

Maximiliano MARZETTI

Associate Professor of Law, IESEG School of Management, Paris, Université de Lille

Shaping the Future: The Role of Business Schools in Educating Emerging Hybrid Legal Professionals ¹

Abstract: This essay examines the transformative impact of technological, market, and other pressures on the legal profession and the new roles these changes create for law and non-law graduates. It explores Richard Susskind's predictions regarding the evolution of the legal profession into hybrid roles that merge legal expertise with other disciplines. The essay argues that business schools have a competitive advantage in educating these new hybrid legal profiles due to their internationalization, interdisciplinarity, and strong connections with the business world. Evidence is provided for the existing demand for hybrid legal roles, such as compliance officers, contract managers, and legal project managers, among others. It concludes by emphasizing the need for business schools to develop appropriate strategies to shape the future of the hybrid legal market and provide the necessary education.

Keywords: Disruptive innovation, artificial intelligence; lawyers; legal education; business schools; interdisciplinary education; managerial sciences; hybrid roles; quasi-legal jobs; compliance.

Façonner l'avenir : le rôle des écoles de commerce dans la formation des professionnels juridiques hybrides émergents

Résumé : Cet essai examine l'impact transformateur des pressions technologiques, de marché et autres sur la profession juridique et les nouveaux rôles que ces changements créent pour les diplômés en droit et non-droit. Il explore les prédictions de Richard Susskind concernant l'évolution de la profession juridique vers des rôles hybrides qui combinent l'expertise juridique avec d'autres disciplines. L'essai soutient que les écoles de commerce ont un avantage concurrentiel dans l'éducation de ces nouveaux profils juridiques hybrides en raison de leur internationalisation, de leur interdisciplinarité et de leurs liens étroits avec le monde des affaires. Des preuves sont fournies

¹ Congrès AFDM sur les « Initiatives et réponses des secteurs public et privé face aux bouleversements globaux - Public and private sector initiatives and responses to global upheavals », 12 et 13 décembre 2024

pour la demande existante de rôles juridiques hybrides, tels que les responsables de la conformité, les gestionnaires de contrats et les gestionnaires de projets juridiques, entre autres. Il conclut en soulignant la nécessité pour les écoles de commerce de développer des stratégies appropriées pour façonner l'avenir du marché juridique hybride et de fournir l'éducation nécessaire.

Mots-clés : Innovation disruptive ; intelligence artificielle ; avocats ; éducation juridique ; écoles de commerce ; éducation interdisciplinaire ; sciences de gestion ; rôles hybrides, emplois quasi-juridiques ; conformité.

Introduction

This essay examines the limitations of traditional law schools in preparing graduates for emerging hybrid legal professional roles. It argues that business schools, with their interdisciplinary approach and strong business connections, are better positioned to educate these new hybrid professionals. The structure of this essay is as follows: In Section 1, “Welcome to the Future: How Technological Disruption Has Forever Changed the Provision of Legal Services,” we discuss Richard Susskind's predictions about the future of law and the impact of technology on legal services, and how they have already concretised, in particular since the irruption and generalisation of the use of Generative AI. In Section 2, “Academic Interdisciplinarity and the Hybridization of Legal Services,” we present our original thoughts on the growth of interdisciplinary education in law schools and how changes in the type of legal services demanded by the market are altering the roles and training for lawyers and non-lawyers alike. In Section 3, “New Hybrid Legal Roles,” we describe the most likely existing and future hybrid legal profiles requested by the job market, such as compliance officers, legal operations managers, and contract managers, among others. We corroborate our hypothesis with findings from recent LinkedIn Learning searches. In Section 4, “Opportunities for Business Schools,” we argue that business schools are well-positioned to educate these new hybrid professional roles, complementing rather than competing with law schools. We conclude by emphasizing the need for business schools to develop strategies to shape the future and take the lead in the training of legal hybrids, by providing complementary non-legal education for law graduates and targeted legal education for business students.

1. Welcome to the Future: How Technological Disruption has Forever Changed the Provision of Legal Services

Richard Susskind is widely known for his works on the future of the legal system and the legal profession. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been one of his core subjects. His initial contributions focused on computational law and the nascent applications of AI within the legal domain, specifically through what was then known as *Expert Systems*, an earlier AI technology which required human training to operate. The current Generative AI (GenAI) Systems, which are based on Google's 2017 Transformer Model (Murgia, 2023) and are the base of ChatGPT, for instance,

have significantly surpassed the capabilities and limitations of *Expert Systems*, as well as doing away with the need for human experts for their training.

Susskind's foundational work in AI and computational law led him to contemplate the broader implications of technological advancements in the legal profession. Thus, he began to examine how disruptive technological changes, coupled with competitive pressures and the dynamics of a globalized working environment, would shape the future of law and legal practice. This line of research prompted Susskind to author a series of influential yet controversial works addressing the future of law and the evolving role of lawyers in this rapidly changing landscape such as *The Future of Law* (R. E. Susskind, 1998), *The End of Lawyers* (R. E. Susskind, 2008) and *Tomorrow's Lawyers*, currently in its third edition (R. E. Susskind, 2023). In *The Future of Professions* (R. E. Susskind & Susskind, 2015), together with his son, extended the analytical framework to other professions. Susskind son, following his father's footsteps, went on to write a solo work, *A World Without Work* (D. Susskind, 2020), on the perspective of job destruction as a consequence of disruptive technology, and how to respond.

Richard Susskind is neither a futurologist nor a guru. His works combined rational analytical tools with the observation of reality to identify patterns and from them deduce rather than predict likely future scenarios, regardless of what may be considered politically correct or desirable. True scholarship is meant to challenge existing views, grounded in "what is," rather than "what ought to be." Some legal professionals found Susskind's insights shocking and chose to attack him personally or ignore the reality, much like the proverbial ostrich buried its head in the sand.

Remarkably reality has vindicated Susskind, as many of his "predictions" have materialized, leaving his detractors with no choice but to adapt or face redundancy. Current AI technologies, including Natural Language Processing, Large Language Models (LLMs), Neural Networks, and Gen AI, are beginning to revolutionise the provision of legal services, just as he had anticipated decades ago. Additionally, globalization, geopolitical instability, and recurrent economic and financial crises have exerted, and continue to exert, pressure on the business models of multinational law firms and their clients (*Big Law*). Cost-sensitive corporate clients are demanding more value for less money and seeking more interdisciplinary and functional legal work.

Technology is the primary driver of change in the work environment, including legal work. Much of the work most lawyers currently do, in particular repetitive low-skilled tasks such as legal research, document review or basic legal drafting, can be outsourced to non-lawyers or cheaper lawyers in distant jurisdictions (as legal process outsourcing has proven) and more recently, can be substituted, or at least complemented, by LLMs and GenAI systems combined with legal databases.¹ Moreover, technology will continue to disrupt the market for legal services, and the rate of technological change is expected to accelerate exponentially. If Kurzweil is right and the *singularity* is around the corner, predicting further changes would be futile after some point in time. (Kurzweil, 2005).

¹ For instance, Bloomberg Law, Lex Machina, Westlaw Precision, Lexis + AI, Paxton AI, etc.

In any case, at the moment, existing technology, in particular, LLMs and GenAI, allows low-skilled, repetitive, and tedious legal tasks, such as case law research, or sifting through extensive contracts with myriads of appendixes, to be automated, without requiring the intervention of any human being with a law degree, or at least not until the reviewing phase. More importantly, technology allows legal work to be standardised and “commoditised” easily, so that it can then be divided into chunks and assigned to different professionals, with or without a law degree, in search of cost-effectiveness and task efficiency. Certainly, some may object, that some legal tasks cannot be “commoditised” and will remain human and “bespoke,” for instance, those that require an experienced lawyer. There are also tasks that, because of legal constraints, not because of technology’s limitations, can only be performed by a lawyer (due to the lawyer’s monopoly in the provision of some legal services).

However, lawyers cannot expect to be insulated from competing with nonlawyers forever. In some countries, such as the UK, some of those boundaries are already being eroded. Richard Susskind refers to this trend as the “liberalization” of legal services, with *Alternative Business Structures* (ABS), that allow nonlawyers to run law firms, serving as a core example. The “liberalisation” trend may encounter resistance in some countries where the lobby of professional legal associations remains strong, such as in France. However, the current *status quo* may not last forever. Therefore, it is in the best interest of legal professionals to innovate, to be chosen by their clients due to their diverse pool of competencies, and not because the law leaves them no choice.

Naturally, AI elicits radical emotions, from unbridled optimism to its potential to increase human productivity and creativity to grim prophecies about the end of the world or the extinction of the human race, a common trope in many sci-fi films and series (e.g., *Terminator*, *Ex Machina*, *Westworld*, etc.). People are concerned by AI, and legitimately so. A report found that in the US 75% of employees are concerned AI will make certain jobs obsolete and 65% feel anxious about AI replacing their jobs.(Ernst & Young, 2023) . However, despite these reports, the rate of job destruction and job creation due to Gen AI and other AI remains unknown. If we look back at history for guidance, most new disruptive technologies were feared and contested, even violently (let us not forget the 18th century Luddite Movement) and they both destroyed some old jobs while creating new ones. We may expect, *mutatis mutandis*, a similar pattern concerning AI. However, for the moment, it is unclear whether AI job destruction will outweigh AI job creation or the rate of technological substitution of human jobs. The speed of technological change is key, as argued by Yu explained in an insightful paper concerning the printing press. (Yu, 2006). Gutenberg’s printing press took decades or even centuries to become a mainstream affordable technology, which gave scribes and amanuenses enough time to learn new skills to transition into new jobs as clerks, printers, or editors. However, AI technology is advancing at an incredibly fast pace.

Despite all, Susskind’s insights provide a rather optimistic view of the future of the legal profession, provided one embraces change as one of the few perennial dynamics of human life.¹ Susskind suggests that while the legal profession will change, lawyers will not disappear; they will adapt and

¹ As already recognized Parmenides in the sixth or fifth century BCE.

evolve. However, to do so, lawyers must adapt and acquire new competencies and skills. Beardslee DeStefano suggests innovation must become a new key discipline in itself for lawyers and law students (DeStefano, 2019). Today, existing GenAI technologies coupled with precise legal databases can perform in seconds tasks that previously took human lawyers days or weeks. However, human directiveness and supervision are and will remain necessary. Therefore, and here comes the good news, present and future lawyers should do well to master the strategic use of AI systems to enhance human capacities, rather than to replace them.

2. Academic Interdisciplinarity and the Hybridization of Legal Services

Technological change, as usual, will create winners and losers. Some existing legal roles may disappear or see their employability reduced, while new ones will emerge. In the latter case, Susskind refers to the emergence of a series of “new legal jobs” for lawyers, or legally-trained persons, all of which are interdisciplinary in nature. Some of these jobs will be *quasilegal jobs* by what I mean, following DeStefano (DeStefano, 2014); jobs that do not require a law degree, but having one may be an advantage. In addition, we also believe, some legal jobs carried out by lawyers, will be outsourced to non-lawyers with sufficient legal training.

Beyond technological change, other trends contribute to significantly shaping the future of the legal profession, namely, interdisciplinary legal education and the hybridisation of job profiles. In law schools around the globe, law is taught as a form of vocational training, mainly to be able to litigate in court. This model has existed since the Middle Ages and has changed little to this day. (Gordley, 2014). The study of law has been taught relying on its own legal method (predominantly following the scholastic model of *scientia iuris*, or doctrinal legal scholarship). In such a model, the social sciences have a modest if not non-existent space in the curriculum. From a sociological perspective, the law has become a self-reproducing and hyper-cyclically closed social system (Teubner, 1988, 1993).

However, market and social forces demand change and innovation in the provision of legal services. Clients demand lawyers who solve legal problems also considering economic, financial, strategic, and other facets. The *raison d'être* of interdisciplinarity is the recognition and acceptance that most problems are too difficult and multifaceted to be solved by one discipline alone. At the same time, interdisciplinarity tends to breed innovative solutions. In recent times, concepts such as interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinarity have become commonplace, however they are not analogous concepts. (Fawcett, 2013; Helmane & Briška, 2019). For the purpose of this paper we will refer to interdisciplinarity, as a learning strategy that requires integrating two or more disciplines to address one single and complex real-world problem, solving it by blending and combining their respective insights (Bosch, 2020).

The increasing interdisciplinarity within law schools is exemplified by the emergence of various “Law and” movements. Among these, *Law and Economics* (L&E), also known as the *Economic Analysis of Law* (EAL), stands out as the most prominent and influential. The L&E movement

began to coalesce into a distinct school of thought in the latter half of the 20th century in the United States, driven by a series of seminal publications by both lawyers and economists (Becker, 1974; Calabresi, 1970; Calabresi & Melamed, 1972; Cooter & Ulen, 1988; R. A. Posner, 1975; R. A. Posner, 1972; *inter multis*). This innovative approach, while not dismissing the value of doctrinal legal scholarship, relegated it to a secondary role, incorporating methodologies from outside the legal domain—initially focusing on microeconomic theory and welfare economics—to gain a deeper understanding of the legal system. Notably, some of its *founding fathers* questioned the epistemic correctness of law as an autonomous discipline (Posner, 1987).

The success of L&E, particularly in the US, can be attributed to several factors, including the competitive environment of legal education (Garoupa & Ulen, 2007). Moreover, a significant factor contributing to the prominence of L&E in the U.S. is the peculiar approach to formal legal education. Unlike continental Europe, where law is typically taught at the undergraduate level, in the U.S. legal education is offered at the graduate level. The *Juris Doctor* (JD) degree, which is a prerequisite for taking any of the fifty state bar exams, is accessible to individuals holding bachelor's degrees in diverse fields such as economics, psychology, history, languages, etc. This educational structure fosters an environment where JD students bring varied academic backgrounds, methodologies and epistemological paradigms to their legal studies. Consequently, it is not surprising that graduates who have spent three or four years studying other disciplines before pursuing law often integrate their prior knowledge and methodologies into their legal education, thereby contributing to the interdisciplinary study of law.

Moreover, interdisciplinarity seems to attract more interdisciplinarity. In recent years, disciplines coming from outside the economic field have been integrated into L&E scholarship to challenge, refine, and test some of its underlying economic assumptions, such as the hyperrationality of the *homo oeconomicus*, among others. For instance, through *Behavioral Law and Economics* (Hayden & Ellis, 2006; Sunstein, 2000) and *Empirical Legal Studies* (R. Cooter, 2011). These developments continue to enrich the study of law by incorporating diverse insights and methodologies.

The notion that lawyers should be knowledgeable in economics and statistics, in particular, is not a recent development. As early as 1897, Wendell Holmes Jr. proclaimed, “for the rational study of the law, the blackletter man may be the man of the present, but the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics” (Holmes, 1897). Despite the various merits and criticisms of this perspective, the L&E movement has successfully challenged the traditional doctrinal legal scholarship paradigm of legal education and promoted interdisciplinarity. As a result, it has paved the way for other interdisciplinary approaches, including *Law and Finance* (La Porta et al., 1998), *Law and Literature* (Posner, 2009), *Law and Humanities* (Sarat et al., 2009), *Law and Critical Studies* (Unger, 1986), among many others. The diversity of methodologies (social sciences and humanities) and ideologies (conservative and progressive) of the “Law and” approaches are worth noting and to be welcomed, as diverse views can lead to new innovative solutions that a monolithic approach may overlook.

Such *interdisciplinary turn* in legal scholarship has also revitalized foundational supportive fields of legal education, such as the *Sociology of Law*, which traces its origins to 19th-century classical sociologists like Durkheim (Durkheim, 1893), Maine (Maine, 1861), and Weber (Weber & Tribe, 2019). In contemporary times, the *Sociology of Law* has broadened its scope, incorporating methodologies and insights from various social sciences, and has become known, particularly in the United States, as *Law and Society* (Barkan, 2024; Vago & Barkan, 2018). The *rebranding* and enlarged scope of the sociological approach to law may reflect and try to capitalize on the success of the “Law and” interdisciplinary movements. Given the prestige of US law schools,¹ the epistemological innovations developed there are exported globally, with varying degrees of success in their implementation across different countries (Mathis, 2013).

Corporate clients seemed to have welcomed the academic hybridisation of legal studies. It seems evident why. Lawyers trained in economics or management are better prepared to understand the non-legal dimensions of legal problems, so they can provide better solutions, that add more value to their employers or clients. As we will show *infra*, current job advertisements seem to validate this trend.

3. New Hybrid Legal Roles

The assertion that there is an oversupply of lawyers, which leads to insufficient employment opportunities for law graduates, is not a novel concern. Over a century ago, Calamandrei addressed this issue in his work *Troppi Avvocati!* (Calamandrei, 1921), highlighting the surplus and inadequate preparation of Italian lawyers at that time. Contemporary Italian scholars (Saccò, 2021) suggests that the situation remains largely unchanged a century later. In the United States, legal education is significantly more costly than in Europe. Tamanaha posits that the scarcity of legal positions for new law graduates, who are often burdened with substantial debt from their legal studies, presents a profound ethical dilemma (Tamanaha, 2012).

These and similar claims assume a static view of the legal profession, primarily training law students to advise clients advisement or represent them in court, mainly working in law firms integrated exclusively by lawyers. However, from our perspective, an additional, confounding problem, exacerbating the employability problems for new law graduates, lies in the misalignment between the knowledge and skills currently demanded by the market, and those imparted in law schools.

In *Tomorrow's Lawyers*, Susskind posits that while traditional legal roles and jobs may diminish, confirming the current trend, they will not entirely disappear. Some roles, such as the “expert trusted advisor” or the “enhanced practitioner” will continue to find jobs. However, these roles may be available for those at the apex of the pyramid of a lawyer’s job.

¹ According to reputable rankings, most of the top 10 law schools in the world, are located in the US. Vid., inter multis, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2024/subject-ranking/law;> and [https://www.topuniversities.com/university-subject-rankings/law-legal-studies.](https://www.topuniversities.com/university-subject-rankings/law-legal-studies)

More interestingly, Susskind suggests new legal roles will emerge to address the changing needs of the market. In Chapter 16 of the latest edition of *Tomorrow's Lawyers*, Susskind provides a comprehensive enumeration and a description of these new profiles, namely: *legal design thinkers*, *legal knowledge engineers*, *legal no-coders*, *legal technologists*, *legal hybrids*, *legal process analysts*, *legal managers*, *legal data scientists*, *legal data visualizers*, *research and development workers*, *digital security guards*, *online dispute resolution practitioners*, *moderators*, *legal management consultants*, and *legal risk managers*.

While thought-provoking, Susskind's enumeration of emerging legal roles is in our view redundant. While he enumerates *legal hybrids (stricto sensu)* as one species of the new legal jobs, upon closer examination, it becomes evident that all the roles he mentions are hybrid in nature, since they all require knowledge of law, as well as expertise in at least another discipline. Thus, all the new legal jobs are legal hybrids (*lato sensu*). More importantly, the crucial question Susskind does not address in his book is where these legal hybrids will be educated. We contend that business schools are well-positioned to provide some of the training the new hybrid legal profiles will need.

The notion that lawyers, particularly those providing services in the corporate or business sectors, must adopt hybrid profiles and possess knowledge beyond the blackletter of the law is not a creation of Susskind. For instance, Gilson (Gilson, 1998) and Khong (Khong, 2020) suggest that business-oriented lawyers must become *transaction cost engineers*. These authors imply that to become an effective corporate lawyer, it is essential to understand basic notions of transaction cost economics. (Coase, 1960; Williamson, 1989). Effective corporate decision-making requires evaluating legal decisions from a cost-benefit analysis, taking into account an environment where transaction costs are positive, and options multiple, such as using the market or the firm structure (Coase, 1937).

The job market already demands hybrid legal profiles and offers quasi-legal jobs that require legal knowledge but not necessarily a law degree. However, in some cases, holding a law degree may provide a competitive advantage. For instance, one early example of the latter case is illustrated by the emergence of *legal consultants* in the US, in particular, *employment law consultants* (Rostain, 2006).

Due to new technologies, certain legal tasks can be separated, standardised, and commoditised, allowing them to be broken down and assigned to distant professionals with or without legal training at a comparatively much lower cost. Consequently, a new professional role, the *Legal Process Manager*, has emerged. This development may be beneficial for corporate firms, but it represents additional market pressures for lawyers, who may be forced to compete for or relinquish some legal tasks.

The laws that insulate lawyers from competition with non-lawyers, will not protect them from these trends in areas and tasks where a law degree or bar association membership is not a legal requirement. Hybrid legal roles are growing in number, becoming distinct and specialised, despite divergence in their denomination. In the following paragraphs I will provide some examples of these trends.

Transactional lawyers, whether working in-house in the legal department of a company, or externally, in a law firm, manage corporate clients' contractual needs. However, companies have begun to rely on contract managers, who may or may not have legal training, to oversee the entire contract lifecycle. Thus, the contract manager has taken up some of the tasks traditionally performed by transactional lawyers, in particular in an early stage, such as negotiation and contract drafting. Lawyers may be involved in later stages only, in cases of breach of contract leading to court or arbitral proceedings. The *French Contract Management Association* defines contract management as a comprehensive set of management activities that commence well before the contract is signed, specifically at the initiation of the contract capture phase, and continue through to the execution of the contract, receipt of payment, and completion of the contract closure procedure.¹ Contract managers take full advantage of AI technologies provided by *lawtech* startups,² and standardisation (contract templates or contractual clauses catalogues) to reduce costs and increase efficiency. The specialised and iterative process of contract management allows to building of a body of contractual knowledge (contractual intelligence) to help companies achieve their business goals, preserve relationships and minimise breaches and disputes, which in turn reduces further the scope of intervention of lawyers in corporate contract governance. After all, from a business perspective, the primary goal of a contract is not to shield liability or minimise legal risk, albeit they are important concerns, but to achieve the contractual commercial objectives (DiMatteo, 2010; Orozco, 2021). Thus, contract management practices promote innovation, while prioritising the contractual business objectives over legalistic aspects. To that end, and based on insights from behavioural sciences and principles of design thinking, literature on contractual best practices incorporating plain legal language, legal design and visualisation techniques is growing at the international of contract law, proactive practices and visual studies (Barton et al., 2021; Haapio et al., 2021; Waller et al., 2016).

Another newcomer is the *legal operations manager* (LOM), a position that unequivocally signals the desire to seek efficiency and cost-effectiveness in running legal departments, and law firms. In other words, managerial imperatives are incorporated into the provision of legal services. Coherent with the famous dictum (erroneously) attributed to Peter Drucker³ that states that “you can't manage what you don't measure”, LOMs adhere to performance metrics (such as *Key Performance Indicators*, KPIs) to enhance operational efficiency. To cater to this new niche, some French business schools have begun offering specialised training for LOMs.⁴ For similar reasons, some law firms have begun to hire legal project managers, a different name for a position with similar tasks to those of LOMs, with the intent of streamlining the provision of legal services.⁵

¹ <https://www.afcm-asso.fr/contract-management/>.

² For instance, in France, CALAME, Leeway, Seraphin Legal, *inter al.*

³ <https://drucker.institute/thedx/measurement-myopia/>.

⁴ <https://alll.legal/formation-legal-operations/>

⁵ For instance, in France, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer: <https://france.freshfieldscareers.com/careers/hub/legal-project-manager/>.

Intellectual property rights (IPRs, such as trademarks, patents, design rights, and copyrights, *inter al.*). Therefore, strategically managing IPRs is crucial to a company's success. IP lawyers are usually involved in the prosecution, transactions, and litigation concerning IPRs. However, many tasks traditionally performed by IP lawyers are being compartmentalised and assigned to specialised profiles, with or without legal training, such as *Brand Protection Managers*, *Licensing Managers*, etc. IP legal education traditionally neglects strategic, valuation and managerial aspects of IPRs, which are key for business. As we have argued in an earlier paper, as important as training IP lawyers, is to train IP Managers who, after all, are going to extract value from them (Marzetti, 2011). IP protection for protection's sake is futile, absent any strategic concern. Because most law degrees and master of law degrees in IP neglect the managerial aspects, some professional providers have begun to fill in the gap. Thus, outside law schools, we can find training programs for quasilegal roles such as *Licensing Executives*,¹ *Patent Valuation Analysts*,² or *Qualified Patent Information Professionals*, to name a few.³ These new roles require some understanding of the legal aspects of IPRs, but not necessarily a law degree, and are complemented by training in other disciplines, such as science, economics, etc. (Harrison et al., 2012). In the context of Fortune 500 companies, IP management was historically a prerogative of the General Counsel (GC), primarily focusing on the registration and enforcement of IPRs. A recent new role, popular within big tech companies, is that of the *Chief Intellectual Property Officer* (CIPO). The CIPO, besides protecting IPRs, is also concerned with the exploitation and monetisation of a company's IP portfolio, as well as acquiring new strategic IPRs through licensing agreements or mergers and acquisitions (Wild, 2007). Positioned within the *C-Suite* and reporting directly to the CEO, CIPOs influence the overall business strategy (Clover, 2013).

However, perhaps the most noticeable trend is the rise of the *Compliance Officers* (CO). Since the 1990s, due to changes in the US government's strategy to tackle white-collar crime and other corporate abuses, the CO became a widespread new position inside companies (The Emergence of Compliance, 2016). COs address legal, regulatory, and sometimes ethical aspects of business operations (Breux et al., 2006). Many companies have a *Compliance Department* completely separated and independent from the *Legal Department*, with a Chief CO reporting directly to the CEO (DeStefano, 2016). Even if some have criticised the separation between legal and compliance functions, it remains a growing trend (DeStefano, 2014). Besides some legal rules that imposed the compliance function to firms (such as, for example, anticorruption compliance pursuant to the so-called *Loi Sapin 2* in France, or the *Data Protection Officer* mandated by the EU's GDPR, which can be considered a specialised type of CO combining legal, technological, and data management knowledge) the rationale behind it is straightforward to companies: prevention is preferable, and more cost-effective, than remediation. This principle, originally borrowed from medicine, had already been applied to legal practice. Brown's *Preventative Law Movement* in the 1950s US-

¹ <https://www.lesi.org/about/resources/certified-licensing-professional>; <http://www.licensingcertification.org/what-is-clp/>.

² <https://cpva.info/>.

³ <https://www.qpip.org/>.

trained lawyers to assist their clients avoid legal problems (Brown, 1950b, 1950a). *Mutatis mutandis*, some of the principles of the *Preventative Law Movement* inspired decades later another group of interdisciplinary-oriented lawyers, known in Europe as the *Proactive Law Movement* and business lawyers (Berger-Walliser & Østergaard, 2012; Haapio, 2006). *Proactive Law* scholars while accepting the importance of compliance practices, consider them insufficient (Berger-Walliser & Shrivastava, 2014), Focusing only on risk management and defensive strategies may forego opportunities to use the legal system as a source of competitive advantage. (Bird & Park, 2017).

The growing popularity of *Alternative Dispute Resolution* (ADR) may also limit the availability of legal work for litigation lawyers, at least in some areas. *Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management* and *Dispute Resolution Professionals*, such as intra- and inter-company mediators, if successful, will reduce the need to engage lawyers in litigation proceedings. ADR is coherent with a proactive approach to law and compliance strategies. It can represent, however, an opportunity for lawyers willing to acquire new skills and wear an *ADR hat*. Susskind emphasizes in particular the potential of *Online Dispute Resolution* (ODR) for future lawyers, a modality whose utility, after the Covid-19 pandemic, seems unclear (Paulson, 2021). In any case, both online and offline ADR, as well as Conflict Prevention and Management, are trends that are likely to continue to develop in the future.

There are additional hybrid legal roles, but for the sake of brevity, we will stop here. To provide some evidence, albeit with many limitations, we include below some findings from job searches conducted on *LinkedIn Jobs*¹. This limited evidence suggests that there is already a demand for hybrid legal profiles and quasi-legal jobs, primarily within business companies and, to a lesser extent, law firms. It is important to note the limitations of this assessment: it is not an empirical study and is limited to only two developed countries (France and the UK). There may be repeated results due to inaccurate translations or terminological issues, as the names of hybrid legal roles are not uniform. However, it serves as an illustrative example (table 1).

¹ On 31.10.2024.

Job description	France	UK
Lawyer jobs (including in-solicitor, in-house counsel [<i>juriste</i>] and barrister/attorney at law [<i>avocat</i>])	1633 results [<i>juriste</i>] 633 results [<i>avocat</i>]	4493 results (lawyer voice) 3069 results (solicitor's voice) 32 results (solicitor voice).
compliance jobs (including regulatory, ethics, legal and specialised fields: privacy/data protection)	324 results (compliance, among other job descriptions) 395 results (“compliance” + “ethics”, among other job descriptions) 66 results (“compliance officer” as main job description) 30 results (“compliance manager” as the main job description).	226 results (compliance, among other job descriptions) 155 results (“compliance” + “ethics”, among other job descriptions) 229 results (“compliance officer” as the main job description) 478 results (“compliance manager” as the main job description).
Privacy/data protection counsel, manager, officer, professional (UK//EU GDPR)	8,526 results (total in the area) 419 results (DPO, among other job descriptions) 60 results (DPO as a main job description).	8,846 results (total jobs in the area) 168 results (DPO, among other job descriptions) 34 results (DPO as a main job description).
Contract managers	623 results (“contract manager”, among other job descriptions) 267 results (“contract manager” as the main job description).	889 results (“contract manager”, among other job descriptions) 284 results (“contract manager” as the main job description).
Policy and/or regulatory affairs analyst, officer, specialist, manager	1 result (“regulatory affairs” as a main job description) ¹ 9 results (“policy manager” as main job description).	1 result (“1 result (“legal knowledge manager” as a main job description) 59 results (“policy manager” as the main job description).
Legal project manager	No matching results (“legal project manager” as the main job description)	7 matching results (“legal project manager” as the main job description).
Legal knowledge lawyer/manager ²	No matching results (“legal knowledge lawyer” as the main job description) 1 result (“legal knowledge manager” as a main job description).	17 matching results (“legal knowledge lawyer” as the main job description) 1 result (“legal knowledge manager” as a main job description).
Legal operations associate, manager, officer, specialist jobs	No matching results (“legal operations” as the main job description).	20 results (“legal operations” as a main job description).

Table 1: illustrative example

4. Opportunities for Business Schools

Up to this point, we have discussed why the provision of legal services is changing, primarily due to the emergence of new technologies, the demand for new hybrid legal roles that capitalize on the standardization and commoditization of legal tasks, and the growth of academic interdisciplinarity.

¹ Mainly connected to pharmaceuticals or life sciences, candidates are usually required to have a degree in these areas.

² These jobs require creating legal contents for other lawyers or the general public within companies or law firms, in which they differ from teaching or academic jobs at universities or research centres.

At the same time, we saw new laws and quasi-law jobs being created, albeit not exactly the ones predicted by Susskind. Moreover, all of the new and future legal and quasi-legal jobs, require mastering different disciplines and skills.

Currently, law schools do not prepare their graduates for hybrid roles in which a legal degree may constitute a competitive advantage but is not a *sine qua non*-requirement (quasi-legal jobs). Moreover, our research suggests training for most of these new hybrid roles is either provided in-house by companies or by professional education centres, which typically issue certificates based on standardized procedures and best practices but that are not of the formal higher education sectors (law or business schools). We contend that business schools are in a good position to provide this type of education, should they decide so. Training new hybrid legal profiles, such as COs, LOMs, CMs, etc., does not imply entering into direct competition with law schools, whose main role is, for the moment, to educate law graduates for jobs in which the law degree is a *sine qua non-requirement*, usually due to legal constraints. Rather, business school can complement the legal education of some law graduates, expanding their knowledge, skills and employability horizons. At the same time, business schools can prepare business graduates for some jobs that require some legal expertise, but not a law degree.

We believe business schools have a distinct advantage in providing high-quality hybrid education for several reasons. Firstly, business schools operate within an international educational market, allowing graduates from top institutions in the US or Europe to compete for similar jobs worldwide. This global exposure enables business schools to offer an education that is tailored for a global marketplace. Secondly, top business schools often hold prestigious accreditations, such as the so-called *Triple Crown*,¹ which assures students and employers of the quality of education provided (Akerlof, 1970). Thirdly, business schools have a diverse faculty, encompassing all the necessary expertise to teach the varied subjects required for educating hybrid legal profiles, combining hard sciences (such as math and finance) and social sciences (such as marketing and negotiation). Lastly, business schools maintain close contact with the business world and potential employers through extensive networks and internship agreements.

The chart below summarises how the new lawyer's jobs proposed by Susskind and the current quasi-legal positions demanded by the market align with the competencies that business schools can already provide (Table 2).

¹ Comprising the Association of MBA's (AMBA), the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB) and the EQUIS accreditations.

New jobs for lawyers according to Richard Susskind	Additional/complementary competencies and skills (non-legal)
Legal Design Thinker	Design Thinking, Legal Design
Legal Knowledge Engineer	Knowledge Management
Legal No-coder	No-coding, Low-coding, Management of Information Systems
Legal technologist	Technology Management
Legal Hybrid (stricto sensu)	Economics (lawyer-economist), Management (lawyer-manager)
Legal Process Analyst	Process Management, Supply Chain Management, Logistics
Legal Project Manager	Project Management
Legal Data Scientist	Data Science
Legal Data visualizer	Data Visualisation
R&D worker	R&D Management, Innovation Management
Digital Security Guard	Privacy, Cybersecurity
ODR Practitioner	Dispute Resolution/ODR Management, Dispute Prevention, Conflict Management, Negotiation, Mediation
Moderator	Open-sourcing, Moderating Skills, Communication Skills
Legal Management Consultant	Management Consulting, Change Management, Consulting Skills
Legal Risk Manager	Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Risk Management
Hybrid legal profiles/quasi-legal business jobs already requested by the job market	Additional/complementary competencies and skills (non-legal)
Compliance Officer/Manager	Risk Management, Risk Matrix, Compliance Program Design, Auditing, Data Protection, Ethics
Contract Manager	Contract Management, Contract Lifecycle, Legal Design, Negotiation, Ethics
Data Protection Officer/Manager	Management of Information Systems, Data Analytics, Cybersecurity
Regulatory Affairs/Policy Manager	Public Relations, Lobbying
Managing Partner (Law Firm)	General Management, Marketing, Brand Management, Finance, Communication, Negotiation, Strategic Planning, Knowledge Management
Legal Operations Manager	Project Management, Business Intelligence, Finance, Knowledge Management, Strategic Planning
Licensing/Brand Managers	Brand Management, Communication, Negotiation
Legal Project Management	Project Management, Communication, Negotiation
Legal Knowledge Management	Knowledge Management

Table 2: New jobs for lawyers according to Richard Susskind

Thus, business schools could leverage their competitive advantages in three significant ways. Firstly, they could offer specialized training in non-legal areas to law graduates, to become competitive in new hybrid legal positions where a law degree is not determinant. Secondly, business schools can provide legal education to business graduates, preparing them for quasi-legal roles in the business world, such as COs, CMs, LOMs, etc., where a law degree is not required.

Regarding collaboration with other institutions, such as law schools and professional training bodies, business schools could pursue strategies to offer double degrees and provide access to third-party professional certifications valued by the market. Joint degrees and master's programs, such

as dual bachelor's degrees in law and management,¹ or law and economics, and master's degrees like JD/MBA² or DU/³LLM/MBA, already exist. However, these programs tend to be too generalistic, merely juxtaposing legal and business curricula. This approach may not be ideal. These programs should be revamped and updated to provide specific training for the new hybrid roles described above. Business schools could and should collaborate with other institutions, such as law schools and professional training bodies, to provide added value to their students and avoid being perceived as competitors.

As *Big Law* firms operate like multinational service companies, experienced lawyers and managing partners need managerial education too. Specialised MBAs or EMBA, executive education programs and in-house training within law firms could cater to this niche, particularly in international legal hubs, like Paris. Equally important, law graduates need entrepreneurial education, particularly to develop *legaltech* startups. Law schools typically do not prepare lawyers to be entrepreneurs, and business graduates often lack the legal acumen needed to launch this type of venture, yet such a profile is absolutely essential for the future of law (Katz, 2014). It is important to note that a law professor at a business school should adopt a different approach compared to those teaching at law schools, focusing on proactive legal strategies rather than reactive ones, highlighting interdisciplinarity and situating legal analysis within a business context. Additionally, they should teach how to use the legal system to gain a competitive edge in managerial decision-making. However, a comprehensive exploration of this topic warrants a separate discussion.

Conclusion

In this brief essay, we have attempted to demonstrate that the legal profession and legal roles will likely undergo significant transformations in the coming years, driven by diverse factors, such as technological change, market pressure and increased interdisciplinarity in education. Susskind posits that new legal hybrid jobs will be needed in the future. However, he does not specify where the education for these hybrid jobs will be provided. We believe business schools are in an advantageous position to provide the education legal hybrids need today.

We have distinguished between hybrid legal profiles that require a legal degree and quasi-legal jobs that do not. Business schools can cater to both profiles by offering managerial education for the former and tailored, business-oriented legal education for the latter.

Due to their internationalisation, accreditation system, diverse faculty, and close ties to the business world, business schools are ideally positioned to shape the future of hybrid legal education that the job market already demands.

¹ For instance, in France, the *Business Law & Management* double degree between EDHEC and *Université Catholique de Lille*: <https://www.fld-lille.fr/formation/business-law-management/>.

² A selection of 15 JD/MBA programs can be found here: <https://www.inspirafutures.com/blog/top-15-jd-mba-programs>.

³ For instance, in France, the *Université de Lyon's DU LL.M - MBA management stratégique des risques et droit des affaires*, which specifically prepares students for a CO career: <https://seg.univ-lyon2.fr/diplome-universitaire/ll-mba-management-strategique-des-risques-et-droit-des-affaires>.

Bibliographie

- AKERLOF G. A. (1970), The Market for “Lemons”: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84 (3), p. 488-500.
- BARKAN S. E. . (2024), *Law and Society: An Introduction*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Law-and-Society-An-Introduction/Barkan/p/book/9781032264813>.
- BARTON T. D., HAAPIO H., HAZARD J. G. & PASSERA, S. (2021), Legal Innovation in Contracting, and Beyond: Merging Design and Technology Tools for the Information Age. *Mapping Legal Innovation*, p. 159–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47447-8_8.
- BECKER G. S. (1974), *Essays in the economics of crime and punishment* (Human behavior and social institutions), In *NBER*, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- BERGER-WALLISER G., & ØSTERGAARD K. (2012), *Proactive Law in a Business Environment*, In *undefined*. WDJØF Publishing, Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.
- BERGER-WALLISER G. & SHRIVASTAVA P. (2014), “Beyond Compliance: Sustainable Development, Business, and Proactive Law”, *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 46.
- BIRD R. & PARK S. (2017), Turning Corporate Compliance Into Competitive Advantage. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law*, 19(2). <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jbl/vol19/iss2/2>.
- BOSCH G. S. (2020), “Deconstructing Myths about Interdisciplinarity”, *European Journal of Legal Education*, 1(1), 27–48. <https://www.ejle.eu/index.php/EJLE/article/view/4>.
- BREAUX T. D., VAIL M. W. & ANTON A. I. (2006), “Towards regulatory compliance: Extracting rights and obligations to align requirements with regulations”, *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering*, 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RE.2006.68>.
- BROWN L. M. (1950a), *Manual of Preventive Law*. Prentice-Hall. https://books.google.fr/books/about/Manual_of_Preventive_Law.html?id=jL2fQAAACAAJ&redir_esc=y.
- BROWN L. M. (1950b), *Preventive Law*, Greenwood Press.
- CALABRESI G. (1970), *The Cost of Accidents: A Legal and Economic Analysis*, Yale University Press.
- CALABRESI G. & MELAMED A. D. (1972), Property rules, liability rules, and inalienability: one view of the cathedral. *Harvard Law Review*, 85(6), 1089. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1340059>.
- CALAMANDREI P. (1921), *Troppi avvocati!* La Voce.

- CLOVER S.-J. (2013), *The C-suite CIPO. IAM.*
- COASE R. H. (1937), “The Nature of the Firm”, *Economica*, 4(16), p. 386-405.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-0335.1937.TB00002.X>
- COASE R. H. (1960), “The Problem of Social Cost”, *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 3, p. 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1086/466560>.
- COOTER R. (2011), *Maturing into Normal Science: The Effect of Empirical Legal Studies on Law and Economics. University of Illinois Law Review*,
<https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/unilllr2011&id=1485&div=55&collection=journals>
- COOTER R. D. & ULEN T. (1988), *Law and Economics*, Longman.
- DESTEFANO M. B. (2014a), “Compliance and Claim Funding: Testing the Borders of Lawyers’ Monopoly and the Unauthorized Practice of Law”, *Fordham Law Review*, 82, 2961.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-028730-0.50008-2>.
- DESTEFANO M. B. (2014b), “Creating a Culture of Compliance: Why Departmentalization May Not Be the Answer”, *Hastings Business Law Journal*, 10(1), p. 71–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1214/AOMS/1177705148>.
- DESTEFANO M. B. (2016), “The Chief Compliance Officer”, *The Practice, Harvard Law School Center on the Legal Profession*. <https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/the-compliance-movement/the-chief-compliance-officer>.
- DESTEFANO M. B. (2019), “Innovation: A New Key Discipline for Lawyers and Legal Education”. In *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Elsevier BV.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3411020>.
- DIMATTEO L. A. (2010), “Strategic Contracting: Contract Law as a Source of Competitive Advantage”, *American Business Law Journal*, 47(4), p. 727–794.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1744-1714.2010.01108.X>.
- DURKHEIM E. (1893), *De la division du travail social*. Félix Alcan.
<https://www.librairiedalloz.fr/livre/9782130619574-de-la-division-du-travail-social-8e-edition-emile-durkheim/>.
- ERNST & YOUNG (2023), *AI Anxiety in Business Survey*.
https://www.ey.com/en_us/consulting/businesses-can-stop-rising-ai-use-from-fueling-anxiety
- FAWCETT J. (2013), “Thoughts About Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary, and Transdisciplinary Research”, <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0894318413500408>, 26(4), p. 376–379.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0894318413500408>.

- GAROUPA N. & ULEN T. S. (2007), “The Market for Legal Innovation: Law and Economics in Europe and the United States”, *Alabama Law Review*, 59. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/bamalr59&id=1567&div=49&collection=journals>.
- GILSON R. J. (1998), “Lawyers as Transaction Cost Engineers”, In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics and the Law* (p. 1166–1172). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-74173-1_219.
- GORDLEY J. (2014), *The jurists: a critical history*, Oxford University Press.
- HAAPIO H. (2006), “Introduction to Proactive Law: A Business Lawyer’s View”, In *A Proactive Approach, Scandinavian Studies in Law* (Vol. 49). Stockholm Institute for Scandinavian Law. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284027387_Introduction_to_Proactive_Law_A_Business_Lawyer’s_View.
- HAAPIO H., BARTON T. D. & COMPAGNUCCI M. C. (2021), “Legal design for the common good: proactive legal care by design”, *Legal Design: Integrating Business, Design and Legal Thinking with Technology*, 56–81. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839107269.00011>.
- HARRISON S. S., SULLIVAN P. H. & DAVIS J. L. (2012), *Edison in the boardroom revisited: how leading companies realize value from their intellectual assets*. Wiley. <https://www.oreilly.com/library/view/edison-in-the/9781118170120/>.
- HAYDEN G. M. & ELLIS S. E. (2006), “Law and Economics after Behavioral Economics”, *University of Kansas Law Review*, 55, <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ukalr55&id=639&div=22&collection=journals>
- HELMANE I. & BRIŠKA I. (2019), “What is Developing Integrated or Interdisciplinary or Multidisciplinary or Transdisciplinary Education in School?”, *Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology “Signum Temporis,”* 9(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1515/SIGTEM-2017-0010>.
- HOLMES O. W. Jr. (1897), *The Path of the Law*. Martino Fine Books.
- KATZ D. M. (2014), “The MIT School of Law - A Perspective on Legal Education in the 21st Century”, *University of Illinois Law Review*, 2014. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/unilllr2014&id=1451&div=&collection=>.
- KHONG D. W. K. (2020), “The Future of Lawyers as Transaction Cost Engineers”, In *Legal Education and Legal Traditions: Selected Essays* (p. 15–26). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50903-3_2.
- KURZWEIL R. (2005), *The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*, Penguin Publishing Group. <https://books.google.com.ar/books?id=9FtnppNpsT4C>.

- LA PORTA R., LOPEZ-DE-SILANES F., SHLEIFER A. & VISHNY, R. W. (1998), “Law and Finance”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(6), 1113–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1086/250042>.
- MAINE H. S. (1861), *Ancient law, its connection with the early history of society and its relation to modern ideas*. John Murray. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001748004>.
- MARZETTI M. (2011), “IP Education – what next? A view from the Southern Cone”, *WIPO Magazine*, https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2011/05/article_0008.html.
- MATHIS K. (2013), *Law and Economics in Europe: Foundations and Applications*, Springer Netherlands.
- MURGIA M. (2023), “Transformers: The Google scientists who pioneered an AI revolution”, *Financial Times*, <https://www.ft.com/content/37bb01af-ee46-4483-982f-ef3921436a50>.
- OROZCO D. (2021), “Strategically astute contracting: The Ticketmaster case study”, *Business Horizons*, 64(2), p. 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BUSHOR.2020.11.003>.
- PAULSON K. J. (2021), “Mediation in the COVID-19 Era: Is Online Mediation Here to Stay?”, *Southwestern Law Review*, 51. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/swulr51&id=150&div=&collection=>
- POSNER R. A. (1972), *Economic Analysis of Law*, Little, Brown.
- POSNER R. A. (1975), “The Economic Approach to Law”, *Texas Law Review*, 53. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/journal_articles/1882.
- POSNER R. A. (1987), “The Decline of Law as an Autonomous Discipline: 1962–1987”, *Harvard Law Review*, 100, p. 761–780. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1341093>.
- POSNER R. A. (2009), *Law and Literature*. Harvard University Press. https://books.google.com.ar/books?id=_grzG3CUSikC.
- ROSTAIN T. (2006), “The Emergence of “Law Consultants.””, *Fordham Law Review*, 75(3), <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol75/iss3/12>.
- SACCÒ P. (2021), “100 anni dopo il saggio Troppi avvocati di Calamandrei. Che avvocati servono in Italia?”, *Avvenire.It*, <https://www.avvenire.it/economia/pagine/che-avvocati-servono-in-italia>.
- SARAT A., ANDERSON M. & FRANK C. O. (2009), “Law and the Humanities: An Introduction”, In *Law and the Humanities: An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511657535>.
- SUNSTEIN C. R. (2000), *Behavioral Law and Economics*. Cambridge University Press.

- SUSSKIND D. (2020), *A world without work: technology, automation, and how we should respond*, Metropolitan Books.
- SUSSKIND R. E. (1998), *The future of law : facing the challenges of information technology*, Oxford University Press.
- SUSSKIND R. E. (2008), *The End of Lawyers? Rethinking the Nature of Legal Services*, Oxford University Press.
- SUSSKIND R. E. (2023), *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future* (3rd ed.), Oxford University Press.
- SUSSKIND R. E. & SUSSKIND D. (2015), *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts*. Oxford University Press.
- TAMANAH B. Z. (2012), *Failing law schools*. University of Chicago Press.
- TEUBNER G. (1988), *Autopoietic Law: a New Approach to Law and Society*, w. de gruyter. <https://books.google.com/books?id=fq86iejy1dgc>.
- TEUBNER G. (1993), *Law as an Autopoietic System*. Blackwell Publishing, <https://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23894>.
- THE EMERGENCE OF COMPLIANCE (2016), Harvard Law School Center on the Legal Profession, <https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/the-compliance-movement/the-emergence-of-compliance/>.
- UNGER R. M. (1986), *The Critical Legal Studies Movement*.
- VAGO STEVEN & BARKAN S. E. (2018), *Law and Society*, Routledge.
- WALLER R., WALLER J. HAAPIO H., CRAG G. & MORRISSEAU S. (2016), Cooperation through clarity: Designing simplified contracts. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/2055563616668893*, 2(1-2), p. 48-68, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2055563616668893>.
- WEBER M. & TRIBE K. (2019), "Economy and Society: A New Translation", In *Max Weber Studies* (Vol. 19, Issue 2), p. 965-967, Harvard University Press.
- WILD J. (2007), *Digging deeper into the CIPO role*. IAM. <https://www.iam-media.com/article/digging-deeper-the-cipo-role>.
- WILLIAMSON O. E. (1989), "Transaction cost economics", In *Handbook of Industrial Organization* (Vol. 1, p. 135-182). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X\(89\)01006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X(89)01006-X).
- YU P. K. (2006), Of Monks, Medieval Scribes, and Middlemen. *Mich. St. L. Rev, 1*, Available at: <https://scholarship.law.tamu.edu/facscholar/432>.