

Gordana Ignjatovic, BA¹
ESP/LE Lecturer,
Faculty of Law, University of Niš

UDK: 004.8:378.147.091.32
UDK: 378.096:340.12(497.11 Niš):004.8

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15772682

Оригиналан научни чланак

Примљен: 16. 05. 2025.

Прихваћен: 28. 05. 2025.

AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION: TEACHERS AND STUDENTS ATTITUDES ON AI INTEGRATION IN LEGAL EDUCATION AT THE LAW FACULTY IN NIŠ

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) has had a major transformative impact in many sectors but it has also generated different opinions on many unresolved AI-related issues. Diverse attitudes are particularly prominent in educational contexts, where the use of AI technologies involves an additional set of pedagogical considerations. Their application in legal education and practice entails further concerns due to the distinctive nature of the legal profession and prevalent conventional approach to managing data, documents and human interactions. In an attempt to examine the current situation concerning AI integration in Serbian legal education, this paper presents the results of the empirical research aimed at assessing the attitudes and perceptions of the teaching staff and students at the Law Faculty in Niš on the use of AI technologies in legal education and related AI integration issues at the personal, academic/scientific research, educational, and institutional level. The first part of the paper provides an overview of the key findings and analyzes the major AI integration issues raised by respondents in the two surveys. With reference to the conceptual framework of agency in education, the second part focuses on the stakeholders' roles and possible courses of action in the AI integration process. Based on the provided analysis, the author draws conclusions on future considerations in the process of AI integration in Serbian legal education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), legal education, LF Niš empirical survey results, Serbia.

¹ Corresponding author: Gordana Ignjatovic, BA (MA Equivalent), ESP/Legal English Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Niš, Serbia; e-mail: goga@prafak.ni.ac.rs; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-4933>

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has generated a lot of hype since 2020, when international organizations and developed countries embarked on establishing a regulatory framework for ethical and human-centered application of AI technologies.² The Republic of Serbia set out on this path by adopting the first National AI Development Strategy (2020-2025), focusing on the national infrastructure and applied AI (Ignjatović, 2024:245-246). Serbia has recently adopted a new National AI Development Strategy (2025-2030),³ which envisages the development of regulatory framework, investments in infrastructure, human resources and education, particularly in non-tech sectors. These issues are to be addressed in the forthcoming period but Serbia still does not have any regulatory framework on AI integration. Thus, as AI technologies keep evolving, many technical, socio-political, legal, ethical and educational issues still remain unresolved.

Prior theoretical research on AI integration at the national level shows that the Serbian legal sector seems to be lagging behind the proactive approach to AI integration in developed countries.⁴ The formal integration of AI technologies in Serbian legal education is underdeveloped, primarily due to the lack of systemic and structured approach to a range of AI integration issues: regulatory framework, investments, infrastructure, tech support, resources, guidelines, AI literacy/skills courses and training programs, risk-assessment and supervision mechanisms (Ignjatović, 2025: 304, 305).

Based on the prior research, there seems to be a lack of empirical research on AI integration in Serbian legal education, particularly in terms of assessing the current situation and attitudes of key participants on different AI-related issues. In this contexts, this article presents and discusses the empirical research results on the attitudes of the teaching staff and students at the Law Faculty, University of Niš (hereinafter: LF Niš) on the use of AI technologies in legal education. The survey results may contribute to raising awareness about this highly relevant subject matter, ensure better understanding of impediments and concerns which have to be adequately addressed in the prospective AI integration processes, and provide ideas for designing viable solutions for AI integration in Serbian legal education.

²For more on the AI regulatory framework at the international, regional and national level, see: Ignjatović, 2024: 239-247.

³See: GovRS/NITRA (2025). Strategija razvoja veštačke inteligencije 2025-2030 (AI Development Strategy 2025-2030), *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 5/2025, Vlada RS/Ministarstvo nauke, tehnološkog razvoja i inovacija RS, 17.01.2025.

⁴For more on the AI integration issues in legal education and practice at the global and national level, see: Ignjatović, 2025.

2. Law Faculty Niš: Teacher and Student Surveys on AI in Legal Education (2024)

This part of the paper presents the results of two small-scale surveys on the attitudes of the teaching staff and students at the LF Niš on the use of AI technologies in legal education. The surveys aimed to examine the respondents' actual use of AI for personal, educational, academic/scientific and professional purposes, and their opinions on advantages and disadvantages of AI integration in legal education. The survey findings will be analyzed with reference to the conceptual framework of agency⁵ in education.

2.1. LF Niš Teacher Survey on AI in Legal Education: Summary and analysis of results

To explore the current attitudes to AI integration in legal education, the author first conducted an empirical research (survey), titled *LF Niš Teacher Survey on AI in Legal Education (2024)*.⁶ The target group included LF Niš teaching staff (46 in total). The responses were submitted by 24 respondents (52%).⁷

⁵ In education, *agency* is the capacity to identify values, goals, priorities and outcomes, to take proactive, purposeful and effective action to pursue them, and to take responsibility for one's decisions, actions and growth. It entails a number of core components: autonomy, freedom of choice, motivation, active engagement, self-awareness, confidence and self-efficacy, self-regulation, self-reflection (Education Hub, 2020). The common types of agency are: a) *collective agency* (of authorities and institutions); b) *multi-party agency* (of management, departments, services) and *individual agency* (of their representatives); c) *co-agency* (of peers, teachers-students, teachers-parents); d) *community agency*; e) *teacher agency*, and f) *student/learner agency* (OECD, 2019:1, 4-8).

⁶ The research was conducted in the period 7-31 Oct. 2024, on a voluntary basis. Research data were collected via a Google form semi-structured questionnaire, including 14 prompts: 9 structured (multiple choice) and 5 open-ended prompts. The survey questions were: Q1. Name 5 AI-based tools you have used/are aware of; Q2. Do you use AI tools, for which purposes?; Q3. AI tools in private life; Q4. AI tools in academic/professional life; Q5. AI tools in the teaching/learning process; Q6. AI at the Uni Niš; Q7. AI at the LF Niš; Q8. AI tools in the LF Niš curricula; Q9. AI use in LF Niš instruction; Q10. AI content in class; Q11. Advantages of AI use in legal education; Q12. Disadvantages of AI use in legal education; Q13. AI integration in legal education at LF Niš; Q14. Further comments/concerns on other relevant issues (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024, 5.10. 2024).

⁷ In addition to equal gender representation: 12 female and 12 male respondents (50% each), there was an even distribution of respondent' academic ranks: 10 full professors (41.6%), 7 associate professors (29.1%), 3 assistant professors (12.5%), and 4 teaching assistants/associates (16.6%). The percentage of surveyed respondents (52%) formally makes the survey representative.

In response to the open-ended prompt on AI tools (**Q1**), the respondents demonstrated awareness of a range of common and purpose-specific AI tools.⁸ In terms of frequency of using AI tools for different needs (**Q2**), the *overall average* results show that they are *occasionally* used by 55.55%, *never* used by 31.24%, and *daily* used by 13.2% of teachers, but the results on specific use vary (*Table 1*).⁹ Focusing on three education-related uses (b/c/d), most teachers (61%) *occasionally* use AI tools for these purposes; the average *daily* AI use is fairly low (11%) while some teachers (27.7%) *never* use AI for these purposes. As for personal use *in private life* (**Q3**), 45.45% of teachers use AI for different practical purpose,¹⁰ while one (4.2%) reported not using AI at all. In terms of personal use for *academic/scientific/professional purposes* (**Q4**), 25% of teachers do not use AI tools while 25.58% use them to a varying degree per purpose.¹¹ As for *personal AI use in the educational process* (**Q5**), 33.35% of respondents expressly reported not using AI at all, while 14.81 % use AI, largely as an assistive tool, to gather teaching resources and visualize content, while other uses are significantly lower¹² (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

⁸ In response to *Q1*, the respondents identified the common AI platforms/tools: Google Maps (24), Translate (21), Open AI ChartGPT (14), Earth (12), Lens (6), Gemini (5), Google Scholar (2), Law ChatGPT (2), and other purpose-specific tools: DALL-e, Bing/Copilot, Adobe Designer, Moveit, Michelin maps, Peak Lens, Sky map, AirVisual, Grammarly, Duoligo, Suno, Siri/Alexa/Cortana AI assistants.

⁹ Most teachers *occasionally* use AI tools for private (62.5%), educational (66.6%), academic/professional purposes and professional development (58.3% each), financial (50%), and administrative purposes (37.5%). The results on *daily* use are lower: for personal/private purposes (25%), academic/professional, professional development and work-related purposes (16.6% each), and financial purposes (4.2%). Many respondents *never* use AI for administrative and financial purposes (45.8% each), educational (33.3%), academic/professional and professional development (25% each).

¹⁰ As for *personal* use, AI tools are mainly used for: information/directions (83.4%), translation/revising (79.1%), payment (66.7%), personal learning (62.5%), grammar/plagiarism check (50%), image recognition (41.6%), entertainment/leisure/health (37.5%), speech/text/image recognition (25%), creating artistic content (16.7%), chat-bot (25%) and AI assistants use (12.5%).

¹¹ As for *personal* use for *academic/scientific/professional purposes* (**Q4**), most teachers use AI for scientific research: collecting resources/comparing results/summarizing content (58.4%), and reviewing/revising data: plagiarism/grammar/spell check (41.6%); fewer teacher use AI for: scientific writing: generating ideas, analyzing/interpreting results (20.8%); automating administrative tasks: reports/reviews/presentations (20.8%), drafting documents: reports, reviews, contracts (16.7%), visualizing content: presentations, charts/graphs/images (12.5%), and predicative analysis: data/performance, statistics (8.3%).

¹² As for *personal AI use for educational purposes* (**Q5**), AI tools are mostly used to gather teaching resources (41.6%) and visualize content (20.8%), and less so for generating/

Table 1. LF Niš Teacher Survey Q2: Teachers' personal use of AI tools for different purposes

Q2: Do you use AI-powered platforms/tools? For what purposes? How often?	Never	Occasionally	Daily
a) personal use of practical AI-powered apps in private life	12.5% (3)	62.5% (15)	25% (6)
b) academic/professional purposes (data research, writing, summarizing, etc.)	25% (6)	58.3% (14)	16.5% (4)
c) professional development/learning purposes	25% (6)	58.3% (14)	16.5% (4)
d) educational purposes (teaching and learning, training others, etc.)	33.3% (8)	66.6% (16)	0
e) workplace-related purposes (time/work-management, automating paperwork)	45.8% (11)	37.5% (9)	16.5% (4)
f) financial, commercial, business transaction purposes	45.8% (11)	50% (12)	4.2% (1)
Total: Average	31.24%	55.55%	13.2%

Source: LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Education (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 10.11.2024).

Thus, *at the personal level*, although almost half of respondents (45.45%) use AI for different personal needs (Q3), largely on the occasional basis (55.55%), very few teachers (13.2%) use AI daily (Q2). As for AI use for *personal education-related purposes*, most teachers (61%) use AI tools occasionally but very few (11%) use them daily. AI use for *personal academic/scientific/professional development purposes* (Q4) is much lower (25.58%). Even fewer teachers (14.81%) use AI *in the educational process*, largely as an assistive tool, while many (33.35%) do not use AI (Q5). The teachers' fairly low use of AI tools for *personal educational, academic/scientific and professional development purposes* raises the issues of their motivation, willingness and competencies to use AI in formal legal education settings.

Table 2. LF Niš Teacher Survey: Q 6: AI technology at UNI Niš, and Q7: AI technology at LF Niš

Q6. AI technology at UNI Niš Q7. AI technology at LF Niš Does the UNI Niš/ LF Niš provide any of the following opportunities to teachers, students, and administrative staff? (check all that apply)	Q6. AI technology at UNI Niš				Q7. AI technology at LF Niš			
	for teaching staff	for students	for administrative staff	NO/ not available	for teaching staff	for students	for administrative staff	NO/ not available
a) in/formal AI introductory courses	20.8% (5)	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	70% (17)	16.6% (4)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	70% (17)
b) formal/informal training on AI literacy	16.6% (4)	14.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	75% (18)	16.6% (4)	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	75% (18)
c) prof. development for scientific purposes	16.6% (4)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	79% (19)	16.6% (4)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	79% (19)
d) prof. development for educational process	16.6% (4)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	79% (19)	20% (5)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	75% (18)
e) prof. development on AI-tools for administration: admission, enrollment	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	79% (19)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	83% (20)
f) AI tools for administrative purposes (course registrations, record keeping)	4.2% (1)	14.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	87.5% (21)	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	75% (18)
g) legal framework for AI use in education	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	83% (20)	20.8% (5)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	70% (17)
h) AI-development strategy, policy in edu.	12.5% (3)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	83% (20)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	79% (19)
i) academic integrity policy on AI in edu.	16.6% (4)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	79% (19)	12.5% (3)	4.2% (1)	0	79% (19)
j) relevant infrastructure for using AI	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	87.5% (21)	16.6% (4)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	79% (19)
Total: Average	11.15%	7.43%	8.33%	80.2%	14.38%	5.85%	6.66%	76.4%

Source: LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Education (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 10.11.2024).

drafting documents (16.7%), assistance in syllabus/lesson planning (16.7%), creating tasks (12.5%), assessment: quizzes, rubrics, feedback (12.5%), AI in tasks/activities (8.3%), and predictive analysis (4.2%).

The next part of the survey examined the institutional approach to AI integration in terms of available learning opportunities for students, teachers and administrative staff provided at the University (Uni Niš) (Q6) and the LF Niš level (Q7). *Table 2* shows fairly similar overall average results.

In terms of AI *opportunities at the University Niš level (Q6)*, **80.2%** of respondents (on average) think that there are *no available opportunities* at the Uni Niš level. Most respondents report on the general lack of AI infrastructure (87.5%), AI tools for administration (87.5%), legal framework for AI use (83%), AI development policy (83%), academic integrity policy (79%), professional development opportunities for scientific, educational, and administrative purposes (79% each), formal/informal AI competencies training (75%), and AI literacy courses (70%). The results per individual groups are much lower: a few respondents note some *opportunities for teachers (11.15%* on average), *the administrative staff (8.33%)*, and *students (7.43%)*;¹³ the overall average for all three groups is **9%** (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

As for AI *opportunities at the institutional LF Niš level (Q7)*, **76.4%** of respondents (on average) think that there are *no relevant opportunities* at the LF Niš. Most respondents report on the lack of AI development policy, academic integrity policy, infrastructure (79% each), AI training for scientific (79%) and educational purposes (75%), formal/informal AI literacy training (75%), introductory AI courses and AI legal framework (70% each), professional development for administrative purposes (83%) and AI tools training for such purposes (75%). The results on *available opportunities* per group are much lower: a few respondents noted some *opportunities for teachers (14.38%* on average), while very few noted *opportunities for the administrative staff (6.6%* on average) and *students (5.85%* on average);¹⁴ the overall average for all three groups is **8.96%** (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

¹³ At the *Uni Niš level*, some *opportunities for teachers* (11.15 %) are: introductory AI courses (20%), AI literacy training, professional development and academic integrity policy (16.6% each), legal framework and AI development policy (12.5% each), and AI infrastructure (8.3%). The *opportunities for the administrative staff* (8.33%) are: AI courses and AI literacy (12.5% each), AI training for administrative purposes (12.5%), and AI tools training (8.3%). The *opportunities for students* (7.43%) are: introductory AI courses, legal framework for AI and for administrative purposes (8.3% each), AI development policies and academic integrity policy, AI literacy training, professional development for scientific and educational purposes (4.21% each).

¹⁴ At the LF Niš level, some *opportunities for the teaching staff* (14.38% on average) are: AI legal framework and professional development on AI use (20% each), AI literacy and training courses (16.6% each), AI infrastructure and development for scientific purposes (16.6% each), academic integrity policy (12.5%), AI development strategy, AI training, and

The next part of the survey examined the current *AI learning opportunities in the LF Niš curricula* at the undergraduate, master, and doctoral degree level (**Q8**). The results presented in *Table 3* show to what extent AI content and activities are present in the LF Niš curricular and extracurricular activities. The overall average results show that **71.4%** of respondents consider that there are *no available opportunities* for integrating AI tools, skills and contents in the curricula, syllabi, courses and extracurricular activities. Most teachers note a lack of opportunities for: AI pedagogy training, AI literacy/skills training (83% each), academic/scientific research (79%), recommended self-study resources (75%), legal research (70%), extracurricular activities (70%), AI content (66.6%), and AI modules/courses (41.6%). Notably, 70% of teachers think that new AI modules/courses are not under consideration, but 20.8% note that they are available at the master degree level (Law&ICT program). Most opportunities are available in the master degree curriculum (**18.9%** on average), but there are very few opportunities in the undergraduate curriculum (**7.8%**) and the doctoral degree curriculum (**2.7%**);¹⁵ the overall average of available opportunities at all three institutional levels is **9.8%** (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

prof. development for administrative purposes (8.3% each). Some *opportunities for the administrative staff* (6.6% on average) are: AI tools training (12.5%), legal framework and AI development policies (8.3% each), introductory AI courses and AI literacy training (8.3% each), development for administrative purposes (8.3% each), and AI infrastructure (4.2%). Some *opportunities for students* (5.85% on average) are: introductory AI courses (12.5%), AI literacy and AI training for administrative purposes (8.3% each), legal framework and AI development policies (4.2% each), AI infrastructure and academic integrity policy (4.2%), prof. development for scientific, educational and administrative purposes (4.2% each) (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

¹⁵ At the LF Niš *master degree level*, respondents report on AI and law courses (50%), AI-related units/topics (29.1%), AI training for prof. practice and extracurricular activities (16.6% each), academic research and education training (12.5% each), recommended self-study resources (8.3%), and formal/informal AI literacy/skills training (4.2%). At the *undergraduate degree level*, a few respondents noted some AI-related content in classes and extracurricular activities (12.5% each), AI and law courses, informal AI literacy/skills training, AI tools for academic/professional purposes, and recommended self-study (8.3% each). At the *doctoral degree level*, very few respondents report on AI and law courses/content, extracurricular activities, and recommended self-study resources (8.3% each) (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Table 3. LF Niš Teacher Survey Q8: AI in the LF Niš curricula/syllabi/courses

Q8. AI in the LF Niš curricula/syllabi/courses: Are any of these offered within the LF Niš curricula, syllabi, courses, or extracurricular/informal training opportunities? (check all that apply)	LF Niš <i>undergraduate</i> curriculum	LF Niš <i>master degree</i> curriculum	LF Niš <i>doctoral degree</i> curriculum	NO/ no available opportunities
a) new AI & Law courses/modules (policy, practice, ethics, problems)	8.3% (2)	50% (12)	8.3% (2)	41.6% (10)
b) practical (hands-on) training on AI tools for academic (research)	8.3% (2)	12.5%(3)	0	79% (19)
c) practical training on AI tools for professional/legal purposes	8.3% (2)	16.6% (4)	0	75% (18)
d) pedagogy-related training on AI use in the classroom	0	12.5% (3)	0	83% (20)
e) informal/optional training in AI literacy and related skills	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	0	83% (20)
f) recommended self-study online to develop AI literacy/skills	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	75% (18)
g) some AI-related units/lessons and topics in the course syllabus	12.5%(3)	29.2%(7)	0	66.6% (16)
h) extracurricular activities (courses, clinics, projects)	12.5%(3)	16.6% (4)	8.3% (2)	70% (17)
i) LF considers introducing new modules/courses on AI literacy/skills	4.2% (1)	20.8% (5)	0	70% (17)
Total: Average	7.85%	18.9%	2.76%	71.46%

Source: LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Education (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 10.11.2024).

Overall, *at the institutional level*, the results show insufficient *institutional agency*¹⁶ in addressing AI integration issues for educational, scientific and administrative purposes. The high averages on the *lack of AI learning opportunities* at the *Uni Niš (80%)* and at the *LF Niš (74.4%)* are supported by the low averages of available opportunities for all groups (teachers, students and administrative staff) both at the *Uni Niš* and at the *LF Niš (9% each)* (Q6-Q7). It seems that neither *Uni Niš* nor *LF Niš* has even started tackling AI issues, which are the cornerstone for AI integration in the teaching/learning process. Similarly, most LF teachers (**71.46%**) report on a *lack of learning opportunities in the LF Niš curricula*, while the available opportunities in the undergraduate, master and doctoral degree curricula are low (**9.8%** on average) (Q8). The available opportunities in a master program (18.9%) indicate that there is some education *about* and *for* AI but education *with* AI is non-existent across the LF Niš curricula. The high averages on insufficient learning opportunities and the low figures on available opportunities indicate the need to provide relevant AI literacy/skill and pedagogy-training courses, revise the institutional curricula, and explore opportunities for incorporating AI-and-law content in subject-specific instruction.

To examine the current teaching staff activities, the next part of the survey examined the *actual AI use, experimentation with AI tools, consideration and intention to use AI* in educational contexts (Q9). The overall average results (in Table 4) show that **10.98%** of respondents use AI for some teaching purposes, **10.2%** experiment with AI tools, **40.1%** still consider AI use, and **40.5%** have no intention to use AI. Some teachers (10.98%) report on *using AI*: to incorporate AI topics (20.8%), research/collect and generate teaching material (12.5% each), instruct on AI use for legal purposes (12.5%), research

¹⁶ *Collective agency* includes collaboration, joint action and shared responsibility on a macro-scale (by society, competent authorities, departments, institutions, community) aimed at achieving common goals and general welfare (OECD, 2019:9).

and recommend self-study resources (8.3% each), while some (6.25%) are still learning about AI use. Some teachers (10.2%) report on *experimenting with* AI tools: to research/collect and generate material (16.6% each), develop students' AI literacy/skills, incorporate AI topics, introduce AI administrative routines, recommend self-study resources (12.5% each), and introduce new summative/formative assessment forms (8.3%), but some (16.6%) need more experimentation. Many teachers (40.1%) report on *considering AI use*: to promote ethical/critical AI use (54.3%), research/collect and generate material (45.8% each), introduce AI routines, instruct on AI use for legal research, AI literacy/skills, introduce new assessment forms (41.6% each), recommend self-study resources (29.1%), and incorporate AI topics (25%), while 33.3% of teachers are still considering AI opportunities. On the other hand, **40.5%** of teachers (on average) report that they *do not intend* to use AI in instruction, which clearly indicates the prevalent respondents' mindset: skepticism, reluctance, strong resistance and disinterest. Notably, 25% of teachers from this group noted the need for further learning, experimentation and consideration; their replies per several educational purposes reflect critical assessment and recognition that AI tools may be useful for some goals: to instruct on academic research and recommend self-study resources (50% each), introduce new assessment forms (45.8%), AI administrative routines, develop students' AI literacy/skills, incorporate AI topics and instruct on AI legal drafting (41.6% each), promote ethical AI use (37.5%), and research/collect (33.3%) and generate teaching material (37.5%). Notably, respondents from all groups (25% using, 16.6% experimenting, 33.3% considering, and 25% non-users) express the need for further learning, experimentation and consideration before reaching an informed decision on AI integration (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Table 4. LF Niš Teacher Survey Q9: Teachers' use of AI in instruction (for teaching/learning purposes)

Q 9. AI in instruction (for teaching/learning purposes): Do you use, consider using, or experiment with AI tools for teaching/learning purposes in your classes? For which purposes? (check all that apply)	USE	Experiment with	Consider using	NO intention to use AI in instruction
a) research and collect relevant teaching/learning material	12.5% (3)	16.6% (4)	45.8% (11)	33.3% (8)
b) generate relevant teaching/learning material, activities, tasks	12.5% (3)	16.6% (4)	45.8% (11)	37.5% (9)
c) develop students' AI literacy and skills	4.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	41.6% (10)	41.6% (10)
d) promote ethical/responsible AI use, fact-checking, problem solving	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	54.1% (13)	37.5% (9)
e) incorporate AI-related topic in class activities	20.8% (5)	12.5% (3)	25% (6)	41.6% (10)
f) introduce AI-based course administration of (papers/ tasks/projects)	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	41.6% (10)	41.6% (10)
g) instruct Sts on AI use in academic research	8.3% (2)	0	41.6% (10)	50% (12)
h) instruct Sts on AI use for legal purposes (drafting legal docs)	12.5% (3)	0	41.6% (10)	41.6% (10)
i) introduce new AI-based forms of summative/formative assessment	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	41.6% (10)	45.8% (11)
j) recommend AI-based tools/platforms/courses for students' self-study	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	29.2% (7)	50% (12)
k) I'm still learning to use/experimenting with/considering AI use.	25% (6)	16.6% (4)	33.3% (8)	25% (6)
Total: Average	10.98%	10.2%	40.1%	40.5%

Source: LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Education, (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 10.11.2024).

The teaching staff activities reflect the current *teacher agency*.¹⁷ Considering that the teachers' *actual use* of AI tools (**10.9%**) and *experimentation* with AI tools (**10.2%**) are quite low, that many teachers are still *considering* AI use (**40.1%**), and that **40.5%** of surveyed teachers have *no intention to use* AI (Q9), these results reveal a significant lack of proactive approach to exploring available AI opportunities for instructional design and teaching/learning purposes. Despite the prevalent negative mindset (40.5%), a sub-group of respondents (25%) within that group critically assessed that AI may be useful for some educational purposes. It also seems promising that teachers from all groups (including 25% of non-users) note the need for further learning, experimentation and consideration, which is confirmed in their comments on the lack of AI literacy/skills courses and teacher training on AI integration (Q14).

The survey further explored *the actual integration of AI-related content in subject-specific contexts (Q10)*. In the open-ended prompt, respondents were asked to specify AI-and-law content, legal contexts and activities used in LF Niš classes. The results show that **62.5%** (15) teachers have *not* included any AI content, while **37.5%** (9) provided subject-specific examples of content, contexts and tasks: a) AI and law (4): discussions on AI in legal/judicial practice (videos, documents); b) AI in criminal law (1): predictive justice; c) AI in civil law (2): tort liability (lectures, cases, discussion); d) AI in constitutional law (2): constitutional process, elections, AI/digital transformation and human rights; f) AI in master Law&ICT courses (2): law&programming, blockchain; international law) (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in LE, 2024). These findings indicate that some teachers have recognized the importance of AI in legal discourse and exerted efforts to provide new insights by integrating AI issues in their course syllabi. Thus, they have demonstrated some *teacher agency*, proactive approach to facilitating new learning opportunities. To promote their agency, teachers should revise and update their syllabi, consider more extensive integration of subject-specific AI-and-law issues, and thus facilitate students' learning *about* AI and *for* AI. The new insights may contribute to promoting learning *with* AI in legal education, research and practice. Yet, these individual efforts hardly suffice in terms of a structured AI integration across the LF Niš curricula.

¹⁷ Generally, *teacher agency* the capacity to design and facilitate supportive learning, act purposefully and effectively, contribute to student/institutional growth, and direct one's own professional development. (OECD, 2019:8).

The next question (**Q13**) surveyed the teaching staff attitudes on whether AI-powered technologies should be integrated in legal education at the LF Niš (assessed on the 5-point Likert scale). *Table 5* shows divided opinions: 25% of respondents strongly agreed, 29.2% agreed, 29.2% had mixed opinions, 12.5% disagreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed. Overall, the results show that the largest number of respondents **54.2%** respondents are *positive* about AI, **29.2%** have *mixed* opinions, while **16.7%** have a *negative* stance on AI integration in legal education at the LF Niš (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Table 5. LF Niš Teacher Survey **Q13:** LF Teachers' attitudes to AI integration in legal education at LF Niš

Q 13. Do you think AI-powered technologies should be part of legal education at LF Nis? (scale 1-5) 24 responses				
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree not disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25% (6)	29.2%(7)	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	4.2% (1)
Total:	54.2% (13)	29.2% (7)		16.7 % (4)

Source: LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Education (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 10.11. 2024).

To cast more light on the respondents' mindset, the next two open-ended prompts examined the respondents' attitudes on advantages (Q11) and disadvantage (Q11) of AI integration in legal education.

The teachers' responses on *advantages, benefits and opportunities*(**Q11**) may be grouped as follows:¹⁸

a) *pragmatic goal-oriented benefits* (11): AI tools provide quick, time-efficient and cost-effective access to data, enable search for up-to-date material in subject-specific areas, summarize and analyze data and provide process/performance/product-driven results (lectures, presentations, documents, papers, etc.);

b) *instruction-oriented benefits* (10): interesting content and interactive classes enhance motivation, engagement, interaction, personalized learning for academic/professional and self-study purposes; AI tools connect students and promote alignment of syllabi at the national/international level;

c) *pedagogy-oriented benefits* (6): AI tools may save time and assist teachers in preparing classes, lectures, teaching material, generating ideas; they facilitate experiential learning and professional development; their integration across the curricula may promote interdisciplinary education;

¹⁸The responses were provided by 18 respondents (75%), 2 respondents (8.3%) stressed the need for caution, 2 respondents (8.3%) provided no reply, 1 respondent (4.2%) had no specific opinion, and 1 respondent (4.2%) found no benefits.

d) *scientific research-oriented benefits* (6): AI tools facilitate research on subject-specific topics, offer new ideas for consideration, compare legal solutions, save time in drafting scientific papers, provide better structure of the final product and valuable assistance in writing (grammar/spelling/plagiarism check);

e) *competence/skills-oriented benefits* (5): AI tools promote teacher research, critical material selection, lesson planning and material development skills; they promote students' legal research, analysis, problem-solving and writing skills (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

The responses on *disadvantages, challenges, concerns and risks* (Q12) may be grouped as follows:¹⁹

a) *overreliance* (7): dependence on quick-and-easy AI-generated outputs raises concerns: plagiarism and copyright issues; less thinking, no individuality, lack of intellectual vigour; recursive AI use without critical consideration; AI addiction: inability to work on one's own; stagnation of cognitive functions or "mind-dumbing" while "students should be encourage to think for themselves and express their own opinions without heavily relying on AI";

b) *bias, inaccuracies and hallucinations* (5): there are concerns about reliability and inaccuracies in AI outputs "based on input data whose quality and accuracy are not verified"; AI may misinterpret data, provide inaccurate conclusions; students may use AI-generated content "without critical assessment" and without using their own knowledge, argumentation, legal reasoning and creativity in problem-solving;

c) *privacy and security risks* (3): we should consider "possible costs" (risks and effects) of AI use on privacy, data protection, security; there is "a lack of information on dangers of using AI";

d) *ethical and professional issues* (3): there are concerns about plagiarism, unethical, irresponsible use and abuse; there is a need for plagiarism-detection tools and training "to identify bias and check facts";

e) *inadequate legal framework, information and education* (3): there is a lack of AI strategies, policies, regulations, guidelines for institutions, teachers and students; there is a lack of AI literacy/competence training, and a lack of information on risks of using AI in legal education;

f) *AI limitations and drawbacks* (4): AI integration should be explored and addressed with caution: "AI cannot understand the complexities of human

¹⁹The responses were provided by 19 respondents (79.1%); 4 (16.6%) provided no response, and 1 had no opinion (4.2%).

language and conduct”; AI can be used for research and statistics but “it is unsuitable for complex interpretation tasks and conclusions, which should be handled by traditional legal methods”; “AI is still unable to implement legal norms in daily situations; it should not to be used as a panacea for (resolving) legal issues, nor should it serve as a substitute for addressing matters which shall stay out of its reach” (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

In the final open-ended prompt (**Q14**), respondents were invited to share opinions on AI issues that may not have been covered in the questionnaire. In their comments, the teachers (12) reiterated their prior positions: one respondent had no dilemma about AI integration in legal education, hoping that the survey findings may be an incentive for AI integration at the institutional level; two respondents expressed intention to increase AI use for educational purposes. Some teachers (3) urged for caution due to risks, called for “proper regulation, ethical and responsible use”, and warned about possible abusive practices. Some teachers (3) noted that “AI cannot replace human creativity”, emphasizing that students should exercise critical thinking “without heavily relying on AI for quick solutions” and warning about the “mind-dumbing” effects.²⁰ One teacher outlined the future course of action: “successful AI use in education requires careful planning, teacher training, good infrastructure, and constant evaluation; HE institutions need to set clear goals how they want to use AI: for personalized learning, automating administrative tasks, or enhancing engagement”. One teacher noted the need for “a balanced, human-centered and pedagogy-driven approach, aligned with ethical standards, legal framework, good practices, institutional needs and educational goals” (LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Overall, the presented survey results clearly indicate divided opinions of the teaching staff at LF Niš on AI use in legal education, ranging from full rejection and reluctance to full acceptance (Q13). On the one hand, more than half of respondents (54.2%) are *positive* about AI integration in legal education, recognizing the increasing need for AI as a practical assistive tool which may improve some aspects of legal education. This stance is substantiated by responses on observed advantages of AI use in legal education: pragmatic goal-oriented, instruction-oriented, pedagogy-oriented, scientific

²⁰ In recent literature, there is a term “*brain rot*”, announced as the OUP word of the year 2024 and defined as follows: “brain rot” (n.): the supposed deterioration of a person’s mental or intellectual state, especially viewed as the result of overconsumption of material (particularly online content) considered to be trivial or unchallenging; or something characterized as likely to lead to such deterioration” (OUP, 2024). In the context of AI technologies, “brain rot” entails deterioration of the human mind under the detrimental impact of the latest GenAI technologies (Forbes, 2024).

research-oriented and competence/skills-oriented benefits (Q11). Due to observed limitations, drawbacks and concerns, some teachers (**29.2%**) have *mixed* feelings, emphasizing the need for a cautious, well-structured and responsible approach to AI integration, more AI learning opportunities and relevant safeguards to address risks. On the other hand, some respondents (**16.7%**) have a *negative* attitude to AI integration in legal education, illustrated in the observed disadvantages: overreliance; bias, inaccuracies, hallucinations; ethical and professional concerns, privacy/security risks; inadequate legal framework, information on AI integration, and AI literacy/skills training (Q12). However, we may not disregard a large group of teachers (48%) who opted out of the survey but whose “silence” may be interpreted as strong rejections, skepticism, disagreement or indifference. These distinctive perspectives should be properly considered in the AI decision-making processes as a valuable source of constructive criticism on issues that have to be addressed in the AI decision-making and integration processes.

2.2. LF Niš Student Survey on AI in Legal Education: Summary and analysis results

In order to explore the perceptions of LF Niš students’ on AI integration in legal education and their actual use of AI technologies, the author conducted a small-scale (pilot) student survey, titled *LF Niš Students’ Survey on AI in Legal Educations* (2024),²¹ including a sample of law students who attended ELP/Legal English courses at the LF Niš.²² The survey was forwarded to a total of 45 ELP/LE students and responses were submitted by 10 students (22%).²³ The research sample is by no means representative, which is certainly a limiting factor that may make the quantitative results tentative and generate certain reservations, but it does not diminish the value of students’ qualitative (narrative) responses. The pilot survey results are indicative of the students’ attitudes and actual AI use for different purposes, which may

²¹ The survey included 14 questions: Q1. Name 5 AI tools; Q2. Do you use AI tools? For which purposes?; Q3. AI tools in private life; Q4. AI tools in academic/professional life; Q5. AI tools in the learning process; Q6. AI at the Uni Niš; Q7. AI at the LF Niš; Q8. AI in the LF curricula; Q9. AI use in LF instruction; Q10. AI-related content in class; Q11. AI advantages in legal education; Q12. AI disadvantages in legal education; Q13. AI integration at LF Niš; Q14. Further comments (LF Niš Students Survey, 2024).

²² For the lack of direct contact with students in the autumn term 2024, the survey focused on students who had attended the first-year ELP course and the third/fourth-year LE courses in the spring term 2024.

²³ In addition to equal gender representation: 5 female and 5 male respondents (50% each), there was an even distribution across courses: 5 first-year ELP students, 4 student from the 3rd/4th year LE courses and 1 PhD student (LF Niš Students’ Survey, 2024).

serve as a stepping stone for further research and consideration at both institutional and individual level.

In response to the open-ended prompt on AI tools (**Q1**), students' replies indicate their awareness of the common AI-based platforms/tools and many purpose-specific applications.²⁴ As for the frequency of using AI tools for different personal purposes (**Q2**), the overall average results show that **38.33%** of students *never* use AI, **45%** *occasionally* use AI, and **16,66%** use AI on a *daily* basis, but percentages vary per specific usage (*Table 6*).²⁵ The three personal education-related purposes (b/c/d) show that most students use AI tools *occasionally* (50%), some students (23.3%) use them *daily*, and some students (26.6%) *never* use them for these purposes (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Table 6. LF Niš Students' Survey: **Q2:** Personal use of AI tools for different purposes

Q2: Do you use AI-powered platforms/tools? For what purposes? How often?	Never	Occasionally	Daily
a) personal use of practical AI-powered apps in private life	10% (1)	70% (7)	20% (2)
b) academic/professional purposes (data research, writing, summarizing, etc.)	30% (3)	50% (5)	20% (2)
c) professional development/learning purposes	20% (2)	60% (6)	20% (2)
d) educational purposes (teaching and learning, training others, etc.)	30% (3)	40% (4)	30% (3)
e) workplace-related purposes (time/work-management, automating paperwork)	60% (6)	30% (3)	10% (1)
f) financial, commercial, business transaction purposes	80% (8)	20% (2)	0
Total: Average	38.33%	45%	16.66%

Source: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Education, 2024 (prepared by author based on Google form calculations, 5.3. 2025).

As for *personal use* of AI tools *in private life* (**Q3**), **61%** of students (on average) reported using AI, largely on the occasional basis (45%) (**Q2**), for different practical purposes.²⁶ Considering AI use *for personal academic/scientific/professional purposes* (**Q4**), **32.85%** use AI tools for: reviewing/revising data (80%) and scientific research (60%), while other uses are much lower: writing, administrative tasks (20% each); predicative analysis, drafting documents, visualizing content (10% each); one student (10%) reported not

²⁴ In response to *Q1*, students noted: Open AI ChartGPT (10), Google Maps (8), Translate (8), Lens (5), Earth (4), Grammarly (3), MS Bing/Copilot (4), Gemini (2), G-Assistant (2); Pinterest, Duoligo, Craiyon, Quilbo, MyAI, Apple Intelligence, InferKit (1 each).

²⁵ Most student *occasionally* use AI purposes (20%). The *daily* use is much lower: educational (30%), personal/ needs, research, prof. development (20% each), and work-related purposes (10%). Most students *never* use AI for financial (80%), work-related (60%), academic/professional/educational purposes (30% each), and prof. development (20%) (LF Niš Students' Survey, 2024.).

²⁶ As for *personal use in private life* (**Q3**), most students use AI for: information/direction (90%), translation/revising (90%), image recognition (80%), chatbots (70%), grammar/plagiarism check, speech/text/image recognition (60% each), entertainment/leisure, learning languages/skills, AI assistants (50% each), artistic content (40%), and payment (30%).

using AI. In terms of using AI *for personal educational purposes (Q5)*, **40%** of students do not use AI tools while **20%** use AI to gather resources (50%) and generate material (20% each), for extracurricular activities (30%), to visualize content, draft documents, assessment, predictive analysis (10% each) (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in LE, 2024). Although the LF students' results on using AI tools for personal needs are higher than the LF teachers' results across several factors²⁷, they raise the issues of students' motivation, willingness and perhaps competencies to use AI in formal legal education settings.

The next part of the survey examined the students' perceptions on the institutional approach to AI integration in terms of available learning opportunities provided for students and teachers at the university level (Uni Niš) (Q6) and at the LF Niš level (Q7). The collected data are shown in *Table 7*.

Table 7. LF Niš Students' Survey: **Q6:** AI technology at UNI Niš; and **Q7:** AI technology at LF Niš

Q6. AI technology at UNI Niš Q7. AI technology at LF Niš Does the UNI Niš/ LF Niš provide any of the following opportunities to teachers/students?	Q6. AI technology at UNI Niš				Q7. AI technology at LF Niš			
	for teaching staff	for students	NO/ not available	I don't know	for teaching staff	for students	NO/ not available	I don't know
a) formal/informal AI introductory courses	0	20% (2)	60% (6)	40% (4)	0	20% (2)	70% (7)	10% (1)
b) formal/informal training on AI literacy	0	0	70% (7)	30% (3)	0	0	80% (8)	20% (2)
c) prof. development for scientific purposes	10% (1)	20% (2)	60% (6)	30% (3)	10% (1)	10% (1)	80% (8)	10% (1)
d) prof. development for educational process	0	10% (1)	50% (5)	40% (4)	0	0	80% (8)	20% (2)
e) prof. development for administration, admission, registration for courses/exams	0	0	60% (6)	40% (4)	0	0	80% (8)	20% (2)
f) AI tools training for administrative purposes	0	0	50% (5)	50% (5)	0	0	70% (7)	20% (2)
g) legal regulation for AI use in education	20% (2)	20% (2)	40% (4)	30% (3)	0	0	60% (6)	30% (3)
h) AI-development strategy, policy in edu	0	0	50% (5)	50% (5)	0	0	70% (7)	30% (3)
i) academic integrity policy on ethical AI use	0	0	50% (5)	50% (5)	0	10% (1)	70% (7)	20% (2)
j) relevant infrastructure for using AI	0	10% (1)	50% (5)	40% (4)	0	0	80% (8)	20% (2)
Total: Average	3%	8%	54%	39%	1%	4%	74%	20%

Source: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Education, 2024 (prepared by author based on Google forms calculations, 5.3. 2025).

In terms of AI *learning opportunities at the University Niš level (Q6)*, **54%** of students (on average) think that there are *no opportunities* in terms of: AI literacy training (70%), AI introductory courses (60%), training on AI use for scientific (60%) and educational purposes (50%), AI strategy/policies, academic integrity policy, AI infrastructure (50% each), training for administration (60%) and administrative purposes (50%), and AI legal framework (40%). Many students (**39%**) are unaware or barely aware of such opportunities for students (8%) and teachers (3%) (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

²⁷ E.g. in Q3, students' results are 35-45% higher for image/speech/text recognition; 23-25% for chatbots/AI assistants, leisure/art purposes; 7-10% higher for translation/ text revising, information/directions; but 16% lower for personal learning.

As for *AI learning opportunities at the LF Niš level (Q7)*, **74%** of students (on average) think that there are *no opportunities* in terms of: AI infrastructure (80%), AI literacy/skills training (80%), AI courses (70%), AI policies and academic integrity policy (70% each), AI legal framework (60%), professional development for scientific, educational, administration (80% each) and administrative purposes (70%). On average, **20%** have *no knowledge* about this matter while very few students are aware of some opportunities for students (4%) and teachers (1%) (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).

Overall, **at the institutional level**, the survey results on the *AI learning opportunities* at the *Uni Niš* and at the *LF Niš* (Q6-Q7) indicate insufficient institutional agency to provide relevant conditions for AI integration. Most students report on the *lack of opportunities* at the *Uni Niš* (**54%**) and *at LF Niš* level (**74%**); some students have no knowledge about such opportunities (39% for *Uni Niš*, and 20% for *LF Niš*), but very few are aware of some opportunities for students and teachers (11% at *UNI Niš*, 5% at *LF Niš*).²⁸ Considering the high figures on insufficient opportunities and lack of knowledge about them, students' perceptions indicate not only the need for more AI learning opportunities for both groups (at both levels) but also the need to provide transparent information on such opportunities (if any).

As for the *AI learning opportunities in the LF Nis curricula (Q8)*, *Table 8* shows to what extent AI contents are available in the undergraduate, master, and doctoral degree curricula. On average, **78.88%** of students think that there are *no opportunities* for: AI training for academic/professional and educational purposes (100% each), AI literacy/skills training (90%), AI contents (80%), recommended self-study resources (70%), AI modules/course (50%), and extracurricular activities (40%). While 80% of students think that new AI modules/courses are not under consideration, 20% think they are part of the master degree curriculum. They note some opportunities in the master degree (**15.55%**), the undergraduate degree (**12.22%**), and the doctoral degree (**5.5%**) curricula (LF Niš Students' Survey, 2024).²⁹ Overall, these

²⁸ Notably, LF teachers' responses on lacking opportunities are higher: *at the Uni Niš* (80%) and *at the LF Niš* (74.4%), while available opportunities for teachers and students at both institutions are similar (9.5% on average) (LF Nis Teacher Survey, 2024).

²⁹ At the LF Niš *master degree level*, students note some learning opportunities in AI courses/modules (50%), extracurricular activities (30%), AI-related classes/topics and recommended self-study resources (20% each). At the LF Niš *undergraduate level*, students note extracurricular activities (50%), recommended self-study resources (20%), informal AI literacy/skills training, and AI-related content (10% each). At the LF Niš *doctoral degree level*, very few students note new AI courses/modules (20%), recommended self-study resources,

results indicate a general *lack of AI learning opportunities* across the LF Niš curricula (**78.88%**); while most opportunities are available at the master degree (15.55%), the overall average of available opportunities in the undergraduate, master and doctoral degree curricula is low (**11%**) (Q8).³⁰ Thus, students' perceptions confirm the insufficient institutional agency to explore AI opportunities, revise and update the curricula, and more substantially include AI content in curricular and extracurricular activities. As AI tools are not formally used in instruction, teachers/students may be lacking AI competencies. Thus, LF Niš may institute an extensive needs analysis on the teachers/students stance on AI use in legal contexts, provide AI literacy/skills training for all interested parties, introduce (risk-free) AI tools for experimentation and instruction, and gradually promote AI use for legal education purposes.

Table 8. Question 8: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in the LF Niš curricula/syllabi/courses

Q8. AI in the LF Niš curricula/syllabi/courses: Are any of these offered within the LF Niš curricula, course syllabuses, individual courses, or informal training opportunities? (check all that apply)	LF Niš undergraduate curriculum	LF Niš master degree curriculum	LF Niš doctoral degree curriculum	NO/no opportunities available
a) new AI and Law courses/modules (policy, practice, ethics, risks)	10% (1)	50% (5)	20% (2)	50% (5)
b) practical (hands-on) training on AI tools for academic (research)	0	0	0	100% (10)
c) practical training on AI tools for professional/legal purposes	0	0	0	100% (10)
d) pedagogy-related training on AI use in the classroom	0	0	0	100% (10)
e) informal/optional training in AI literacy and related skills	10% (1)	0	0	90% (9)
f) recommended online resources for self-study for AI literacy/skills	20% (2)	20% (2)	10% (1)	70% (7)
g) some AI-related units/lessons and topics in the course syllabus	10% (1)	20% (2)	0	80% (8)
h) extracurricular activities (courses, clinics, projects)	50% (5)	30% (3)	10% (1)	40% (4)
i) LF considers introducing new modules/courses on AI literacy/skills	10% (1)	20% (2)	10% (1)	80% (8)
Total: Average	12.22%	15.55%	5.55%	78.88%

Source: LF Niš students' Survey: AI in Education, 2024 (prepared by author based on Google forms calculations, 5.3. 2025).

The next part surveyed the students' perceptions on the *teachers' current use, experimentation with, and consideration/intention to use AI tools in the educational process (Q9)*. The results in Table 9 show that **32%** (on average) consider that teachers have *no intention* to use AI tools in the educational process, **58%** report having *no knowledge* about it, while very few students report on teachers' actual AI use (1%), *experimentation with* AI (4%), and *consideration to use* AI (7%)³¹ (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in LE, 2024). The

and extracurricular activities (10% each) (LF Niš Students' Survey, 2024).

³⁰ By comparison, most LF teachers (71.46%) noted a general *lack of AI opportunities at LF Niš*, while available opportunities at the undergraduate, master and doctoral degree levels are low (9.8% average) (LF Nis Teacher Survey, 2024).

³¹ By comparison, 40.5% of teachers reported having *no intention to use* AI for educational/scientific/professional purposes, while 10.9% *actually use*, 10.2% *experiment with*, and 40.1% *consider* using AI for these purposes (LF Nis Teacher Survey, 2024, Q9).

results indicate insufficient teacher agency in exploring subject-specific AI learning opportunities and the need to transparently address the listed educational goals to enhance the *student agency*.³²

Table 9. Question 9: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in the classroom (for teaching/learning purposes)

Q 9. AI in the classroom (for teaching/learning purposes): Do your teachers use, experiment with, or consider using AI tools? For which teaching/learning purposes?	USE	Experiment with	Consider using	NO intention to use AI in instruction	I don't know
a) research and collect relevant teaching/learning material	0	20% (2)	10% (1)	20% (2)	60% (6)
b) generate relevant teaching/learning material, activities, tasks	0	10% (1)	10% (1)	30% (3)	50% (5)
c) develop students' AI literacy and skills	0	0	0	50% (5)	50% (5)
d) promote ethical AI use, fact-checking, problem solving	0	0	10% (1)	40% (4)	50% (5)
e) incorporate AI-related topic in class activities	0	0	10% (1)	20% (2)	70% (7)
f) introduce AI course administration (papers, tasks/projects).	0	0	10% (1)	30% (3)	60% (6)
g) instruct Sts on AI use in academic research	10% (1)	0	10% (1)	20% (2)	60% (6)
h) instruct Sts on AI use for legal purposes (drafting legal docs)	0	10% (1)	10% (1)	40% (4)	50% (5)
i) introduce AI-based forms of summative/formative assessment	0	0	0	30% (3)	70% (7)
j) recommend AI tools/platforms/courses for students' self-study	0	0	0	40% (4)	60% (6)
Total: Average	1%	4%	7%	32%	58%

Source: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Education, 2024 (prepared by author based on Google forms calculations, 5.3. 2025).

The survey further explored the actual *integration of AI-related content in subject-specific contexts (Q10)*. In the open-ended prompt, students were asked to specify AI-related content, legal contexts and types of activities used in LF Niš classes. Notably, 80% of students did not have any AI-related content and 20% provided examples of AI-and-law content in curricular or extracurricular activities.³³ Two students (20%) had class discussions on AI use in legal and judicial practice, and two students (20%) participated in extracurricular courses/conference on AI use in legal research, drafting documents, crime monitoring and prevention (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Education, 2024). Overall, as the students' views reflect a very limited scope of integration of AI-and-law contents in LF Niš courses, the findings confirm the insufficient teacher agency in facilitating students' learning *about* AI and *for* AI, while students comments (Q14) indicate that learning *with* AI is formally unavailable. Thus, in order to enhance enhancing *students' agency*, trust and collaboration in the AI integration process, LF teachers have to take a more proactive approach: revise and update the syllabi, incorporate AI-related legal issues in subject-specific courses, promote students' learning

³² *Student agency* is the capacity to actively participate in shaping one's learning, make responsible choices, develop a autonomy and a growth mindset, i.e. to have a voice, choice and take ownership of one's learning (OECD, 2019:2,5).

³³ By comparison, LF teachers' responses on *actual integration of AI-related content in subject-specific contexts (Q10)* show that 37.5% included AI-and-law content while 62.5% did not include such content in their classes (LF Nis Teacher Survey, 2024).

about and *for* AI, raise students' awareness about AI competencies for specific legal purposes, and eventually enhance learning *with* AI.

The next question surveyed the students' attitudes on whether AI technologies should be integrated in legal instruction at the LF Niš (**Q13**). The overall results (*Table 10*) show that half of the students (**50%**) are *positive* about AI integration, some (**30%**) have *mixed* opinions, while some (**20%**) have a *negative* opinion about AI use in legal education (LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Legal Education, 2024). Although these results are similar to the LF teachers' results, students have a slightly more negative attitude than their teachers.³⁴ Based on the students' narrative responses (Q14), it may be explained by uncertainty and observed lack of knowledge and transparent information about the AI integration.

Table 10. *Question 13:* Students' attitudes to AI integration in legal education at LF Niš

Q 13. Do you think AI-powered technologies should be part of legal education at LF Niš? (scale 1-5) 24 responses				
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree (mixed)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10% (1)	40%(4)	30% (3)	20% (2)	0%
Total:	50% (5)	30% (3)	20 % (2)	

Source: LF Niš Students' Survey: AI in Education, 2024 (prepared by author based on Google forms calculations 5.3. 2025).

To cast more light on the students' opinions, the survey next explored their perceptions on the advantages (Q11) and disadvantages (Q12) of using AI technologies in legal education.

In response to the open-ended question on the *advantages, benefits and opportunities* of integrating AI in legal education (**Q11**), the students' responses (10) may be grouped as follows:

a) *pragmatic goal-oriented benefits* (9): AI tools provide quick and easy access to data, facilitate research, recommend references, locate sources in specific legal areas, simplify and summarize complex topics, provide process/performance/product-driven support (synonyms, rephrasing, rewriting, proofreading, spelling/grammar and plagiarism check), speed up text analysis, save time and enhance efficiency in task-completion, provide better structure and "boost precision" of the final product, facilitate immediate communication, guidance and help via virtual assistants that address "every single detail";

b) *competence/skills-oriented benefits* (6): AI tools may facilitate and promote students' research skills, gathering/selecting relevant material, generating

³⁴ The LF Niš teachers' opinions (Q13): positive (54.3%), mixed (29.2%) and negative (16.7%) (LF Niš Teacher Survey, 2024).

and drafting legal documents; they may enhance students' legal skills: legal analysis, problem-solving skills, task organization and management skills, efficiency in task-completion; they may promote critical thinking, attention to detail, precision, careful wording and structure, academic/scientific writing skills, proofreading, etc.;

c) *learning-oriented benefits* (6): AI tools save time, quickly find answers, generate ideas, resources and educational material, simplify legal texts, organize written work, rephrase/rewrite and provide writing assistance (grammar/spell check, synonyms), generate text/visuals; they may modernize legal education and promote research in AI technologies for legal purpose.³⁵

In terms of *disadvantages, challenges, concerns and risks* of using AI in legal education (**Q12**), the students' responses (10) may be grouped as follows:

a) *AI technology and legal/professional issues* (7): there is a lack of legal AI tools in Serbian, trained on Serbian legal sources; legal AI tools may be costly and inaccessible; there are modernization costs, potential risks and difficulties in introducing new technologies; AI use is unregulated: there are safety, data protection and privacy issues; AI tools are prone to malfunctioning (e.g. plagiarism, grammar and spell-checkers); humans are currently competing with AI which may soon replace humans in legal jobs;

b) *overreliance on AI* (6): overuse and abuse of easily accessible AI tools generates overdependence on AI-generated results, less effort to do the independent "manual work" and less thinking as "the robot does all the work for you"; no critical thinking, lack of individuality, creativity and authenticity; it is "risky" in legal contexts as it may cause serious mistakes, misunderstanding, misuse/abuse and violations of law;

c) *unreliability, inaccuracies and malfunctions* (5): AI use raises concerns about reliability and accuracy of AI-generated data: outdated information (legislation no longer in force), "shallow approach to legal tasks", limited scope of applicable law, wrong sources, imprecise citation, missing references, inaccuracies in legal texts, which makes them "useless" because one has to "double-check everything"; it particularly refers to Serbian legal sources where the AI-generated results may be oversimplified, oversummarized, misinterpreted or manipulated to such an extent that the essential meaning is lost;

³⁵ In comparison to teachers' responses, LF students focus on practical goal-oriented, competence/skills-oriented and learning-based benefits, while LF teachers note a wider range of practical, educational, academic/scientific and professional purposes (practical goal-oriented, instruction-oriented, pedagogy-oriented, research-oriented, and competence/skills-oriented advantages).

d) *AI integration in legal education (2)*: it takes time and money to adopt and integrate new technologies, address risks, “think outside the box”, set “foundations” for future AI use, and “keep up with the AI evolution”; students need training on effective use of AI tools for legal purposes;

e) *AI limitations and shortcomings(4)*: AI can assist lawyers in certain “manual” tasks but the results may be superficial, misleading or mistaken; GenAIs “give an impression” of assistance but cannot be fully trusted as they do not provide relevant legal assistance in Serbian contexts; AI tools cannot replace human lawyers and outperform human creativity (LF Niš Students’ Survey: AI in Legal Edu, 2024).³⁶

In the final open-ended prompt (**Q14**), respondents were invited to share opinions on AI-related issues that may not have been covered in the survey. In addition to previously presented positions, two students stressed that AI should not be used in legal education and expressed preference for “classical” forms of learning and research. One student noted that “legal profession is not about knowing a solution to every problem in advance but about knowing where to find possible answers and how to use them creatively”. One student noted that legal education should be modernized but AI tools should be carefully assessed, pre-tested and integrated due to observed risks, which have to be kept under control. Based on the experiential learning activities, some students noted that distinctive lawyer skills are needed to address highly complex legal issues which cannot be adequately resolved by AI tools, particularly in Serbian contexts due to the lack of legal AI tools, which are inaccessible.³⁷ In view of prospective human redundancy (being replaced by intelligent machines), one student noted that human-AI collaboration would be “a winning combination”: combining AI and humans who can provide expert guidance on legal issues that cannot be properly addressed by AI alone (LF Niš Students’ Survey: AI in LE, 2024).

Overall, comparing the LF students and teachers’ response on advantages of AI integration (Q11), there is an obvious difference in priorities: LF students focus on major practical goal-oriented, competence/skills-oriented and learning-based benefits; LF teachers’ priorities are more versatile, covering a range of practical, educational, academic/scientific research, and professional

³⁶ By comparison, we may note that LF teachers cover a wider range of issues (overreliance, unreliability, ethical/professional issues, legal framework, privacy/security, and social/legal limitations) but students have raised new important issues: lack of legal AI tools, human redundancy, human-AI collaboration, and structured AI integration in legal education.

³⁷ This stance is in line with the opinions of Serbian legal practitioners; for more, see: Ignjatović, 2025:298.

development purposes (practical goal-oriented, instruction-oriented, pedagogy-oriented, research-oriented, and competence/skills-oriented benefit). While both students and teachers recognize the practical (applicative) use of AI technologies as supplementary and assistive tools, both groups stress the need for more learning opportunities, practical AI literacy/skills training, safeguards to counter observed risks, and a cautious, structured and ethical approach to AI integration in educational and legal contexts. As for observed disadvantages (Q12), teachers' responses cover a wider range of issues (overreliance, unreliability, legal framework, privacy/security, ethical/professional issues, and social/legal limitations). However, students' replies raise new practical issues: the lack of legal AI tools in Serbia, lack of structured AI integration, redundancy and loss of legal job, and human-AI collaboration as a prerequisite for preserving human agency, creativity and supervision. Some students raised the issue of adequate approach to AI integration, which should take into account the major features of legal education: a complex set of lawyer (discursive) competencies, legal conventions (managing documents, data, oral/written communication), communicative and interpersonal (soft) skills.³⁸ The negative attitudes to AI integration are based on critical assessment of disadvantages and risks (Q12), which generate criticisms, distrust, skepticism, hesitation or reluctance to use AI in legal education.³⁹ These diverse perspectives should be properly addressed in the prospective AI integration process.

On the whole, the empirical research results seem to confirm many conclusions of the author's prior theoretical research on this matter.⁴⁰ In the next part, we will consider the major issues raised by the survey participants and possible courses of action in prospective AI integration in Serbian legal education.

3. Agency-based Considerations for prospective AI integration at LF Niš

Based on the presented analysis, we may revisit the major issues raised in the two surveys from the perspective of agency in education, by focusing to the prospective roles and actions of key participants.

³⁸ Some legal scholars in developed countries have similar opinions; see: Ignjatović, 2025: 292,303.

³⁹ In developed countries, legal scholars/practitioners have similar critical attitudes; see: Ignjatović, 2025: 292.

⁴⁰ For more, see: Ignjatović, 2025: 304-306.

First, the survey results indicate insufficient ***institutional agency*** in view of providing relevant AI learning opportunities at the Uni Niš and LF Niš. Considering the reported lacks (infrastructure, resources, AI policies, guidelines, tech support, AI literacy/skills training) and students' insufficient awareness of such opportunities, both institutions should more substantially invest in material and human resources, provide and learning opportunities for teachers, students and administration staff, as well as transparent information about such opportunities. At the Uni Niš level, it is essential to cater for the needs of the non-tech faculty (in social sciences and humanities) by providing safe experimentation hubs, AI literacy/skills and pedagogy training courses, and opportunities for experiential learning *about, for* and *with* AI. At the LF Niš level, although there are some forms of learning *about* and *for* AI (in a master program), there are no formal/informal opportunities for learning *with* AI. It hardly suffices in terms of an extensive AI integration across the LF Niš curricula and taking advantage of the observed AI benefits in legal education and practice.⁴¹ Although prior research demonstrated some institutional agency at the Uni Niš and LF Niš,⁴² both institutions should take a more proactive approach by assessing the needs of all stakeholders, providing AI literacy/skills training, safe experimentation spaces (hubs, sandboxes) and experiential learning opportunities, promoting the use of risk-free AI tools (MS Notebook), providing AI integration resources, guidelines and pedagogy training in subject-specific contexts. It may contribute to raising awareness about the relevance of using AI technologies in different legal education contexts, promote constructive dialogue and promote the actual learning *about, for* and *with* AI. To that end, law schools may refer to good comparative practices in developed countries which provide an extensive range of curricular and extracurricular opportunities for safe, critical and creative AI use in education.⁴³

Second, the survey results indicate insufficient ***teacher agency***, reflected in modest use of AI tools for legal education purposes and sporadic integration of AI-and-law content across the LF Niš curricula. It is likely caused by the passive institutional approach to AI integration, the lack of AI literacy/skills training, AI integration guidelines and pedagogy training, which ultimately generate uncertainty and affect the teachers' mindset on AI use in

⁴¹ For more, see: Ignjatovic, 2025: 287, 290-292

⁴² Uni Nis participated in the Applied AI Erasmus project, LF Nis introduced AI courses in the Law&ICT master degree program and is currently involved in the DigiRights project, see: Ignjatovic, 2025: 296 (fn 76, 77), 297 (fn 85)

⁴³ For examples of *available AI opportunities* at law schools in developed countries, see: Ignjatović, 2025: 286-287, 293-294.

legal education. The diverse attitudes (ranging from full acceptance to overt rejection and indifference) and distinctive shades of perception (hesitation, skepticism, reluctance, resistance, indifference) indicate the need to properly address the teachers' mindset issues. Although some teachers have recognized the relevance of integrating AI-and-law content in their subject-specific contexts and resorted to self-study, it hardly suffices in terms of AI integration across the LF Niš curricula. The comparative practices in developed countries may serve as a good starting point for addressing these issues, developing strategies to counter the negative mindset, providing incentives for professional development, and enhancing AI competencies for legal purposes.⁴⁴ To enhance their agency, teachers should take a more proactive approach: assess students' opinions on AI integration in subject-specific contexts, revise and update the syllabi, carefully plan and incorporate AI-and-law content in their courses, raise students' awareness about AI tools and competencies for legal purposes, facilitate learning *about* and *for* AI, and learning *with* risk-free AI-powered tools (PDF Gear, NoteBook). The key prerequisites are continuous education, training, experimentation and gradual integration in line with the learners' and subject-specific needs, institutional resources, transparent AI integration policies and procedures, academic integrity policies, ethical standards and pedagogical goals. The flexible and proactive approach will contribute to enhancing *student agency*, trust and collaboration in the AI integration process.

Third, the survey results indicate insufficient ***student agency*** considering the sporadic and quite low use of AI tools for educational, academic/scientific research and professional development purposes. Notably, LF students' attitudes to AI use in legal education are slightly more negative than their teachers'. It may be explained by the observed lack of knowledge and transparent information about the AI integration, the lack of AI literacy/skills training for educational purposes, unavailability of reliable AI tools in formal legal education, and sporadic integration of AI-related content in curricular/extracurricular activities. Thus, the student agency may be enhanced by addressing these observed issues, introducing risk-free (assistive) AI tools in instruction, raising students' awareness about the relevance of AI tools in legal education and practice, and providing meaningful experiential learning which promotes critical thinking, creativity and responsible AI use in line with the highest academic integrity standards and envisaged pedagogical goals. In addition, some students urge for an adequate approach to AI integration, which should cater for the essential discursive (lawyer) skills and the human nature of the legal profession reflected in communication,

⁴⁴For more on *good practices* in developed countries, see: Ignjatovic 2025: 293-294, 300-302.

interpersonal and life skills, which cannot be replaced by AI tools.⁴⁵ Students' critical assessment and experiential learning show that available (open) AI tools are rather unreliable and ineffective in Serbian legal contexts. It indicates the need for procuring trustworthy legal AI tools in Serbian language, which are currently in short supply because AI tools have not been trained on Serbian legal sources, which are either inaccessible or incomprehensively consolidated.⁴⁶ As a solution for precluding human redundancy, some students propose an approach based on human-AI collaboration in resolving issues that cannot be properly addressed by AI tools. These observations are in line with the contemporary human-centric literature on interactive learning environments where the AI analytical and assistive capacities are combined with the human touch in order to create engaging learning opportunities (Chiu & Pericles, 2025: 923) and keep human intelligence "in the loop" by preserving human creativity, critical thinking and supervision over AI at all times (Ignjatović, 2025: 292, 306).

Fourth, the survey results clearly indicate the need for *collective agency* of all stakeholders involved in the AI integration process (competent administrations, tech and legal sectors, institutions, teachers, students, employers). While each participant plays a specific role in the process, their activities are correlated, interdependent and complementary; thus, the efficiency and final outcomes of AI integration largely depend on their constructive dialogue, collaboration, joint decision-making and joint efforts to create a sustainable AI integration framework, including investments and funding, structure and organization, institutional/curricular design, instructional design, integration in the educational process, continuous assessment and supervision to address emerging impediments, risks and concerns.⁴⁷ The stakeholders' collective agency may significantly contribute to assessing AI issues in specific educational contexts from different perspectives in AI decision-making processes, as well as to building trust, responsibility and ownership of the process, which will gradually counter the negative stance to AI integration (hesitation, reluctance, skepticism, distrust and indifference). The collaborative approach should also include *human-AI collaboration*, embodied in teacher-AI collaboration and student-AI collaboration in creating engaging interactive learning environments (Chiu & Pericles, 2025:921-922) focusing on developing the participants' critical thinking, creativity, multiple intelligences and wellbeing.

⁴⁵ In comparative literature, there is a similar stance; see: Ignjatović, 2025: 292, 297-298.

⁴⁶ For more on, see: Ignjatovic, 2025: 297-298.

⁴⁷ For more, see: Ignjatovic, 2025: 305-306.

4. Concluding remarks: Considerations for future action

The swift evolution of AI technologies has generated ample technical, legal, ethical, socio-economic and educational dilemmas, which are even more prominent in fairly traditional legal education settings, particularly in terms of establishing a relevant pedagogical framework for AI integration. The conducted empirical research aimed to assess the views of the teaching staff and students at the Law Faculty in Niš on AI integration in legal education. As expected, the survey results yielded a full scale of diverse opinions and distinctive perspectives to an almost equal extent among LF teachers and students alike.⁴⁸ The findings reflect common attitudes, dilemmas and concerns observed worldwide:⁴⁹ some people are instantly thrilled to try out the latest high-tech “thingamajigs”, while others are intrigued but cautious, carefully selecting, assessing and learning about new tools before using them for specific purposes; some are distrustful, skeptical and reluctant to use the “fancy toys” due to many unknowns, concerns or unease, while others are expressly opposed due to observed risks, inadequate safeguards or ethical issues; some are indifferent or disinterested in using AI for any purpose. While respondents with positive attitudes may be intrinsically motivated to use AI for different purposes, it is more important to properly address the issues raised by respondents who may have mixed or negative opinions about AI integration, and the “silent” stance of those who may be indifferent or disinterested.

These diverse perspectives are by no means negligible. First, the respondents’ careful consideration of benefits and critical comments on observed drawbacks should be considered with utmost care as they may be a valuable source of valuable information and constructive criticism on ample technical, social, legal, ethical and pedagogical issues which have to be carefully assessed and properly addressed in complex AI decision-making and integration processes.⁵⁰ They may also serve as guidelines in devising an acceptable blended learning approach to AI integration or integrating some alternative (digital) learning solutions in Serbian in legal education. *Second*, the unavoidable issues of skepticism, resistance and reluctance should be addressed by providing transparent information on available learning opportunities, infrastructure and resources, practical AI literacy/skills training, experimentation

⁴⁸ LF teachers: positive (54.3%), mixed (29.2%), negative (16.7%); LF students: positive (50%), mixed (30.2%), negative (20%)

⁴⁹ For more on *attitudes* to AI integration in different legal contexts in developed countries, see: Ignjatović, 2025: 289-292.

⁵⁰ For more on some *AI integration issues* and how they are addressed in developed countries, see: Ignjatović, 2025: 300-303.

opportunities in subject-specific contexts, integration guidelines, technical and pedagogical support in developing teaching/learning resources, assessment, risk-management, monitoring, supervision, etc. The gradual integration of assistive (risk-free) AI-powered tools and balanced integration of AI-and-law contents in subject-specific contexts may eventually promote learning with AI for legal purposes. *Third*, in terms of the observed overreliance on AI and abusive practices which may hinder intellectual growth, undermine critical thinking and creativity, it is essential to consider a balanced blended learning approach to AI integration in legal education. Such an approach may promote a holistic human-centered, pedagogy-driven and competency-based learning in legal contexts, which would promote ethical/responsible use, critical thinking and creativity at all stages of the educational process. *Fourth*, AI integration cannot be forced on institutions, teachers or students. It should be a matter of voluntary choice and voice of all participants, constructive dialogue and collaborative efforts of all stakeholders and joint agreement of direct participants on the most appropriate approach to AI integration. It should be based on voluntary and informed consent, preceded by strategic planning, infrastructure, support, guidance, training and, above all, a gradual and balanced integration in the curricula in line with ethical and professional principles, academic integrity standards, and envisaged educational and professional goals. Above all, the integration framework should be flexible and adaptable enough to provide sufficient latitude for the selection and pre-testing of AI tools, safe experimentation, modification and constant updating of AI tools and safeguards. *Fifth*, in order not to remain stuck in the rut amidst the fast-changing AI-powered world, it is essential to keep learning, experimenting and gradually introducing carefully selected tools and acceptable (automated and assistive) forms of AI integration. In that process, there is no doubt that each teacher may find a comfortable scope and form of using AI technologies for legal education purposes. *Sixth*, given the lack of normative framework, guidance and support from competent national authorities and insufficient opportunities at the institutional level, interested parties may take alternative pathways to AI integration. Instead of waiting for the top-down intervention, the key participants (institutions, teachers, students) may exercise their collective and individual agencies and take a proactive *bottom-up* approach: develop the institutional or individual AI integration frameworks (policies, strategies, guidelines, resources) based on existing good practices; enhance cooperation with AI industry (legal tech sector), practitioners specializing in AI and other entities in instituting joint educational programs; and provide extensive learning opportunities for the administration, teaching staff and students in line with the institutional,

curricular and subject-specific needs. *Seventh*, considering the increasing application of AI tools in many sectors, AI technologies cannot be ignored. Thus, humans have to learn to coexist and collaborate with AI technologies, put them to good use, and constantly keep them under human scrutiny. These activities will empower the participants, enhance their motivation, facilitate their constructive dialogue and collaboration, actively involve them in decision-making processes, gradually contribute to changing their mindset, and promote their agency in the prospective AI integration for legal education purposes.

On the whole, the empirical research findings confirm the need for a more strategic, comprehensive and well-balanced approach to AI integration in Serbian legal education in order to keep pace with the latest technological developments for legal education purposes. In order to promote positive use of AI and not keep lagging behind, the stakeholders in legal education should not rule out viable alternative options and should remain vigilant in terms of current and future AI integration opportunities. As the ultimate goal of AI integration is ethical, critical and creative AI use in subject-specific contexts, all stakeholders should exercise their individual and collective agency by participating in all decision-making and integration processes aimed at devising the relevant institutional and subject-specific AI integration solutions. In that context, the presented analysis of the empirical research results is a modest contribution to raising the stakeholders' awareness about the observed AI integration issues, ensuring better understanding of the impediments and concerns, encouraging cooperation in exploring learning opportunities, and promoting the stakeholders' collective agency in instituting viable AI integration solutions. As AI technologies keep evolving, there is a need for regular assessment of key participants' opinions on AI-related issues, particularly in terms of instituting a relevant pedagogical framework. The AI pedagogy-related issues will be the subject matter of subsequent research on AI integration in legal education.

References

Chiu, Th. K. F. & Pericles 'asher' Rospigliosi (2025). Encouraging human-AI collaboration in interactive learning environments (Editorial), In: *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33 (2), 921-924, Taylor & Francis online, DOI: 10.1080/10494820.2025.2471199, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/10494820.2025.2471199>

Ignjatović, G. (2024). AI Technologies in Education: Regulatory frameworks at the international, regional and national level, *Zbornik radova Pravnog*

fakulteta u Nišu, br.103/2024 (pp.235-260), <https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpf1-55374>;
<https://aseestant.ceon.rs/index.php/zrpf1/article/view/55374/26839>

Ignjatović, G. (2025). AI Technologies in Legal Education: Milestones and Signposts for AI Integration, *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Nišu*, Vol. 1, br. 104/2025 (pp. 283-312), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpf1-56986>, <https://aseestant.ceon.rs/index.php/zrpf1/article/view/56986/27842>

OECD (2019). Future of Education and Skills 2030: Conceptual Learning Framework, OECD, 2019; https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/learning/student-agency/Student_Agency_for_2030_concept_note.pdf

Legal documents

GovRS/NITRA (2025). Strategija razvoja veštačke inteligencije 2025-2030 (AI Development Strategy 2025), *Službeni glasnik RS*, br.5/2025, Vlada RS/Ministarstvo nauke, tehnološkog razvoja i inovacija **17.01.2025.**

Online sources

Education Hub (2020).The Role of Agency in Learning, The Education Hub, New Zealand, 20.1.2020, <https://theeducationhub.org.nz/agency/> (assessed 20.12.2024).

Forbes/Eliot (2024): Generative AI and Brain Rot, (L. B. Eliot), Forbes, 18 June 2024, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lanceeliot/2024/06/18/generative-ai-and-brain-rot/> (accessed 10.12.2024)

OUP/ (2024).“Brain rot” named Oxford word of the year 2024, Oxford University Press, 2.12.2024; <https://corp.oup.com/news/brain-rot-named-oxford-word-of-the-year-2024/> (accessed 10.12.2024)

Empirical research sources

LF Niš Teacher Survey: AI in Education (2024), prepared 5.10.2024, analyzed 10.11. 2024.

LF Niš Students’ Survey: AI in Education (2024), prepared 10.10.2024, analyzed 5.3. 2025.

Гордана Игњатовић,

Предавач Енглеског језика правне струке,
Правни факултет Универзитета у Нишу

**ВЕШТАЧКА ИНТЕЛИГЕНЦИЈА У ПРАВНОМ ОБРАЗОВАЊУ:
СТАВОВИ НАСТАВНИКА И СТУДЕНАТА ПРАВНОГ ФАКУЛТЕТА У НИШУ**

Sažetak

Све већа примена вештачке интелигенције (Artificial Intelligence) у многим секторима доноси значајне трансформативне промене али бројне дилеме и различита мишљења о многим нерешеним питањима. Различити ставови о вештачкој интелигенцији су још израженији у сектору образовања где њена употреба обухвата додатни корпус педагошко-методолошких питања. Примена вештачке интелигенције у правном образовању доноси нове дилеме због карактеристичне природе правне професије која почива на правним конвенцијама у разним облицима усмене и писане комуникације, тако да су мишљења о употреби вештачке интелигенције у правничком образовању и пракси прилично подељена. У настојању да се прикаже тренутна ситуација и мишљења кључних актера у образовном процесу о употреби вештачке интелигенције у правничком образовању у Србији, овај рад представља резултате емпиријског истраживања о ставовима наставног особља и студената Правног факултета, Универзитета у Нишу. У првом делу рада даје се преглед резултата истраживања (анкета) и анализирају кључна питања о употреби/примени вештачке интелигенције на личном, академском/научноистраживачком, образовном и институционалном нивоу. На основу приказаних резултата, у другом делу рада се разматрају улоге и активности кључних актера (високошколских институција, наставника и студената) у предстојећем процесу увођења вештачке интелигенције у образовање правника, са посебним освртом на проактивно деловање кључних актера у том процесу. На основу дате анализе, аутор размарта кључна питања на које су анкете указале и предлаже правце даљег деловања у процесу интеграције вештачке интелигенције у правничко образовање у Србији.

Кључне речи: вештачка интелигенција, образовање правника, емпиријско истраживање ПФ Ниш, Србија.