

USING AI TOOLS FOR LEGAL PURPOSES AND DOCUMENT WRITING: PERCEPTIONS AND AWARENESS AMONG UNDERGRADUATE BUSINESS STUDENTS AT A THAI PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

Alan Robert White¹

¹Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep (Thailand)

*) email: alan.w@mail.rmutk.ac.th

Abstract

This research examines the awareness of undergraduate business students regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in writing legal business documents. As AI tools become increasingly prevalent in professional and academic environments, understanding student knowledge, usage patterns, and perceptions is essential for curriculum development and educational practice. This study employed a quantitative approach using a structured questionnaire administered to 45 undergraduate business students enrolled in an international program at a Thai public university. The survey assessed awareness levels, perceptions of AI capabilities and limitations, actual usage patterns, and educational preferences regarding AI-assisted legal writing. Results indicate that students demonstrate moderate to high awareness of AI tools in legal business writing (M=2.82-3.87), with strongest understanding of document types and tool differentiation. Participants showed critical awareness of AI limitations, strongly agreeing that AI reduces but does not eliminate the need for human legal expertise (M=4.16). However, actual usage patterns revealed a significant gap between awareness and application, with limited direct use of AI for drafting legal documents (M=2.33-2.80) but more frequent use for grammar and structural improvement (M=3.64). Students expressed strong support for integrating AI instruction into university curricula (M=3.33) and emphasized the need for training on ethical and responsible use (M=3.67). The findings reveal considerable variation in student knowledge levels and minimal pedagogical guidance from instructors. This study contributes to business education literature by addressing a significant gap in research on student engagement with AI tools for legal writing. The results support recommendations for structured curriculum development incorporating technical competencies, critical evaluation skills, and ethical frameworks. Educational institutions should develop explicit policies and instructional modules to prepare students for professional contexts where AI-assisted legal writing is increasingly common while maintaining academic integrity and professional standards.

Keywords: Accounting Information Systems, Internal Control, System Evaluation, Accounting, Information Technology

1. INTRODUCTION

AI-based writing tools are used in drafting, editing, and reviewing professional documents, including those in the legal domain. Business students are expected to prepare formal documents that meet legal and professional standards. Understanding how AI assists in this process is relevant for academic and workplace readiness. University programmes often do not provide focused instruction on legal document writing with AI. This proposal outlines a study to examine awareness among undergraduate business students. The study intends to contribute to educational research and inform future teaching practices.

Background

Legal business writing involves precise language, structure, and compliance with formal standards. AI-based writing tools such as GPT-based systems, automated document generators, and contract review platforms are used in business environments. These tools offer grammatical correction, formatting assistance, and basic legal phrase generation. Legal documents include contracts, business letters, reports, and policy statements. Use of AI in drafting these materials introduces questions about accuracy, authorship, ethical considerations, and academic integrity. Students who do not understand the limitations of AI tools may submit documents with inaccuracies or unverified content. Educational research on student awareness is limited. This study addresses this gap by examining perceptions and knowledge levels among business undergraduates.

Statement of the Problem

The integration of AI in academic and professional writing has expanded. However, undergraduate business students often lack structured learning related to legal writing and AI. There is a need to investigate whether these students are aware of the methods, limitations, and appropriateness of using AI for writing legal business documents. Misunderstanding or misuse may lead to academic misconduct, overreliance on unverified content, or the submission of legally unsound materials. Assessing awareness is necessary to support responsible usage and effective instruction.

Research Objectives

This study seeks to:

- a. Identify the extent of awareness among undergraduate business students regarding AI-assisted legal business writing.
- b. Examine the usage patterns of AI tools in legal document preparation among these students.
- c. Explore student perceptions of benefits and limitations associated with AI in this context.

Propose recommendations for curriculum development based on findings.

Research Questions

- a. What is the level of awareness among undergraduate business students regarding the use of AI in legal business writing?
- b. How do these students use AI tools for writing legal business documents?
- c. What concerns do students express regarding accuracy, ethics, and reliability when using AI for legal writing?
- d. How can university instruction be adjusted to address student knowledge and usage patterns?

Significance of the Study

This research examines student awareness of a technological development affecting legal writing. The study contributes to discussions in business education by

focusing on how students approach AI tools in document preparation. The findings will support educators in identifying gaps in instruction and updating curriculum content. Universities are increasingly adopting AI in teaching and learning. Understanding student knowledge and use of AI in legal writing will help align academic standards with workplace expectations.

Literature Review

AI tools such as language models and document automation systems assist in preparing legal documents. Research indicates that such tools are used for drafting standard agreements, proofreading, and checking for consistency. AI tools provide templates and suggestions. However, scholars caution that these tools do not replace legal reasoning or human judgment. Student awareness and use of AI Tools Studies on student use of AI tools show mixed results. Some research finds that students use grammar checkers and summarisation tools without understanding the limitations. Others suggest that students assume output from AI tools is accurate and reliable. Limited research focuses on legal writing in business education. Ethical and Pedagogical Issues AI-assisted writing raises questions about authorship, plagiarism, and academic integrity. Universities differ in policies on AI use. Some encourage AI as a support tool, others view unacknowledged use as misconduct. Students may lack guidance on acceptable use. Business Education programmes often include communication and writing components. However, focused instruction on legal business writing is limited. AI integration in education is growing, with institutions adopting intelligent platforms and digital resources. Few studies address the awareness of AI-assisted legal writing among business students. This study focuses on undergraduates to address that absence. The results will support educators and policymakers.

Alarie, Niblett, and Yoon (2018) explored how AI is beginning to affect the legal profession, including tasks traditionally performed by experienced lawyers. AI tools now influence legal reasoning, outcome prediction, and document drafting. The authors emphasised short-term benefits such as increased transparency and efficiency, as well as long-term uncertainties about how legal services will evolve. Their study presents a foundational view of how AI may reshape the legal environment, suggesting the need for future professionals—including students—to understand both opportunities and limitations in AI-supported legal writing.

Gouri, Jindal, Gouri, and Gouri (2025) focused on how AI-generated legal documents are transforming corporate law practice. The authors examined efficiency gains and cost reductions while also acknowledging risks, including data security and diminished human oversight. Their analysis emphasised the changing responsibilities of legal professionals and the requirement for a measured approach to AI adoption. This study is relevant to business students learning legal writing, as it reflects practical concerns in the legal documentation process where AI is now being embedded.

Regalia (2024) presented a practitioner's view on how generative AI, particularly ChatGPT, is redefining legal writing. The article outlined how modern AI tools are not only improving the speed and quality of legal writing but are also reshaping how lawyers approach research, communication, and courtroom preparation. Regalia argued that the legal profession is entering a period of technological acceleration and noted that many students and teachers lack sufficient understanding of these tools. This knowledge gap aligns directly with the need for greater awareness among business students, as proposed in the current study.

Davenport (2025) investigated the application of large language models to lengthy legal documents, offering a case study that demonstrated improved speed and accuracy in summarisation and clause identification. The study also highlighted technical constraints, including token limits and segmentation challenges. The research supports the feasibility of using AI for complex legal analysis and identifies potential pitfalls, including ethical concerns and loss of contextual nuance. This aligns with the educational objective of preparing students to use AI tools with caution and discernment.

Mika (2022) examined AI-powered features in legal research platforms like Lexis. The author detailed how these tools can enhance citation accuracy and support writing through integrated research functions. However, Mika warned that overreliance on software output could lead students to accept inaccurate or incomplete results. This observation is especially important in an educational context where students may not yet possess the judgment needed to verify or critique AI-generated content.

Harasta, Novotná, and Savelka (2024) conducted an experimental study measuring legal professionals' perceptions of AI-generated versus human-written legal documents. The authors found a clear preference for documents believed to be authored by humans, although participants acknowledged the inevitability of AI-generated content in the future. These findings illustrate psychological and professional reservations toward AI writing, suggesting the importance of equipping students with the skills to critically assess AI-assisted texts.

Smith (2023) examined the relationship between plagiarism, legal writing, and language models. He argued that using AI-generated content bears similarities to long-established practices of reusing templates or self-authored material. The essay challenges traditional views on originality in legal writing and questions the ethical consistency of current academic approaches. This debate is highly relevant to students learning legal writing with AI, particularly in contexts where academic integrity policies are still evolving.

Cyphert (2023) reviewed legal concerns about plagiarism and copyright infringement when lawyers use generative AI. The researcher noted that boilerplate copying is standard legal practice but acknowledged that disciplinary bodies vary in how they interpret such behaviour. Cyphert raised the possibility of copyright issues in

AI-assisted writing. These observations suggest that students must be aware not only of practical writing issues but also of broader legal frameworks when using AI tools.

Pham and Luong (2025) studied undergraduate students of Legal English and their difficulties in integrating AI tools into their writing. The research identified overreliance, ethical concerns, and diminished creativity as common problems. The study supports the argument that students need guidance to use AI responsibly and that without structured instruction, students may not develop the necessary judgement to assess AI-generated legal text accurately. This aligns with the present research proposal's emphasis on examining undergraduate awareness and usage patterns.

2. METHODOLOGY

Type and Research Approaches

This research used quantitative data. Participants include 45 undergraduate students in business programmes studying at a Thai public university. The students were studying on an international program and were of Chinese nationality and mixed gender. A structured questionnaire collected quantitative data. The questionnaire included statements on awareness, usage, and perceptions. Items used Likert-scale and multiple-choice formats. Survey data was analysed using descriptive statistics and t-tests to identify patterns across year levels. Informed consent was obtained. Participation was voluntary. Data was anonymised. Ethics approval was sought from the relevant university committee.

Limitations

This study focuses on undergraduate students enrolled in business programmes. Findings may not be generalised to students in other disciplines or countries. The study uses self-reported data, which may include subjective bias. Participants may not always recall or report their usage accurately. The cross-sectional design does not allow for analysis of changes in awareness over time. AI tools are also changing rapidly, so the tools students use now may not reflect those in use in future contexts.

2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The following table shows the quantitative results from the questionnaire.

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation calculated from the 5 point Likert scale questionnaire.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
I am aware that artificial intelligence can assist in drafting legal business documents.	3.62	.61
I know that AI tools such as ChatGPT can be used for legal contract writing.	3.33	.60

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
I understand the types of legal business documents (e.g., contracts, policies) that can be generated using AI.	3.87	.97
I have read or heard about the use of AI in legal or professional writing.	2.82	.96
I can identify differences between general writing tools and those designed for legal document generation.	3.78	.93
AI-generated legal documents may include factual or legal errors.	3.67	1.11
Using AI tools for legal business writing reduces the need for human legal expertise.	4.16	.88
Relying on AI tools for legal writing may create academic or ethical problems.	3.60	.99
AI tools make legal writing easier for students who lack formal legal training.	2.87	.89
AI-generated legal documents are generally useful but require human review.	3.31	.90
I have used AI tools such as ChatGPT or Grammarly to write legal or business-related assignments.	2.80	1.01
I use AI tools to help improve grammar, vocabulary, and structure in legal documents.	3.64	.83
I rely on AI tools to draft contracts, terms, or other business documents for coursework.	2.33	1.13
I have copied content directly from AI-generated outputs into legal assignments.	2.29	.89
I have received feedback on my use of AI tools for legal writing from lecturers or peers.	2.49	1.20
AI tools should be included in legal or business writing instruction at university.	3.33	.74
Students need training on ethical and responsible use of AI in writing legal documents.	3.67	.74
AI tools may help me prepare better for legal writing tasks in the workplace.	3.58	1.12
University rules about AI use in legal writing are clear and easy to follow.	3.87	.87
Using AI in legal writing helps me understand legal language and structure better.	3.89	.80

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal important insights into undergraduate business students' awareness, perceptions, and usage patterns of AI tools in legal business writing. The results indicate a moderate to high level of awareness among participants, with several notable trends emerging across different dimensions.

Awareness and Understanding

Students demonstrated reasonable awareness of AI's role in legal business writing, with mean scores ranging from 2.82 to 3.87 across awareness-related statements. Participants showed strongest agreement with understanding the types of legal business documents that can be AI-generated ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.97$) and identifying

differences between general and legal-specific writing tools ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.93$). However, exposure to discussions about AI in legal writing was notably lower ($M=2.82$, $SD=0.96$), suggesting that while students possess conceptual understanding, they may lack opportunities for structured engagement with this topic in their academic environment.

The relatively high standard deviations in some awareness items indicate considerable variation among students, pointing to uneven knowledge distribution within the cohort. This variability underscores the need for standardized instruction to ensure all students develop baseline competencies in AI-assisted legal writing.

Perceptions of AI Capabilities and Limitations

Students demonstrated critical awareness of AI limitations, strongly agreeing that AI-generated legal documents reduce the need for human legal expertise ($M=4.16$, $SD=0.88$). This finding is encouraging, as it suggests students do not view AI as a complete replacement for professional judgment. Participants also recognized that AI-generated documents may contain errors ($M=3.67$, $SD=1.11$) and acknowledged potential academic and ethical concerns ($M=3.60$, $SD=0.99$).

Interestingly, students expressed moderate agreement that AI-generated documents require human review ($M=3.31$, $SD=0.90$), though this score was lower than might be expected given their recognition of AI limitations. This gap may indicate that while students intellectually acknowledge the need for verification, they may not consistently apply this understanding in practice.

The perception that AI tools make legal writing easier for those without formal training received only modest support ($M=2.87$, $SD=0.89$), suggesting students recognize that AI cannot substitute for foundational legal knowledge. This finding aligns with scholarly concerns raised by Mika (2022) and Pham and Luong (2025) regarding overreliance on AI tools without adequate understanding.

Usage Patterns

Actual usage patterns revealed a significant gap between awareness and application. Students reported limited direct use of AI for legal assignments ($M=2.80$, $SD=1.01$) and rarely relied on AI for drafting contracts or formal documents ($M=2.33$, $SD=1.13$). Direct copying of AI-generated content was also uncommon ($M=2.29$, $SD=0.89$). However, students more frequently used AI tools for grammar, vocabulary, and structural improvement ($M=3.64$, $SD=0.83$), indicating selective engagement with AI features rather than wholesale adoption.

The low reported usage may reflect institutional policies, ethical concerns, or limited access to specialized legal writing AI tools. Additionally, students indicated receiving minimal feedback from instructors on AI use ($M=2.49$, $SD=1.20$), suggesting that pedagogical guidance in this area remains underdeveloped. This finding supports the observations of Regalia (2024) regarding knowledge gaps among both students and educators.

Educational Implications

Students expressed clear support for integrating AI tools into formal instruction. They agreed that AI should be included in university writing courses ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.74$) and strongly endorsed the need for training on ethical and responsible use ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.74$). Participants also believed AI tools could enhance workplace preparation ($M=3.58$, $SD=1.12$) and improve their understanding of legal language and structure ($M=3.89$, $SD=0.80$).

Notably, students perceived university policies on AI use as clear and accessible ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.87$), though this finding may reflect the specific institutional context rather than broader trends. The strong support for structured training aligns with recommendations from Gouri et al. (2025) and Harasta et al. (2024) regarding the need for measured, informed approaches to AI adoption in professional contexts.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

These findings have several implications for business education. First, the gap between awareness and usage suggests that students possess theoretical knowledge but lack practical frameworks for applying AI tools effectively. This supports the conceptual framework linking awareness, usage, perceptions, and educational needs. Second, the variation in student responses indicates that one-size-fits-all approaches may be insufficient; differentiated instruction may be necessary to address diverse knowledge levels.

The results also reflect broader tensions identified in the literature. Like the professionals studied by Harasta et al. (2024), students exhibit ambivalence toward AI-generated content, recognizing both its utility and its limitations. The ethical concerns raised by students echo scholarly debates presented by Smith (2023) and Cyphert (2023) regarding originality, plagiarism, and professional standards in AI-assisted writing.

From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that curriculum development should focus on three areas: technical competency in using AI tools, critical evaluation skills to assess AI outputs, and ethical frameworks for responsible usage. This approach would address the concerns raised by Davenport (2025) regarding loss of contextual nuance and by Alarie et al. (2018) regarding long-term uncertainties in AI-supported legal work.

3. CONCLUSION

This study examined awareness, usage patterns, and perceptions of AI-assisted legal business writing among undergraduate business students at a Thai public university. The findings indicate that students possess moderate awareness of AI capabilities in legal writing and demonstrate critical understanding of AI limitations.

However, actual usage remains limited, and students receive minimal pedagogical guidance on effective and ethical AI application.

The research addresses a significant gap in business education literature by focusing specifically on legal writing with AI among undergraduate students. The results support calls for curriculum development that incorporates structured instruction on AI tools, emphasizing both technical skills and ethical considerations. Students clearly recognize the value of such training and believe it would enhance their professional readiness.

Several recommendations emerge from this study. Universities should develop explicit policies and instructional modules addressing AI use in legal business writing. These modules should cover technical functionality, critical assessment of AI outputs, verification procedures, and ethical frameworks aligned with academic integrity standards and professional norms. Faculty development initiatives should ensure educators possess sufficient knowledge to guide students effectively, addressing the gap noted by Regalia (2024).

The study's limitations must be acknowledged. The focus on a single cohort of international Chinese students in a Thai university limits generalizability to other contexts, cultures, or educational systems. Self-reported data may not fully capture actual behaviors, and the cross-sectional design provides only a snapshot of a rapidly evolving technological landscape. Future research should employ longitudinal approaches to track changes in awareness and usage over time, include comparative studies across disciplines and institutions, and examine actual student work to validate self-reported behaviors.

Despite these limitations, this research contributes to understanding how business students engage with AI tools in legal writing contexts. As AI becomes increasingly embedded in professional practice, as noted by Gouri et al. (2025), educational institutions must ensure students develop the competencies needed to use these tools responsibly and effectively. The findings suggest that students are receptive to such instruction and recognize its importance for their academic and professional development.

Future investigations should explore how different pedagogical approaches affect student competency, how institutional policies shape usage patterns, and how AI literacy in legal writing correlates with broader professional outcomes. As AI tools continue to evolve, ongoing research will be essential to ensure business education remains aligned with workplace realities while maintaining academic standards and ethical integrity.

REFERENCES

- Alarie, B., Niblett, A., & Yoon, A. H. (2018). How artificial intelligence will affect the practice of law. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 68(supplement 1), 106–124.
- Cyphert, A. B. (2023). Generative AI, plagiarism, and copyright infringement in legal documents. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology*, 25, 49.
- Davenport, M. J. (2025). Enhancing legal document analysis with large language models: A structured approach to accuracy, context preservation, and risk mitigation. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 15(2), 232–280.

- Gouri, H., Jindal, P., Gouri, R., & Gouri, V. (2025). AI-generated legal documents: Challenges and opportunities for corporate law firms. *Exploration of AI in Contemporary Legal Systems*, 73–84.
- Harasta, J., Novotná, T., & Savelka, J. (2024). It cannot be right if it was written by AI: On lawyers' preferences of documents perceived as authored by an LLM vs a human. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 1–38.
- Mika, K. (2022). Friend or foe? Lexis artificial intelligence (AI) in legal writing. *Proceedings: Online Journal of Legal Writing Presentations*, 3(1), 24.
- Pham, T. T. D., & Luong, M. H. (2025). Students' challenges in employing AI tools in legal writing. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 5(2), 75–86.
- Regalia, J. (2024). From briefs to bytes: How generative AI is transforming legal writing and practice. *Tulsa Law Review*, 59, 193.
- Smith, M. L. (2023). Language models, plagiarism, and legal writing. *University of New Hampshire Law Review*, 22, 361.