Molinari M, Giacalone M, 'How to Move toward AI-supported Labour Justice: The IDEA Chatbot Proposal' (2025) Special Issue 2 EJPLT.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.57230/EJPLT25SIJMMMG
Corresponding author. E-mail address: marianna.molinari@vub.be (M. Molinari)
Pleinlaan no. 2, Brussels (BE)

EJPLT
ISSN 2704-8012



How to Move toward AI-supported Labour Justice: The IDEA Chatbot Proposal

Come progredire verso una giustizia del lavoro supportata dall'IA: la proposta del Chatbot IDEA

MARIANNA MOLINARI
Joint Doctoral Researcher
Vrije Universiteit Brussel University of Bologna

MARCO GIACALONE
Research Professor
"Digitalisation and access to justice" (DIKE) research group
Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Abstract

This article examines how AI and predictive algorithms can be integrated into EU labour-law dispute resolution in redundancy dismissal cases, without undermining procedural guarantees. Based on interviews and focus groups with legal professionals and policymakers in six EU Member States (Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, Lithuania), it maps attitudes toward AI and predictive algorithms, and identifies the key legitimacy frontier: broad acceptance of bounded support functions (e.g., drafting and workflow support), but strong resistance to outcome-facing uses that may steer behaviour or constrain judicial independence. Policymakers emphasise data protection, accountability, and operational feasibility, as preconditions for deployment. On this basis, the article positions the IDEA chatbot as a transparency-oriented instrument for procedural guidance and dispute navigation, aimed at reducing information asymmetries and supporting informed choices.

© The author(s) 2025, published by Suor Orsola Benincasa Università Editrice.
This contribution is licensed under a Creative Common Attribution 4.0 International Licence CC-BY-NC-ND, all the details on the license are available at:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Abstract
Questo articolo esamina come l'IA e gli algoritmi predittivi possano essere integrati nella risoluzione delle controversie di diritto del lavoro dell'UE, in particolare nei casi di licenziamento per giustificato motivo oggettivo, senza compromettere le garanzie procedurali. Sulla base di interviste e focus group con professionisti legali e decisori pubblici in sei Stati membri (Belgio, Croazia, Repubblica Ceca, Estonia, Italia, Lituania), lo studio rileva il principale confine di legittimità: ampia accettazione di funzioni di supporto circoscritte (ad es. redazione di atti e supporto ai flussi di lavoro), ma forte resistenza verso usi orientati all'esito, che possano influenzare i comportamenti o comprimere l'indipendenza giudiziaria. I decisori pubblici sottolineano, inoltre, la protezione dei dati, l'accountability e la fattibilità operativa, come condizioni essenziali per l'adozione. Su questa base, l'articolo inquadra il chatbot del progetto IDEA come dispositivo orientato alla trasparenza per la guida procedurale e la "navigazione" tra le opzioni di risoluzione della controversia, e volto a ridurre le asimmetrie informative e a supportare scelte consapevoli.

Keywords: Predictive Justice; Artificial Intelligence; Labour Law; Dispute Resolution

Summary: 1. Introduction. – 2. Predictive Justice in Practice. – 2.1 Forms. – 2.2 Uses. – 3. Real-World Attitudes toward AI and Predictive Justice: Insights from the IDEA Project. – 3.1 Qualitative Approaches in User-Centred Design. – 3.2 Interviews and Focus Groups with Key Stakeholders. – 3.3 Interviews and Focus Groups with Policymakers. – 4. From Predictive Justice to AI-Supported Labour Dispute Resolution: The IDEA Chatbot Proposal. – 4.1 A Tool for Labour Law Litigation Support. – 4.2 A Regulatory Instrument in Redundancy Cases. – 5. Conclusions and Future Works.

1. Introduction.

Predictive justice has become a prominent topic in legal scholarship and policy debates, driven by the expanding use of data-driven analytics and AI across public institutions.[1] While assessments range from enthusiasm about efficiency gains to scepticism grounded in concerns over bias, opacity, and judicial independence, public authorities increasingly fund exploratory initiatives that test predictive and AI-assisted functionalities within justice systems[2]. Yet the key governance question is not whether AI can be introduced into courts in the abstract, but which functions can be introduced legitimately, under what institutional conditions, and with what safeguards – especially where tools may shape dispute behaviour, without formally deciding cases.

[1] F Pasquale, G Cashwell, 'Prediction, Persuasion, and the Jurisprudence of Behaviourism' (2018) 68 University of Toronto Law Journal 63. M Hildebrandt, 'Data-Driven Prediction of Judgment: Law's New Mode of Existence?' (2019).
[2] F Bex, H Prakken, 'Can Predictive Justice Improve the Predictability and Consistency of Judicial Decision-Making?' in *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems* (IOS Press, 2021) 207-214; M Medvedeva, P McBride, 'Legal Judgment Prediction: If You Are Going to Do It, Do It Right' in *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2023* (2023) 73-84.

This article addresses that question through the EU-funded IDEA project (Grant Agreement No. 101160528, 2024–2026), which examines the conditions under which AI-assisted tools may be integrated into labour-law dispute resolution – specifically redundancy dismissal litigation – without undermining procedural guarantees. It advances two claims. First, across six Member States (Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, Lithuania), legitimacy concerns concentrate at the point where AI shifts from information and workflow support to outcome-facing guidance capable of steering expectations and decisions. Second, policymakers' risk-calibrated approach favours a pathway of bounded automation (administrative infrastructure and procedural guidance), rather than adjudicative prediction. Empirically, these claims are grounded in qualitative data collected through interviews and focus groups with legal professionals and policymakers, enabling a comparison between use-side legitimacy constraints and institution-side implementation constraints.

Section 2 clarifies what "prediction" means in legal contexts and distinguishes key uses of predictive techniques. Section 3 synthesises stakeholder attitudes across the six Member States. Section 4 presents the IDEA chatbot as a transparency-oriented tool for procedural and doctrinal guidance in redundancy disputes and argues that it operates as a regulatory instrument rather than an adjudicative predictor. Section 5 concludes with implications and future research directions.

2. Predictive Justice in Practice.

2.1 Forms.

In machine learning, "prediction" refers to any inference made to enhance existing information about a specific problem.[3]

In the legal field, predictions are crucial and can serve various purposes. They may not always directly impact a case's final decision: they can forecast case results, but also assist decision-makers in their judgments. The interpretation of predictions often varies depending on the intended user.[4] They can help identify relevant legal sources, factors influencing outcomes (e.g., recidivism or non-payment), and elements such as litigation costs and damages.[5]

Predictions can concern both past and future events. For past cases, predictions classify outcomes based on case details, excluding the verdict itself. In contrast, predictions about future cases tend to be more direct. These systems can also identify key "predictors," such as specific facts, arguments, or judges, linked to certain outcomes.[6]

[3] F Galli, G Sartor, 'AI Approaches to Predictive Justice: A Critical Assessment' (2023) 5 Humanities and Rights Global Network Journal.
[4] F Bex, H Prakken, 'Can Predictive Justice Improve the Predictability and Consistency of Judicial Decision-Making?' in *Legal Knowledge and Information Systems* (IOS Press 2021) 207-214.
[5] F Lagioia, R Rovatti and G Sartor, 'Algorithmic Fairness through Group Parities? The Case of COMPASPMOC' (2023) 38 AI & Society 459-478.
[6] M Medvedeva, M Wieling and M Vols, 'Rethinking the Field of Automatic Prediction of Court Decisions' (2023) 31 Artificial Intelligence and Law 195-212.

Another distinction lies in whether predictions are based on the text of judgments or non-textual information, such as keywords, case facts, or details about the parties involved.[7]

2.2 Uses.

Efforts to automate legal reasoning have focused on improving predictions to assist legal professionals in evaluating case outcomes. Traditional logic-based methods, along with computing and data limitations, hindered legal forecasting. However, recent advances in AI, particularly in machine learning and natural language processing (NLP), have revitalized this potential.[8]

Previously, intelligent systems required humans to define knowledge through rules and algorithms. These systems processed legal knowledge, but often missed deeper legal nuances.

Rule-based systems, limited by predefined rules, struggle in judicial contexts requiring flexibility, while case-based systems predict outcomes by comparing new cases to past ones. However, they face challenges like time-consuming categorization and biases.

To enhance case-based systems, NLP is being tested to improve accuracy and efficiency in predictions.[9]

AI research now focuses on learning implicit knowledge from large datasets. Machine learning systems derive knowledge from data, rather than experts. The main approaches are supervised learning, where systems learn from past cases to predict judicial decisions; reinforcement learning, which is rarely used in predictive justice due to difficulty defining justice objectives; and unsupervised learning, which is used for clustering tasks.

All machine learning systems rely on two components: the learning algorithm (which trains the model) and the learned model (which generalizes connections between inputs and outputs).[10]

3. Real-World Attitudes toward AI and Predictive Justice: Insights from the IDEA Project.

In this section, drawing on the legal and technical theory outlined above, we gather real-world attitudes and concerns raised regarding the use of predictive

[7] F Galli, G Sartor, 'AI Approaches to Predictive Justice: A Critical Assessment' (2023) 5 Humanities and Rights Global Network Journal.
[8] KD Ashley, 'A Brief History of the Changing Roles of Case Prediction in AI and Law' (2019) 36 Law Context: A Socio-Legal J. 93.
[9] S Brüninghaus, KD Ashley, 'Predicting Outcomes of Case-Based Legal Arguments' in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law* (2003) 233-242; S Brüninghaus and KD Ashley, 'Combining Case-Based and Model-Based Reasoning for Predicting the Outcome of Legal Cases' in *International Conference on Case-Based Reasoning* (Springer 2003) 65-79.
[10] E Alpaydin, *Introduction to Machine Learning* (MIT Press 2020).

techniques in the judiciary, particularly in EU labour law litigation related to redundancy dismissals.[11]

3.1 Qualitative Approaches in User-Centred Design.

In user-centered design, interviews are a qualitative method where designers gather insights, preferences, and feedback from users.[12] These interviews, typically structured or semi-structured, explore users' needs, behaviors, and motivations related to a product or service.[13] Focus groups similarly provide in-depth views on specific topics, facilitated by a moderator.[14]

A mixed-methods approach is used to capture both breadth and depth. Interviews offer detailed insights into legal, procedural, and user experience aspects, while focus groups validate findings and help develop solutions with stakeholders.

These insights will guide future research, ensuring the IDEA project's outputs reflect the practical realities of judicial professionals. Early discussions revealed profession-specific differences: court staff emphasised efficiency, while judges raised concerns about due process and "automation bias",[15] supporting a human-in-the-loop approach for predictive functions.[16]

3.2 Interviews and Focus Groups with Key Stakeholders.

Within the IDEA project, primary stakeholder data were collected from judges, court personnel, lawyers, mediators, and ICT professionals with expertise in labour-law dispute resolution. Although the interviews and focus groups were conducted across Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania, the analysis below does not proceed through country-by-country vignettes. Instead, it synthesises the empirical material into cross-cutting comparative findings, using national references only where they illuminate meaningful variation in digital readiness, professional practice, or risk perceptions.

Across Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania, legal professionals and court stakeholders draw a consistent functional boundary between AI as infrastructural support and AI as outcome-relevant

---

[11] The data supporting the findings of this study are openly available as part of the *I-Tools to Design and Enhance Access to Justice* (IDEA) Project (Grant Agreement No. 101160528, European Commission, 2024–2026). The empirical material, including survey datasets and aggregated comparative results across Member States, is published in the open-access Deliverable D2.3 – Final Report and Guidelines JUST-2023-JACC-JUSTICE [<https://zenodo.org/records/17552958>]. No additional proprietary or confidential data were generated or analysed for this article.

[12] AE Blandford, 'Semi-Structured Qualitative Studies' *Interaction Design Foundation* (2013).

[13] LE Wood, 'Semi-Structured Interviewing for User-Centered Design' (1997) 4 Interactions 48-61.

[14] AJ Onwuegbuzie and others, 'A Qualitative Framework for Collecting and Analyzing Data in Focus Group Research' (2009) 8 International Journal of Qualitative Methods 1-21.

[15] J Burrell, 'How the Machine 'Thinks': Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms' (2016) 3 Big Data & Society 2053951715622512.

[16] V De Stefano, 'Negotiating the Algorithm: Automation, Artificial Intelligence, and Labor Protection' (2019) 41 Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal 15.

prediction. In all six jurisdictions, respondents generally accept AI for tasks such as legal research support, summarisation, translation, drafting assistance, anonymisation, and administrative workflow optimisation. By contrast, they remain reluctant - often explicitly resistant - to tools that would predict case outcomes or otherwise steer adjudication in redundancy dismissal disputes, primarily due to concerns about reliability, bias, opacity, and the preservation of judicial independence.

A first cross-cutting theme concerns trust, reliability, and epistemic control. Stakeholders in the Czech Republic and Estonia place particular emphasis on the practical risks of unstable outputs, especially hallucinations and plausible-but-false legal content, which they consider structurally incompatible with professional responsibility in litigation. Belgian and Croatian respondents articulate similar concerns in slightly different terms, framing unreliability as a risk of oversimplification and misleading authority: even when outputs are not formally binding, their presentation can induce overreliance, distort parties' expectations, and compromise critical legal scrutiny. The shared implication is that any tool deployed in labour litigation must be designed so that its outputs remain contestable, traceable, and non-authoritative - or else it risks functioning as a de facto decision-shaping instrument.

A second theme is the perceived threat to judicial independence and individualised reasoning. In Belgium, judges and lawyers emphasise that redundancy disputes are fact-sensitive and that mechanised pattern-matching risks flattening the legal relevance of nuance. Croatian respondents add an expectation-management dimension: a prediction that diverges from the actual outcome may materially affect settlement decisions and litigation strategy, producing behavioural effects independent of correctness. Czech and Estonian respondents frame the same concern through the lens of systemic trust: if AI becomes a normalised reference point, its outputs may discipline reasoning even without formal automation. This reinforces a governance conclusion that "human-in-the-loop" is not merely a technical preference, but an institutional safeguard intended to keep legal judgment anchored in accountable human reasoning.

Third, the interviews reveal that acceptance varies depending on whether AI is perceived as supporting professional competence or substituting it. Lawyers across Belgium and Croatia express concern that prediction-oriented tools could erode due diligence and argumentative craft, while also entrenching majoritarian jurisprudence and limiting doctrinal innovation. In Lithuania, respondents are comparatively open to broader AI use-cases, including predictive approaches, but this openness is constrained by infrastructural limitations (outdated systems) and limited AI literacy within judicial settings. The Czech Republic shows the most active "bottom-up" experimentation among lawyers and ICT specialists, but not with predictive justice as such; the experimentation is directed toward research, document processing, and search functionalities rather than outcome prediction.

Fourth, cross-country variation is better explained by digital readiness and data ecosystems, than by deep normative divergence. In Croatia, stakeholders explicitly link predictive feasibility to the availability of a large, well-organised jurisprudential database and warn that existing repositories with imprecise

labels would undermine predictive accuracy. Lithuania's stakeholders similarly describe institutional and capacity barriers - hardware/software constraints and training gaps - that limit feasible adoption beyond basic efficiency tools. Estonia and the Czech Republic, where advanced digitisation initiatives exist in some institutional contexts, still treat predictive justice as premature, largely because reliability and accountability thresholds are perceived as unmet. Italy stands apart in that respondents view certain publisher-based predictive systems as useful orientation tools for litigation strategy; yet even in Italy, the acceptance is conditional and bounded: prediction is tolerated only insofar as it remains auxiliary and does not displace judicial evaluation in complex or discretionary cases.

Taken together, the evidence suggests that, across the six Member States, "predictive justice" is not understood as a single intervention, but as a spectrum of functions with escalating governance sensitivity. The legitimacy frontier appears to be located where AI shifts from (i) information and workflow support to (ii) outcome-facing guidance capable of shaping behaviour and expectations. For redundancy dismissal disputes, stakeholders' expressed preferences indicate that near-term implementation should prioritise transparent, low-risk functionalities (legal information retrieval, drafting assistance, anonymisation, procedural guidance) and reserve any predictive component - if considered at all - for contexts with robust data governance, explicit safeguards against overreliance, and institutional accountability arrangements capable of sustaining contestability and trust.

3.3 Interviews and Focus Groups with Policymakers.

Policymaker interviews and focus groups captured strategic and operational perspectives on AI integration in labour justice systems across Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania. Rather than reporting each national account separately, this section distils the dataset into thematic governance findings, highlighting how policymakers frame feasibility, risk, and institutional legitimacy, and where cross-country differences emerge in capacity, implementation timelines, and regulatory sensitivity.

Across Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania, policymakers adopt a predominantly institutional, risk-calibrated perspective on AI in labour justice systems. Their approach is generally incremental and function-specific: AI is viewed as most justifiable, in the near term, when deployed for administrative support and procedural accessibility (document management, anonymisation, drafting assistance, search, and user-facing guidance), rather than for outcome prediction. Predictive justice, in contrast, is treated as governance-sensitive, conditional on strong preconditions - especially compliant data processing, robust oversight, and clear accountability pathways.

A first shared policy theme is implementability under legal constraints, with data protection compliance positioned as a primary gating factor. In the Czech Republic, policymakers articulate concern that AI deployment may violate data protection rules in the processing of personal data and stress that many tools have not been integrated into court workflows precisely because institutional

guardrails are not yet in place. Belgian policymakers, while more open to certain embedded tools (editing/translation and database functionalities), emphasise that prediction outputs are often overly general and risk embedding bias, particularly because the system cannot provide a "counter-voice" or meaningful judicial feedback. In both jurisdictions, the overarching policy concern is that AI's practical authority can exceed its legal accountability: tools can become behaviourally influential without being formally decision-making, thereby creating governance gaps.

Second, policymakers repeatedly warn against the standardisation or mechanisation of judicial reasoning, even when they do not frame this as a constitutional issue. Czech policymakers explicitly describe the risk that automated models replicate existing decision patterns without sensitivity to individual circumstances and social context, potentially producing rigid outcomes. Estonian policymakers similarly signal limited optimism about AI for adjudication while recognising targeted uses for drafting descriptive parts of decisions and improving legal information search - functions that are administratively beneficial yet less likely to steer substantive outcomes. This indicates a policy preference for AI that enhances institutional capacity without reshaping the normative structure of adjudication.

Third, policy accounts foreground the operational logic of low-risk testing and bounded deployment. Croatian policymakers, in particular, articulate an experimentation pathway that uses low-stakes or low-value claims as a testing ground, precisely because errors are more containable and institutional learning can occur without irreparable harm. They also propose predictive tools for calculable elements (court fees and litigation expenses), signalling that prediction is seen as more acceptable when it concerns administrative certainty, rather than substantive legal evaluation. This resonates with the broader policy pattern across the six Member States: predictive functionality is perceived as more governable when it targets parameters that are transparent, contestable, and less value-laden.

Fourth, the six-country evidence suggests that policy trajectories are shaped by institutional capacity and digital maturity. Lithuania provides the clearest illustration of a planned, staged approach: while predictive justice is not currently operational, policymakers describe active exploration of internal chatbots and AI-assisted drafting, and they indicate future implementation plans for automated templates and anonymisation tools, with a concrete timeline (notably, publication-related tooling planned for 2027). This forward planning contrasts with the Czech and Estonian policymaker accounts, which emphasise the absence of systematic deployment and a more cautious stance, and with Belgium and Italy, where experimentation appears more dispersed across embedded tools and jurisprudential analysis, yet remains bounded by concerns about bias, discretion, and legitimacy.

Overall, policymakers across Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania appear aligned around a governance model of calibrated innovation: AI should first enter labour justice systems as administrative and informational infrastructure, with measurable organisational benefits and clearer accountability. Predictive justice, where considered, is treated as exceptional and conditional - more plausible for structured, auditable sub-tasks

(fees, document classification, pattern identification), than for outcome-facing guidance in redundancy disputes. For the IDEA project, this synthesis supports the strategic design decision to avoid predicting judicial behaviour and instead prioritise procedural and doctrinal guidance that is transparent, auditable, and compatible with institutional accountability and data protection obligations.

4. From Predictive Justice to AI-Supported Labour Dispute Resolution: The IDEA Chatbot Proposal.

Rather than advancing "predictive justice" in the narrow sense of outcome forecasting, the IDEA project operationalises a more governance-compatible pathway for AI in labour litigation: AI-supported dispute navigation and procedural transparency. The proposed chatbot is designed to orient parties in redundancy dismissal disputes toward appropriate dispute-resolution pathways – such as automated negotiation, online mediation, settlement, or litigation – by translating doctrinal and procedural requirements into accessible, context-sensitive guidance. Crucially, it avoids predicting judicial behaviour or recommending forum selection. Instead, it provides contestable and auditable prompts (e.g., legal thresholds, deadlines, documentation requirements, and procedural steps), that can be scrutinised by professionals and that preserve judicial independence and human responsibility for legal evaluation.

This design choice directly reflects the empirical findings reported in Section 3. Across the six Member States, both legal professionals and policymakers endorsed AI primarily for bounded support functions and expressed greater resistance where systems become outcome-facing or behaviour-steering. Section 4 therefore presents the chatbot as a concrete instantiation of that "bounded automation" pathway: it is conceived, first, as a litigation-support tool that improves access to procedural information and dispute-resolution orientation (Section 4.1), and second, as an instrument that can operationalise redundancy-related obligations by structuring compliance and informing choices without displacing legal counsel or adjudication (Section 4.2). In this sense, the chatbot's significance is not predictive performance, but the way it translates legal norms into transparent procedural guidance capable of reducing information asymmetries while remaining compatible with data protection, accountability, and due process requirements.

4.1. A Tool for Labour Law Litigation Support.

The IDEA project is developing a conversational AI chatbot to guide parties in labour disputes toward the best dispute-resolution pathway, such as automated negotiation, online mediation, or traditional settlement procedures. The chatbot uses NLP, going beyond basic keyword matching to interpret legal and factual contexts and offer tailored, context-sensitive

responses.[17] It helps users understand potential legal outcomes, compare resolution options, and make informed decisions.[18]

The system aims to improve transparency and accessibility in legal processes by enhancing the clarity and circulation of procedural information, promoting consensual dispute resolution, and ultimately lowering litigation rates.[19] Trained on anonymised judicial decisions, it ensures privacy and complies with data protection regulations. A pilot deployment will take place in three courts across the EU for user testing.

In redundancy dismissal cases, the chatbot will provide guidance on doctrinal and procedural matters while avoiding predictions about judicial behaviour or forum selection. It will focus on delivering transparent prompts, such as explaining legal thresholds and deadlines, rather than opaque outputs, allowing professional scrutiny.[20]

4.2. A Regulatory Instrument in Redundancy Cases.

The IDEA chatbot can also serve as a regulatory tool within EU labour law, particularly in redundancy dismissal scenarios. It helps users understand legal obligations and procedural choices without replacing legal counsel. The system offers anticipatory guidance, outlining consultation requirements, necessary documentation, and post-decision assistance, functioning as an algorithmic regulation that supports human judgment.[21]

The chatbot aligns with Directive 98/59/EC, helping employers and workers navigate redundancy processes by clarifying legal consequences and ensuring compliance with procedural duties. For workers, it reduces information gaps, explaining data disclosure requirements, reasons for layoffs, and selection criteria. It also offers counterfactual prompts to strengthen the worker's legal position.[22]

The system is designed with strict governance, ensuring privacy and compliance through anonymised data, continuous audits, and human oversight. This prevents judicial profiling, maintains transparency, safeguards judicial independence, promotes fair hearings, and reduces legal errors.[23]

---

[17] E Cirillo and others, 'A Chatbot for Specialized Domains' in International Conference on P2P, Parallel, Grid, Cloud and Internet Computing (Springer 2024) 1-12.
[18] M Giacalone and others, 'Enhancing Access to Justice via LLMs in the Field of Asset Division: Crea2 and the Digital Journey' (2025) 16 European Journal of Law and Technology.
[19] O Rabinovich-Einy and E Katsh, 'Digital Justice: Reshaping Boundaries in an Online Dispute Resolution Environment' (2014) 1 IJODR 5.
[20] P Cortés, 'Developing Online Dispute Resolution for Consumers in the EU: A Proposal for the Regulation of Accredited Providers' (2011) 19 International Journal of Law and Information Technology 1-28.
[21] DM Katz, MJ Bommarito II and J Blackman, 'A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States' (2017) 12 PloS One e0174698.
[22] S Danziger, J Levav and L Avnaim-Pesso, 'Extraneous Factors in Judicial Decisions' (2011) 108 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 6889-6892.
[23] E Dagnino and I Armaroli, 'A Seat at the Table: Negotiating Data Processing in the Workplace: A National Case Study and Comparative Insights' (2019) 41 Comparative Labour Law & Policy Journal 173.

5. Conclusions and Future Works.

This article examined the integration of AI in EU labour-law dispute resolution through the lens of predictive justice, drawing on interviews and focus groups with legal professionals and policymakers in Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Lithuania. The comparative analysis shows that the central divide is not between "pro-AI" and "anti-AI" positions, but between AI as support infrastructure and AI as outcome-facing guidance.[24] Across jurisdictions, stakeholders generally accept AI for legal research, drafting, translation, summarisation, anonymisation, and administrative workflow optimisation, while remaining reluctant to endorse tools that predict outcomes or steer adjudication in redundancy dismissal disputes due to concerns about reliability, bias, opacity, and judicial independence.[25]

Importantly, professional and policymaker perspectives converge on a shared governance logic. Legal professionals emphasise due process risks, automation bias, and the fragility of trust when outputs appear authoritative yet remain contestable only in practice. Policymakers emphasise implementability under legal constraints – particularly data protection compliance – and favour function-specific deployment where accountability is clear and error costs are containable. The result is a consistent policy trajectory of calibrated innovation: AI is more likely to enter labour justice systems first through bounded, auditable functions and only exceptionally - if at all-through outcome prediction.[26]

These findings directly inform the design rationale of the IDEA chatbot. By avoiding prediction of judicial behaviour and focusing instead on transparent procedural and doctrinal guidance (thresholds, deadlines, documentation, and legally relevant prompts), the chatbot is positioned as a regulatory instrument that operationalises procedural entitlements under Directive 98/59/EC while preserving human judgment and judicial independence. The article therefore suggests that, in European labour litigation, the most plausible near-term pathway toward "predictive justice" is not adjudicative forecasting, but the deployment of transparency-oriented tools that reduce information

[24] F Bex and H Prakken, 'On the Relevance of Algorithmic Decision Predictors for Judicial Decision Making' in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law* (2021) 175-179. J Peters, F Bex and H Prakken, 'Arguments Based on Domain Rules in Prediction Justifications' in *CEUR Workshop Proceedings* (2024) 90-99 CEUR WS.

[25] M Medvedeva, A Üstün, X Xu, M Vols, M Wieling, 'Automatic Judgment Forecasting for Pending Applications of the European Court of Human Rights' in *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Automatic Semantic Analysis of Information in Legal Text* (ASAIL 2021) 12-23, CEUR Workshop Proceedings. M Molinari and M Giacalone, 'AI and Digital Justice in EU Labour Law: A Comparative Study on Predictive Tools and Judicial Transformation' *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* (2025) 8 Section Technology and Law, <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1742239>.

[26] M Steiert, 'The Landmark Case that Went Missing: Collective Redundancies, Unjustified Dismissal and the Denied Horizontality of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights in C-196/23 Plamaro' (2025) 16 European Labor Law Journal 20319525251335869 DOI: 10.1177/20319525251335869. E Graham, 'Vulnerable to Redundancy: Examining Access to Justice for Pregnant Women and New Mothers' (2025) 38(2) Australian Journal of Labour Law 144-168.

asymmetries and support legally accountable decision-making by parties and professionals.[27]

The study has limitations. The empirical material is qualitative and context-dependent, and it captures attitudes during an evolving phase of institutional experimentation; findings should therefore be interpreted as mapping legitimacy constraints and implementation logics rather than measuring system performance. Future work will be driven by pilot testing across three jurisdictions, including user evaluations of accuracy, usability, trust, and behavioural effects, alongside continued governance assessments of auditability, data protection compliance, and accountability arrangements. Expanding the approach to other fields (e.g., family or commercial disputes) should proceed only after function-specific validation and a demonstrated capacity to preserve procedural guarantees.

[27] A Rotolo and G Sartor, 'Argumentation and Explanation in the Law' *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* (2023) 6 Section Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence, <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1130559>.