Student Negotiators—Suffolk University. (n.d.). Retrieved 8 September 2025, from https://www.suffolk.edu/news-features/news/2025/03/18/20/19/ai-negotiation-tool

Guo, K., Wang, J., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). Using chatbots to scaffold EFL students' argumentative writing. Assessing Writing, 54, 100666. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2022.100666

How law students are using AI to improve legal skills. (n.d.). MyCase. Retrieved 8 September 2025, from https://www.mycase.com/blog/ai-for-law-students/

Huang, W., Jiang, J., King, R. B., & Fryer, L. K. (2025). Chatbots and Student Motivation: A Scoping Review. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00524-2

Temirbekov, Z. (2021). Some Issues of Application of Artificial Intelligence Technology in Higher Education. Higher School of Kazakhstan, 4, 51–54.

Information about authors

Temirbekov Zhalgas - PhD in Jurisprudence (Maqsut Narikbayev University), LLM in International Law (University of Reading), Teaching Professor, Maqsut Narikbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan. email: zh_temirbekov@kazguu.kz ORCID: 0009-0009-0238-6019