

Chapter # 22

TEACHING LAW IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: TIME FOR CURRICULUM REFORM?

Allison Geduld

University of Johannesburg, South Africa

ABSTRACT

A revolution has been introduced by the introduction of generative artificial intelligence (AI). Generative AI systems can now perform activities relating to problem-solving and decision-making. The introduction of AI questions traditional approaches to teaching and learning but brings with it a plethora of ethical issues such as academic integrity. Curriculum policy documents on legal education in South Africa outline essential skills for law graduates such as reading, writing and research skills. None of these documents speak to the ethical use of AI tools. The central question of this study is: what aspects of legal curricula in South Africa should be addressed to adequately prepare law graduates for the legal profession in the age of AI? The first part consists of a consideration of the relevant skills that are needed for law graduates in the age of AI. The second part evaluates the various quality standards documents on legal education in South Africa against the findings in the first part. The final section will propose recommendations for curriculum reform. This paper concludes that legal curricula must incorporate skills training aimed at the use of AI tools.

Keywords: legal education, artificial intelligence, curriculum, ethics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The world has been revolutionised by the introduction of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) to the public towards the end of 2022. What makes GenAI revolutionary is that it can perform tasks that were previously thought to only be performed by human beings, such as text and image generation, knowledge representation and text analysis (Nowrozy and Jam, 2024). At universities, GenAI tools such as ChatGPT have been used for tasks such as language and grammar correction, information searches and text generation. The use of GenAI tools brings with it a host of ethical dilemmas including academic integrity, bias and privacy (Floridi, 2024; Mahmud, 2024). Academic integrity could potentially be compromised as students might submit GenAI answers as if they are not their own. Bias might be present as the data that GenAI relies upon might be biased towards a group of people. Privacy issues might be implicated by GenAI as personal information that is shared with a GenAI tool is not necessarily protected. The rapid introduction of GenAI questions the responsiveness of university curricula.

This paper focuses on legal education in South Africa, specifically teaching practices as it relates to GenAI. GenAI tools are increasingly being used by legal practitioners to draft documents and find relevant information (Magesh *et al.*, 2024). The central question of this study is: which aspects of legal curricula should be adapted to adequately prepare law students for the legal profession in the age of GenAI?

The first part of the paper considers the context of legal education in South Africa and the requisite skills law graduates should have. Drawing from various studies, the second part of the paper considers the potential to use GenAI to develop some of the essential skills mentioned in policy documents on legal education. The last part recommends changes to legal curricula in South Africa.

2. LEGAL EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

The first democratic legal education in South Africa started in 1998 with the adoption of *The Qualification of Legal Practitioners Amendment Act* of 1997. The aim of democratic legal education was to provide quality legal education that was equitable and accessible (Gardbaum, 2015). Already, early on in the programme there were complaints from academics and legal practitioners that students were lacking literacy skills such as writing and reading (Gardbaum, 2015). To address the concerns of various stakeholders a legal education summit was held in 2013 where a task team was constituted that would set up a standards document relating to skills and standard setting (Sedutla, 2013). The task team, after comment by relevant stakeholders and approval by the Council for Higher Education (CHE), set up a document that contained the required knowledge, skills and applied competencies that all law graduates should achieve at the end of their academic study for their law degree. Students should have a basic knowledge of law subjects (Council on Higher Education, 2015). The skills and competencies, also known as graduate attributes, that law students should demonstrate include the following: critical thinking skills, research skills, ethics and integrity, communication skills and literacy, numeracy, information technology, problem solving, self-management and collaboration, transfer of acquired knowledge, agency accountability and service to the community (Council on Higher Education, 2015).

All Bachelor of Law (LLB) programs in South Africa were reviewed during 2015-2016 using the LLB standards as a guiding document. The report by the review panel found that knowledge of law was not found to be problematic (Council on Higher Education, 2018). While most universities had various interventions aimed at research and writing, it did not always translate into success where students were not assessed on reading and writing in individual modules (Council on Higher Education, 2018). Half of the law faculties were found to be lacking in the development of critical thinking (Council on Higher Education, 2018). Instances where critical thinking was lacking the panel noted the presence of rote learning and a lack of robust class discussions (Council on Higher Education, 2018). The report noted that there were no modules dedicated to computer literacy and based on the self-evaluative reports by the different faculties it was taken as conclusive that training was sufficient. Amongst the recommendations made by the panel was that more assessments should be set that assess reading, writing and research skills (Council on Higher Education, 2018).

The abovementioned policy (Council on Higher Education, 2015) and report (Council on Higher Education, 2018) indicate the essential skills for law students. The documents are close to silent on the ethical use of AI tools or other technological systems. This is understandable, as these tools have only been used in the last three years. However, given the rapid rate of change and development, law schools should start thinking about how AI tools can enhance graduate attributes. Law schools should also continuously consider which skills remain relevant for the working world students will enter. The next section considers the potential of AI tools to enhance some of the essential skills of law students namely writing, critical thinking, research skills and problem solving.

3. POTENTIAL SKILLS ENHANCEMENT WITH GENAI

3.1. Writing

As alluded to above, writing is an indispensable skill for a lawyer. Good writing is also part and parcel of good communication. For many years academics and legal practitioners in South Africa have lamented that the writing skills of law students are not up to standard (Crocker, 2018; Greenbaum & Bangeni, 2019). Some authors have argued that GenAI tools can be used for more routine tasks in relation to writing including drafting outlines, bouncing ideas, technical corrections, stylistic and grammar corrections (Costa et al., 2024; Regalia, 2024; Alkamel and Alwagieh, 2024). In the South African context, most law students are not native English speakers. Tools such as Grammarly and Quillbot can be useful in assisting students to convey their ideas. If GenAI can be used for the routine tasks, such as language correction, more time can be freed up in lecture halls to focus on higher order skills such as critical thinking. One of the most common uses of using AI tools is for language editing. The idea is that students would write a text and then use these programmes to correct grammatical and language errors. These tools are generally well accepted, aside from the debate on whether students need to learn language skills in the traditional manner. Arguments in favour of GenAI correction tools suggest that it is no different than using a human language editor or even the spellchecker on MS Word (Lewis, 2024). Furthermore, several studies suggest that language editing GenAI tools are not just useful for editing the written product but helping students learn from their errors (Amyatun and Kholis, 2023; Weber et al., 2025).

Are there some possible dangers if we leave all our writing up to GenAI? There could potentially be. Writing is a process of editing and correcting, a first draft is rarely what any student submits for an assessment. Tu et al., (2024) adds that writing is a creative process and students might lose out on the development of a (better) legal argument in the drafting process when using GenAI. Writing should be seen as a form of thinking (Tu et al., 2024). Williams (2024) suggests placing greater emphasis on oral examinations, to counteract potential academic misconduct. For example, where students are required to submit a written assignment, it should be accompanied by an oral component to test their knowledge. Group, or collaborative assignments, have also been proposed as a safeguard against overreliance on AI. Williams (2024) is of the opinion that students might have a stronger sense of accountability when working with other students in a group.

It has been suggested that corpus linguistics and GenAI can be used to improve writing of students. Discipline-specific corpora has long been used as a method to improve the vocabulary of students. Cheung and Crosthwaite (2025) suggest using corpora in the form of chatbots to enhance disciplinary writing. This approach, rather than just a GenAI tool such as ChatGPT, increases creditability and accountability of the tool as the sources of information are more controlled (Cheung and Crosthwaite, 2025).

While GenAI can be used to correct grammar and stylistic errors in the writing process there might be potential harm if AI is expected to do the bulk of legal argumentation. GenAI should not be used as a substitute for the writing process but as tool to enhance the final product. Tu et al. (2024) maintain that overreliance on GenAI might stifle the lawyer's creative process and thereby hinder legal developments.

3.2. Critical Thinking

As mentioned above, law graduates need to demonstrate the ability to engage critically and analytically with law. The LLB Standards (Council on Higher Education, 2015) includes under critical thinking skills the ability to 'analyse, synthesise, judge critically and evaluate

problems and situations' (LLB Standards - Council on Higher Education, 2015). One of the concerns about the use of GenAI tools by students is that over-reliance on it will lead to a decline in critical thinking and analytical skills (Costa et al., 2024; Prakasha and Nair, 2024). Critical thinking is related to the essential decision-making process of legal practitioners. Critical thinking can be contrasted with naïve thinking. Moppett (2025) notes that legal practitioners exercise these critical thinking skills when they decide on a litigation strategy, exercise judgment in legal matters or develop client relationships. Lawyers will need to use their critical thinking skills to assess answers produced by GenAI. It is this skill that law lecturers need to home in on. Critical thinking should be thought of as a process rather than a final event. James and Burton (2017) describe critical thinking as a process, involving interpretation, analysis, evaluation and synthesis. Interpretation involves understanding the meaning of a statement before the evaluation has started. The second phase of critical thinking involves analysis. James and Burton (2017) describe analysis as a deepened understanding. At this stage, the student needs to identify the underlying assumptions and principles relating to the statement identified in the first phase (James and Burton, 2017). The third phase, evaluation, consists of questioning the statement in terms of accuracy, legality, reasonableness, persuasiveness, theoretical soundness or any other relevant criteria (James and Burton, 2017). The final phase, synthesis, consists of a consolidation of the first three phases that culminates in the student's own conclusion (James and Burton, 2017).

GenAI can be used to stimulate critical thinking in its various stages set out by James and Burton (2017) above. During such an exercise, students will need to go through the steps of critical thinking. Bliss (2024) suggests asking students to prompt an answer from GenAI whereafter they are allowed to evaluate the answer given. Although GenAI is used, such an assignment still develops critical thinking and analytical thinking skills. Furthermore, such an exercise acquaints students with the use of AI. Dietis (2024) suggests prompting AI to produce arguments for and against a topic and asking students to give a (substantiated) answer as to which they prefer. Youn, Park and Murphy (2024) suggest giving an article to students to read and summarise and then prompting a summary from GenAI on the article whereafter students critically engage with that summary. In this way, students must evaluate the answer given by AI. Students might also be encouraged to use AI in a Socratic method (Orynnbassarova and Porta, 2024). In other words, the better the quality of their questions, the better answers they will receive. Bliss (2024) suggests that law students revise and refine a draft answer produced by AI, and using AI has a debate partner rather than naively accepting the first answer given. There are some aspects to be mindful of when using GenAI tools to enhance critical thinking. Darwin et al., (2024) note that although GenAI has the potential to enhance critical thinking, it could create 'echo chambers' as it is limited in the number of perspectives that it can produce. Liu et al. (2025) describe 'echo chambers' as spaces where groups emphasise one particular viewpoint and discredit any outside viewpoint. Echo chambers are detrimental to the development of critical thinking as it might be difficult to think critically about perspectives without alternative perspectives and viewpoints. Other limitations identified by Darwin et al. (2024, p. 15) in their study include oversimplification of concepts by AI and lack of personalization in AI algorithms. Tertiary education usually involves studying complex concepts. The study of law involves studying concepts, but the application of rules and the changing scenarios are not always as straightforward as they may appear. Furthermore, the lack of personalisation in algorithms restricts critical analysis by not tailoring searches to individual criteria (Darwin et al., 2024)

3.3. Research Skills

There are potential benefits of using Gen AI for the development of research skills (Balan, 2024). Gen AI has been beneficial in the initial brainstorming phase of research (Songkram et al., 2024). An additional benefit of GenAI is that it can speed up productivity during the research process. Traditionally, a person may have to use search engines to look up literature on a topic. With the use of GenAI, a person may, for example, prompt the search of the most notable works on a topic. On some search engines, Gen AI is being used to summarise key points or findings in publications. These tools can greatly speed up the initial process of finding and identifying literature (Faber, 2024). Gen AI might also be able to assist with creating an outline for a research paper. AI-powered search engines are already being used in legal practice., including Lexis+ AI and Westlaw AI – Assisted Research which are large language models used as legal research tools to find court cases, legislation and other legal documents (Magesh et al., 2025). Clearing up time with more routine tasks creates time for the actual writing process. The most significant danger in using GenAI for finding sources is that it might hallucinate and the sources might be incorrect (Magesh et al., 2025). Sources provided by GenAI should always be verified as there is no GenAI research legal tool that is free of hallucination (Magesh et al., 2025).

3.4. Problem-Solving

Law students need to be equipped with problem-solving skills. Traditionally, clinical legal education has been used to expose students to real-life legal problems and scenarios. Moot courts and mock trials have also been used to expose students to court setups and protocols. However, law modules usually have a large amount of students and doing mock trials with large groups of students can be time-consuming. For this reason, virtual courtrooms (powered by AI) have been used by Law Faculties. The University of Johannesburg has designed a virtual courtroom that confronts students with real-life scenarios in courtrooms. During the development phase of AI-generated simulations, expert advice is usually sought after. This consultative phase addresses the tendency of GenAI products to provide false or irrelevant scenarios.

4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

4.1. Academic Integrity

It is of utmost importance that law graduates conduct themselves with ethical integrity. One of the biggest challenges associated with GenAI is the risks it poses to ethical behaviour. The biggest risk facing students is a lack of academic integrity. It is quite easy for students to submit an assignment question into GenAI and to submit an answer as is. Plagiarism has existed even before the arrival of GenAI. However, there is no completely reliable tool to detect the use of AI (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). It should be noted that universities and institutions have differing policies on the extent to which GenAI can be used. Some universities ban it completely, while others encourage its use.

4.2. Bias and Fairness

Bias and fairness issues are also one of the ethical concerns related to the use of GenAI (Balan, 2024; Li et al., 2025). Li et al. (2025) notes that since societal biases already exist, it is likely that these biases will be reproduced in GenAI models as they rely on existing textual data. Li et al. (2025) further note that the most frequently reported cases of bias relate to gender, race, nationality and professional biases. Within the African context, an awareness of bias and fairness is crucial, as GenAI tools are often trained on Eurocentric and patriarchal data (Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2020; Mubangizi, 2024).

4.3. Privacy and Data Concerns

LLMs such as ChatGPT use publicly available data, data licensed from third parties, as well as data provided by users (Ye et al., 2024). Where personal data is used from any of the sources, breaches of personal data might take place either by reproduction of the data or breaches from 3rd parties (Ye et al., 2024; Feretzakis et al., 2024).

4.4. Legal Practice

In the South African legal fraternity, the existing framework has been used to regulate unethical behaviour in relation to the use of GenAI. The existing framework consists of the Ethical Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct is issued in terms of the Legal Practice Act.

The viewpoints of the legal fraternity on the use of GenAI seem to be mixed. A few cases have dealt with the use of generative AI by legal practitioners in South Africa. In *Makunga v Barlequins Beleggings* (WCC) (unreported case no 19733/2017, 1-12-2023), a legal practitioner used GenAI to draw up his heads of argument. He had disclosed this fact to the court and the presiding officer commended the pleadings. In *Parker v Forsyth* (Johannesburg Regional Court) (unreported case no 1585/20, 29-6-2023), the attorney had sent a list of non-existing citations to the defendant before it was heard before a court. The citations were fictitious and it was found that ChatGPT was used. The court found that although there was no deliberate misleading of the court, that the parties were nevertheless “overzealous and careless”. The matter was reported to the Legal Practice Council.

In the second matter, *Mavundla v MEC: Department of Co-Operative Government and Traditional Affairs* 2025 (3) SA 534 (KZP), one of the parties before the court presented citations that were fictitious. The court referred to the duty on legal practitioners not to mislead the court. The presiding officer in this matter emphasised that technology should be used with independent reading. The presiding officer further emphasised that it remains the responsibility of legal practitioners to verify information that is used and if this is not done it is unprofessional. The matter was referred to the Legal Practice Council as well. In *Northbound Processing v Diamond Regulator* (2025/072038 ZAGPJHC 661), there was a similar case of fictitious cases found in pleadings. In the matter, the presiding officer referred the relevant parties to the Legal Practice Council.

In the abovementioned cases, the existing code of conduct was used to deal with the matter. It might be that disclosure would make a difference in how the use of GenAI is viewed. While it remains uncertain whether a code of conduct related to AI will be produced, it is encouraging to note that a group of legal practitioners and academics have proposed guidelines on the ethical use of GenAI in legal practice. The first guideline is integrity and diligence in the use of AI, meaning that practitioners should always check the relevance and accuracy of the information provided by GenAI. The second is the appropriate use of GenAI, which means that it should be used for routine tasks rather than substantive legal reasoning (Thaldar et al., 2025). Thirdly, independent critical thinking should not be sacrificed when using GenAI during legal research, the practitioner should always critically assess the information provided (Thaldar et al., 2025). Another guideline is that the use of GenAI should always be to the benefit of the client, which might mean charging a lower fee for increased efficiency (Thaldar et al., 2025). The working group also addresses disclosure, suggesting that there is currently not a need to disclose the use of AI as this might create the idea that the product provided has not done so responsibly (Thaldar et al., 2025). It might be that as the use of AI becomes more acceptable and common practice that disclosure could be expected in practice. Another guideline is that legal practitioners should also take care that the necessary protection against breaches of data and privacy are in place (Thaldar et al., 2025). Additional guidelines refer to bias and awareness of cybersecurity and staying up to date with the evolution of GenAI technology (Thaldar et al., 2025). These guidelines are currently going through a consultative process.

5. CURRICULUM REFORM FOR GENAI?

The discussion above, raises the question whether law curricula need to be reformed to deal with the challenges and risks posed by GenAI. Law graduates will be entering a working world where AI is already being used. In addition, as with other ethical dilemmas, there is the risk of using AI in an irresponsible manner. In South Africa, the LLB standards (Council on Higher Education, 2015) speaks to requisite skills and indicates the importance of ethical behaviour. The above-mentioned cases illustrate that existing principles on ethical conduct can be used.

However, the adoption of GenAI is still in its nascent stages which necessitates that Law schools will have to consider the skills that the next generation of law students need to be equipped with. It might be that students are in need of new skills, such as learning how to operate AI-operated search tools. In addition to technical skills related to AI, law students need to demonstrate an ethical awareness of the use of GenAI, in the working world generally, and more specifically in the legal practice. Having said that, law schools should not lose sight of the basic skills, that were taught prior to the advent of GenAI. These skills are still relevant to the practice of law.

Based on the above discussion, the following recommendations are made.

5.1. Policy Development

Firstly, universities should have a clear policy on the use of GenAI. The policy should not simply state that GenAI should be used ethically. Ethical use should be explained. It is recommended that GenAI policies should exist at different levels of universities. For example, while there might be a university policy, faculties should create more detailed and subject-specific policies, that are aligned with university policies. At the institutional level, policy should be created that ensures equitable access to the required hardware, software and technical support (Faber, 2024). It is suggested that law schools incorporate the ethical use of GenAI into courses on academic integrity, non-discriminatory use of GenAI and practices related to data protection. The LLB curriculum already contains objectives to ethical behaviour. It is recommended that the objectives on ethical behaviour be expanded to include ethical behaviour in relation to GenAI. Gutowski and Hurley (2025) recommend that law schools involve all relevant stakeholders when designing policy around GenAI. In the South African context, this would mean that professional bodies, such as the legal practice council should also be involved in policy design.

5.2. Mandatory Training

Secondly, all academic staff should be trained in the use and ethics of GenAI (Munir, 2025). Since it is encouraged that lecturers incorporate GenAI components into their coursework, it only follows that lecturers convey the correct policies to students. Faber (2024) maintains that it is important that future lawyers have AI literacy. Given the importance of being AI literate, it is recommended that lecturers and students take mandatory courses on AI literacy. Kong et al. (2021) propose that an AI literacy course for university students can have three basic components: (a) teaching basic AI components (b) using AI components for evaluation and (c) using AI for problem solving.

5.3. Hands on Activities in Class

Thirdly, as discussed above, the integration of GenAI into legal education offers various avenues for the enhancement of skills for future lawyers. The curriculum should specifically speak to the potential of GenAI tools to improve writing, research and problem-solving skills of law students. Eckart (2022) suggests that law students be exposed to GenAI writing tools in writing courses as early as the first year already.

At the same time, lecturers should give clear written instructions on the extent to which AI can be used. It is also recommended that GenAI be used in real time classroom settings before students do so independently. Students should be properly briefed on assignments related to AI and the risks of using AI (Bliss, 2024).

5.4. Diversification of Assessments

In the last instance, it is recommended that there be a variety of assessments including written, oral, formative, summative, online and in-person. While it is encouraged that the ethical use of GenAI be used, other assessments such as written tests can still be utilised.

It is important that the law curriculum reflects the ethical behaviour that will be required from students in the professional world. It seems as if the guidelines proposed by the working committee mirrors the required skills by students, namely critical thinking, research, writing and problem-solving.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

GenAI tools have infiltrated university and work life. In the short time that it has existed, it has been used exponentially. Law graduates will be required to be proficient in legal technologies in their professions (Farber, 2024). This paper has found that it is possible to use GenAI in a manner that enhances existing skills needs while also exposing students to the use of GenAI. It is recommended that assignments are used which are aimed at practicing skillful working rather than a blanket prohibition. Skills that can be enhanced include writing, research, problem-solving and critical and analytical thinking. It is imperative that law curricula incorporate courses that inform students of the ethical use of GenAI tools. While GenAI can perform tasks that previously only humans could do, it does not replace humans and GenAI cannot be used ethically without human oversight.

REFERENCES

- Alkamel, M & Alwagieh, N. (2024). Utilizing an adaptable artificial intelligence writing tool (ChatGPT) to enhance academic writing skills among Yemeni university EFL students. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 1-9.
- Amyatun, R. & Kholis, A. (2023). Creating Artificial Intelligence (AI) like QuillBot AI assist Student's Writing Skills? Assisted Learning to Write Texts using AI. *English Language Education Reviews*, 3(2), 135-154.
- Balan, A. (2024). Examining the ethical and sustainability challenges of legal education's AI revolution. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 31(3), 323-348.
- Bliss, J. (2024). Teaching Law in the Age of Generative AI. *Jurimetrics*, 111-161.
- Cheung, L & Crosthwaite, P. (2025). CorpusChat: integrating corpus linguistics and generative AI for academic writing development. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-27.
- Costa, K., Ntsobi, P. M., & Mfolo, L. (2024). Challenges, benefits and recommendations for using generative artificial intelligence in academic writing – a case of ChatGPT. *Medicon*, 7(4). Retrieved from <https://themedicon.com/pdf/engineeringthemes/MCET-07-236.pdf>

- Crocker, A. (2018). Facing the Challenge of Improving the Legal Writing Skills of Educationally Disadvantaged Law Students in a South African Law School. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 21, 1-27.
- Council on Higher Education. (2015). Qualification Standard for Bachelor of Laws (LLB). Retrieved from <https://www.che.ac.za/file/7297/download?token=JjuWknW1>
- Council on Higher Education. (2018). Report on the National Review of LLB Programmes in South Africa. Retrieved from <https://www.che.ac.za/publications/reports/state-provision-bachelor-laws-llb-qualification-south-africa>
- Dietis, N. (2024). *Bringing GenAI into the university classroom*. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/spotlight/bringing-genai-university-classroom>
- Darwin, R & Mukmination, N & Suryati, N & Laksmi, E & Marzuki. (2024). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits and limitations. *Cogent education*, 11(1), 1-18.
- Eckart, A. N. (2022). Transactional Artificial Intelligence. *Legal Writing: The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute*, 26(2), 273-294.
- Faber, 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(3), 349-363.
- Feretzakis, G., Papaspyridis, K, Gkoulalas-Divanis, A. & Verykios, V. S. (2024). Privacy-preserving techniques in generative AI and large language models: narrative review. *Information*, 15(11), 697.
- Floridi, L. (2024). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: exacerbated problems, renewed problems, unprecedented problems*. Retrieved February 17, 2025, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4801799
- Gutowski, N. & Hurley, J. (2025). Forging Ahead or Proceeding with Caution: Developing Policy for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education. *University of Louisville Law Review*, 63(3), 581-626.
- Greenbaum, L & Bangeni, B. (2019). Bachelor of Laws (LLB) students' views of their literacy practices: Implications for support in a time of change. *Reading & Writing-Journal of the Reading Association of South Africa*, 10(1), 1-10.
- James, N. & Burton, K. (2017). Measuring the critical thinking skills of law students using a whole-of-curriculum approach. *Legal Education Review*, 27, 1-20.
- Kong, S. C., Cheung, W. M. Y. & Zhang, G. (2021). Evaluation of an artificial intelligence literary course for university students with diverse study backgrounds. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100026.
- Lewis, C. D. (2024). All in: Strategic approaches to incorporating AI into legal higher education. *Kuwait International Law School Journal*, 1-29.
- Li, M. Enkhtur, A., Yamamoto, B. A., Cheng, F., & Chen, L. (2025). Potential Societal Biases of ChatGPT in Higher Education: A Scoping Review. *Open Praxis*, 17(1), 79-94.
- Liu, J. Schwarz, A., Risius, M., Hirschheim, R., & van Scotter, J. (2025). Conceptualizing Echo Chambers and Information Cocoons: A Literature Review and Synthesis of Current Knowledge and Future Directions. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 34(2), 1-19.
- Makunga v Barlequins Beleggings (Pty) Ltd t/a Indigo Spur* (19733/2017) [2023] ZAWCHC 196.
- Magesh, V., Surani, F., Dahl, M., Suzgun, M., Manning, C, & Ho, D. (2024). Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools. Retrieved February 17, 2025, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.20362>
- Mahmud, S (Ed). (2024). *Academic Integrity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. IGI Global.
- Mavundla v MEC: Department of Co-Operative Government and Traditional Affairs* (7940/2024P) [2025] ZAKZPHC 2
- Moppett, S. A. (2025). Preparing Students for the Artificial Intelligence Era: The Crucial Role of Critical Thinking Skills. *Suffolk University Law School Research Paper*, 25(4), 1-31.
- Mubangizi, J. C. (2024). Artificial Intelligence, Human Rights and Sustainable Development: An African Perspective. *Perspectives of Law and Public Administration*, 13(3), 374-389.

A. Geduld

- Munir, B. (2025). Integrating Generative AI in Legal Pedagogy: A Case Study. *International Journal of Legal information*, 53(3), 272-284.
- Nowrozy, R. & Jam, D. (2024). *Embracing the generative AI revolution: Advancing tertiary education in cybersecurity with GPT*. Retrieved 17 February, 2025, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.11402>
- Orynbassarova, D. & Porta, S. (2024). Implementing the Socratic Method with AI: Opportunities and Challenges of Integrating ChatGPT into Teaching Pedagogy. *International Conference on Emerging eLearning Technologies and Applications*, 526-532.
- Parker v Forsyth* (1585/20) [2023] ZAGPRD 1
- Prakasha, A. & Nair, V. (2024). Integrating generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges. *Law, Technology and Humans*, 6(3), 60-79.
- Sedutla, M. (2013). LLB summit: legal education in crisis?: news. *De Rebus*, 8-10.
- Songkram, N., Chootongchai, S., Keereerat, C., & Songkram, N. (2024). Potential of ChatGPT in academic research: exploring innovative thinking skills. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-23.
- Thaldar, D., Mbatha, S., Botes, M., & Esselaar, P. (2025). Responsible AI use in South African legal practice: A call for ethical guidelines. *De Rebus*.
- Tu, S., Cyphert, A., & Perl, S. (2024). Artificial Intelligence: Legal Reasoning, Legal Research and Legal Writing. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science and Technology*, 25, 105-125.
- Ye, X., Yan, Y., Li, J., & Jiang, B. (2024). Privacy and personal data risk governance for generative artificial intelligence: A Chinese perspective. *Telecommunications Policy*, 48(10), 102851.
- Youn, H., Park, N., & Murphy, R. (2024). Beyond writing a summary: Utilizing AI tools to enhance writing skills. *Communication Teacher*, 39(1), 49-55.
- Weber, F., Wambsganss, T., & Sollner, M. (2025). Enhancing legal writing skills: The impact of formative feedback in a hybrid intelligence learning environment. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 650-677.
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltyniek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Sigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1-39.
- Williams, C. V. (2024). Bracing for Impact: Revising Legal Writing Assessments Ahead of the Collision of Generative AI and the NextGen Bar Exam. *Legal Writing: J. Legal Writing Inst.*, 28, 1-76.
- Zuiderveen Borgesius, F.J. (2020). Strengthening legal protection against discrimination by algorithms and artificial intelligence. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 24(10), 1572-1593.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Full name: Allison Jade Nicole Geduld

Institutional affiliation: University of Johannesburg

Institutional address: Johannesburg, Auckland park, Kingsway Avenue

Short biographical sketch: Allison Geduld is a senior lecturer in the Public Law Department at the University of Johannesburg. She obtained her LLB, BA (Hons), LLM and LLD from the North-West University. She lectures Jurisprudence and Interpretation of Statutes. Her research explores the constitutional value of *ubuntu* in the South African legal system and in teaching and learning practices.