

Секція А1 Освітні науки	
УДК 377.1:004.8]:34-057.85	
Дата першого надходження статті до видання	2026-06-16
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування	2026-07-18
Дата публікації/оприлюднення	2026-07-18

Application of generative artificial intelligence in forming professionally oriented digital competence of future lawyers in college

Hanna Shayner

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages for Engineering,
Lviv Polytechnic National University, Lviv, Ukraine
e-mail: hanna.i.shayner@lpnu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0086-5579>

Abstract. The article substantiates the theoretical and practical aspects of integrating generative artificial intelligence (AI) and large language models (LLMs) into the educational process of professional pre-higher education institutions to shape the professionally oriented digital competence of future professional junior bachelors of law, alongside analyzing the associated socio-legal and pedagogical risks. Based on the synergy of systemic, competence-based, and activity-based approaches, as well as methods of pedagogical modeling and case studies (specifically evaluating US and Chinese judicial precedents), the study proves the necessity of transitioning from a knowledge-based to an activity-based learning model. The paper reveals the potential of generative AI as a tool for optimizing students' routine processes (searching regulatory frameworks, analyzing big data) and simulating professional scenarios. Particular attention is paid to the foreign language preparation of future lawyers (ESP); AI is identified as an adaptive contextual tutor that deconstructs Anglo-American legal concepts and transforms passive lexical acquisition into active communication skills through role-play simulations and instant feedback. The author proposes a dualistic modular framework of AI competence, consisting of invariant (universal prompt engineering, academic autonomy) and variable (specialized legal software) modules. Key risks are identified and systematized: neural network "hallucinations," AI plagiarism, the devaluation of fundamental education, and clip-based thinking. The student's role is defined as a critical supervisor of digital assistants, which requires advanced data verification skills through official legislative registries. Finally, the study justifies recommendations for the institutional regulation of AI boundaries and the transformation of State Final Examination (SFE) formats through the introduction of oral examinations and practice-oriented case studies. The research materials can be used to update the educational programs of the "Law" specialty (081) and professional development programs for teachers of professional pre-higher education institutions.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, large language models, prompt engineering, digital competence, professional junior bachelor, Law specialty, institution of professional pre-higher education, academic integrity.

Застосування генеративного штучного інтелекту у формуванні професійно-орієнтованої цифрової компетентності майбутніх юристів у коледжі

Шайнер Ганна Ігорівна

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов технічного спрямування,

Національний університет «Львівська політехніка», Львів, Україна

e-mail: hanna.i.shayner@lpnu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0086-5579>

Анотація. У статті обґрунтовано теоретичні та практичні аспекти інтеграції генеративного штучного інтелекту (ШІ) та великих мовних моделей (LLM) в освітній процес закладів фахової передвищої освіти для формування професійно-орієнтованої цифрової компетентності майбутніх фахових молодших бакалаврів права, а також проаналізовано супутні соціо-правові та педагогічні ризики. На основі синергії системного, компетентнісного та діяльнісного підходів, а також методів педагогічного моделювання та аналізу кейсів (зокрема, судових прецедентів США та Китаю) доведено необхідність переходу від знанієвої до діяльнісної моделі навчання. Розкрито потенціал генеративного ШІ як інструменту оптимізації рутинних процесів студентів (пошук нормативних баз, аналіз великих масивів даних) та симуляції професійних сценаріїв. Окрему увагу приділено іншомовній підготовці майбутніх юристів (ESP); визначено, що ШІ діє як адаптивний контекстуальний тьютор, який деконструє англо-американські юридичні поняття та трансформує пасивний лексичний запас у навички активної комунікації через рольові ігри та миттєвий зворотний зв'язок. Запропоновано дуалістичну модульну структуру ШІ-компетентності, що складається з інваріантного (універсальний промпт-інжиніринг, академічна автономія) та варіативного (професійне юридичне ПЗ) модулів. Виявлено та систематизовано ключові ризики: «галюцинації» нейромереж, ШІ-плагіат, девіація фундаментальної освіти та кліпове мислення. Визначено роль студента як критичного супервізора цифрових асистентів, що вимагає навичок верифікації даних через офіційні реєстри. Обґрунтовано рекомендації щодо інституційного регулювання використання ШІ та трансформації форматів державної підсумкової атестації (ДПА) шляхом впровадження усних захистів та практико-орієнтованих кейсів. Матеріали дослідження можуть бути використані для оновлення освітніх програм спеціальності 081 «Право» та програм підвищення кваліфікації викладачів закладів фахової передвищої освіти.

Ключові слова: генеративний штучний інтелект, великі мовні моделі, промпт-інжиніринг, цифрова компетентність, фаховий молодший бакалавр, спеціальність Право, заклад фахової передвищої освіти, академічна доброчесність.

Introduction

Topicality of the problem. The emergence and widespread adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) in the education system over the past few years has significantly transformed and diversified the landscape of scientific research in the fields of educational philosophy, pedagogy, teaching methods, psychology, and sociology. Researchers from various fields are assessing the potential of AI, its impact on the learner's personality, and the changes it is already gradually bringing to the learning, development, and education of students. At the core of this technological shift are generative AI models and large language models (LLMs), which possess the unique capacity to co-create content, synthesize unstructured data, and provide personalized corrective feedback. These capabilities fundamentally distinguish them from traditional, static digital learning platforms and instruction software.

It should be noted, however, that in some areas, the education system as a whole has proven unprepared for such a rapid intrusion by AI, which, while offering innovative solutions to some issues and problems, raises and exacerbates others, deeper and more global in scale and consequences. A profound structural contradiction has emerged between the exponential, non-linear velocity of AI evolution and the traditionally conservative, bureaucratic nature of

institutionalized education. This systemic mismatch is particularly evident in vocational and professional pre-higher education sectors, such as colleges, where curricula must rapidly adapt to volatile market demands while maintaining academic integrity and rigorous professional standards.

This problem becomes exceptionally acute in the field of legal education. The digital transformation of modern legal institutions including the implementation of e-governance, automated contract verification, and electronic justice systems, demands a completely new paradigm of training. Future professional junior bachelors of law can no longer rely solely on a conventional, text-memorization model of learning. Instead, they require a robust, professionally-oriented digital competence that enables them to strategically deploy AI as an analytical assistant while maintaining strict supervision over its outputs. Consequently, there is an urgent scientific and practical need to investigate the pedagogical conditions, risks, and modular frameworks that define the integration of generative AI within the professional preparation of future legal experts in the college environment [1].

Literature review. Currently, the scientific literature is only beginning to discuss the challenges and risks that threaten humanity in the era of the dynamic development and proliferation of AI. A challenge is defined as an external provocative influence that requires a response and, if ignored, can develop into a threat. Risk is the combination of the likelihood of dangerous and undesirable consequences arising from a challenge. Depending on the nature of the threat, the risks of widespread AI adoption can be philosophical, where AI's influence on people can contribute to changes in their worldview; psychological, where constant interaction with voice assistants and AI-powered chatbots can lead to psychological disorders in humans (e.g., asocialization and a distorted perception of reality); related to information security, where the deployment of AI systems can lead to a leak of users' personal data; or pedagogical, where the integration of AI into education can lead to problems related to the process and outcome of acquiring new knowledge.

In the initial stage of the emergence of new innovative tools, the focus of researchers has been on studying the didactic and methodological potential of specific AI-based technological solutions. The ability of AI to engage in dialogic interaction with the user, which in a number of ways characterizes communication between people, and to provide various types of feedback [2] in an adaptive mode significantly distinguishes it from other traditional digital learning tools. As a result, a "pedagogical delight" effect has been observed in the scientific literature, where researchers focus primarily on the didactic and methodological capabilities of AI for solving certain educational, methodological, and research problems. This is certainly objectively justified when the educational interaction of students with AI tools is aimed at creating additional opportunities for deeper study of specialized academic disciplines and the development of necessary professional competencies. Examples of such studies include the works devoted to the use of AI tools in the training of students of different specialties. The ability of generative AI to adapt text complexity and to develop didactic, educational, and assessment materials has stimulated the creation of meaningful models of personalized learning, implemented, in part, on the basis of intelligent learning systems (ILS) [16].

The spread of AI in education, as well as its significant advantages, consisting of the ability to take on many tasks traditionally performed by teachers, inevitably leads to a rethinking of educational methodology and the beginning of a discussion about revising some aspects of traditional approaches and teaching methods [5]. In our view, the authors rightly argue for the need for such a rethinking not only by the didactic and methodological potential of AI, which has already been covered in the scientific literature, but also, most importantly, by the problem areas that, in terms of their scope and depth of dissemination, pose real challenges and threats to the education system as a whole and the development of students' cognitive abilities in particular. In their works, scholars, from various methodological perspectives, identify specific problems facing the education system in the era of the spread of AI. Many of

the issues discussed separately have common roots and are the result of deeper and more widespread problems. This necessitates a comprehensive study of the pressing challenges and risks facing the education system in connection with the integration of AI [6], [7], [8], [9].

The aim of the article is to substantiate the theoretical and practical aspects of integrating generative AI into the educational process of colleges for shaping the professional-oriented digital competence of future lawyers, and to analyze the associated socio-legal risks.

Scientific Novelty

Conceptualization of a Dualistic Modular AI Competence Framework: For the first time within the system of professional pre-higher education (colleges), a bifurcated structural framework for AI competence has been modeled specifically for future professional junior bachelors of law. This model scientifically distinguishes between an invariant module (encompassing universal prompt engineering, academic autonomy, and critical evaluation) and a variable module (focused on specialized legal software and big data analytics).

Redefining the Educational Triad and the Student's Role: The study shifts the paradigm from a traditional knowledge-memorization model to an activity-based pedagogical model within the "instructor-artificial intelligence-student" triad. It theorizes the new role of the legal student not merely as a passive consumer, but as a critical supervisor of digital assistants, establishing the cognitive necessity of real-time data verification through official legislative registries to counter neural network "hallucinations."

Didactic Modeling of Generative AI in ESP Training: The research defines the specific pedagogical mechanism of generative AI acting as an adaptive contextual tutor in English for Specific Purposes (ESP). It conceptualizes how Large Language Models (LLMs) deconstruct complex Anglo-American legal concepts (e.g., tort law, due diligence, equity) to transform passive lexical acquisition into active professional communication skills through simulated role-plays and instant feedback.

Systematization of Socio-Pedagogical Risks in Legal Education: The study provides a comprehensive taxonomy of risks accompanying AI integration in vocational legal training. It establishes explicit links between technical vulnerabilities (data leaks, hallucinations, plagiarism) and cognitive-pedagogical threats (clip-based thinking, deviation of fundamental education, and the devaluation of scientific thinking).

Practical Significance

Curriculum and CPEP Modernization: The developed modular frameworks and pedagogical models serve as a direct practical blueprint for updating Core Professional Education Programs (CPEPs) and adjusting the curricula of the "Law" specialty in colleges to match the volatile demands of the digitalized legal market. **Methodological Guidelines for Classroom Integration:** The study provides actionable methods for law college instructors to integrate students' extracurricular AI interactions into traditional classroom sessions. This includes introducing the evaluation of a "digital trace" (such as dialogue screenshots and version history) to foster critical thinking and ensure academic integrity. **Institutional Regulatory Frameworks:** The findings offer a concrete foundation for professional pre-higher education institutions to design local policy documents and precise compliance scales that define the acceptable boundaries and percentages of AI-human co-creation in written assignments. **Transformation of Assessment and State Final Examination (SFE) Formats:** The research outlines practical alternatives to traditional testing and qualifying papers vulnerable to AI plagiarism. It provides recommendations for implementing oral defenses of AI-generated solutions, practice-oriented case studies, and personal reflective essays.

Methodology

To achieve the determined purpose and ensure a comprehensive analysis of generative artificial intelligence (AI) integration into the process of training future lawyers, a complex of complementary scientific methods was applied. The methodological foundation of this study is grounded in the synergy of systemic, competence-based, and activity-based pedagogical approaches.

The following theoretical and empirical methods were utilized in the course of the research:

- Systemic and structural analysis – to investigate the modern digital educational environment of colleges and to conceptualize the dualistic structure of students' AI competence, identifying its functional elements and interconnections.
- Pedagogical modeling – applied to design the structural framework of AI competence, specifically for dividing the training content into invariant (universal prompt-engineering and critical thinking skills) and variable (highly specialized professional legal AI tools) modules.
- Case study method (comparative analysis of legal and educational precedents) – used to critically evaluate the practical manifestation of AI integration in real-world judicial systems and legal practices internationally (specifically analyzing the 2025 Lynn White eviction case in the US and the Chinese "smart court" decision support systems). This method allowed for the synchronization of college educational outcomes with actual global market trends.
- Deductive method and pedagogical synthesis – used to identify, classify, and theorize the key philosophical, psychological, pedagogical, and information security risks (such as AI plagiarism and the devaluation of fundamental scientific thinking) that modern higher and professional pre-higher education systems face.
- Prognostic methods – applied to develop normative and organizational recommendations for transforming State Final Examinations (SFE) formats and establishing local institutional policies for the acceptable use of generative neural networks in academic and research activities.

Research Limitations. Institutional and Educational Level Focus: The structural frameworks and pedagogical models developed in this study are tailored specifically to professional pre-higher education (colleges training professional junior bachelors). Therefore, the findings may not be fully generalizable to higher education systems (Bachelor's or Master's degree levels) or non-legal fields of study. Dynamic Velocity of AI Technology: Due to the exponential, non-linear evolution of generative AI tools and LLMs, the specific software capabilities, interfaces, and algorithmic limitations analyzed reflect the current state of technology and are subject to rapid obsolescence, requiring continuous dynamic updates to the variable module. Methodological and Empirical Boundaries: The research relies primarily on theoretical modeling, pedagogical synthesis, and qualitative case study analysis (specifically evaluating US and Chinese legal precedents). The findings lack long-term longitudinal empirical data and large-scale statistical validation regarding the quantitative impact of AI tools on student performance metrics over multiple academic semesters.

Results

The integration of AI has given rise to new challenges facing the modern higher education system. The most significant of these include:

- a) changes in the content of instruction;
- b) changes in traditional approaches and methods of teaching and assessment;

c) the changing role of the instructor in the “instructor-artificial intelligence-student” triad.

Each of these will be considered in more detail. The integration of AI into education will facilitate a number of changes in learning content. Firstly, given the prevalence of clip-based thinking among young people, the transition from a “knowledge-based” to an “activity-based” learning model is particularly urgent. In situations where AI can instantly provide necessary factual information, the value of simply obtaining and memorizing it diminishes. Learning must shift from the transfer of knowledge to learning how to work with constantly changing data sets. Practical skills such as applying knowledge in real-world activities, analyzing and critically evaluating AI feedback, working in teams, finding innovative solutions, and integrating newly acquired knowledge and experience into students' existing knowledge systems are becoming increasingly important.

One striking example of the dominance of the activity-based learning model is foreign language teaching. To master language as a means of communication, it must be learned through direct interaction. As a result of such learning, students not only memorize new vocabulary and become familiar with grammatical constructions in theory, but also develop essential skills in oral and written communication in a foreign language [17].

In the framework of professional linguistic preparation, generative AI serves as a powerful catalyst for future lawyers mastering English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and specialized legal terminology. Rather than relying on static bilingual dictionaries, law college students can utilize AI chatbots as personalized, adaptive language tutors available for contextual learning. Specifically, students can prompt generative models to deconstruct complex Anglo-American legal concepts (such as tort law, due diligence, or equity) and provide comparative explanations within the context of continental law systems [17].

Furthermore, generative AI allows students to practice simulated professional writing and vocabulary acquisition by generating customized legal case studies, contracts, and briefs containing target terminology. Students can interact with the AI to perform role-play exercises such as mock international client consultations or contract negotiations, thereby transforming passive lexical knowledge into active professional communication skills. Additionally, neural networks can instantly analyze a student's written text, offering corrective feedback on the precise usage of legalese, formal academic phrasing, and professional style, which significantly accelerates the internationalization of future legal experts' digital and linguistic competencies.

Secondly, given the didactic potential of AI, AI competence should be included among universal competencies and become part of the curriculum for students in all fields of study and specializations [4], [10], [11], [13]. This type of competence for college students may include two modules: invariant and variable. The invariant module is aimed at developing students' abilities to correctly interact with generative AI tools to solve educational and research problems, correctly formulate queries, and analyze and critically evaluate AI feedback. AI tools for solving professional problems will be aimed at developing their academic autonomy and also promoting their demand in the modern labor market.

Thirdly, the ability of AI-based technological solutions to take on many secondary tasks in various professional fields, as well as their constant improvement, will inevitably lead to significant changes in the world of professions. Due to an objective reduction in financial costs, a number of professions will disappear completely. Requirements for specialists in many other fields will change. New professions will emerge to solve new problems in the new world with AI. Colleges must flexibly respond to the needs of economic sectors, essentially preparing the specialists of “tomorrow.” This will require, with foresight, developing core professional education programs (CPEPs) with new content, modifying the curricula of existing CPEPs, and merging or eliminating certain specialties [12], [15].

The widespread use of AI technologies in practice has led to the emergence of two fundamental problems. The first is the devaluation of fundamental education and scientific

thinking. For centuries, education was characterized by a fundamental and systematic approach, a focus on the in-depth study of theoretical disciplines, scientific principles and patterns, the connection between humanities and natural sciences, a long-term approach, and a focus on developing analytical skills, an understanding of the cause-and-effect relationships between facts, events, and phenomena, and critical and scientific thinking. During their studies, students developed skills in learning autonomy, enabling them to further develop within the "lifelong learning" paradigm to meet their personal or professional interests and needs. New knowledge was built on a solid foundation of existing knowledge and practical experience. Ideally, in this context of the value of fundamental education, the advent of AI would allow students to delegate the solution of a number of secondary tasks or operations to AI tools and focus more on solving other tasks characterized by a high level of cognitive complexity. In reality, the rapid spread of AI with its ability to quickly generate ready-made answers contributes to the devaluation of fundamental education and scientific thinking, encourages the development of clip-based thinking, and the spread of AI plagiarism in the academic environment. Not seeing the value in developing systemic knowledge, many students prefer to receive quick and not always correct answers from generative AI without a deep understanding of the nature of this information.

The second is related to the use of AI's didactic potential in the educational process. The ability of AI tools to take on a number of secondary tasks requires educators to change traditional teaching methods and formats so that students' experiences with AI expand their opportunities to acquire additional knowledge or develop necessary skills.

At the current stage of AI adoption, changes in teaching approaches and methods should focus on integrating extracurricular interactions between students and specific AI-based technological solutions into traditional teaching methods. This interaction should be consistent with program requirements in terms of subject matter and complexity. Materials from students' extracurricular interactions with AI should be discussed in subsequent classroom sessions. Students should provide a "digital trace" of their work with AI (screenshots of dialogue with AI, version history of written assignments, etc.). This approach to teaching will foster students' critical thinking, analytical skills, and responsibility for the process and outcome of their learning.

Similar changes affect the use of assessment methods. Specialized AI tools are capable of developing assignments and automatically assessing students' knowledge. The ability of generative AI tools to provide evaluative and corrective feedback creates the necessary conditions for the automated evaluation of creative written work (e.g., essays, papers, term papers, theses, and research articles). The scientific literature describes the effectiveness of incorporating stages of student interaction with AI into traditional teaching methods in specialized disciplines [16].

Undoubtedly, the organic integration of AI into the educational process and changes in traditional approaches and teaching methods will require teachers to reconsider their attitude toward AI as a "participant" in the educational process within the "instructor-artificial intelligence-student" triad. AI's ability to interact with students and teachers in a dialogic and personalized manner significantly distinguishes it from other previously known educational tools, which largely provide formulaic responses. In this regard, initiating a discussion regarding the status of AI in the educational process seems timely and important. At the same time, despite possible changes in traditional approaches and methods of teaching and assessment that allow the integration of AI-assisted student practice into traditional teaching methods, issues of assessing the products of AI-human co-creation remain unresolved. How to assess a student's work, 5, 10, 20%, etc., of which was completed using AI? How to distinguish, for example, the use of AI for linguistic editing of an essay from rewriting the work based on AI recommendations? A possible solution would be the adoption of regulations outlining the areas

and degrees of AI use in educational or research tasks according to a specific scale of acceptable use.

The final decision on the criteria for the acceptable use of AI should be made by specialists in each specific field. To prevent teacher bias when applying these criteria, it is necessary to develop local (departmental or faculty) documents containing clarified requirements and examples of the legal and acceptable use of AI in teaching and research.

The widespread use of AI plagiarism in the academic environment necessitates the revision of certain assignment formats or final assessment forms. Given the widespread use of AI plagiarism, it seems appropriate to revise certain formats for the State Final Examination (SFE). Specifically, either a significant transformation of the final qualifying paper's content or its replacement with other SFE forms is required. Potentially effective solutions include: oral examinations that include critical analysis of AI-generated solutions, creative projects, practice-oriented case studies, and essays reflecting students' personal experiences and value judgments.

The introduction of artificial intelligence into legal practice inevitably entails a transformation in the requirements for professional lawyer competencies. Thus, a modern lawyer must not only have a knowledge of the law but also understand how artificial intelligence systems operate in the context of law enforcement. Lawyers must be able to use specialized software for document analysis, case management, and automation of legal processes. They must also understand how neural networks and machine learning algorithms function in order to competently assign tasks to developers and evaluate the performance of AI systems. The future belongs to specialists capable of working at the intersection of law, information technology, and business processes. The ability to work with big data, interpret the results of machine analysis, and explain complex technological concepts in accessible language is also becoming an integral part of the profession [14].

Attention must be paid to adapting law college educational programs to the new realities of digital transformation. Leading colleges are already launching educational programs, as well as retraining and professional development courses. As noted, AI in scientific research is a tool that has the potential to enrich the learning and research process for both students and faculty. Key applications of AI in scientific research include the automation of large-scale data processing, natural language processing, the development of predictive models, and the formulation of a range of ideas that enable the definition of a research hypothesis [2].

Discussion

The use of artificial intelligence in the judicial system, which has already demonstrated its potential in real courtrooms, is of particular interest. According to international media reports, in 2025 American Lynn White won an eviction case using the ChatGPT neural network. Over the course of several months, White actively downloaded court documents, analyzed the judge's procedural errors, studied the law, and drafted responses to the court. The result exceeded her expectations: the court not only overturned the eviction decision, but also wrote off \$55,000 in fines and \$18,000 in back pay.

In recent years, media reports have been actively circulating about China's complete transition to a "smart court" system powered by artificial intelligence capable of independently issuing verdicts. First of all, it must be noted that there is no digital judge hearing cases and rendering decisions. The real purpose of the implemented systems is to provide comprehensive support for the judicial process. As researchers note, the "smart court" system does indeed use big data and machine learning to assist human judges: it helps to quickly find similar cases from previous years, suggest possible legal provisions, and generate draft decisions and supporting court documents. Thus, this is a Decision Support System (DSS), not a replacement of a human judge with an algorithm. The system is designed so that if a judge and the AI system disagree,

the judge is required to enter an explanation of their decision into the system [3]. This is not intended to replace a human judge with an electronic one, but to reduce corruption and unreasonable decisions. This approach represents an innovative mechanism for ensuring judicial accountability.

Despite the obvious potential of AI technologies to improve the efficiency of legal practice, their use is associated with a number of significant risks that must be considered both in practice and in the professional training of lawyers. The main risks include:

- the reliability of generated information (so-called "hallucinations" of neural networks),
- threats to data confidentiality and information security, and the potential decline in professional qualifications due to excessive reliance on automated tools.

Thus, artificial intelligence cannot completely replace the legal profession, but it is significantly transforming the professional workflow by automating routine tasks and freeing up resources for more complex analytical tasks that require human intervention. A key competency of modern lawyers is the ability to effectively interact with AI tools, which requires an understanding of both their capabilities and their inherent limitations. The development of generative neural networks, capable of analyzing legislation and case law, formulating legal positions, and even drafting procedural documents, is undermining the lawyer's monopoly on the interpretation of legal texts and the application of legal norms. However, maintaining the human factor in legal activity remains necessary, as texts written by neural networks require critical analysis by professionals.

In the context of practical implementation within professional pre-higher education, the direct utilization of generative AI tools by law college students manifests primarily through advanced prompt engineering tailored to legal tasks. In their daily academic and research activities, students actively deploy neural networks to optimize routine processes: searching for relevant regulatory frameworks, synthesizing large volumes of legal texts, and generating initial drafts of non-procedural documentation. Furthermore, interactive dialogues with AI chatbots allow future lawyers to simulate real-world professional scenarios. For instance, students can use generative models as simulated opposing counsel or mock clients to test their legal arguments, practice advisory communication, and identify potential logical gaps in a case strategy. However, this active student engagement with technology necessitates a simultaneous development of advanced verification skills. In order to mitigate the profound risks of "AI hallucinations," where neural networks generate fictional legal precedents or non-existent statutory clauses, students must cultivate a rigorous habit of double-checking every AI-generated output against official national registries and verified legislative databases. Thus, the student's role shifts from a passive consumer of automated data to an active, critical supervisor of digital legal assistants.

Conclusions

The rapid intrusion of generative artificial intelligence (AI) and large language models (LLMs) into professional pre-higher education has initiated a profound paradigm shift, fundamentally altering the training of professional junior bachelors in law. Based on the comprehensive pedagogical modeling, systemic analysis, and international case evaluations conducted in this study, several critical conclusions can be formulated:

Shift to Activity-Based and Linguistic Learning: The traditional knowledge-memorization model in legal education has proven highly vulnerable to technological devaluation, given AI's capacity for instantaneous information retrieval. Consequently, college curricula must pivot toward an activity-based model. In the realm of professional linguistic preparation, generative AI serves as an adaptive, contextual tutor for mastering English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and complex legal terminology. By transforming passive lexical

acquisition into active communication through simulated contract negotiations, international client consultations, and instant style correction, generative tools significantly accelerate the internationalization of future lawyers' digital and linguistic competencies.

The Dualistic Modular Framework of AI Competence: To build a robust, professionally-oriented digital competence, it is established that law college training should incorporate a bifurcated framework. This includes an invariant module, focused on universal prompt-engineering, academic autonomy, and the critical evaluation of AI feedback, and a variable module dedicated to highly specialized, professional legal AI tools for big data analysis and contract automation. This dual structure ensures that graduates remain competitive and highly demanded in a volatile digital labor market.

Mitigation of Pedagogical and Socio-Legal Risks: While AI significantly optimizes routine processes, such as drafting non-procedural documents or analyzing regulatory frameworks, it simultaneously introduces profound risks. Chief among these are "AI hallucinations" (the generation of fictional legal precedents or non-existent statutory clauses), the proliferation of academic plagiarism, and the devaluation of systemic, fundamental scientific thinking. To mitigate these threats, students must transition from passive consumers of automated data to active, critical supervisors, cultivating a rigorous habit of verifying all AI-generated text against official national legislative databases and registries.

Institutional and Curricular Re-Engineering: Confronting the reality of human-AI co-creation requires concrete organizational and normative solutions. Educational institutions must adopt strict local regulations and clear scales of acceptable AI use to prevent assessment bias within the "instructor-artificial intelligence-student" triad. Furthermore, to combat widespread AI plagiarism, a radical transformation of the State Final Examination (SFE) formats is necessary. Replacing or supplementing traditional final papers with practice-oriented case studies, creative projects, and oral examinations centered on the critical analysis of AI-generated solutions represents a highly effective mechanism for ensuring authentic student accountability.

Future studies should focus on the empirical validation of the proposed invariant and variable modular frameworks across various regional law colleges, alongside the development of standardized, automated criteria for detecting and evaluating the precise margins of acceptable AI usage in students' creative and research endeavors.

Список використаних джерел

1. Shayner H., Havran M., Krasa H. Realities and trends of academic mobility of students at Ukrainian higher educational institutions. Вісник науки та освіти. 2024. № 8(26). С. 627–638. URL: <http://perspectives.pp.ua/index.php/vno/article/view/14551>
2. Шайнер Г. І., Барабаш О. В., Бияк Н. Я. Навчальні цілі та освітні можливості використання мережі Інтернет та нейромереж. Суспільство та національні інтереси. 2026. № 1(21). С. 500–510. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2026-1\(21\)-500-510](https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2026-1(21)-500-510)
3. Zheng G. G. China's grand design of people's smart courts. Asian Journal of Law and Society. 2020. Vol. 7(3). P. 561–582. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2020.20>
4. Олійник В. В. Цифрова компетентність як чинник професійного зростання. Вища освіта України. 2022. № 2. С. 15–22.
5. Марченко О. Цифрова компетентність у системі формування інформаційної культури майбутніх юристів. Наукові інновації та передові технології. 2026. № 4(56). С. 1494–1506. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2026-4\(56\)-1494-1506](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2026-4(56)-1494-1506)
6. Гаврілова Л., Топольник Я. Цифрова культура, цифрова грамотність, цифрова компетентність як сучасні освітні феномени. Інформаційні технології і засоби навчання. 2017. Том 61, № 5. С. 1–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v61i5.1744>

7. Клеба А. Цифрова компетентність майбутніх учителів інформатики як складова їх професійної компетентності. Науковий часопис НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 5 «Педагогічні науки: реалії та перспективи». 2019. Вип. 72, том 1. С. 223–226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2020.72-1.49>
8. Ковальчук А. Розвиток цифрової компетентності майбутніх педагогів професійного навчання в умовах цифровізації. Молодь і ринок. 2023. № 11–12 (219–220). С. 148–153.
9. Пригодій М. Методичні засади застосування цифрових технологій у підготовці майбутніх кваліфікованих робітників. Вісник Національної академії педагогічних наук України. 2024. Том 6, № 1. С. 1–13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37472/v.naes.2024.6104>
10. Спірін О., Овчарук О. Цифрова компетентність. Енциклопедія освіти / Нац. акад. пед. наук України. 2-ге вид., допов. та перероб. Київ : Юрінком Інтер, 2021. С. 1095–1096.
11. Швардак М., Іванова В. Формування цифрової компетентності майбутніх фахівців в умовах дистанційного навчання. Перспективи та інновації науки. 2025. № 7(53). С. 1053–1063. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2025-7\(53\)-1053-1063](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2025-7(53)-1053-1063)
12. Ferrari A. DIGCOMP: A framework for developing and understanding digital competence in Europe. Luxembourg : Publications Office of the European Union, 2013. 48 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2788/62993>
13. Vuorikari R., Punie Y., Gomez S. C., Van Den Brande G. DigComp 2.0: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. Seville : Joint Research Centre, 2016. 44 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2791/11517>
14. Martin A. Digital literacy and the "digital society". Digital Literacies: Concepts, Policies and Practices. 2008. Vol. 30. P. 151–176.
15. Siemens G. Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning. 2005. Vol. 2(1). P. 3–10.
16. Zawacki-Richter O., Marín V. I., Bond M., Gouverneur F. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. 2019. Vol. 16, Article 39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>
17. Kohnke L., Moorhouse B. L., Zou D. ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. RELC Journal. 2023. Vol. 54(2). P. 537–550. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>

References

1. Shayner, H., Havran, M., & Krasa, H. (2024). Realities and trends of academic mobility of students at Ukrainian higher educational institutions. *Visnyk Nauky ta Osvity*, (8(26)), 627–638. <http://perspectives.pp.ua/index.php/vno/article/view/14551>
2. Shayner, H. I., Barabash, O. V., & Byiak, N. Ya. (2026). Navchalni tsili ta osvitni mozhlyvosti vykorystannia merezhi Internet ta neiromerezh [Educational goals and educational opportunities of using the Internet and neural networks]. *Suspilstvo ta natsionalni interesy*, (1(21)), 500–510. [https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2026-1\(21\)-500-510](https://doi.org/10.52058/3041-1572-2026-1(21)-500-510)
3. Zheng, G. G. (2020). China's grand design of people's smart courts. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 7(3), 561–582. <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2020.20>
4. Oliynyk, V. V. (2022). Tsyfrova kompetentnist yak chynnyk profesiinoho zrostannia [Digital competence as a factor of professional growth]. *Vyshcha osvita Ukrainy*, (2), 15–22.

5. Marchenko, O. (2026). Tsyfrova kompetentnist u systemi formuvannia informatsiinoi kultury maibutnikh yurystiv [Digital competence in the system of forming the information culture of future lawyers]. *Naukovi innovatsii ta peredovi tekhnolohii*, 4(56), 1494–1506. [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2026-4\(56\)-1494-1506](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-5274-2026-4(56)-1494-1506)
6. Havrilova, L., & Topolnyk, Ya. (2017). Tsyfrova kultura, tsyfrova hramotnist, tsyfrova kompetentnist yak suchasni osviti fenomeny [Digital culture, digital literacy, digital competence as modern educational phenomena]. *Informatsiini tekhnolohii i zasoby navchannia*, 61(5), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v61i5.1744>
7. Klieba, A. (2019). Tsyfrova kompetentnist maibutnikh uchyteliv informatyky yak skladova yikh profesiinoi kompetentnosti [Digital competence of future computer science teachers as a component of their professional competence]. *Naukovyi chasopys NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seriiia 5. Pedahohichni nauky: realii ta perspektyvy*, 72(1), 223–226. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2020.72-1.49>
8. Kovalchuk, A. (2023). Rozvytok tsyfrovoy kompetentnosti maibutnikh pedahohiv profesiinoho navchannia v umovakh tsyfrovizatsii [Development of digital competence of future vocational education teachers in the conditions of digitalization]. *Molod i rynek*, (11–12(219–220)), 148–153.
9. Pryhodii, M. (2024). Metodychni zasady zastosuvannia tsyfrovyykh tekhnolohii u pidhotovtsi maibutnikh kvalifikovanykh robitnykiv [Methodological principles of digital technologies application in the training of future skilled workers]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrainy*, 6(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.37472/v.naes.2024.6104>
10. Spirin, O., & Ovcharuk, O. (2021). Tsyfrova kompetentnist [Digital competence]. In *Entsyklopediia osvity* (2nd ed., pp. 1095–1096). Yurinkom Inter.
11. Shvardak, M., & Ivanova, V. (2025). Formuvannia tsyfrovoy kompetentnosti maibutnikh fakhivtsiv v umovakh dystantsiinoho navchannia [Forming the digital competence of future specialists in the conditions of distance learning]. *Perspektyvy ta innovatsii nauky*, 7(53), 1053–1063. [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2025-7\(53\)-1053-1063](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2025-7(53)-1053-1063)
12. Ferrari, A. (2013). *DIGCOMP: A framework for developing and understanding digital competence in Europe*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2788/62993>
13. Vuorikari, R., Punie, Y., Gomez, S. C., & Van Den Brande, G. (2016). *DigComp 2.0: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens*. Joint Research Centre. <https://doi.org/10.2791/11517>
14. Martin, A. (2008). Digital literacy and the "digital society". *Digital Literacies: Concepts, Policies and Practices*, 30, 151–176.
15. Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3–10.
16. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>
17. Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>