

On the Suitability of pre-trained foundational LLMs for Analysis in German Legal Education

Lorenz Wendlinger¹, Christian Braun², Abdullah Al Zubaer¹,
Simon Alexander Nonn², Sarah Großkopf², Christofer Fellicious¹,
Michael Granitzer¹

¹Chair of Data Science, Universität Passau, Germany

²Institut für Rechtsdidaktik, Universität Passau, Germany

Correspondence: lorenz.wendlinger@uni-passau.de

Abstract

We show that current open-source foundational LLMs possess instruction capability and German legal background knowledge that is sufficient for some legal analysis in an educational context. However, model capability breaks down in very specific tasks, such as the classification of “Gutachtenstil” appraisal style components, or with complex contexts, such as complete legal opinions. Even with extended context and effective prompting strategies, they cannot match the Bag-of-Words baseline. To combat this, we introduce a Retrieval Augmented Generation based prompt example selection method that substantially improves predictions in high data availability scenarios. We further evaluate the performance of pre-trained LLMs on two standard tasks for argument mining and automated essay scoring and find it to be more adequate. Throughout, pre-trained LLMs improve upon the baseline in scenarios with little or no labeled data with Chain-of-Thought prompting further helping in the zero-shot case.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are trained on web-scale corpora that encompass a significant cross-section of human knowledge and communication. They offer generalization abilities that allow natural language instruction without any or with little need for fine-tuning. With Ainslie et al.’s (2023) Grouped-Query Attention, context windows are large enough to provide exhaustive and relevant background information. For this reason, they are poised to be a replacement for task-specific models in niche and evolving domains.

Legal analysis is such a domain, with a large quantity of new laws and court decisions that

make human analysis time consuming, while the structure and style of legal appraisal remain largely static. We want to empirically verify the assumption that the current crop of open-source local LLMs can understand this appraisal style by checking if they can correctly recognize it.

The German *Gutachtenstil* (appraisal style) is similar in structure and purpose to the IRAC (*Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion*) method of legal analysis. It starts with a *Major claim* that names the legal question that is analyzed, the *Definition* that defines the requirements that need to be fulfilled to affirm the major claim. After that, in the *Subsumtion*, the facts of the case are applied to the different elements of the definition. Lastly, the *Conclusion* is reached by answering the question raised in the major claim. It is intended as a guide to help structure the thinking of law students. In German law, this schema is complex enough to be a focus of entry and intermediate level college lectures, with some universities even offering dedicated courses to teach the appraisal style. As it is seldom found in legal practice outside of universities, but rather substituted with the modified *Urteilsstil*, that starts with the conclusion and then uses the steps of definition and subsumption to justify the result, legal corpora may not contain enough examples to implicitly encode this information.

We consider this to be the minimum level of evidence required as proof for legal understanding. If a legal practitioner cannot appropriately structure the constituents of arguments into this appraisal style, they show a lack of understanding which may also result in content-specific mistakes. Similarly, if any student cannot recognize the elements of the appraisal style and fails to apply it in their own reasoning, they run a risk of exhibiting

lapses in logic, of overlooking facts or legal requirements. Therefore, we start our analysis by testing whether LLMs can reliably identify the elements of this argumentation style.

To test the upper bounds of LLM capability, we perform a specific test to check the assessment capabilities of the models in the complex but controlled context of a challenging new dataset. The task of grading full legal opinions requires close to complete legal understanding. It can only be facilitated with a large catalog of background knowledge, comprised of the legal context, concurring and dissenting legal opinions and secondary literature. The examination of multiple statutes and constituent facts also necessitates the ability to appropriately contextualize and structure the components of the legal network that is established around an appraisal. For this purpose, we introduce a dataset of full legal papers written and graded in the context of legal education.

We further investigate the performance of pre-trained LLMs in two simpler related tasks in the realm of argument mining and automated essay scoring. This provides some context on the influence of task difficulty, language barriers, and domain-specific adaptations.

The used codebase as well as code for all experimental setups with results are available at https://github.com/wendli01/legal_analysis_llm.

2 Related Work

Recent work explores using generative LLMs for argument mining and essay scoring tasks, though most methods focus on extractive models instead. We summarize relevant results from automated essay scoring and argument mining below.

Rodriguez et al. (2019) apply two early transformer models to the Automatic Essay Scoring (AES) dataset from (Taghipour and Ng, 2016). They find that these models are competitive with Long Short-Term Memory Networks (LSTMs) and can outperform them as well as human scoring in this task if combined into a heterogeneous ensemble. Yang et al. (2020) use multiple losses to fine-tune language models on the Automated Student Assessment Prize (ASAP) dataset. Ormerod et al. (2021) use efficient Transformer vari-

ants to score essays. They find that they can achieve equivalent performance at a significant efficiency increase.

Lai et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive overview of LLMs in Chinese legal applications. They find that there are multiple models that are fine-tuned on Chinese legal QA corpora as well as more general models for legal consultation and reasoning. They point out the major problems with legal LLMs, mainly the difficulty of data quality control as well as bias and interpretability issues. They further allude to the inherent uncertainty of legal concepts, that makes the legal domain challenging to adapt LLMs to.

Mizumoto and Eguchi (2023) explore the applicability of GPT-3.5 to AES on the TOEFL11 corpus. They find that it generally lags behind the baseline Bayesian regression model operating on linguistic features only, but that combining the two leads to a slight improvement.

Colombo et al. (2024) fine-tune Mistral 7B on a large English legal corpus and publish the resulting *SauLLM-7B*. They perform general instruction fine-tuning followed by specific legal instruction fine-tuning with synthetic data generated by the base model. They find that the resulting model outperforms the base in the newly introduced LegalBench-Instruct, Legal-MMLU and perplexity, i.e. quality-of-fit, on legal documents.

Xiao et al. (2024) experiment with using GPT models for automated essay scoring and semi-supervised grading systems. They find that a fine-tuned variant of GPT-3.5 outperforms other models and the traditional baseline in most ASAP sets as well as on a private Chinese student English essay dataset.

Stahl et al. (2024) explore the impact of different prompts and prompting strategies in automated essay scoring. They find that the specific prompt has a measurable effect, while more complex strategies can be detrimental.

The use of LLMs for argument mining has seen growing interest in recent times. For instance, Al Zubaer et al. (2023) analyze the performance of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 for argument component classification via prompting in the legal domain. They find that open-source local models perform better than propriety models and demonstrate the significance of including

similar examples (in contrast to random and dissimilar) examples in prompts to boost the model’s performance.

Otiefy and Alhamzeh (2024) explore another sub-component of argument mining in relation detection between argument components using fine-tuned transformer-based models and GPT-4 for the financial domain. They find GPT-4’s performance to be better than the fine-tuned transformer-based models.

Similarly, Gorur et al. (2024) demonstrate the effectiveness of Llama 2 and Mixtral for argument relation identification where given a pair of argument components, the model classifies the relation between them (support or attack). They find that Llama 2 and Mixtral outperformed traditional RoBERTa-based baseline in different domains ranging from essays to online debate forums.

3 Methods

We use multiple prompt engineering techniques for both the design of our analysis systems and post-mortem analysis. These include forays into few-shot prompting, chain-of-thought prompting, retrieval augmented generation, instruction following and pseudonymization.

We consider an excerpt (Table 8) of relevant categories from White et al.’s (2024) *LiveBench*¹, a contamination-free LLM leaderboard. While Llama 3 and GPT-3.5 are close in the overall score, they exhibit opposite and complementary strengths in the two most relevant tasks, reasoning and language comprehension. This allows for speculation as to which of the two skills is more relevant in legal analysis. Mixtral 8x7B is competitive in reasoning but falls short in the language comprehension task.

3.1 Generative Pre-trained Transformer

The GPT family of LLMs is based on a decoder-only architecture that is trained on a web-scale corpus of documents and made available for commercial use by OpenAI. GPT-3.5 is a model that is optimized for assistant tasks.

¹<https://livebench.ai/>

3.2 Llama 3

AI@Meta’s (2024) Llama 3 is an improved decoder-only transformer with a more advanced tokenizer using Ainslie et al.’s (2023) grouped query attention. It is trained using a context window of size 8,192 tokens and boasts an effective inference maximum of approx. 128k. We use the *Meta-Llama-3-70B-Instruct* checkpoint².

3.3 Mixtral

Mixtral (AI, 2024) is a Sparse Mixture-of-Experts (SMoE) model built from 8 Mistral-7B experts and purported to be on par with or outscore GPT-3.5 as well as Llama2 70B in several language understanding and LLM assistant tasks. It boasts a context length of 32k tokens through local attention and efficient sparse inference via a router network that selects 2 out of 8 experts for each layer and token. It exhibits low bias and hallucination tendencies while showing fluency in, among other languages, German. We make use of the *Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1* checkpoint³.

3.4 Jina Embeddings

Mohr et al. (2024) propose the more focused and lightweight BERT-based Jina Embedding model. We use the German-English bilingual 161 million *base-de* version⁴ to generate embeddings for Retrieval augmented Generation.

3.5 Prompting Strategies

We use and describe here several prompting strategies from the literature, of which Sahoo et al. (2024) provide a systematic survey, with slight adaptations to our domain.

In Radford et al.’s (2019) zero-shot prompting, a model is only instructed with the task plus context and background knowledge, if available. This requires no labeled training data and is therefore compelling for novel and niche applications.

In contrast, Brown et al. (2020) show that integrating even a few examples can enhance model responses. This adaptation is quantitatively cheap but requires carefully chosen high

²<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-70B-Instruct>

³<https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/jinaai/jina-embeddings-v2-base-de>

quality data. The added complexity also results in longer prompts and runtimes as well as a higher likelihood of unintended bias.

Lewis et al. (2020) use Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) to provide additional context based on a knowledge base, e.g. the Wikipedia. They use a pre-trained encoder to obtain dense representations for all snippets in the knowledge base and integrate those that have maximum inner-product similarity with the query embedding into the prompt.

Wei et al. (2022) show that allowing LLMs to explain their decision step-by-step is beneficial in many complex tasks. We find that this Chain-of-Thought prompting impacts instruction following, as it reduces the importance of the initial instruction. For this reason, we employ pattern matching to find the most mentioned category in the model response and report this as the result.

Zhang et al. (2022) propose *Auto-CoT* to bridge the gap between Zero-Shot-CoT and Few-Shot-CoT with manual examples. They form clusters of similar prompts and for those generate rationales that are used as prompt examples. These are pre-selected using a criterion geared towards simplicity.

Similar to this work, we propose Generated Artificial Rationales (GAR) that are applicable to classification and regression scenarios with moderate to large amounts of labeled training data without rationales. We slightly adapt Zhang et al.’s (2022) selection criterion to ensure the correctness of the rationale that was generated under the same conditions that the model operates under in testing. As a rejection method this is inefficient, but we can integrate a similar sampling technique to Auto-CoT and thereby include a relevancy bias.

We choose to develop simple prompts in lieu of complex roles or instruction as (Stahl et al., 2024) shows that their effectiveness can be very specific and task dependent. However we make use of the instruction fine-tuning of the investigated models by providing a separate system prompt (c.f. prompt 2) and result prompt in the user role (c.f. prompt 3).

4 Results

We evaluate the suitability of pre-trained generative LLMs on 4 datasets across the two

Dataset	Class.	Docs	Items	Length
SPWSLE ¹	6	382	14734	627
CIMT ² CD_C	4	366	1704	62

(a) German Argument Mining

Dataset	Lang	Points	Docs	Length
GSHA	de	0-18	71	5877
1			1783	350
ASAP ³ 2	en	10-60	1800	350
8			723	650

(b) Automated Essay Scoring

Table 1: Dataset statistics with annotation schema, number of documents, number of annotated items and mean document length in tokens. Datasets from ¹: (Weber et al., 2023), ²: (Romberg and Conrad, 2021), ³: (Hamner et al., 2012).

tasks of argument mining and essay scoring. We first describe the datasets and accompanying evaluation methodology before reporting the main results as well as ablation studies.

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate the effectiveness of pre-trained generative LLMs on 4 datasets, with 2 each for argumentation mining and essay scoring, c.f. table 1 for their properties. For both tasks, we included a simpler and standard dataset to investigate the impact of outright task difficulty.

4.1.1 SPWSLE

The Dataset introduced in *Structured Persuasive Writing Support in Legal Education: A Model and Tool for German Legal Case Solutions* (Weber et al., 2023) comprises 413 student submitted solutions to 4 different legal cases with a mean length of 60.8 sentences. We abbreviate the classes as follows: **MC** = Major Claim, **C** = Conclusion, **D** = Definition, **S** = Subsumption, **LC** = Legal Claim, **P** = Premise, **N** = None.

This dataset splits the class Subsumption into two different subclasses, Premise and Legal Claim. The premise serves as a statement of the facts as they relate to the Definition, and the Legal Claim then matches the facts of the Premise to the Definition.

4.1.2 Graded Strafrecht Hausarbeiten

We present here the **Graded Strafrecht HausArbeiten** dataset which is distinguished by its small size as well as the complexity of its samples and the task. It is intended as a transfer learning challenge for models with

high instruction and language capability as it does not provided enough data for full fine-tuning on the main task. As such, it encompasses 76 distinct student solutions to a legal problem complex with a final grade on an 18 point scale attached to each.

The student solutions were created by intermediate and advanced German law students in the course of their regular studies. They were provided with the facts of a criminal law case and tasked with solving it over several weeks. Use of legal commentaries, textbooks and databases was allowed. Out of a larger cohort, 76 students then provided their consent for the use of their work and its grade for our research. Afterwards, the works were corrected by research assistants on a scale from 0-18, with 18 being the best, and 4 being the minimum score required to pass.

4.1.3 ASAP AES

The **A**utomated **S**tudent **A**ssessment **P**rize (Hamner et al., 2012) contains English student essays for 8 different tasks. They are assigned combined scores between 10 and 60 points each. Here we select sets 1,2 and 8 as they are all from the *Persuasive/Narrative/-Expository* category as per (Xiao et al., 2024). We focus on set 8 as it contains the longest and most complex documents, c.f. table 1.

4.1.4 CIMT

Romberg and Conrad’s (2021) CIMT argument mining dataset consists of German language public feedback statements to 5 different infrastructure projects or concepts. These contributions are annotated on a sentence level with the categories *Major Position*, *Premise*, *Major Position + Premise* or *None*. It is therefore similar to SPWSLE, but with a simplified annotation schema and much shorter texts.

4.2 Evaluation Methodology

For all experiments, we report the performance of a linear SVM with Bag-of-Words features as an established baseline.

We re-phrase the classification of appraisal style components as a joint task, that involves the recognition of both the subsumption component as well as its sub-components in one pass. This is in contrast to (Weber et al., 2023), where the authors propose a two-tiered

task that first extracts the main components and further sub-divides the subsumption. It is not exactly clear how they do this, however the presence of a *None* category in both tiers in their evaluation coupled with the absence of a respective category in the annotations hints at a usage as a masking placeholder. Furthermore there is no mapping of annotation categories to classes included. Our estimate is the following: e_1 =Major Claim, e_2 =Conclusion, e_4 =Definition, e_5 =Subsumption, e_6 =Legal Claim, e_7 =Premise, with e_3 remaining unused throughout all data. We choose the joint task as it allows us to investigate the overall error of all components, rather than relying on the results of the previous stage or re-examining all components. However, we also report the results of our pre-trained LLM approach in the two-tiered setting as a point of comparison.

In contrast to the AES dataset used in (Rodriguez et al., 2019) and (Ormerod et al., 2021), the GSHA dataset does not contain scores from multiple annotators. We therefore substitute the Quadratic Weighted Kappa (QWK) with linear and rank correlation and accuracy for evaluation.

4.3 Gutachtenstil Argument Mining

Pre-trained LLMs cannot match the baseline extractive systems in SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining. In both the two-tiered extraction task (cf. table 2) and the joint task (cf. table 3) they fall behind the Bag-of-Words model and underperform especially for the subsumption categories. This can partially be explained by the entanglement of these categories and removing the relevant context, i.e. *Gutachtenstil* explanation, counter-intuitively increases scores (c.f. table 2, Llama 3₁₀ NE). This can be viewed as a manifestation of the inaccurate interpretation of legal concepts identified in (Lai et al., 2023). While Retrieval Augmented Generation helps performance by selecting the most relevant example shots, the overall delta in accuracy and F1 score is still significant at 18.1% and 7.4% respectively.

However, we observe the BoW model to be on par with Weber et al.’s (2023) BERT-based extractive classifier, offering a much more efficient mining system at equivalent effectiveness.

Method	Major Component F1					Subsumption F1		
	D	C	MC	S	N	P	LC	N
BoW+SVM	.91	.84	.96	.65	.77	.67	.48	.90
BERT†	.82	.89	.93	.71	.88	.69	.66	.78
Llama 3 _{10RAG}	.85	.77	.85	.57	.45	.49	.27	.47
Llama 3 ₁₀	.84	.68	.71	.46	.44	.0	.0	.0
Llama 3 ₁₀ NE	.75	.59	.51	.39	.36	.47	.16	.18

Table 2: SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining results in the two-tiered task on a 20% test set with **best** and *second-best* results highlighted. For generative LLMs the subscript denotes the number of example shots provided in the prompt, *RAG* = Retrieval Augmented Generation for example selection, *NE* = No Explanation of the *Gutachtenstil*, † = result from (Weber et al., 2023).

Method	Macro F1	Accuracy
BoW+SVM	.761	.784
Llama 3 _{10RAG}	.580	.710
Llama 3 ₁₀	.470	.585
Mixtral ₁₀	.370	.444
GPT-3.5 ₁₀	.339	.381

Table 3: SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* joint task argument mining results on a 20% test set. For pre-trained LLMs the subscript denotes the number of examples provided in the prompt, *RAG* = Retrieval Augmented Generation for example selection. Detailed results in Table 9.

4.3.1 Retrieval Augmented Generation

To investigate the influence of RAG example selection, we perform a brittleness test by comparing the best and worst possible selection under the chosen criterion (cf. Table 10). We observe this maximum performance margin to be 14.4% macro F1 and 17.1% accuracy overall with major regressions for the *Major Claim* and *Legal Claim* categories. With inverse RAG, providing the supposed least relevant 10 shots decreases performance below that of random example selection with a delta of 3.4% macro F1 and 4.6% accuracy. This hints that there are closely related or otherwise helpful samples in the training set, despite the disjointed documents, and that cosine similarity over embeddings can identify them. The retrieved example selection is not perfectly homogeneous, cf. figure 5, so there is still reasoning required from the model.

The worst-case selection of shots is still helpful in prompting, with a delta of 16.8% F1 and 23.9% accuracy over zero-shot prompting. These results confirm the overall benefit of RAG-based example selection and show that the penalty for sub-optimal selection is low.

4.3.2 Chain-of-Thought Prompting

The CoT strategy from (Wei et al., 2022) is not natively applicable to our few-shot prompting approach. We find that, if the model is presented with sample responses that do not also explain their reasoning, it will fail to do so for the current request as well. There are not detailed explanations available for SPWSLE, and while they could be generated for all training data, this would lead to a very expensive cold-start problem. As a compromise, we limit the generation of artificial reasoning data to a small portion of the available training data. This ensures that examples are provided to the model with sufficient quality and diversity, while remaining tractable. We further investigate whether the advantages of CoT prompting can outweigh the lack of example prompts by implementing a CoT zero-shot model.

Method	Macro F1	Accuracy
CoT ₁₀ ^{80%}	.498	.541
Res ₁₀ ^{80%}	.470	.585
Res ₁₀ ^{03%}	.465	.587
CoT ₁₀ ^{03%}	.453	.484
CoT _{10GAR} ^{03%}	.425	.470
CoT ₀	.333	.393
Res ₀	.268	.30

Table 4: Llama 3 Chain-of-Thought prompting for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining, with best-in-class results highlighted. Subscripts denote the number of shots provided in the prompt, superscripts indicate the training data available (80%, 0.3%, 0%), *Res* = result only prompt, *CoT* = Chain-of-Thought prompt, *GAR* = Generated Artificial Reasoning for prompt examples. Detailed results in Table 11.

We find that with CoT prompting, the Llama 3 shows some deficiencies following instructions. It is necessary to enforce an output format that ends with the category name to provide the explanation context before the

final conclusion. This routinely leads to malformed responses with fictional categories and, despite the explicit target language instruction (c.f. prompt 4), in English instead of German. With increased distance between the instruction and result, attention naturally lowers with the positional encodings diverging. The effect that this has on instruction following outweighs any benefit of the more complex reasoning afforded by CoT prompting.

We therefore employ pattern matching and report the most frequent category in the model answer as the result.

While the generated artificial reasoning shots are generally of high quality, they do not improve consistency. Effectively, this shows that there is error in the chain from feedback request to feedback to result. Therefore either the models capability in providing feedback or integrating feedback is not no par, which we view as a critical issue in education use.

4.3.3 Pseudonymization

With generative pre-trained models, providing new context is difficult. Especially in the legal domain, certain terms carry significant meaning that cannot adequately be expressed in a short definition. In the case of *Gutachtenstil* argument mining, we can check the presence of such meaningful internal representations in two ways. Firstly, we remove the *Gutachtenstil* explanation from the system prompt, relying on knowledge acquired at training time and through example shots alone, and find that it only has a small impact on performance (cf. table 2 Llama 3₁₀ NE).

However, we can effectively remove internal information about the categories by pseudonymizing them via random permutation for each query to the model. With pseudonymization the model cannot recover any meaningful information, cf. table 5, confirming that this internalized knowledge is immediately necessary.

4.4 Public Feedback Argument Mining

As the CIMT dataset contains only 4 categories and their structure is clearer than SP-WSLE, we find performance improved generally, cf. table 6. The features used for the SVM in (Romberg and Conrad, 2021) are not specified, so we were not able to reproduce their re-

Labels	Macro F1	Accuracy
Original	.470	.585
Pseudonyms	.134	.159

Table 5: Inherent knowledge test via pseudonymization for Llama 3₁₀ in the SP-WSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining joint task. Labels are either original or randomly permuted for each request. Detailed results in Table 12.

Model	Macro F1	Accuracy
SVM †	.73 \pm .02	
BoW+SVM	.526 \pm .02	.743 \pm .01
Llama 3 ₀	.445 \pm .01	.612 \pm .02
Llama 3 ₀ CoT	.457 \pm .03	.627 \pm .02
Llama 3 ₁₀	.505 \pm .02	.733 \pm .02
Llama 3 ₁₀ CoT	.503 \pm .01	.732 \pm .02
Llama 3 ₁₀ RAG	.616 \pm .03	.779 \pm .02

Table 6: Argument mining scores for the CIMT CD_C set in 3-fold cross validation. † = results for SVM with unspecified features from (Romberg and Conrad, 2021).

sults. However, Llama 3 can be made competitive with the BoW+SVM baseline and even surpass it with 10 example shots curated via RAG. Again we find that CoT prompting is beneficial for the zero-shot case, however only marginally, but does not offer much, if any, improvement in few-shot prompting.

4.5 Legal Essay Scoring

Our selection of pre-trained LLMs does not perform well in legal essay scoring. Even though their context windows are large enough to include up to 6 examples, they cannot achieve prediction quality beyond random guessing (cf. fig. 6). Various techniques to lower task difficulty, such as simpler grading, additive scoring scale, partial scoring and chain-of-thought prompting did not yield any improvement. We surmise that this grading task is too complex and noisy to be solved with pre-trained generative models of this calibre.

4.6 Student Essay Scoring

The Automated Student Assessment Prize dataset represents a set of much easier scoring tasks than the GSHA. As the texts are both more plentiful and generally much shorter, long contexts and instruction following are less problematic. Accordingly, Llama 3 with 10 example shots outperforms the BoW baseline here with considerable margin, cf. table 7. However the zero-shot scenario regresses con-




Figure 1: Spearman ranking correlation for the ASAP AES transfer study, mean over 3 folds.

siderably in linear correlation and CoT does not offer any improvement. This suggests that even with the slightly more complex set 8 we are observing the limits of model capability.

The improvements over the baseline with Llama 3₁₀ are still a good sign for LLM-based AES in education settings.

Model	Spearman	Pearson
BoW+SVM	.586±.04	.616±.07
Llama 3 ₀	.50±.02	.405±.08
Llama 3 ₀ CoT	.582±.03	.614±.01
Llama 3 ₁₀	.643±.05	.664±.03
Llama 3 ₁₀ CoT	.539±.04	.442±.05
Llama 3 ₁₀ RAG	.658±.05	.658±.03

Table 7: AES correlation scores for ASAP set 8 in 3-fold cross validation.

The main advantage of pre-trained generative LLMs is their adaptability to new tasks, which we test in a transfer study. In a zero-shot scenario this requires no new training data be collected for the new task, while in few-shot prompting example shots from another task can still be useful. The baseline and LLM models operate here on training data, be it for example shots or from-scratch fitting, from one set for the prediction on another set.

As per the transfer study results (cf. figure 1), the penalty for providing foreign example shots to the model is low, and they still offer improved performance over zero-shot. While the baseline model suffers from a domain shift due to its inflexible vocabulary and representations, Llama 3₁₀ adapts to sets 8 and 2 without issues. We believe that this is rooted in the fact that examples are mostly useful for instruction following and their actual content and exact response are secondary. This confirms our earlier results that show the negligible impact of sub-optimal example shot selection.

5 Conclusion

We identified that instruction following and especially German language understanding, are key factors for a significant gap between LLM capabilities and the demands of German legal education. The models studied fail to demonstrate the logical structuring needed for legal understanding and thus cannot effectively score full legal essays. However, simpler English tasks show more promising results, suggesting that pre-trained LLMs could be useful with basic tasks or more advanced models.

Our findings indicate that Llama 3’s superior language comprehension trumps GPT-3.5’s reasoning capabilities, highlighting the importance of linguistic skills in natural language communication. Most models benefit from few-shot prompting, while Chain-of-Thought prompting only helps in zero-shot scenarios. The failure of our Auto-CoT inspired approach providing generated reasoning before extracting final results shows a lack of feedback integration capability.

We identified certain limitations such as inference efficiency and target language understanding in the current generation of LLMs. Even with the efficiency gains provided by Grouped-Query Attention and Mixture-of-Expert models, we find that for incremental tasks, this makes them prohibitively expensive. For languages outside of the main training language, even with multilingual models, proficiency is still lacking.

Overall, prompt-based extractive use of LLMs works well for simple tasks but underperforms in complex tasks with long contexts due to limited language understanding and instruction following. This can be partially mitigated with careful selection of examples.

Limitations While pre-trained LLMs lift the large burden of training, the inference compute is still expensive, which cannot be solved with efficient prompting or fine-tuning alone.

As the examined models benefit from abundant training data, knowledge transfer to new within-domain tasks should be checked to gauge the efficiency of adaptation. However, it was not possible for us to conduct such a study as the linking to the case is not included in the documents or annotations.

As shown by much improved results in English language AES tasks, even with multilingual models, the proficiency in any but the main training language is still lacking.

References

- Mistral AI. 2024. Mistral model card.
- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Joshua Ainslie, James Lee-Thorp, Michiel de Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Federico Lebrón, and Sumit Sanghai. 2023. Gqa: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13245*.
- Abdullah Al Zubaer, Michael Granitzer, and Jelena Mitrović. 2023. [Performance analysis of large language models in the domain of legal argument mining](#). *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Pierre Colombo, Telmo Pessoa Pires, Malik Boudiaf, Dominic Culver, Rui Melo, Caio Corro, Andre FT Martins, Fabrizio Esposito, Vera Lúcia Raposo, Sofia Morgado, et al. 2024. Saullm-7b: A pioneering large language model for law. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03883*.
- Deniz Gorur, Antonio Rago, and Francesca Toni. 2024. [Can large language models perform relation-based argument mining?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.11243.
- B Hamner, J Morgan, MS Lynnvandev, and TV Ark. 2012. The hewlett foundation: Automated essay scoring. *Kaggle*.
- Jinqi Lai, Wensheng Gan, Jiayang Wu, Zhenlian Qi, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Large language models in law: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03718*.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Atsushi Mizumoto and Masaki Eguchi. 2023. Exploring the potential of using an ai language model for automated essay scoring. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 2(2):100050.
- Isabelle Mohr, Markus Krimmel, Saba Sturua, Mohammad Kalim Akram, Andreas Koukounas, Michael Günther, Georgios Mastrapas, Vinit Ravishankar, Joan Fontanals Martínez, Feng Wang, et al. 2024. Multi-task contrastive learning for 8192-token bilingual text embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17016*.
- Christopher M Ormerod, Akanksha Malhotra, and Amir Jafari. 2021. Automated essay scoring using efficient transformer-based language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.13136*.
- Yasser Otiefy and Alaa Alhamzeh. 2024. Exploring large language models in financial argument relation identification. In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop of the 7th Financial Technology and Natural Language Processing, the 5th Knowledge Discovery from Unstructured Data in Financial Services, and the 4th Workshop on Economics and Natural Language Processing @ LREC-COLING 2024*, pages 119–129, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Pedro Uria Rodriguez, Amir Jafari, and Christopher M Ormerod. 2019. Language models and automated essay scoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09482*.
- Julia Romberg and Stefan Conrad. 2021. Citizen involvement in urban planning-how can municipalities be supported in evaluating public participation processes for mobility transitions? In *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Argument Mining*, pages 89–99.
- Pranab Sahoo, Ayush Kumar Singh, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, Samrat Mondal, and Aman Chadha. 2024. A systematic survey of prompt engineering in large language models: Techniques and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07927*.
- Maja Stahl, Leon Biermann, Andreas Nehring, and Henning Wachsmuth. 2024. Exploring llm prompting strategies for joint essay scoring and feedback generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15845*.
- Kaveh Taghipour and Hwee Tou Ng. 2016. A neural approach to automated essay scoring. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1882–1891.
- Florian Weber, Thiemo Wambsganss, Seyed Parsa Neshaei, and Matthias Soellner. 2023. Structured persuasive writing support in legal education: A model and tool for german legal case solutions. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 2296–2313.

Annotate texts according to the Gutachtenstil.
 <EXPLANATION>
 The text must be assigned to exactly one of the following categories: “Major Claim”, “Conclusion”, “Definition”, “Subsumption”, “Legal Claim”, “Premise” or “Unknown”
 Answer in one word.
 Your answer should only mention the relevant component.

Figure 2: Translated system prompt for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining where <EXPLANATION> defines the Gutachtenstil.

Answer in one word. Which part of the Gutachtenstil is this?

Figure 3: Translated result prompt for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Colin White, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Arka Pal, Ben Feuer, Siddhartha Jain, Ravid Shwartz-Ziv, Neel Jain, Khalid Saifullah, Siddhartha Naidu, Chinmay Hegde, Yann LeCun, Tom Goldstein, Willie Neiswanger, and Micah Goldblum. 2024. *Livebench: A challenging, contamination-free llm benchmark*.

Changrong Xiao, Wenxing Ma, Sean Xin Xu, Kunpeng Zhang, Yufang Wang, and Qi Fu. 2024. From automation to augmentation: Large language models elevating essay scoring landscape. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06431*.

Ruosong Yang, Jiannong Cao, Zhiyuan Wen, Youzheng Wu, and Xiaodong He. 2020. Enhancing automated essay scoring performance via fine-tuning pre-trained language models with combination of regression and ranking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1560–1569.

Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2022. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*.

A Appendix

Text:
 <TEXT>
 Explain: What part of the Gutachtenstil is this? Briefly explain your decision in German, up to 100 words.

Figure 4: Chain-of-Thought prompt for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining




Figure 5: Mean proportion of shots with the correct label for a request in SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining. Random selection vs. RAG-based selection via cosine similarity over sentence embeddings.




Figure 6: GSHA automatic essay scoring results with few-shot prompting in 5-fold cross-validation repeated 3 times.

Model	Global	Reasoning	Language
meta-llama-3-70b-instruct	35.99	22.67	34.11
gpt-3.5-turbo-0125	34.77	28.00	24.22
mixtral-8x7b-instruct-v0.1	23.39	23.33	13.76

Table 8: *LiveBench* (White et al., 2024) LLM accuracy scores (%) for categories and models relevant to this work.

Method	Macro F1	Acc.	Class F1					
			D	C	MC	P	LC	S
BoW+SVM	.761	.784	.91	.84	.96	.67	.54	.65
Llama 3 _{10RAG}	.580	.710	.89	.79	.86	.62	.33	.56
Llama 3 ₁₀	.470	.585	.85	.67	.68	.54	.07	.47
Mixtral ₁₀	.370	.444	.73	.48	.54	.42	.09	.34
GPT-3.5 ₁₀	.339	.381	.63	.45	.47	.31	.17	.35

Table 9: Detailed results for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* joint task argument mining on a 20% test set. For pre-trained LLMs the subscript denotes the number of examples provided in the prompt, *RAG* = Retrieval Augmented Generation for example selection.

Method	F1	Acc.	Class F1					
			D	C	MC	P	LC	S
Llama 3 _{10RAG}	.580	.710	.89	.79	.86	.62	.33	.56
Llama 3 _{10\overline{RAG}}	.436	.539	.82	.64	.53	.53	.11	.42
Δ	.144	.171	.07	.15	.33	.09	.22	.14

Table 10: RAG Brittleness test for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining on a 20% test set. \overline{RAG} = Inverse Retrieval Augmented Generation for example selection.

Method	Macro F1	Acc.	Class F1					
			D	C	MC	P	LC	S
CoT ₁₀ ^{80%}	.498	.541	.72	.65	.68	.53	.09	.32
Res ₁₀ ^{80%}	.470	.585	.85	.67	.68	.54	.07	.47
Res ₁₀ ^{03%}	.465	.587	.85	.68	.70	.51	.03	.48
CoT ₁₀ ^{03%}	.453	.484	.86	.60	.33	.49	.08	.35
CoT _{10GAR} ^{03%}	.425	.470	.82	.60	.32	.53	.01	.26
CoT ₀	.333	.393	.57	.51	.45	.29	.05	.13
Res ₀	.268	.30	.63	.29	.50	.04	.05	.37

Table 11: Detailed results for Llama 3 Chain-of-Thought prompting in different data availability scenarios (80%, 0.3%, 0%) for SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining, with best-in-class results highlighted. The subscript denotes the number of shots provided in the prompt, the superscript indicates the training data available if applicable, *Res* = result only prompt, *CoT* = Chain-of-Thought prompt, *GAR* = Generated Artificial Reasoning for prompt examples.

Labels	Macro F1	Acc.	Class F1					
			D	C	MC	P	LC	S
Original	.470	.585	.85	.67	.68	.54	.07	.47
Pseudonyms	.134	.159	.12	.18	.20	.16	.13	.14

Table 12: Detailed results for inherent knowledge test via pseudonymization for Llama 3₁₀ in the SPWSLE *Gutachtenstil* argument mining joint task. The labels are either original or randomly permuted for each request.