

Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education: Comparative Perspectives from the United States and Indonesia

Aan Aswari⁽¹⁾

Faculty of Law, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar, Indonesia.
Email: aanaswari@umi.ac.id

Rizki Ramadani⁽²⁾

Faculty of Law, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar, Indonesia.
Email: rizkiramadani@umi.ac.id

Atikah Azzah Rhamadani⁽³⁾

Faculty of Law Student, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar, Indonesia.
Email: atikaazzah899@gmail.com

Muhammad Ashoer⁽⁴⁾

Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.
Email: muhammad.ashur@umi.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The growing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education has sparked debate about its educational potential and ethical risks. The literature remains fragmented: many studies concentrate on ethical concerns or on the technology itself rather than on structured AI governance, particularly in legal education in developing countries. This study examines how AI may affect academic integrity in legal education and proposes an AI governance framework that considers ethical standards, pedagogical needs, and regulatory responsibilities. It takes a qualitative legal approach combining a normative analysis of laws and institutional policies, a conceptual analysis of AI and professional ethics in legal education, and a comparison between the United States, a mature system with well-established and varied AI governance, and Indonesia, an emerging system with limited regulatory development. The study rests on a systematic review of secondary sources: academic literature, policy documents, and institutional guidelines. The results suggest that AI can make legal education more efficient, support personalized learning, and build students' professional readiness. Used without clear limits, however, it can undermine academic integrity by enabling academic dishonesty, encouraging overreliance on tools, and weakening students' ethical judgment. The paper therefore proposes a multi-layered governance framework of institutional academic policies, AI literacy training, adaptive teaching approaches, and AI detection tools where appropriate, all set within national regulatory frameworks. Its key contribution is to connect institutional and national governance. It argues that Indonesia needs a clear, enforceable AI governance framework so that AI adoption strengthens rather than compromises academic integrity in legal education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Ethics, Legal Education, Academic Integrity, AI Governance, Comparative Law.

I. INTRODUCTION

The fast-growing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into education (Ulum et al., 2025) is raising an important question for law schools: what does it really mean to “deliver” legal education (Salinas, 2023)? It is not only about teaching students the law. It also involves protecting academic integrity and nurturing professional ethics throughout their learning. For years, including in Indonesia, legal education has often been understood mainly as producing graduates who are skilled and professionally ready (Hafidz, 2018). This mindset aligns with the common U.S. idea of “thinking like a lawyer.” But in a learning environment shaped by AI, professionalism cannot be limited to intelligence or cognitive ability. Students also need to be able to critically evaluate AI-generated outputs, apply ethical judgment, and remain committed to intellectual honesty.

Meanwhile, technological development has also changed how legal compliance works in practice (Helmi et al., 2025). In the context of AI-assisted learning, “ethical” behavior needs to be made more concrete. At minimum, it includes three dimensions: (i) transparency, where students disclose when AI tools are used; (ii) accountability, where they verify the accuracy and reliability of AI-produced results; and (iii) intellectual integrity, where AI should not replace independent legal reasoning. When these dimensions are spelled out, ethical expectations in legal education can be turned into clearer, assessable academic standards, rather than remaining normative ideals.

Legal education should prepare students to be both technically capable and ethically responsible (Toussaint, 2023). Teaching ethics in law is not just an “add-on,” it supports students’ moral growth and strengthens their ability to work toward justice. This is important because law is not only about formal rules; it also reflects deeper moral and ethical values. As a result, universities,

professional bodies, and legal communities are paying more attention than ever to ethics in legal education.

At the same time, advances in knowledge and technology have improved people's quality of life (Syabina et al., 2026), but they have also reshaped legal education worldwide. Law has traditionally been understood as a distinctly human domain—focused on judgment, reasoning, and interpretation. Today, that traditional model is being challenged by technological disruption, particularly the rise of AI (Andry et al., 2025). AI systems and technologies are also closely associated with the “Fourth Industrial Revolution” (Rusdiana et al., 2025). In many fields, including education, AI has become an important tool (Ezzerouali et al., 2025). Put simply, AI can be described as the ability of system to learn, build knowledge, and use past experience to solve new problems.

And that capability does beyond improving teaching methods. In legal education, it can change how learning happens in practice. For example, during legal writing or contract drafting exercises, AI can offer structural guidance and provide real-time feedback to help students strengthen their analysis and arguments. But these benefits raise an important question: if students rely on AI too much, it may end up replacing independent legal thinking rather than developing it.

Generative AI is showing up more and more in higher education. But much of the recent research has focused on specific academic integrity risks, rather than broader patterns. As Qadhi notes, “tools like ChatGPT open the door for new kinds of misconduct that can be harder to spot, such as AI-enabled plagiarism, text generation without attribution, and even more subtle form of data manipulation.” These behaviors conflict with long-standing academic ideas about authorship and originality (Qadhi et al., 2024). And the use is already becoming common. For instance, one study found that one in five

students reported using AI for everyday assignments and exams (Ibrahim et al., 2023).

This is especially concerning in legal education, where ethics and integrity are central. If law students use AI to produce papers that do not reflect real understanding or original thinking, academic integrity is clearly at risk. Recent surveys highlight the scale of this behavior. For example, a 2023 survey of 600 students at U.S. colleges found that 49% had used generative AI. Another survey of more than 1,000 U.S. students reported that over a third used ChatGPT for writing tasks, and surprisingly, 75% knew it was cheating but still did it anyway (Intelligent, 2023). This contradiction points to more than just individual ethical failures. It suggests a wider shift in attitudes within AI-enabled learning environments—less adherence to internal academic values, and possibly a lack of deterrence from existing rules. In other words, questions may not be changing behavior as much as they should.

This pattern is even more pronounced in Indonesia. A recent survey found that 86.21% of high school and university students use AI to complete their homework. Of the users, 55.1% use it to compile summaries, and 50.31% use it to write essays or articles (Amigud & Pell, 2025). In the U.S., this has already pushed some law schools to make strong measures. For example, the Pritzker School of Law has banned students from using ChatGPT. Some academics have gone further, describing AI tools as a "threat" or even a "plague in education" (Jensen et al., 2025). Indonesia, however, still lacks a clear policy and legal framework for AI adoption (Raharjo & Rohmadi, 2025). Implementation is also constrained by infrastructure gaps and relatively limited AI literacy. Even when policies exist, they tend to be local and not evenly implemented across the country (Suharyo et al., 2023). Given the situation, AI use in legal education could create a serious paradox. Ethics is supposed to be the core of legal

education, but without careful regulation, technology can gradually erode that foundation. This is why more research is needed on how AI should be restricted and governed in legal education (Bovenkamp & Vollaard, 2019). This concern has been raised by earlier scholarship as well. For example, Fornasier (2021) argues that legal education must develop policies that directly address the ethical risks of AI use. Ajevski et al. (2023) emphasize that policies should pursue two goals at once: make it harder to use AI in assessments and teach students how to use AI constructively. Similarly, Prakash & Nair (2024) recommend that law schools incorporate both AI and ethics into their curricula.

Research on AI in legal education in Indonesia is still limited, and is often not clearly grounded in pedagogical concerns. For example, Kurniawan et al. discuss what legal education might look like in the age of AI and argue that legal philosophy can provide an ethical foundation for using AI. However, their discussion focuses more on AI-enabled law enforcement than on everyday teaching and learning practice in law schools (Taufiqurokhman et al., 2024). That perspective is still valuable, especially because it highlights the need to bring ethical reasoning and philosophical thinking into the curriculum to guide students in how they use AI. In a related way, Yanto points out a growing pragmatic tendency among law students: relying on AI to generate legal opinions without proper research first. To address this, Yanto proposes three ethical principles—review, honesty, and prudence—as guiding norms for students and academics when using AI (Yanto, 2025). Together, these studies show that concerns about AI ethics in Indonesia are increasing. But they also reveal a gap: there are still not enough clear, formal pedagogical and institutional frameworks for how AI should be managed in legal education.

This study makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, it moves beyond ethics alone and examines how AI use in legal education can be

governed through a normative legal approach. In other words, “governance” here is not one single rule. It involves a layered structure, including: (i) national-level legal regulation, (ii) law school institutional policies and academic integrity frameworks, and (iii) pedagogical control mechanisms, such as assessment design, AI literacy integration, and guide on how AI-assisted learning should be carried out.

Second, this study offers a practical conceptual model for managing AI use in legal education—one that tries to balance three things at once: innovation, academic integrity, and professional ethics. The model has four connected parts: (i) institutional academic policies on what AI can be used for; (ii) integrating AI literacy and ethics into the curriculum, so students understand both the tool and the responsibilities behind it; (iii) flexible teaching design that reduces over-reliance on AI while encouraging critical thinking; and (iv) monitoring and detection strategies to help maintain integrity standards.

Third, beyond general ethical principles, the study proposes context-specific safeguards that law schools can actually apply. Instead of treating AI governance as a vague requirement, it embeds it into specific learning activities. For example: (i) clear, differentiated policies that spell out what kind of AI use are permitted, such as research assistance, drafting support, or banning full-text generation; (ii) assessment redesign, shifting toward more process-based evaluation, for instance, oral defense and in-class performance, so student cannot simply outsource work to AI; and (iii) codified ethical guidelines requiring transparency, authentication of AI output, and reflective disclosure about how AI was used.

These steps differ for many existing discussions that stay at the level of ideals or general norms. Here, the ethical principles are translated into concrete educational and institutional practices. Fourth, the study uses Indonesia’s legal

education system as a case study. That allows the analysis to address a regulatory gap that often received less attention in research focused on developing countries.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is conducted using a philosophical and socio-legal juridical approach because it examines the ethical difficulties and growing governance challenges that arise when artificial intelligence (AI) is used in legal education, especially in contexts where formal regulatory frameworks are still limited or not well developed. A strictly normative (doctrinal) approach is not enough, because the study goes beyond established legal rules to also consider emerging ethical standards, evolving academic practices, and how institutions are responding to AI.

The study uses a philosophical juridical method to look at the ethical “why” behind using AI in legal education, focusing on academic integrity, professional responsibility, and how legal education helps shape the normative expectations students are taught to follow. This makes it possible to put “ethical” AI use in context—what it should mean in the day-to-day learning process. In addition, the research also applies to a socio-legal approach to examine how these concerns are handled in real institutional settings.

It further includes a comparative technique comparing the United States and Indonesia. The United States has been more ready and flexible in integrating AI, while Indonesia is operating in a developing-country context with more limited legislative and institutional support. This comparison helps the study identify governance options that make sense for each environment. Overall, by combining philosophical, socio-legal, and comparative perspectives, the research builds a broader framework for understanding and

managing AI use in legal education—going beyond a review of formal regulation.

The research draws on secondary sources, including key legal materials, such as laws, regulations, and policy documents, as well as academic work like journal articles and scholarly publications.

Evidence related to AI governance and ethics in legal education is gathered and organized using a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method, so the relevant literature is collected and processed in a structured way. The data are then analyzed qualitatively, with the aim of interpreting legal norms, comparing regulatory frameworks, and building normative arguments. Finally, this analysis is used to develop recommendations for clearer regulatory guidance and stronger ethical standards for the responsible use of AI in legal education.

III. RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. The Dual-Edged Sword: AI's Impact on Teaching and Cheating

Artificial Intelligence (AI) was first introduced by John McCarthy in 1955 as “the science and engineering of making machines think” (Jaelani et al., 2024). In general terms, AI refers to systems designed to perform tasks that require intelligent behavior—such as interpreting information, responding to changes in the environment, and making predictions (Ramadhani et al., 2025). One way to understand AI is as a collection of algorithms and computational models that process data, identify patterns, and support decision-making (Sarker, 2021). The European Union also describes AI as a system that can demonstrate intelligent behavior to some degree by perceiving its environment, aiming to achieve specific goals, and acting with a certain level of autonomy (Kerekes, 2023).

In education, AI has a major impact on both teaching and academic integrity (Rodrigues & Silva, 2023). On the positive side, AI can support learning in more flexible ways. It enables pedagogical improvements such as real-time customization, and AI-powered tools—like virtual tutors and automated assessment platforms—have been shown to enhance the efficiency and accessibility of teaching and learning. In addition, AI may reduce some of the workload for teachers, allowing them to focus more on building student competencies (Hashem et al., 2024).

However, education digitization also brings serious risks, particularly related to academic cheating and manipulation (Antony et al., 2026). With the rise of generative language models such as ChatGPT, students can draft essays, answer questions, and even complete academic tasks quickly (Cotton et al., 2024). This is concerning because it can increase contract cheating and machine-generated plagiarism: the output may look original, but it does not always reflect the students' actual understanding or effort.

Because of this, AI in education functions like a double-edged sword (Chen & Lin, 2024). It offers opportunities to improve learning and efficiency, but it also creates new ways for unethical academic fraud to occur. In this first section, the first discussion focuses on how these effects show up specifically in legal education within universities, and then examines how law schools in Indonesia and the United States are currently dealing with these developments.

1. Positive Impacts: Efficiency, Personalization, and Developing Adaptability Skills

Using AI in legal education brings several advantages that should be taken seriously. Research shows that AI can strengthen both teaching and learning in law schools. For example, AI can automate time-consuming research tasks such as data analysis. Murray and colleagues found that

generative AI helps lecturers and law students search and evaluate complex legal materials—like legislation, case law, and judicial decisions—more quickly and with improved accuracy (Murray et al., 2024).

At the same time, AI has been increasingly shaping the legal field more broadly (Antoro & Budhijanto, 2026). In the United States, students and academics at many law schools already use AI to support legal research. These tools help students navigate large databases efficiently, improving their research skills. Some U.S. law schools have even partnered with technology companies to bring AI-powered legal research platforms directly into the curriculum. Faculty workshops also help teachers learn how to use NLP-based tools in their classes. In practice, students and legal professionals widely use platforms such as LexisNexis or ROSS Intelligence to search thousands of court decisions in seconds.

Another major benefit is that AI can support more personalized learning. Since AI often uses machine-learning methods, it can adjust the difficulty of course materials to match a student's level and performance. For instance, an AI system might notice that a student struggles with contract law concepts but performs well in civil law. It can then recommend additional resources, generate practice questions, and help regulate the pace of the course. Similarly, if a student begins to improve in constitutional law, AI tools such as GPT-4 can add more targeted questions as the learner's skills develop (Katz et al., 2025).

One concrete example is the use of intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), which provide students with immediate and adaptive feedback. At Georgetown University Law Center, an ITS is used to analyze students' performance in legal writing and offer real-time, data-informed guidance, such as feedback on argument structure and the use of legal sources. Other US institutions, including Stanford Law School, have also begun integrating AI

research and writing support tools (such as ROSS Intelligence and Casetext CoCounsel) into their coursework to help students learn how to research more effectively.

Finally, AI can help students develop skills that make them more competitive in workplace. Law schools are sometimes criticized for focusing heavily on legal theory while not always giving students enough practical training for real-world practice. In a digital era, students who learn to work with AI tools may be more adaptable and better prepared for professional demands such as e-discovery, contract analytics, and online dispute resolution platforms.

These experiences also help students expand their abilities beyond traditional legal training, making them more competitive in a global job market. For example, law students at Brigham Young University Law School (Utah) created an app called “SoloSuit,” which helps people respond to claims related to past debts. The app guides users through questions to understand the lawsuit and draft a response, which they can then print and mail. Meanwhile, the Benjamin Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University launched a Tech Startup Clinic to provide legal support for new tech startups. Together, these examples reflect a broader point: modern lawyers increasingly need technological competence, adaptability, and the ability to collaborate across disciplines (Galloway et al., 2019).

2. *Negative Impacts: “Hallucinations”, Reduced Cognitive Skills, and Threats to Academic Integrity*

In June 2023, a case in a New York federal court showed how quickly AI collide with profession responsibility. Two attorneys from Levidow, Levidow & Oberman were sanctioned after submitting a legal memo that cited six cases that, according to the court, did not actually exist. Even after the mistake was flagged by the opposing party, the attorneys did not correct it right away. When

the judge asked them to prove the cases existed, they submitted screenshots of their chats with ChatGPT as evidence—only for that material to confirm that the citation was the result of AI error, commonly known as a hallucination. A few months later, in December 2023, another similar example surfaced. Michael Cohen admitted that he had provided his lawyers with fabricated legal references generated by Google Bard, which were presented as if they were real.

These two incidents highlight a key danger: AI can generate information that looks credible, but without proper verification it may be misleading. This is especially relevant because AI systems—particularly large language models (LLMs), such as GPT—can produce outputs that sound convincing even when they are false. That misleading output is referred to as "hallucinations": The model generates content based on patterns in data rather than on guaranteed factual accuracy or real-world verification (Herrera-tapias & Hernández, 2025).

In the legal field, accuracy is not a minor issue. Hallucination can lead to misinterpretation of the law, misleading documents, or citations to cases that never existed. And legal work is a high-stakes environment—small mistakes can affect civil rights, individual liberty, or the credibility of contracts. Because of this, lawyers have ethical and professional duties of diligence. For example, the ABA (American Bar Association) Model Rules of Professional Conduct require that legal arguments rest on a trustworthy factual and legal basis (ABA Model Rule 3.1). Using AI content without active checking can therefore create ethical violations.

AI in legal education can still be useful—LLM can support learning and research—but risk grows when students treat AI output as authoritative (Bontridder & Pouillet, 2021). Many students are “digital natives,” but that does not automatically mean they have the critical skills to evaluate advanced tools safely and effectively. Without training, and without habits of verification,

overreliance on AI may reduce students' development in core legal abilities such as statutory interpretation, legal reasoning, and identifying which authorities are actually relevant and reliable.

This concern is reflected in wider education reports. A 2023 report by Inside Higher Ed described a rise in students became so dependent that they struggled during exams because they were unfamiliar with the underlying material (Higher Ed., 2023). In Indonesia, a study by Musthafa found a shift in how students view "knowledge authority," with some believing that confirming truth through AI is easier and more practical (Djakfar Musthafa, 2024)

In the long term, continued dependence may also weaken independence and critical thinking. For instance, research suggests AI reliance can contribute to reduced independent thinking (Zhang et al., 2024). A real example comes from Canada: in a 2023 CBC survey, more than 60% of students said they felt "uncertain" about whether they could build valid arguments without AI, and 35% said they were no longer confident writing assignments without tools like ChatGPT (CBC News, 2023).

Excessive AI use also raises serious academic ethics problems—especially fraud. Academic misconduct can appear in many forms, including plagiarism, improper collaboration, exam cheating, copyright infringement, data falsification, and even fabricated bibliographic references (Rodrigues & Silva, 2023). Over recent years, scholars have increasingly connected generative AI with plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

Generative tools like ChatGPT can make misconduct easier (Magesh et al., 2025) Because students can produce assignments quickly, often with less fear of detection. A 2023 survey reported that 30% of more than 1,000 college students said they used ChatGPT or similar AI tools to complete writing assignments

without telling anyone. The same body of reporting indicated that 17% of law students used AI to write opinions or answer exams (“Intelligent.com,” 2023).

Similarly, a global Turnitin survey found that 79% of academics felt generative AI made cheating easier, yet only 24% of universities said they had formal policies to detect or regulate this kind of use (Turnitin, 2023). Evidence from practice also raises concerns: one Reuters report noted that at the University of Minnesota, low-achieving law students scored higher on final exams when given AI access, but higher-achieving classmates scored worse when using the technology (Reuters.com, 2023). In response to such patterns, Columbia Law School reportedly re-evaluated its home-exam policy.

B. Regulatory Frameworks on AI Use in Legal Education

Today, AI is no longer something law schools can ignore—it is both an opportunity and a challenge. That means that universities need clear academic integrity policies and practical rules for responsible AI use, as soon as possible. Since 2020, the American Bar Association (ABA) Commission on the Future of Legal Education has issued Principles for Legal Education and Licensure in the 21st Century. In its report, the ABA notes that technology is too often treated as a threat rather than as a force that can enable positive change. At the same time, it emphasizes that AI can improve service and efficiency, broaden access, and help more people get legal support.”

This message is important: AI should not automatically be rejected. Instead, the right policies are needed to guide how AI is used in legal education. What law schools need is a measured and balanced approach—one that supports innovation while also protecting students from unethical and unreliable use. As Head and Willis point out, educators should build frameworks that combine technical AI knowledge with ethical and practical

training, so students can use AI tools—but also evaluate and challenge the quality of what those tools produce (Head et al., 2024).

In practical terms, faculties and law schools should also update their curricula by adding AI literacy, ethics, and opportunities for hands-on learning. However, many law schools have been slow to integrate AI into teaching. Some are even resistant to it or remain “closed” to developments happening outside the classroom. This problem appears particularly common in parts of Indonesia, where some academics have a string anti-AI stance. For that reason, the author considers it necessary to compile and analyze policy frameworks that can help law schools respond to AI integration and reduce its negative effects.

1. Formulating an Academic Policy or Guidelines that Addresses the Ethical Dimensions of AI Use

Across many universities, law schools have started creating policies that clarify when and how AI may be used by both students and faculty. For example, an ABA report says that in the United States, most legal education institutions (69%) have updated their academic integrity rules in response to generative AI (ABA, 2024). Other surveys show similar patterns. A 2024 Kaplan study of 97 law schools (including 34 of the top 50 in the U.S.) found that 16% allowed generative AI to help students search for and discuss ideas, while 16% prohibited it; and 15% allowed AI tools to give feedback on essays, and another 15% did not (abajournal.com, 2023).

At the same time, guidance can be inconsistent. Research by Scribbr, reviewing policies at 100 leading universities, found that most institutions (51%) do not have clear, campus-wide rules. Instead, they leave it to individual faculty members to decide what is permitted in their own classes. However, 18% of universities automatically restrict certain software unless the faculty member allows it.

For example, the University of Chicago Law School has a policy on Generative AI that sets clear “standards for students,” while also letting faculty decide how AI can (or cannot) be used in their specific classes and exams. In general, instructors tend to choose among three common approaches:

- a. Ban AI writing tools for assignments: Instructors may decide these tools do not match the course’s learning goals and prohibit them altogether. Some may also use AI-detection tools to help enforce the rule.
- b. Allow AI writing tools in limited situations: Students may be allowed to use AI only for certain tasks—for instance, using it for research only (not drafting), for only particular assignments, or only after requesting permission.
- c. Allow broader use, as long as it is properly cited: Some instructors may permit students to use AI for any assignment, but usually require students to cite the tool and often to explain how it was used.

Another example is the University of California, Berkeley, which is frequently cited as one of the early law schools to publish an AI policy. Berkeley’s guidance stresses that generative AI can threaten the school’s educational mission. So, the policy allows some uses while clearly prohibiting uses considered plagiaristic (Berkeley AGI Policy: Berkeley Law Policy on the Use of Generative AI Software). Specifically, it notes that:

- a. Permitted uses (with limits): AI can be used like a search tool for research, for grammar correction, and for other supportive tasks tied to completing assignments—but it cannot be used to prepare any part of a submitted assignment, and it must should not be used in any exam.
- b. No plagiarism: Ai cannot be used in ways that amount to plagiarism—such as AI-generated content as if it were authored by human person or organization. If instructors want to adjust plagiarism rules, they can do so,

but only by clearly stating the changes in writing and providing proper notice.

In addition, some schools provide a clear, practical guide that helps students use tools like chatGPT, especially for writing. For example, students may be allowed to use GPT for things like brainstorming ideas or generating basic background information on a topic. However, they are not permitted to write any part of a paper. Even if students mention ChatGPT or include a citation, using it to produce draft text is treated as plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

The University of Illinois College of Law also adopts guidelines on generative AI that align with broader university policies. In its academic integrity statement, the university acknowledges that generative AI can bring real benefits—such as supporting teaching, research, and even healthcare-related learning. At the same time, it stresses that AI must be used in an appropriate and responsible way. To support that, the university has implemented an AI Governance framework based on principles such as accountability, inclusivity, reliability and security, fairness, transparency, privacy, and security.

The university's "Awareness" page further explains both the upside and the risks of AI. It covers issues like factual errors and hallucinations, outdated or biased information, potential copyright problems, and risks to data confidentiality. To address these concerns directly, the university provides Generative AI Guidance for Instructors, which suggests for using AI in ways that can boost engagement and support more personalized learning, and Generative AI Guide for Students, constituting rules for responsible use, including how to cite generative AI, how to think critically about AI outputs, and clear do's and don'ts for using these tools.

Table 1. Comparison of AI Usage Policies at Several Law Schools (US and Indonesia)

Law School	Academic Integrity Statement on AI	Guidelines for Instructors	Guidelines/Prohibitions for Students
University of Chicago Law	Generative AI is not allowed if it appears to replicate plagiarism—i.e., similar to work that students did not truly produce.	Instructors can set their own course rules (for example, limitation during exams).	During exams: fully prohibited. For assignments: allowed only for brainstorming or proofreading—not for writing the paper.
UC Berkeley Law	Generative AI may be used for research and grammar, but not for writing assignments; it is also prohibited for exams. Plagiarism is forbidden.	Instructors may adjust the default approach, as long as it clearly communicated in writing.	Students may use AI only for research and correction, not for composing texts. Generating full assignment in sections—or using it in exams—is prohibited.
University of Illinois (Faculty of Law)	Focuses on academic integrity and AI governance principles (e.g., accountability, privacy, security, etc.)	“Generative AI Guidance for Instructors” provides framework support while setting boundaries for AI use	Students are expected to use a AI thoughtfully, incorporate it critically, cite it, follow critical-thinking guidance, and act responsibly.

Law School	Academic Integrity Statement on AI	Guidelines for Instructors	for Guidelines/Prohibitions for Students
Yale Law School	AI is being incorporated into AI courses exist incorporated (e.g., AI & the across the Legal Profession), curriculum but an explicit through training honor-code policy and practice for AI has not been activities (such as established yet simulation and case discussions)	AI is being incorporated into AI courses exist incorporated (e.g., AI & the across the Legal Profession), curriculum but an explicit through training honor-code policy and practice for AI has not been activities (such as established yet simulation and case discussions)	No clear, explicit ban is listed: instead, students are taught to use AI critically and ethically.
Harvard Law School	Offers an “AI and the Law” program to prepare students for a changing legal landscape	Uses formal and program-based instruction (including through “fiction.” the Center on the encouraged to verify Legal Profession) information and think as part of its critically. teaching approach	Faculty emphasize risks such as inaccurate output or “fiction.” Students are encouraged to verify information and think critically.
University of Indonesia (UI)	No specific generative AI policy at the Faculty of Law (FH teach AI literacy UI). However, and ethics, using other UI faculties seminars and tools (FEB UI, FT UI) to support research have general and writing. guidelines.	Lecturers are encouraged to teach AI literacy and ethics, using seminars and tools to support research and writing.	Students may use AI for brainstorming, proofreading, and correction, but it must be critical and transparent—and it should not replace the student’s own creativity.
Gadjah Mada	AI ethics and awareness activities exist	Instructors are encouraged to build critical	Students may use AI as a tool to (research, drafting, brainstorming), but they

Law School	Academic Integrity Statement on AI	Guidelines for Instructors	for Guidelines/Prohibitions for Students
University (UGM)	(hallucinations, bias, privacy), but these are not yet included in the practices. Tools like formal integrity code.	thinking about AI must be about teaching, accuracy, and ethical entirely on AI output. NotebookLM support research based on cited sources.	verify sources, and not rely entirely on AI output.

Source: Secondary data, 2025

Although generative AI is becoming a major concern in higher education worldwide, clear and formal regulations inside law schools in Indonesia are still quite limited. This is different from what has been happening in the United States, where many law schools have already set out explicit rules for AI—both in terms of academic integrity and everyday teaching practices. The goal of this study is to examine how far policy and guidance on generative AI has developed and how it is being applied in five Indonesian law schools: the University of Indonesia (UI), Gadjah Mada University (UGM), Brawijaya University (UB), Padjadjaran University (Unpad) and Airlangga University (Unair).

UI's Faculty of Law does not appear to have a clear written policy specifically governing the use of generative AI. Still, there is a clear direction toward building responsible AI literacy within the broader university approach. For instance, UI's Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Economics and Business have held seminars and created internal guidance on ethical AI use—such as

for proofreading, brainstorming initial ideas, and grammar correction, with a strong emphasis on transparency.

UGM's Faculty of Law has been more visible in encouraging open discussion about generative AI—its role and its risks. Through the Center for Technology and Regulation (CTRL), UGM has hosted seminars on ethics, regulation, and legal consequences of using generative AI. These discussions also highlight concerns like AI hallucinations, algorithmic bias, and privacy violations (Yahya et al., 2026). In addition, UGM provided platforms such as NotebookLM—an AI research assistant—to encourage the use of AI while keeping original of references in place, helping reduce plagiarism risk and improving academic accuracy (law.ugm.ac.id, 2023).

For Brawijaya University, Padjadjaran University, and Airlangga University, we did not find publicly available procedures, rules, or clear guidance on managing generative AI—whether for academics, administration, student conduct, or faculty expectation. We also did not locate any of official academic integrity statements or instructions for students and lecturers about using AI in learning activities, assignments or exams. Overall, this suggests a governance gap and the need to develop AI policies in Indonesia that are grounded in transparency, accountability, and academic integrity—an approach that some Indonesian universities have already begun to adopt.

While UI and UGM seem to be moving earlier toward an ethical and literacy-based approach, other institutions still appear to be in early stages. More broadly, global trends suggest law schools should not only limit AI use in academic work, but also build students' ability to use these tools responsibly. This aligns with widely recognized AI governance principles, including fairness, data security, reliability and openness (Floridi et al., 2018).

2. Building AI Literacy through Organized Training, Programs, and Flexible Teaching Models

Relying only on traditional lecture—where students mainly listen passively—often fails to build the practical skills they need for real legal work. Even the case method (popular since Christopher Columbus Langdell at Harvard in the 1870s) can fall short if it focuses too narrowly on appellate decisions and overlooks other crucial parts of legal practice, such as legislation, regulation and the day-to-day realities of representing clients. Generative AI can support these established approaches rather than replace them. Used well, it can make learning more interactive and tailored to each student's needs.

AI is likely to reshape legal education and help bridge the gap between what law schools teach and what legal work increasingly requires. At the same time, AI raises serious concerns—especially around human judgment and algorithmic bias in decision-making. AI tools can improve productivity (Maskanah, 2025), but schools must ensure students still develop critical thinking and legal reasoning. One promising direction is blended learning: combining AI-supported activities with traditional methods like face-to-face teaching, group discussions and mentoring. In short, law schools should use AI to strengthen legal analysis—not to replace it.

In the legal context, AI literacy is more than understanding the basic technology. It also includes understanding the ethical, legal, and knowledge-related (epistemological) implications of using AI—such as how to judge reliability, how to avoid bias, and how to handle accountability when AI is involved. Many leading U.S. law schools have started major efforts to build AI literacy. For example, a LexisNexis survey found that 78% of law schools plan to teach students about generative AI technologies this spring (Lexisnexis.com). In addition, the American Bar Association (ABA) and the ABA Task Force on

Law and Legal Intelligence released results from an AI and Legal Education Survey: 55% of law schools reported offering specific classes on AI, and 83% pointed to curricular opportunities such as clinics where students can learn how to use AI tools properly.

Harvard Law School has launched the “AI and the Law” program and created the Center on the Legal Profession, which brings AI studies into the broader professional training framework. The program helps students understand how AI affects litigation, negotiation, and cross-border legal practice. Harvard also uses simulation-based classes to explore how tools like ChatGPT and other NLP systems can be used correctly—or misused—in real-world scenarios.

Vanderbilt Law School also launched its Law & Innovation Program in 2015 to prepare students for the future of legal practice through legal industry knowledge, legal technology, innovation, entrepreneurship, and access to legal services. In November 2023, Vanderbilt introduced the Vanderbilt AI Legal Lab (VAILL), which is designed specifically to integrate AI tools into legal education. VAILL offers AI-integrated courses, including a Generative AI for Legal Services Primer, covering AI ethics, rapid engineering, and practical applications for legal research and writing. Vanderbilt has also partnered with the legal tech company Aderant, integrating its AI assistant MADDI into student training modules to support complex legal research tasks.

Several U.S. legal education institutions have also started AI-focused training labs—spaces where students learn hands-on while working with real legal and technological questions. For example, Stanford Law School partnered with the Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence (HAI) to create policy labs. In these labs, students analyze how AI policies affect the legal system, using an interdisciplinary approach that blends law, ethics, and

computer engineering. A similar idea was taken up by the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, which opened a technology lab to train students in using widely available AI tools. The training covers areas such as e-discovery, document review, legal research, and more. The school also runs an annual conference and offers training programs, including cybersecurity and privacy protection (Yuliana, 2022) , along with an online certification program for e-discovery technology professionals. Meanwhile, Hofstra Law launched its Law, Logic & Technology Research Lab in 2010. This lab focuses on creating and applying AI-based programs to make legal practice—and legal education—more efficient and effective.

Table 2. Comparison of AI Programs in Law Schools (US and Indonesia)

Faculty of Law	Name of Program/ Center/Activity	Program Literacy Forms	Focus/AI Pedagogical Model/ Approach
Harvard Law School (USA)	AI and the Law Program, Center on the Legal Profession	AI integration in litigation, negotiation, and transnational law	Simulation-based classes exploring uses and abuses of AI
Vanderbilt Law School (USA)	<i>Program on Law & Innovation</i> (2015)	Legal technology, innovation, entrepreneurship, access to justice	Industry-centered, innovation-focused curriculum
Stanford Law School (USA)	<i>Policy Labs</i> (with Stanford HAI)	Evaluating how AI policies affect the legal system	Interdisciplinary (law, ethics, computer engineering)
Cleveland-Marshall	<i>Legal Technology Lab</i>	E-discovery, legal research, privacy and cybersecurity	Annual conference and legal technology certification

Faculty of Law	Name of Program/ Center/Activity	Program Literacy Forms	Focus/AI Pedagogical Model/ Approach
College of Law (USA)			
Hofstra Law School (USA)	<i>Law, Logic & Technology Research Lab</i> (2010)	AI development to improve legal practice and education	Project-based learning and experimentation
Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia (ID)	Seminar: “AI in Indonesian IPR” (2024)	Using AI in intellectual property rights	Interdisciplinary, non-permanent scientific seminar
Faculty of Law, Gadjah Mada University (ID)	Seminar: <i>Center for Law, Technology, Reg & LegalTech Studies</i> (CTRL UGM)	Seminar: "Implementation of GenAI for Legal Research" (2024)—ethical and technical reflection	Discursive, reflective, case-based pedagogy

Source: Author's processed results, 2025

In Indonesia, legal education is increasingly seen as a way to produce practicing legal professionals, not just develop legal scholarship. As a result, many law faculties have been shifting to being primarily “ready-to-study” centers to functioning more like professional training institutions (Agiyanto et al., 2021). Compared with the United States, several Indonesian law schools still do not have permanent, structured policies or programs that clearly regulate how AI should be used in teaching and learning. For example, the Faculty of Law at the University of Indonesia (UI) does not yet appear to have an official, ongoing AI training program. However, UI does actively hold scientific seminars on generative AI in legal contexts. To mark its 100th anniversary, UI’s

Faculty of Law organized a seminar titled "Artificial Intelligence in the Indonesian Intellectual Property Rights System." The event brought together speakers from the Faculty of Computer Science and the Faculty of Law, focusing on how AI can be used in areas such as intellectual property rights, higher education, and legal research.

Similarly, at Gadjah Mada University (UGM), the Center for Law, Technology, RegTech & LegalTech Studies (CTRL UGM) actively encourages AI-related teaching and literacy efforts. One example is a limited seminar—"Implementing Generative Artificial Intelligence for Legal Research"—held on November 1, 2024, together with Hukumonline. This seminar discussed the use of GenAI for legal research as well as related concerns such as AI ethics, plagiarism and bias. Meanwhile, at the time this compilation was prepared, we did not find reports of AI training programs, legal "labs," or AI literacy activities at the law faculties of Unair, UB and Unpad based on the study material collected.

In contrast, many U.S. law schools are giving students more direct opportunities to learn about AI—often through dedicated and practical learning settings. Some offer courses such as "AI & the Law," along with clinics or workshops related to advocacy. Others also describe ways students can engage with AI through collaborations with university departments like computer science or engineering.

Because digital activity and related transactions are growing rapidly (Muslih & Supeno, 2022), some U.S. schools are moving quickly to keep up. For instance, UC Berkeley School of Law has introduced AI-focused courses and even launched a new LL.M. program specializing in Artificial Intelligence. Berkeley also formed an advisory board made up of industry leaders to help shape the curriculum, including representatives from organizations such as

Meta, the Allen Institute for AI, Infoblox, Anthropic, and civil society groups, along with groups working on responsible innovation. At Northwestern Pritzker School of Law, students can take courses like “AI and Legal Reasoning,” and there is also the Law and Technology Initiative, a partnership between Northwestern Law, the McCormick School of Engineering, and external partners.

3. Using AI Monitoring and Detection to Protect Academic Standards

AI research and regulation are meant to strike a balance: encouraging innovation while also limiting the harms that AI can cause. But as AI tools spread quickly, so does the risk that they will be misused (Nurmansyah et al., 2024). In legal education, “academic standards” usually mean things like: authenticity of student work (it is really their own), accuracy of legal analysis, and independent, original argumentation. Today, generative AI tools such as ChatGPT or Copilot make it easier to draft text quickly. That can raise serious concerns, including plagiarism, automation bias (accepting AI output too readily), or legal arguments that sound persuasive but are not grounded in real critical thinking. That is why AI-based monitoring and detection tools—such as plagiarism detectors, learning behavior analytics, and generative AI trackers—can be a practical support mechanism.

AI detection systems (e.g., Turnitin, which is developing AI-generated content detection) can help lecturers and institutions spot potential issues early—before students submit work that violate academic ethics (Cotton et al., 2024). In the U.S., many law schools have started using AI detection features (including Turnitin's AI detection) to encourage assignments that reflect students’ own effort—not just automated AI output. Importantly, these tools are best treated as helpers, not automatic “judges” of academic dishonesty.

For instance, Chicago Law School set a strict generative AI policy for the Fall Quarter of 2023, consistent with its approach to AI detection. Under their integrity guideline, automated text generation without meaningful human input is considered plagiarism—regardless of whether it is attributed. In this model, instructors may use detection technology to support enforcement of that rule. It is worth noting, however, that available findings are still preliminary and need further validation. In Indonesian, requirements for final work (e.g., theses, dissertations, and journal writing) often use similarity threshold—commonly around 30%—using AI-detection or similarity-check algorithms. At the same time, many universities are also working to strengthen AI ethics guidance. If detection tools are used ethically—transparent, fairly, and responsibly—they can help Indonesian universities strengthen academic integrity and respond to digital disruption.

One major limitation is that detection tools can produce false positives, especially for non-native English writers (Liang et al., 2023). That risk becomes even more serious if the institution does not provide prior training and explanation. So, any monitoring system should be paired with clear institutional norms that are transparent (students know what's being checked and why), fair (results are interpreted carefully), and respectful of academic integrity.

4. National AI Governance Framework and Building Institutional Structures

Even though many universities have started drafting their own policies for teaching, research, and administration, campus-level rules will not be effective unless they are supported by strong state regulation and government institutions that stay responsive to technological change and social impacts. In other words, the university is only one part of a much broader AI governance ecosystem—one that also involves ethics, law, economics, and even national

security. We can think of it as an “academic ecology” connected to wider national systems.

A major challenge is that AI often advances faster than the legal framework can keep up (Arifin et al., 2025), making it difficult to write laws in time (Saputra & Bene, 2024). Because of that, control is needed not just technological, but also institutionally and ethically. The United States—being an early leader in AI—has taken steps to address this through national, institutionalized planning. In 2023, President Biden signed Executive Order 14110, which required government agencies to develop an AI oversight framework to ensure AI is deployed safely and reliably while still following democratic principles.

Under the order, federal agencies had 60 days to appoint a CAIO (Chief AI Officer) and set up an AI Governance Board. This board is expected to review AI risk, monitor compliance, and ensure AI systems do not violate civil rights or non-discrimination laws. The National Science and Technology Council and the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) advise the government and help connect academic and industry stakeholders (Whittlestone & Clark, 2021). In addition, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) supports risk-management approaches, while the White House’s Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights reinforced ethical foundation for responsible AI use—including in higher education. As a result, universities and law schools have begun building internal governance structures too. For instance, Stanford and MIT have internal AI governance committees, while law schools like Georgetown Law and NYU Law have adopted rules for academic work and scholarly writing that emphasize transparency and algorithmic auditing.

In Indonesia, the government also tried to move toward national AI governance, though the implementation is still developing. The Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT) released the National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence (Stranas KA) in 2020 as a starting point for building a national AI governance framework. The strategy prioritizes areas such as health, bureaucratic reform, education and research, food security, mobility, and smart cities (BPPT, 2020). Another important step is Circular Letter No. 9 of 2023 concerning AI Ethics, issued by the Minister of Communication and Informatics. This circular lay out seven AI ethics principles: inclusiveness, responsibility, transparency, fairness, security, data protection, and compliance with law and human rights. These principles are drawn from UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (UNESCO, 2021), as well as standards from the OECD and the EU. However, because this is soft law (not legally binding), its impact depends largely on how seriously each organization implements it.

From the perspective of Indonesia's current legal system, there is still no fully defined, binding national framework that clearly guides all stakeholders. Research suggests that when a country does not have a holistic public policy, universities may respond by creating sector-by-sector rules that are not always consistent, may reflect institutional bias, and often lack strong cross-sector accountability (Floridi et al., 2018). Even where ethical guidelines are emerging—both nationally and through campus initiatives in the United States—these efforts can still be limited when there is no federal-level legislation that is binding for everyone (Nannini et al., n.d.). Without enforceable, coordinated governance, regulations become fragmented, leading to unequal protection of users' rights—especially students and lecturers. Ultimately, if campus and state laws do not work together, AI regulation of in

higher education risks being erratic and reactive, rather than proactive, fair, and consistent.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that managing artificial intelligence (AI) in legal education cannot rely on ethics alone. It needs a combined approach that brings together ethical guidance, teaching and clear regulatory support. By comparing the United States and Indonesia, the study finds that the U.S. has built more flexible institutional systems and clearer academic policies, while Indonesia still lacks a coherent, binding AI framework for higher education. The main novelty of this research is a multi-layered AI governance model that connects several elements— institutional academic policies, AI literacy, adaptable pedagogical methods, and AI monitoring mechanisms— within a wider national regulatory setting. Unlike earlier studies that mainly discussed ethics in general terms, this work turns AI governance into practical institutional and classroom strategies that law schools can apply. Overall, the study concludes that effective AI governance is essential to make sure AI supports learning—strengthening academic integrity and professional ethics in legal education— rather than undermining them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agiyanto, U., Absori, A., Surbakti, N., Raharjo, T., & Ikhwan, A. (2021). Advocate Legal Education in Indonesia: The Need of Spiritual Dimensions Approach. *Al-Risalah: Forum Kajian Hukum Dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*, 21(1), 111–120. <https://doi.org/10.30631/al-risalah.v21i1.742>
- Ajevski, M., Barker, K., Gilbert, A., Hardie, L., Ryan, F., Ajevski, M., Barker, K., Gilbert, A., Hardie, L., Ryan, F., Ajevski, M., Barker, K., Gilbert, A., Hardie, L., & Ryan, F. (2023). *ChatGPT and the future of legal education and practice ChatGPT and the future of legal education and practice*. 9400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2023.2207426>
- Amigud, A., & Pell, D. J. (2025). Responsible and Ethical Use of AI in Education: Are We Forcing a Square Peg into a Round Hole? *World*, 6(2), 81. <https://doi.org/10.3390/world6020081>
- Antony, Sandoval, E. B., & Louis, J. E. (2026). Legal Reform in Indonesia's Response to the Digital Manipulation Era: A Responsive Legal Theory Approach. *Trunojoyo Law Review*, 8(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.21107/tlr.v8i1.30732>
- Antoro, H., & Budhijanto, D. (2026). Admissibility of Artificial Intelligence as Electronic Evidence: Comparative Perspectives from Indonesia, the United States, and Japan. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v14i1.1880>
- Arifin, F., Suryana, C., Maarif, I., Bahri, R. A., & Murbani, A. W. (2025). Designing an AI-Driven Legislation Framework to Improve Indonesia's Law-Making Transparency and Public Participation. *Yustisia*, 14(2), 152–169. <https://doi.org/10.20961/yustisia.v14i2.98092>
- Bontridder, N., & Pouillet, Y. (2021). *The role of artificial intelligence in disinformation*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.20>
- Bovenkamp, H. M. van de, & Vollaard, H. (2019). Strengthening the local representative system: the importance of electoral and non-electoral representation. *Local Government Studies*, 45(2), 196–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2018.1548351>

- Chen, J. J., & Lin, J. C. (2024). *Artificial intelligence as a double-edged sword : Wielding the POWER principles to maximize its positive effects and minimize its negative effects*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491231169813>
- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., Shipway, J. R., Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., Chatting, J. R. S., & Cotton, D. R. E. (2024). Chatting and cheating : Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT Chatting and cheating : Ensuring academic integrity in the era. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Djakfar Musthafa, F. A. (2024). Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence (AI) dalam Pembelajaran: Fenomena Transformasi Otoritas Pengetahuan di Kalangan Mahasiswa. *Journal of Contemporary Islamic Education*, 4(1), 125–136. <https://doi.org/10.25217/jcie.v4i1.4386>
- Ezzerouali, S., Arifin, R., & Banane, M. C. (2025). Can Moroccan Law Ensure Substantive Justice in Protecting Private Life from AI's Impact? *Substantive Justice International Journal of Law*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.56087/substantivejustice.v8i1.333>
- Farber, S. (2024). *Harmonizing AI and human instruction in legal education : a case study from Israel on training future legal professionals*. 5958. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2024.2430018>
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., & Chatila, R. (2018). AI4People — An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society : *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Fornasier, M. de O. (2021). Legal Education In The 21st Century And The Artificial Intelligence Ensino. *Revista Opinião Jurídica*, 19(31), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.12662/2447-6641oj.v19i31.p1-32.2021>
- G, A. P. (2024). *Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education : From Casebooks to Code , Opportunities and Challenges*. 6(3), 60–79.
- Galloway, K., Webb, J., Bartlett, F., Flood, J., & Webley, L. (2019). The Legal Academy's Engagements with Lawtech: Technology Narratives and Archetypes as Drivers of Change. *Law, Technology and Humans*, 1(1), 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.5204/lthj.v1i0.1337>

- Hafidz, J. (2018). *Karakteristik Kebijakan Pendidikan Tinggi Hukum Indonesia Berdasarkan Pancasila dan Undang - Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*. 1, 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.22225/kw.12.1.420.22>
- Hashem, R., Ali, N., El Zein, F., Fidalgo, P., & Abu Khurma, O. (2024). *AI to the rescue: Exploring the potential of ChatGPT as a teacher ally for workload relief and burnout prevention*. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 19, 23. <https://doi.org/10.58459/rptel.2024.19023>
- Head, A., Willis, S., Head, A., & Willis, S. (2024). Assessing law students in a GenAI world to create knowledgeable future lawyers knowledgeable future lawyers. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, 31(3), 293–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2024.2379785>
- Helmi, M. I., Pujiyono, Khamami, & Hidayat, A. S. (2025). Legal Compliance of Acehnese Muslim Society in Technological Disruption Era: Study of Online Gambling and Prostitution. *AL-IHKAM: Jurnal Hukum & Pranata Sosial*, 20(1), 312–340. <https://doi.org/10.19105/al-lhkam.v20i1.15373>
- Herrera-tapias, B. A., & Hernández, D. (2025). ScienceDirect Legal Hallucinations and the Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in the Judiciary. *Procedia Computer Science*, 257, 1184–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2025.03.158>
- Ibrahim, H., Liu, F., Asim, R., Battu, B., Benabderrahmane, S., Alhafni, B., Adnan, W., Alhanai, T., Alshebli, B., Baghdadi, R., Bélanger, J. J., Beretta, E., Celik, K., Chaqfeh, M., Daqaq, M. F., Bernoussi, Z. El, Fougny, D., Soto, B. G. De, Gandolfi, A., ... Zaki, Y. (2023). Perception , performance , and detectability of conversational artificial intelligence across 32 university courses. *Scientific Reports*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-38964-3>
- Jaelani, A. K., Luthviati, R. D., Siboy, A., Al-Fatih, S., & Hayat, M. J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Policy in Promoting Indonesian Tourism. *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, 7(1), 109–137. <https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v7i1.10623>
- Jensen, L. X., Buhl, A., Sharma, A., & Bearman, M. (2025). Generative AI and higher education : a review of claims from the first months of ChatGPT. *Higher Education*, 89(4), 1145–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01265-3>

- Katz, D. M., James, M., Gao, S., Arredondo, P., & Katz, D. M. (2025). *GPT-4 passes the bar exam Subject Areas: Author for correspondence: (December)*. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2023.0254/1328474/rsta.2023.0254>
- Kerekes, L. (2023). Aspects of the regulation of artificial intelligence. *Indonesia Private Law Review*, 4(2), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.25041/iplr.v4i2.2987>
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*, 4(7), 100779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779>
- Loacker, B. (2023). Does the Ethos of Law Erode? Lawyers ' Professional Practices , Self - Understanding and Ethics at Work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 187(1), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05276-x>
- Magesh, V., Surani, F., Dahl, M., Suzgun, M., Manning, C. D., & Ho, D. E. (2025). *Free ? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools*. 216–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jels.12413>
- Murray, B. M. D., Heaton, A., Jackson, N., Lienau, B., Nipper, K., Price, L., & Paul, D. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence for Learning the Law : Generative AI for Academic Support in Law Schools and Universities education has garnered significant attention in recent years , transforming traditional learning*. 1–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331241240459>
- Muslih, M., & Supeno. (2022). Financial Technology: Digital Legal Challenges and Indonesia's Economic Prospects After Covid-19 Outbreak Article. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 30(2), 255–266. <http://www.ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/legality>
- Nannini, L., Balayn, A., & Smith, A. L. (n.d.). *Explainability in AI Policies : A Critical Review of Communications , Reports , Regulations , and Standards in the EU , US , and UK*. 1198–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594074>
- Nurmansyah, G., Arya, G., Wiranata, B., Fardiansyah, A. I., & Mladenov, S. V. (2024). Preventing AI-based phishing crimes across national borders through the reconstruction of personal data protection laws. *Nurmansyah*, 15(2), 286–311. <http://www.apwg.org>.

- Qadhi, S. M., Alduais, A., Chaaban, Y., & Khraisheh, M. (2024). Generative AI, Research Ethics, and Higher Education Research: Insights from a Scientometric Analysis. In *Information (Switzerland)* (Vol. 15, Number 6). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). <https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060325>
- Raharjo, R. S., & Rohmadi, S. H. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Indonesian Education: A Critical Review of Ethical Considerations, Implementation Challenges, and Educational Management Perspectives. *At-Tarbawi: Jurnal Kajian Kependidikan Islam*, 10(1), 50–68. <https://doi.org/10.22515/attarbawi.v10i1.12141>
- Ramadhani, E. R., Rachmawati, A. R., & Kurnikova, R. H. (2025). Integrating Islamic Values with the Right to Be Forgotten: A Legal Approach to Addressing Deepfake Pornography in Indonesia. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah*, 17(1), 112–131. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i1.28880>
- Rodrigues, M., & Silva, R. (2023). *Artificial intelligence : threat or asset to academic integrity ? A bibliometric analysis intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-09-2023-1666>
- Rusdiana, E., Aidonojie Atagemen, P., Jufri, M., & Ismaila, H. (2025). Augment Legal Efforts through Artificial Intelligence in Curtailing Economic Fraud in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges. *IJCLS (Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies)*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i1.22147>
- Salinas, O. J. (2023). Secondary Courses Taught by Secondary Faculty: A (Personal) Call to Fully Integrate Skills Faculty and Skills Courses into the Law School Curriculum Ahead of the NextGen Bar Exam. *Minnesota Law Review*, 107(6), 2663. <https://doi.org/10.24926/265535.4341>
- Saputra, B., & Bene, O. (2024). Hungary's AI Strategy: Lessons for Indonesia's AI Legal Framework Enhancement. *Jambe Law Journal*, 7(1), 25–58. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jlj.7.1.25-58>
- Sarker, I. H. (2021). *Machine Learning : Algorithms , Real-World Applications and Research Directions*. (March). <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202103.0216.v1>
- Setiawan Andry, Rindia Fanny Kusumaningtyas, Afifah Widyastuti, & Ibadurrahman Hanan Abdullah. (2025). The Urgency of Legal Profession

Regulation Amidst The Integration of Artificial Intelligence. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 9(2), 1484–1517. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lslr.v9i2.26448>

Suharyo, Subyantoro, & Pristiwati, R. (2023). Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Konteks Kurikulum Merdeka pada Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah: Membangun Keterampilan Menuju Indonesia Emas 2045. *Humanika*, 30(2), 208–217. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.v30i2.60563>

Syabina, A. F., Masum, A., Yunus, A., & Ruslan, A. (2026). Administrative Law Dilemma from Taxing the Economic Presence in Cloud Computing Post-Constitutional Court Decision in Indonesia. *Administrative and Environmental Law Review*, 7(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.25041/aclr.v7i1.4586>

Taufiqurokhman, Murod, M., & Wibisono, D. K. (2024). Development of the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Technology and Jakarta Smart City (JSC). *Ilomata International Journal of Social Science*, 5(3), 799–817. <https://doi.org/10.61194/ijss.v5i3.1203>

Toussaint, E. C. (2023). The Purpose of Legal Education. *California Law Review*, 111(1), 1–70. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38G73749G>

Ulum, K. M., Ariyanti, S., Witro, D., & Nasyiah, I. (2025). Integration Of Islamic Philanthropy With Financial Technology: The Case Study of Waqf towards Sustainable Funding in Indonesia. *Jurisdictie: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syariah*, 16(1), 77–123. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j.v16i1.30447>

Ummi Maskanah. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Civil Justice: Comparative Legal Analysis and Practical Frameworks for Indonesia. *Jambura Law Review*, 7(1), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.49.1.2020.80-89>

Whittlestone, J., & Clark, J. (2021). Why and How Governments Should Monitor AI Development. *Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford.*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.12427>

Yahya, M. W. B. H. M., Rahmat, M., Parihat, Munawar, G., & Amiruddin. (2026). Artificial Intelligence In Islamic Education: Strengthening Religious Tolerance Or Reproducing New Socio-Legal Risks? *PETITA: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum Dan Syariah*, 11(1), 897–919. <https://doi.org/10.22373/petita.v11i1.1184>

- Yanto, O. (2025). *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan Etika Penggunaan Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Pendidikan Hukum Etika Penggunaan Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Pendidikan Hukum*. 54(4). <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol54.no4.1732>
- Yuliana. (2022). The Importance Of Cybersecurity Awareness For Children. *Lampung Journal of International Law*, 4(1), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.25041/lajil.v4i1.2526>
- Zhang, S., Zhao, X., Zhou, T., & Kim, J. H. (2024). Do you have AI dependency? The roles of academic self-efficacy, academic stress, and performance expectations on problematic AI usage behavior. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00467-0>