

Մանկավարժություն և դասավանդման մեթոդիկա

Ashot Hayrapetyan

Doctor of Law, Associate Professor

Email: hayrapetyan.ashot@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5937-8185

DOI: 10.53614/18294952-2026.1-194

THE APPLICATION OF MODERN TECHNOLOGIES IN THE METHODOLOGY OF JUDGES' CONTINUOUS TRAINING

Over the past two decades, the continuous training of judges has undergone a paradigmatic shift from a lecture-centred approach towards participant-centred adult learning. This article examines how modern technologies—namely, learning management systems, videoconferencing, multimedia content, simulations, immersive environments, and artificial intelligence—may be integrated into the methodology of judicial training without compromising the principles of andragogy. The analysis is theoretical and is based on the European and international normative-methodological framework for judicial training, foundational scholarship on adult learning, and peer-reviewed research in educational technology, including studies originating at Harvard University. The novelty of this contribution resides in the systematic mapping of specific technological instruments across the four stages of the judicial training cycle (needs assessment, design, delivery, and evaluation) and in the derivation of selection criteria based on the principles of adult learning, as opposed to existing literature which treats e-learning in judicial education in more generic terms. Findings include the development of a step-by-step approach to integrating technology, the examination of the dual character of artificial intelligence as both an object and an instrument of judicial education, and implementation principles addressing matters of confidentiality, judicial independence, and the digital divide. These findings are of direct practical relevance to judicial training institutions.

Key words: judicial training, andragogy, educational

technology, e-learning, blended learning, artificial intelligence, training cycle, judicial education.

Introduction

The education of the judiciary occupies a significant position within the field of professional learning. It is aimed at highly qualified adults holding high degrees of public authority, whose time is severely constrained and whose professional culture attaches paramount importance to autonomy, legal reasoning and doctrinal precision. Judicial training institutions have accordingly internalised the proposition that judges, as adult professional learners, do not learn in the same manner as students. The approach to learning for these professionals requires relevance, immediacy of application and due regard for professional experience (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2015). At the same time, the implementation of electronic case management, remote hearings, digital evidence, and the increased use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in court administration and legal research are rapidly reshaping the judiciary's professional environment (UNESCO, 2025).

These two developments raise a single methodological question: how should modern technologies be applied within the system of judges' continuous training to reinforce, rather than hinder, the adult learning principles on which contemporary judicial education rests? The question is by no means rhetorical. Based on findings from European surveys of judicial training institutions, the adoption of technological tools is increasing rapidly, yet their distribution remains uneven. The majority of institutions already utilise online learning platforms, produce interactive digital content, and deploy online assessment tools. The shift towards digital infrastructure has been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, forcing many judicial academies to transition from residential seminars into distance and blended formats within an exceptionally short timeframe (EJTN, 2020). However, despite these developments, the methodological guidance continues to lag behind the infrastructure (EJTN, 2026).

The present article addresses the aforementioned question across three categories of work. The first is the European and international normative-methodological framework of judicial training, set out in the handbooks and guidelines of the European Judicial Training Network concerning training methodology, distance learning and evaluation (EJTN, 2016; 2017; 2020). The second category includes the foundational literature on adult learning, namely, andragogy, experiential learning, and transformative learning (Knowles, 1980; Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1991). The third is the peer-reviewed literature on technology-enhanced education, with a primary focus on research conducted at Harvard University on case-method teaching, peer instruction, immersive learning, and adult development (Crouch and Mazur, 2001, pp. 970–977; Dede, 2009, pp. 66–69; Kegan and Lahey, 2009; Nohria, 2021). The central thesis advanced in this paper is that technology in judicial training is not an end in itself but a tool to amplify methodology. Each technological instrument must be tied to a specific stage of the judges' training

cycle and justified by the adult learning principle which it aims to serve.

Theoretical Basis

The approach to the research under review is therefore based on the analysis and synthesis of three groups of sources, namely normative-methodological literature on judicial education, basic scientific literature on adult learning, and peer-reviewed scientific literature on technology-supported education. Each group of technologies will be analysed relative to the stages of the judicial education process and the criteria of andragogy, which must, therefore, first be set out.

The prevailing approach to professional training is andragogy, which is the art and science of facilitating adult learning. Knowles distinguished andragogy from pedagogy on the basis of six assumptions: that adults require knowledge of the reasons for their learning, they already bring to the process a substantial body of experience which functions as a learning resource; they are self-directing, their readiness to learn is directly tied to their social and professional roles; their approach to education is centred on problem solving rather than mere consumption of the subject, and their motivation is predominantly internal (Knowles, 1980; Merriam, 2001, pp. 3–14; Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2015). With respect to judges, these assumptions hold particularly true. European judicial training methodology expressly requires practice-oriented teaching formats, the results of which can be applied in the courtroom shortly after the training event, with immediacy of application as a defining criterion of quality (EJTN, 2016).

Three distinct but interrelated theories build upon this foundation. Experiential learning theory posits that learning occurs through a spiral process of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb, 1984), while Honey and Mumford (1992) added the idea of four individual learner types, including activist, reflector, theorist, and pragmatist, each of which the judicial trainer needs to satisfy within a homogenous professional and yet heterogeneous cognitive audience.

Transformative learning theory posits that adult learning entails critical reflection on one's own frames of reference (Mezirow, 1991; Merriam and Caffarella, 1999), which in essence is the core outcome that training in judicial ethics, bias, or conduct is intended to induce. Finally, Harvard scholarship on adult development warns that professional adults are frequently “immune to change”, a phenomenon involving unconscious commitments that prevent new behaviour despite conscious will (Kegan and Lahey, 2009). Content-delivery technology alone cannot overcome these commitments, but practice and reflection technologies can.

European judicial training methodology puts these theories into practice by adopting a cyclical approach to training management that involves identifying learning needs, designing, delivering, and evaluating a training program (EJTN, 2016; 2017). In this approach, each of these managerial aspects remains subordinate to the actual learning process undertaken by adult professionals. This subservience, therefore, becomes the criterion for evaluation adopted in this article: only tech-

nologies that enhance the learning process are included in the program. This same approach is implicit in the broader empirical literature. For example, a study involving 225 research papers indicated that active methods of learning were far superior to conventional lecture teaching in terms of success and failure (Freeman et al., 2014, pp. 8410–8415), and systematic evidence from problem-based learning showed that this method was associated with deep approaches to learning (Dolmans et al., 2016, pp. 1087–1112). The issue, therefore, is not whether a certain technology will be used; rather, it concerns whether its use will make the learning process more active, relevant and reflective.

It must be noted that the evidence of effectiveness cited herein originates predominantly in higher education and adjacent professional fields, and its transferability to judicial settings, although theoretically warranted, cannot be empirically verified in the present inquiry. The proposed model functions as a set of testable propositions. Future research should include empirical examinations, such as a quasi-experimental comparison between blended learning and conventional classroom learning for a specific continuing training program at a judicial academy, the assessment of knowledge transfer via delayed follow-up, and the evaluation of judges' receptiveness to using AI-based tools in their professional education. These studies will contribute to the understanding of the model's boundary conditions across different judicial systems.

Results: Technology Across the Stages of the Training Cycle Digitally Supported Needs Assessment

The first stage of the cycle is identifying genuine training needs. It is governed by the first principle of European judicial training methodology, which requires that any training programme must be needs-oriented (EJTN, 2016). The classical instruments utilised in this cycle, including questionnaires, interviews and focus groups addressed to judges, court presidents, trainers and training institutions, are each being transformed by digitalisation, supplemented by the analysis of higher-court decisions and trainers' reports.

Online survey tools make it possible for judicial training institutes to undertake needs assessment on an annual, rather than biannual, basis, to do so simultaneously in all jurisdictions and to keep an eye on their response rates, which is vital, since poor response rates affect the validity of the data on which the programming decisions are based. The use of branching questions enables specific questions to be asked depending on the respondent's role (judge vs court employee), all within a single tool, while automated data collection and aggregation shorten the analysis stage from months to mere days. The use of video conferencing allows interviewers and focus groups to be held virtually from any location, eliminating transportation costs. This becomes particularly significant in cases of geographically dispersed judiciaries. In addition to stated needs, technology opens a second, behavioural channel. The analytics derived from electronic case management systems and

appellate statistics can reveal issues and knowledge gaps that judges do not necessarily articulate, thereby complementing the analysis of higher-court jurisprudence, in accordance with the recommended European practice (EJTN, 2016). The methodological limitation is rooted in andragogy: while digital information can provide insight into the organisation's needs, it does not offer any clues about the participants' interests. It therefore cannot be used as a substitute for the introductory exchange in which the trainer clarifies needs and expectations with the participants in person, a prerequisite for the adult learner's self-directedness (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 2015).

Technology-Enhanced Course Design

The design phase converts the discovered needs into learning objectives, content, methods, and media, where the objective is normally stated in reference to Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive levels, from recall to evaluation (Bloom et al., 1956).

Technology reshapes design decisions in three respects. The first concerns the blended learning approach. Learning management systems (LMS) enable designers to distinguish between what requires face-to-face engagement and what can be achieved through asynchronous learning experiences. The knowledge-level objectives, such as legislation that has recently been passed, leading cases, and procedural changes, are all included in the pre-class e-modules, video presentations, and required readings, thereby reserving the limited face-to-face time for the higher-level objectives, such as analysis, evaluation, and professional conduct, which require human interaction. Research on blended learning demonstrates that, if properly designed, such a combination can significantly transform the process rather than merely be additive (Garrison and Kanuka, 2004, pp. 95–105). The analysis prepared for the U.S. Department of Education found blended formats to be, on average, albeit modestly, more effective than exclusively face-to-face interactions (Means et al., 2010). The “flipped classroom” approach has strong academic foundations. At Harvard, Eric Mazur developed peer instruction, a method in which participants study the basic material before class. At the same time, classroom time is used for conceptual questions, individual answers, peer discussion and collective reflection. Research has strongly supported that this method noticeably improves conceptual understanding (Crouch and Mazur, 2001, pp. 970–977). Applied to judicial training, the same approach would mean that judges first receive the doctrinal material in advance, for example, through a short recorded lecture on pre-trial detention standards. The seminar itself would then be used for practical work, for instance, an anonymous poll on a difficult hypothetical case, discussion in pairs, and a final group debriefing.

The second concerns the design of multimedia materials. The cognitive theory of multimedia learning provides evidence-based rules on how this must be structured, including the combination of words and graphics, the elimination of extraneous material, and the segmentation of content into learner-paced units that need to be applied to every slide, video, and e-module produced by a judicial

academy (Mayer, 2009). The third concerns the design of digital cases and simulations. The case method, which has been refined for over a century at Harvard, teaches judgment rather than doctrine. It teaches the capacity to make decisions under conditions of uncertainty and incomplete information (Nohria, 2021). An effective teaching case places the participants within a realistic scenario, presents a multitude of genuine perspectives and forces them to grapple with constraints and difficult choices (Derek Bok Center). The interdisciplinary literature points to similar design principles, namely relevance to the learner's practice, realism of the content, openness to interpretation, and a structure that forces the participant to make a decision (Kim et al., 2006, pp. 867–876; Herreid, 2011, pp. 31–40). Methodological literature also shows that analysing detailed and ambiguous real-life situations has particular value for developing reasoning and judgment (Eisenhardt, 1989, pp. 532–550; Yin, 2014). Technology can enhance such designs. Digital case files may incorporate scanned evidence, audio recordings of witness testimony, and procedural timelines, allowing the training material to reproduce the evidentiary complexity of a real-life case file in a way that a short written narrative cannot.

Technology in Training Delivery

Delivery constitutes the stage at which the trainer must act simultaneously as a provider of knowledge and as a facilitator of practice-oriented exchange among experienced professionals (EJTN, 2016). Technology multiplies the available delivery formats along a continuum extending from the fully residential to the fully remote.

Virtual classrooms and webinars demonstrated during the pandemic that interactive judicial training is capable of surviving the loss of physical co-presence, provided that the methodology is adapted rather than transplanted: abbreviated sessions, the deliberate employment of breakout rooms to reproduce small-group work, chat and polling functions to activate silent participants, and explicit ground rules for the online environment (EJTN, 2020).

Simulation-based formats derive even greater benefit. Online moot courts may be conducted by videoconference, with the allocation of roles, the exchange of documents, and the recording of hearings, with the recording itself serving as a feedback tool that enables participants to observe their own questioning technique and courtroom management (Kolb, 1984). The immersive technologies stand at the forefront of these developments. Research conducted at the Harvard Graduate School of Education has demonstrated that immersive interfaces, namely virtual and augmented reality, enhance the learning process through situated experience and the adoption of multiple perspectives, enabling forms of practice that are too rare, too costly, or too sensitive to be staged physically (Dede, 2009, pp. 66–69). Therefore, the potential applications of digital tools in judicial education are evident. Virtual courtroom scenarios for managing disruption or self-represented litigants, perspective-taking exercises in which the trainee experiences a hearing from the position of a vulnerable witness, and crisis simulations that no academy

could ethically recreate with living participants. Gamification techniques, such as those involving choices and time-bound decisions with instant consequences, could be successfully employed in problem-based learning favoured by adults. On the other hand, using these tools ensures that the participants make decisions, commit errors and draw lessons from them without any practical ramifications. This is consistent with the classical group dynamics theory, which regards psychological safety as a necessary precondition for risk-taking within a learning environment (Bion, 1961).

Digital Assessment and Evaluation

The cycle concludes with the assessment of learning and evaluation of the training. These are two operations which must be distinguished. The assessment gathers data concerning what the participants have learned, whereas evaluation passes judgment upon the value of the programme on the basis of that data (Hanna and Dettmer, 2004). Technology reinforces every element of this stage. The pre-test, conducted via online tools, operationalises diagnostic assessment by providing the instructor with information on trainees' knowledge levels before the training process begins. Response systems provide a continuous formative assessment process, which is congruent with the fact that the more often learners are assessed, the less test anxiety they experience and the more focused their attention becomes on the act of learning itself (Hanna and Dettmer, 2004).

Electronic portfolios enable future judges to accumulate evidence of their skill development through draft judgments, simulation recordings, and reflective journals for use in self- and peer assessment procedures, both of which have been well recognised as contributors to professional reflective practice (Boud, 1995).

Evaluation itself becomes more expansive and deeper as well. Digital reaction questionnaires increase response rates and enable longitudinal comparisons across training events. Learning analytics extracted from the LMS reveal whether certain courses were completed, abandoned, or revisited, thereby incorporating behavioural data alongside subjective satisfaction levels. Most importantly, modern technologies enable deferred evaluation, three or six months following the actual session, and assess the transfer of acquired skills to a real-world environment, an extent of evaluation previously impossible due to logistical issues of the past and actively encouraged by current European evaluation standards (EJTN, 2017). However, there is again a methodological issue. Data devoid of action is void. The value of evaluation lies in its ability to influence the future process of needs assessment and program design, something only human decisions can accomplish (EJTN, 2017).

Artificial Intelligence: A Dual Imperative for Judicial Training

Artificial intelligence occupies a position of particular significance as it enters judicial education in a dual capacity: both an object and an instrument of learning. As an object of study, artificial intelligence literacy has become a key training

requirement. AI is increasingly present in judges' work not only as evidential material but also as a component of litigant pleadings, court administration, and research; in response to this situation, substantial capacity-building efforts have been made, including most notably the UNESCO project entitled "Judges' Initiative," which has produced large-scale MOOCs on the subject of AI and the rule of law reaching tens of thousands of judicial officials in more than 160 nations worldwide, and guidelines on using AI systems in courts and tribunals in line with fundamental human rights considerations (UNESCO, 2025). The very format of such an initiative, a MOOC targeting an international judiciary, can be viewed as a showcase of technology-based training methodology.

As an instrument, AI affords judicial academies capabilities which map directly onto the training cycle. In needs assessment, natural language processing enables analysis of open-ended questionnaire responses and appellate decisions on a scale unattainable with manual coding. In design, generative tools may accelerate the drafting of hypotheticals, distractor answers and scenario variants — invariably subject to expert verification, since fabricated authority in a judicial training case constitutes not a pedagogical defect but a professional hazard. In delivery, AI-driven simulated parties may afford every trainee unlimited, patient practice in questioning or settlement dialogue. In assessment, adaptive testing adjusts the difficulty of items to the individual, in keeping with the andragogical premise that adults progress at their own pace. Each application, however, introduces the very risks that the substantive training warns against: bias in training data, opacity of outputs, and the confidentiality of judicial information processed by third-party systems. The methodological rule that follows is one of symmetry: a judicial academy ought to hold its own use of AI to the same standards of transparency, human oversight, and data protection that it teaches judges to demand of AI in the courtroom (UNESCO, 2025).

Discussion

What significance do these results have in relation to the question posed in the introduction, namely, the manner in which technologies ought to be applied to reinforce rather than hinder adult learning? The stage-by-stage mapping confirms the expectation derived from the theoretical basis: upon examination, every documented success of educational technology in the sources reviewed proves to be a success of andragogy delivered through technological means. Blended designs succeed because they protect contact time for experience-based, problem-centred interaction (Garrison and Kanuka, 2004, pp. 95–105; Means et al., 2010); peer instruction succeeds because it renders the reasoning of participants visible and social (Crouch and Mazur, 2001, pp. 970–977); immersive simulation succeeds because it supplies the concrete experience with which the experiential learning cycle commences (Kolb, 1984; Dede, 2009, pp. 66–69). The results accordingly correspond to, rather than contradict, the established theory of adult learning; the contribution of the present article resides in the systematic

transposition of this correspondence into the specific institutional architecture of judicial training.

At the same time, the judiciary is not a neutral domain for educational technology, and four concerns underlie the results. The first concerns confidentiality and security. Training materials constructed upon real cases, recorded simulations of judicial reasoning and needs-assessment data relating to individual judges are sensitive by their very nature; the platforms employed must accordingly satisfy data-protection standards exceeding those of generic corporate training, and guarantees of anonymity in digital questionnaires must be genuine rather than merely declaratory. The second concerns judicial independence. Learning analytics, which assesses the performance of individual judges in continuous training, can easily lead to a form of judicial evaluation conducted either by the executive branch or by higher judicial courts; the clear dividing line set forth in the European tradition where continuous training is not typically evaluated individually should be consciously redefined in the digital world where anything and everything is measurable (EJTN, 2016; 2017). The third concerns the digital divide and trainer capacity. European experience indicates that the binding constraint is ordinarily not infrastructure but trainers' competence, which is why training-of-trainers programmes now routinely incorporate modules on online facilitation and digital content creation (EJTN, 2020; 2026). The fourth concerns the fallacy of substitution. The gravest risk lies in employing technology to perform more cheaply what ought not to be performed at all, such as broadcasting lectures to passive remote audiences. This format has been established as inferior (Freeman et al., 2014, pp. 8410–8415).

Conclusion

Modern technologies do not alter the purpose of judicial training. They alter its reach. When properly placed within the training cycle, digital instruments transform needs assessment from periodic surveys into continuous, multi-source information databases, permit designers to reserve in-person interactions for complex objectives, they provide multiple avenues for the realistic, safe and repeated practice that can be accomplished via online simulations and immersion technologies, and they turn evaluation into a longitudinal, behavioural, and meaningful process. Artificial intelligence further accentuates these capabilities while also being an object of training itself.

The thread which runs through every stage is an andragogical discipline. The judge within a training room, whether physical or virtual, remains an experienced, self-directing and problem-centred adult, whose learning succeeds where it is relevant, applicable and respectful of experience, and fails where it is passive, abstract and imposed. Technology amplifies whichever methodology it is given. When applied to the lecture method, technology delivers an extended lecture; when applied to the participant-centred methodology that has emerged as a result of more than six decades of adult education research and the modern system of

judicial training programs based on this method, technology yields a judiciary with the capacity to learn at the same speed as its environment evolves. Thus, the challenge for the courts' training centres lies not in using technology but in integrating it into their methods, which ultimately amounts to training trainers to handle the new tool within an old methodology.

References

- Bion, W.R. (1961). *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bloom, B.S., Engelhart, M.D., Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H. and Krathwohl, D.R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Company.
- Boud, D. (1995). *Enhancing Learning Through Self-Assessment*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Crouch, C.H. and Mazur, E. (2001). Peer Instruction: Ten years of experience and results. *American Journal of Physics*, 69(9), pp. 970–977. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1374249>
- Dede, C. (2009). Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. *Science*, 323(5910), pp. 66–69. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167311>
- Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, *Teaching with Cases*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. <https://bokcenter.harvard.edu/cases>
- Dolmans, D.H.J.M., Loyens, S.M.M., Marcq, H. and Gijbels, D. (2016) Deep and surface learning in problem-based learning: a review of the literature. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 21(5), pp. 1087–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9645-6>
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), pp. 532–550. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385>
- European Judicial Training Network (EJTN). (2016). *Handbook on Judicial Training Methodology in Europe*. 2nd edn. Brussels: EJTN. <https://ejtn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Handbook-Judicial-training-methodology-in-Europe-2016.pdf>
- European Judicial Training Network (EJTN). (2017). *Guidelines for Evaluation of Judicial Training Practices*. Brussels: EJTN. <https://ejtn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Handbook-JTM-guidelines-for-evaluation-of-judicial-training-practices-2017.pdf>
- European Judicial Training Network (EJTN). (2020). *Judicial Training Methods – Distance Learning Handbook*. Brussels: EJTN. <https://ejtn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Handbook-Distance-learning-2020.pdf>
- European Judicial Training Network (EJTN). (2026). *State of Judicial Training in Europe*. Brussels: EJTN. https://ejtn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/EJTN_State-of-Judicial-Training-in-Europe2026_EN.pdf
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S.L., McDonough, M., Smith, M.K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H. and Wenderoth, M.P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), pp. 8410–8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
- Garrison, D.R. and Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001>

- Hanna, G.S. and Dettmer, P.A. (2004). *Assessment for Effective Teaching: Using Context-Adaptive Planning*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Herreid, C.F. (2011). Case study teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2011(128), pp. 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.466>
- Honey, P. and Mumford, A. (1992). *The Manual of Learning Styles*. Maidenhead: Peter Honey Publications.
- Kegan, R. and Lahey, L.L. (2009). *Immunity to Change: How to Overcome It and Unlock the Potential in Yourself and Your Organisation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Kim, S., Phillips, W.R., Pinsky, L., Brock, D., Phillips, K. and Keary, J. (2006). A conceptual framework for developing teaching cases: a review and synthesis of the literature across disciplines. *Medical Education*, 40(9), pp. 867–876. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02544.x>
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education.
- Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F. and Swanson, R.A. (2015). *The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*. 8th edn. London: Routledge.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mayer, R.E. (2009). *Multimedia Learning*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M. and Jones, K. (2010). *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf>
- Merriam, S.B. (2001). Andragogy and self-directed learning: Pillars of adult learning theory. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2001(89), pp. 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.3>
- Merriam, S.B. and Caffarella, R.S. (1999). *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide*. 2nd edn. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nohria, N. (2021). *What the case study method really teaches*. Harvard Business Review, 21 December. <https://hbr.org/2021/12/what-the-case-study-method-really-teaches>
- UNESCO. (2025). *Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/rule-law>
- Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 5th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Աշոտ Հայրապետյան

Իրավագիտության դոկտոր, դոցենտ

Էլ. փոստ՝ hayrapetyan.ashot@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5937-8185

ԺԱՄԱՆԱԿԱԿԻՑ ՏԵԽՆՈԼՈԳԻԱՆԵՐԻ ԿԻՐԱՌՈՒՄԸ ԴԱՏԱՎՈՐՆԵՐԻ ՇԱՐՈՒՆԱԿԱՆ ՎԵՐԱՊԱՏՐԱՍՏՄԱՆ ՄԵԹՈԴԱԲԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՄԵԶ

Վերջին երկու տասնամյակների ընթացքում դատավորների շարունակական վերապատրաստումը կրել է հայեցակարգային (պարադիգմային) փոփոխություն՝ դասախոսակենտրոն մոտեցումից անցում կատարելով մասնակիցակենտրոն մեծահասակների ուսուցմանը: Սույն հոդվածը ուսումնասիրում է, թե ինչպես կարող են ժամանակակից տեխնոլոգիաները, մասնավորապես՝ ուսուցման կառավարման համակարգերը, տեսակոնֆերանսները, մուլտիմեդիական բովանդակությունը, սինուլյացիաները, իմերսիվ միջավայրերը և արհեստական բանականությունը, ինտեգրվել դատավորների շարունակական վերապատրաստման մեթոդաբանության մեջ՝ առանց անդրագոգիկայի սկզբունքները խախտելու:

Վերլուծությունը տեսական բնույթ ունի և հիմնված է դատավորների վերապատրաստման եվրոպական և միջազգային նորմատիվամեթոդական շրջանակի, մեծահասակների ուսուցման հիմնարար տեսությունների, ինչպես նաև կրթական տեխնոլոգիաների վերաբերյալ գրախոսվող գիտական հետազոտությունների վրա, ներառյալ՝ Հարվարդի համալսարանում իրականացված ուսումնասիրությունները:

Հոդվածի գիտական նորույթը կայանում է դատավորների վերապատրաստման ցիկլի չորս փուլերի՝ կարիքների գնահատման, նախագծման, իրականացման և գնահատման, հետ կապված կոնկրետ տեխնոլոգիական գործիքների համակարգված քարտեզագրման, ինչպես նաև դրանց ընտրության չափանիշների՝ մեծահասակների ուսուցման սկզբունքներից բխեցման մեջ՝ ի տարբերություն առկա գրականության, որտեղ դատավորների կրթության ոլորտում էլեկտրոնային ուսուցումը քննարկվում է առավել ընդհանուր ձևով:

Հետազոտության արդյունքները ներառում են տեխնոլոգիաների ինտեգրման փուլային մոտեցման մշակումը, արհեստական բանականության երկակի բնույթի ուսումնասիրությունը՝ որպես դատավորների կրթության և առարկա, և գործիք, ինչպես նաև ներդրման այնպիսի սկզբունքների քննարկումը, որոնք վերաբերում են գաղտնիությանը, դատական անկախությանը և թվային անհավասարությանը: Ստացված արդյունքներն անմիջական գործնական նշանակություն ունեն դատավորների վերապատրաստում իրականացնող հաստատությունների համար:

Հիմնաբառեր. դատավորների վերապատրաստում, անդրագոգիկա, կրթական տեխնոլոգիաներ, էլեկտրոնային ուսուցում, խառը ուսուցում, արհեստական բանականություն, վերապատրաստման ցիկլ, դատական կրթություն:

Ашот Айрапетян
Доктор юридических наук, доцент
Эл. адрес: hayrapetyan.ashot@yahoo.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5937-8185

ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ В МЕТОДОЛОГИИ НЕПРЕРЫВНОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ СУДЕЙ

За последние два десятилетия система непрерывного обучения судей претерпела парадигмальный сдвиг, перейдя от лекционно-ориентированного подхода к ориентированному на участников обучению взрослых. Настоящая статья исследует, каким образом современные технологии, в частности системы управления обучением (Learning Management Systems, LMS), видеоконференцсвязь, мультимедийный контент, симуляции, иммерсивные среды и искусственный интеллект, могут быть интегрированы в методологию непрерывного обучения судей без нарушения принципов андрагогики.

Анализ носит теоретический характер и основывается на европейской и международной нормативно-методологической базе подготовки судей, фундаментальных исследованиях в области обучения взрослых, а также на рецензируемых научных исследованиях в сфере образовательных технологий, включая исследования, проведенные в Гарвардском университете.

Научная новизна статьи заключается в систематическом сопоставлении конкретных технологических инструментов с четырьмя этапами цикла обучения судей — оценкой потребностей, проектированием, реализацией и оценкой результатов, а также в выведении критериев их отбора на основе принципов обучения взрослых, в отличие от существующей литературы, где электронное обучение в сфере судебного образования рассматривается в более общем виде.

Результаты исследования включают разработку поэтапного подхода к интеграции технологий, анализ двойственной роли искусственного интеллекта как одновременно объекта и инструмента судебного образования, а также рассмотрение принципов внедрения, касающихся вопросов конфиденциальности, независимости судебной власти и цифрового неравенства. Полученные результаты имеют непосредственное практическое значение для учреждений, осуществляющих подготовку и непрерывное обучение судей.

Ключевые слова: подготовка судей, андрагогика, образовательные технологии, электронное обучение, смешанное обучение, искусственный интеллект, цикл обучения, судебное образование.

Հոդվածը խմբագրություն է ներկայացվել՝ 2026թ. փետրվարի 27-ին:
Հոդվածը հանձնվել է գրախոսման՝ 2026թ. ապրիլի 3-ին:
Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 2026թ. ապրիլի 29-ին: