ISSLP

Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

Review Article

Legal Realism and the Predictability of Judicial Decisions

Matthew Angelosanto[1*] iD

[1] Department of Legal Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

* Corresponding author email address: matangelosanto@uniroma.it

This review article explores the profound implications of legal realism on the predictability of judicial decisions, challenging the conventional notion that legal outcomes can be precisely anticipated through the application of statutes and precedents alone. Legal realism, advocating for a more nuanced understanding of the law, emphasizes the significance of external, social, and psychological factors in shaping judicial behavior. Through a comprehensive analysis of the literature, this article explores the origins and development of legal realism, its theoretical underpinnings, and the debates surrounding its contrast with legal formalism. It further examines the challenges in predicting judicial decisions, highlighting the influence of external factors, the intricacies of legal reasoning and discretion, and the inherent complexity and uncertainty of the law. The implications of legal realism extend to legal education, practice, policy, and reform, advocating for an approach that integrates practical skills, embraces interdisciplinary insights, and fosters a reflective and context-aware practice of law. The review concludes with a discussion on future directions for research and exploration within the legal realist framework, underscoring the importance of empirical studies, technological advancements, and interdisciplinary approaches in enriching our understanding of the law and promoting justice and fairness. This article contributes to the ongoing dialogue on the impact of legal realism, offering insights that are essential for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers in navigating the complexities of modern legal systems.

Keywords: *Legal Realism, Judicial Predictability, Jurisprudence, Judicial Behavior, Legal Theory.*

How to cite this article:

Angelosanto, M. (2023). Legal Realism and the Predictability of Judicial Decisions. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 2*(3), 4-14. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.2.3.2

1. Introduction

Legal realism, a theory that challenges the notion of legal decision-making as a purely mechanical or formulaic process, asserts that judges' decisions are influenced by a myriad of extrajudicial factors, including personal biases, societal norms, and political pressures. The predictability of judicial decisions is of paramount importance to the legal community and society. It underpins the principle of legal certainty, ensuring that the law is a reliable guide for conduct and a stable basis for expectations. However, the tenets of legal realism suggest that this predictability is inherently compromised by the subjective elements of judicial decision-making. The pioneering work of Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011) underscores the influence of extraneous factors, such as the time of day and the judges' hunger levels, on judicial rulings, thereby challenging traditional notions of judicial objectivity and predictability (Danziger et al., 2011).

Further complicating this landscape is the role of personal values and external societal influences on legal judgments, as explored by Cahill-O'Callaghan (2013) and Tampubolon, Situmeang, and Saragih (2023). Their research illuminates how judges' personal convictions and the broader socio-political context can subtly, yet significantly, sway judicial outcomes. This insight aligns with the legal realist perspective that law is not a closed

system but is deeply intertwined with society (Cahill-O'Callaghan, 2013; Tampubolon et al., 2023).

The advent of machine learning and natural language processing offers new avenues to analyze and predict judicial behavior, as highlighted by Rosili et al. (2021) and Katz, Bommarito, and Blackman (2017). These technological advancements provide empirical evidence supporting the legal realist assertion that judicial decision-making extends beyond the rigid application of legal rules. However, while these methods offer innovative tools to model and predict judicial outcomes, they also underscore the complexity and multifaceted nature of judicial reasoning, further evidencing the challenges in achieving absolute predictability (Katz et al., 2017; Rosili et al., 2021).

The influence of legal realism extends beyond academic discourse, affecting the legitimacy and public perception of the judiciary. Gibson and Caldeira (2011) address the potential repercussions of legal realism's tenets on the perceived legitimacy of the U.S. Supreme Court, suggesting that widespread recognition of extrajudicial influences could undermine the Court's authority. This perspective invites a broader discussion on the balance between acknowledging the realistic influences on judicial decision-making and maintaining the judiciary's integrity and public confidence (Gibson & Caldeira, 2011).

This article aims to navigate these complex waters, offering a comprehensive examination of how legal realism impacts the predictability of judicial decisions. By integrating empirical research, theoretical insights, and the latest advancements in predictive modeling, it seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the interplay between judicial behavior and legal predictability. In doing so, it contributes to the ongoing dialogue on enhancing transparency, fairness, and efficiency in the legal system, while respecting the inherent human elements of judicial decision-making.

As we embark on this inquiry, it is crucial to recognize that the quest for predictability in judicial decisions is not merely an academic exercise but a fundamental concern that touches the core of legal practice, policy-making, and the broader quest for justice and fairness in society. Through this exploration, the article endeavors to offer valuable insights for legal scholars, practitioners, and policymakers, fostering a more informed and

reflective engagement with the principles of legal realism and the realities of judicial decision-making.

2. Methods and Materials

2.1. Literature Search Strategy

The initial phase involved an exhaustive literature search aimed at identifying relevant scholarly articles, book chapters, conference papers, and legal opinions. Key databases such as Westlaw, LexisNexis, JSTOR, PubMed, Google Scholar, and SSRN were searched using a combination of keywords and phrases pertinent to legal realism, judicial predictability, judicial decision-making, and related concepts. The search was not confined to a specific time frame to capture the full breadth of the discourse, acknowledging that the roots of legal realism extend back to the early 20th century.

2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To ensure the relevance and quality of the literature reviewed, explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria were established. Included works had to (a) explicitly discuss legal realism, judicial decision-making, and/or predictability of judicial outcomes; (b) present empirical data, theoretical analyses, or systematic reviews on the topic; and (c) be published in peer-reviewed academic journals, reputable law reviews, or by academic presses. Excluded were non-peer-reviewed articles, opinion pieces without empirical or analytical grounding, and works not directly addressing the core themes of legal realism or judicial predictability.

2.3. Literature Selection and Screening

The literature identified through the search strategy was subjected to a screening process involving two levels of review. The first level entailed a review of titles and abstracts to assess their alignment with the inclusion criteria. The second level involved a full-text review to confirm the relevance and quality of the content. This two-tiered screening ensured that only the most pertinent and scholarly rigorous materials were included in the final analysis.

2.4. Data Extraction and Thematic Categorization

For each selected work, data were extracted on key variables, including the author(s), year of publication,

study design, theoretical framework, main findings, and specific relevance to legal realism and judicial predictability. This information was organized in a standardized format to facilitate comparison and synthesis. Following data extraction, the literature was categorized thematically, grouping works by shared topics or perspectives, such as empirical evidence of extrajudicial influences, theoretical contributions to legal realism, and technological advancements in predicting judicial behavior.

2.5. Synthesis of Findings

The final stage involved a critical synthesis of the literature, aiming to draw out overarching themes, identify consensus and divergences in the findings, and highlight gaps in the existing knowledge. This synthesis not only provides a comprehensive overview of the state of research on legal realism and judicial predictability but also sets the stage for discussing implications, challenges, and avenues for future research.

2.6. Quality Assessment

To ensure the integrity of the review, a quality assessment of the included literature was conducted, evaluating the methodological rigor, theoretical grounding, and relevance of each work. This assessment informed the synthesis of findings, ensuring that conclusions drawn were based on robust and credible evidence.

3. Historical Overview of Legal Realism

3.1. Origins and Development

The origins and development of legal realism can be traced back to the early 20th century, emerging as a critical response to the prevailing legal formalism of the time. Legal realism challenged the notion that judicial decisions could be entirely deduced from objective principles of law applied mechanically to the facts of a case. Instead, legal realists argued that the law is not a fixed set of rules but a dynamic and evolving system shaped by social, economic, and psychological factors that influence judicial decision-making.

This movement found fertile ground in the United States, where it began to take shape in the 1920s and 1930s, primarily through the works of scholars associated with

the Yale and Columbia law schools. Legal realism was partly a reaction to the complexities of the industrialized society of the 20th century, which exposed the limitations of a purely formalist approach to law. The realists posited that the law must be understood not just as a system of rules but as a social institution that reflects and affects the society in which it operates (Tumonis et al., 2013).

The development of legal realism was also influenced by the broader intellectual currents of the time, including pragmatism and the social sciences, which provided new methods and perspectives for understanding law in its social context. Legal realists sought to apply these insights to legal scholarship and practice, advocating for a more empirical and interdisciplinary approach to legal studies.

As a movement, legal realism was never monolithic; it encompassed a range of perspectives and methodologies. However, its core contention was that law cannot be separated from the realities of the judicial process and the broader social forces that shape legal outcomes. This perspective marked a significant departure from the abstract and deductive methods of legal formalism, setting the stage for the subsequent development of legal theory and practice.

3.2. Key Proponents and Theories

Legal realism was championed by a number of influential legal scholars who contributed significantly to its theoretical foundations and its application to legal education and practice. Among the most prominent figures were Karl Llewellyn, Roscoe Pound, and Jerome Frank, each of whom brought unique perspectives to the movement.

Karl Llewellyn, often regarded as one of the most influential legal realists, emphasized the importance of "law in action" as opposed to "law in books." Llewellyn argued that to truly understand the law, one must study how it operates in practice, including how laws are applied by the courts, interpreted by lawyers, and experienced by the public. This approach sought to bridge the gap between the theoretical constructs of the law and its practical realities (Dyèvre, 2010).

Roscoe Pound, another key figure, focused on the social dimensions of law. He advocated for a "sociological jurisprudence" that considered the effects of legal decisions on society. Pound's work highlighted the need

for law to be responsive to social needs and changes, a view that underscored the realist critique of legal formalism's rigidity (Tumonis et al., 2013).

Jerome Frank took the realist critique further by questioning the certainty of legal reasoning itself. He introduced the concept of "legal skepticism," arguing that judicial decisions were often based on the personal biases and subjective judgments of judges, rather than on objective legal principles. Frank's work underscored the unpredictability of judicial decision-making and the role of judicial discretion (Timoshina & Kraevsky, 2021).

The theories proposed by these and other legal realists shared a common skepticism towards the deterministic models of legal formalism. They argued that the law was not a closed system of logically deducible rules but was deeply intertwined with the social, economic, and psychological contexts within which it operated. This perspective led to a more nuanced understanding of the law as a dynamic and context-dependent system, opening new avenues for legal research and practice that incorporated insights from the social sciences and emphasized the empirical study of legal phenomena.

3.3. Legal Realism vs. Formalism

The debate between legal realism and formalism revolves around fundamentally different conceptions of law and its role in society. Legal formalism, the dominant perspective before the rise of legal realism, posits that judicial decisions can and should be derived from applying objective legal principles and precedents to the facts of a case, with little to no consideration for the judge's personal biases or external societal factors. Formalists believe in a clear separation between law and morality, viewing the law as a self-contained system governed by its own rules and logic (Timoshina & Kraevsky, 2021).

Legal realism, on the other hand, challenges this notion by asserting that the law is not a set of abstract rules applied in a vacuum but is deeply influenced by the social, economic, and psychological contexts in which it operates. Realists argue that judges, being human, are inevitably influenced by their own experiences, values, and the broader social environment, leading to decisions that cannot be wholly predicted or explained by formal legal doctrines alone. This perspective emphasizes the importance of "law in action," focusing on how law is

applied and experienced in real-world situations, rather than the idealized "law in books" (Dyèvre, 2010).

A critical point of divergence between the two schools of thought lies in their approach to legal interpretation and the predictability of judicial decisions. Formalists contend that a rigorous application of legal principles ensures consistency and predictability in the law, which is essential for the rule of law and legal certainty. Realists, however, highlight the inherent uncertainty and flexibility in legal interpretation, suggesting that the predictability of judicial outcomes is limited by the variable nature of human judgment and the influence of external factors on decision-making processes. Empirical studies, such as those by Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011), lend support to the realist view by demonstrating how extraneous factors, even as seemingly trivial as the timing of a decision relative to a judge's meal times, can significantly impact judicial rulings (Danziger et al., 2011).

The legal realism vs. formalism debate extends beyond academic discourse, influencing legal education, judicial practice, and the development of legal theory. While formalism offers a model of legal reasoning that aspires to objectivity and predictability, realism provides a more nuanced understanding that acknowledges the complexity and contextual nature of legal processes. This acknowledgment has led to the incorporation of realist insights into various areas of law, encouraging a more pragmatic and interdisciplinary approach to legal studies and judicial decision-making.

In sum, the contrast between legal realism and formalism encapsulates a fundamental tension in legal theory between the ideal of law as a coherent and autonomous system and the reality of law as a human and social enterprise. This tension continues to shape contemporary legal thought, challenging scholars and practitioners to reconcile the demands of legal certainty with the complexities of human behavior and societal change.

4. Theoretical Framework

4.1. Principles of Legal Realism

Legal realism, as a jurisprudential philosophy, is anchored in several core principles that distinguish it from other legal theories, particularly legal formalism. These principles not only critique the prevailing legal

thought of its time but also propose a fundamentally different approach to understanding and practicing law.

1. The Law in Action Principle: One of the hallmark principles of legal realism is the emphasis on "law in action" versus "law in books." Legal realists argue that to truly understand the law, one must look beyond statutory texts, legal codes, and formal rules to see how law operates in real-world contexts. This principle underscores the belief that judicial decisions are shaped not just by legal precedents and statutes but by a myriad of social, psychological, and contextual factors. This perspective encourages an empirical approach to legal studies, where observation and analysis of legal practice provide deeper insights into the law than do theoretical or doctrinal studies alone (Tumonis et al., 2013).

2. The Judicial Discretion Principle: Legal realists assert that judicial discretion plays a significant role in legal decision-making. Contrary to the formalist view that judges merely apply objective legal principles to the facts before them, realists argue that judges make choices influenced by their personal experiences, beliefs, and the specific circumstances of each case. This principle acknowledges the inherent subjectivity and variability in judicial decisions, highlighting the impossibility of complete legal predictability (Tumonis et al., 2013).

3. The Social Influences Principle: Legal realism posits that the law is not an isolated system but is deeply intertwined with society. It contends that legal norms and decisions are influenced by prevailing social values, economic conditions, and political climates. This principle advocates for a broader, more interdisciplinary approach to legal analysis, incorporating insights from sociology, psychology, economics, and other fields to understand the law's role and impact within society (Dyèvre, 2010).

4. The Pragmatic Principle: Legal realism promotes a pragmatic approach to law, focusing on the practical effects of legal decisions rather than abstract legal theories or principles. This principle aligns with the movement's broader critique of formalism, arguing for legal analysis and practice that prioritize the real-world outcomes and implications of legal actions. It encourages judges and legal scholars to consider the broader consequences of legal rulings and to adapt the law to meet societal needs and realities (Timoshina & Kraevsky, 2021).

These principles collectively form the theoretical foundation of legal realism, offering a critique of traditional legal thought and a new paradigm for understanding the complexities of law and its function in society. By emphasizing the empirical, contextual, and pragmatic aspects of law, legal realism has significantly influenced legal scholarship and practice, challenging the legal community to reconsider the nature of law and its role in society.

4.2. Critiques and Counterarguments

While legal realism has profoundly influenced legal theory and practice, it has not been without its critics. The critiques of legal realism primarily revolve around its perceived relativism, skepticism towards legal predictability, and its approach to judicial discretion. Each critique is met with counterarguments by proponents of legal realism, illustrating the ongoing debate within legal philosophy.

1. Critique of Relativism: One of the main criticisms of legal realism is that it leads to a form of relativism, where laws become too flexible and subject to the whims of individual judges. Critics argue that this undermines the stability and predictability of the law, which are essential for a functioning legal system. The concern is that if judicial decisions are largely influenced by personal and external factors, then the rule of law is compromised in favor of the rule of men (Gibson & Caldeira, 2011).

Counterargument: Proponents of legal realism counter this critique by arguing that acknowledging the influence of external factors on judicial decisions does not negate the importance or the role of law; rather, it provides a more accurate and nuanced understanding of how legal decisions are made. They argue that realism does not advocate for unbridled judicial discretion but calls for a transparent acknowledgment of the factors that influence legal outcomes. This transparency, they claim, can lead to a more equitable and responsive legal system.

2. Skepticism Towards Legal Predictability: Critics of legal realism also express concerns about its skepticism regarding the predictability of legal decisions. They argue that predictability is essential for legal certainty and that realism's emphasis on the variability and context-dependence of legal decisions undermines confidence in the legal system (Danziger et al., 2011).

Counterargument: In response, legal realists maintain that their approach does not eliminate predictability but

rather seeks to base predictions on a more comprehensive set of factors, including those outside traditional legal doctrine. By integrating empirical research and interdisciplinary insights, legal realism aims to enhance the understanding and forecasting of judicial behavior, acknowledging the complexity and multifaceted nature of legal decision-making.

3. Approach to Judicial Discretion: Another critique centers on legal realism's perceived endorsement of broad judicial discretion, which critics argue could lead to inconsistency and bias in legal decisions (Timoshina & Kraevsky, 2021).

Counterargument: Legal realists counter this by highlighting that recognizing judicial discretion is not the same as endorsing arbitrariness. They argue that a nuanced understanding of discretion allows for better scrutiny and guidance of judicial decision-making processes. Realists advocate for judicial transparency and accountability, suggesting that an informed approach to discretion can contribute to more reasoned and just outcomes.

In conclusion, while legal realism faces significant critiques, its proponents offer robust counterarguments that defend the philosophy's contributions to a more realistic and comprehensive understanding of the law. The ongoing dialogue between critics and supporters of legal realism reflects the dynamic nature of legal theory and underscores the continued relevance of these debates in shaping contemporary legal thought and practice.

5. Challenges in Predicting Judicial Decisions

5.1. Influence of External Factors

One of the primary challenges in predicting judicial decisions within the framework of legal realism is the significant influence of external factors on judicial behavior. These factors, which range from societal norms and values to the personal characteristics and experiences of judges, introduce a level of unpredictability that complicates efforts to forecast judicial outcomes.

Societal Norms and Values: The legal realist perspective emphasizes that law does not operate in a vacuum but is deeply embedded within the social fabric. As societal norms and values evolve, they inevitably influence the law and its interpretation by judges. This dynamic

interaction between law and society means that changes in public opinion or shifts in cultural attitudes can have a profound impact on legal decisions, making them difficult to predict with certainty. For example, Cahill-O'Callaghan (2013) highlights how judges' personal values, which are shaped by the wider societal context, can affect their legal judgments, underscoring the role of societal values in shaping legal outcomes (Cahill-O'Callaghan, 2013).

Personal Characteristics of Judges: The individual characteristics of judges, including their personal beliefs, experiences, and even their psychological and physical states, can also significantly influence judicial decisions. Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011) provide compelling evidence of how extraneous factors, such as hunger, can affect judicial rulings, demonstrating the extent to which seemingly irrelevant personal factors can impact legal judgments. This finding illustrates the challenge of predicting judicial outcomes based solely on legal principles, as the personal characteristics and states of judges introduce an element of unpredictability (Danziger et al., 2011).

Economic and Political Pressures: Judicial decisions can also be influenced by broader economic and political pressures. Judges, as part of the larger political system, may be subject to the influence of political ideologies, economic conditions, and pressures from interest groups. These factors can subtly or overtly influence judicial behavior, further complicating the task of predicting legal outcomes based on legal doctrine alone (Rosili et al., 2021; Tampubolon et al., 2023).

The influence of external factors on judicial decisions underscores the limitations of traditional models of legal prediction, which often fail to account for the complex web of social, personal, and political influences that shape judicial behavior. Acknowledging and understanding these influences is crucial for developing more nuanced and realistic models of legal prediction, as advocated by legal realism. However, it also presents a significant challenge, as it requires an interdisciplinary approach that integrates insights from law, sociology, psychology, and political science, among other fields, to accurately capture the multifaceted nature of judicial decision-making.

5.2.   Legal Reasoning and Discretion

A central challenge in predicting judicial decisions lies in the intricacies of legal reasoning and the scope of judicial discretion. Legal realism posits that judicial decisions are not merely the outcome of applying clear, predetermined legal rules to the facts of a case. Instead, judges exercise a significant degree of discretion, navigating through complex legal principles, precedents, and statutes to arrive at a decision. This exercise of discretion, while necessary for addressing the nuances of individual cases, introduces variability and unpredictability into the legal system.

Variability in Legal Reasoning: Legal reasoning involves interpreting laws and precedents, which can vary significantly from one judge to another. This variability stems from differences in legal philosophy, interpretative methods, and the weight given to different sources of law. For instance, two judges might interpret the same statute or precedent in markedly different ways due to differing legal philosophies or priorities, leading to divergent outcomes in similar cases. This aspect of legal reasoning complicates the prediction of judicial decisions, as it introduces a subjective element that is difficult to quantify or predict.

Scope of Judicial Discretion: Judicial discretion is a fundamental feature of the legal system, allowing judges to adapt legal principles to the specific circumstances of each case. However, this discretion means that the application of the law is not entirely predictable. Judges must often balance conflicting interests, interpret broad legal standards, and fill gaps in the law, all of which require a degree of judgment that is inherently personal and variable. The extent of this discretion can vary widely depending on the area of law, the nature of the case, and the specific legal questions at issue, further complicating efforts to predict judicial decisions.

The Role of Precedent: While precedent is a cornerstone of common law systems, its application is not always straightforward. Deciding whether and how a precedent applies to a given case involves interpretation, which can be influenced by the judge's views on the relevance and authority of the precedent. Additionally, judges may distinguish a current case from a precedent on the basis of factual or legal nuances, leading to different outcomes even in cases that appear similar on the surface.

The challenges posed by legal reasoning and discretion highlight the limitations of predictive models that rely solely on legal rules and precedents. To more accurately forecast judicial decisions, it is necessary to account for the complex and often subjective process of legal reasoning. This requires not only a deep understanding of legal doctrine but also insights into how judges think and make decisions, including the psychological and cognitive processes that underlie judicial reasoning. Recognizing the central role of discretion and reasoning in judicial decision-making is essential for grappling with the unpredictability of legal outcomes and for developing more sophisticated approaches to legal prediction.

5.3.   Complexity and Uncertainty in Law

The inherent complexity and uncertainty in law present significant challenges to predicting judicial decisions, even beyond the influences of external factors and the nuances of legal reasoning and discretion. Legal realism underscores that the law is not a static set of rules but a dynamic system that evolves over time, influenced by changing social, economic, and political contexts. This dynamism, while necessary for the law to remain relevant and responsive, adds layers of complexity and unpredictability to judicial decision-making.

Dynamic Nature of Legal Norms: Legal norms and standards are not fixed; they evolve in response to new social realities, technological advancements, and shifts in public values. This continuous evolution means that legal outcomes that were predictable under one set of norms may become less so as those norms shift. For example, advancements in digital technology have raised new legal questions that existing laws were not designed to address, creating uncertainty in areas like privacy rights, intellectual property, and cybercrime. This evolving legal landscape challenges the ability to predict judicial decisions based on past rulings or established doctrines.

Interpretative Flexibility: The law often contains broad principles and open-textured norms that provide a general guide for conduct but leave considerable room for interpretation. This flexibility is necessary for the law to apply to a wide range of circumstances, but it also means that there is often no single "correct" interpretation of a legal rule. Judges must interpret these flexible norms in light of the specific facts of each case, leading to variability in how legal principles are applied. This interpretative flexibility introduces a level of

uncertainty that makes it difficult to predict judicial outcomes with high accuracy.

Conflicting Legal Principles: Legal systems frequently encompass conflicting principles and values that must be balanced against one another. Judges are often tasked with reconciling these conflicts, such as balancing the right to freedom of expression with the right to privacy. The outcome of such balancing acts can depend on the specific context of a case as well as the personal values and judgment of the judge, further complicating the predictability of legal decisions.

The complexity and uncertainty inherent in the law necessitate a nuanced approach to understanding and predicting judicial decisions. It requires an acknowledgment of the law's dynamic nature and the inherent limitations of any legal system to provide clear, deterministic answers to all legal questions. Legal realism offers valuable insights into these challenges by highlighting the multifaceted influences on judicial decision-making and advocating for a more empirical, interdisciplinary approach to legal studies. To navigate the uncertainty in law effectively, scholars and practitioners must embrace the complexity of legal phenomena and seek to understand the broader social, economic, and psychological factors that influence judicial behavior.

6. Contemporary Applications and Implications

6.1. Legal Education and Practice

The principles of legal realism have profound implications for legal education and practice, advocating for a shift towards more experiential learning and a greater emphasis on understanding the law in its social context. This shift challenges the traditional focus on doctrinal learning, which emphasizes the memorization and analysis of legal rules and precedents, and instead promotes a more holistic approach to legal education that prepares students for the realities of legal practice.

Integration of Practical Skills: Legal realism emphasizes the importance of "law in action" and thus advocates for legal education that integrates practical skills training with theoretical learning. This includes clinical education, internships, and simulation exercises that allow students to experience firsthand how the law operates in real-world contexts. Such experiential learning opportunities help students develop practical

skills, such as legal research, writing, negotiation, and advocacy, which are critical for effective legal practice.

Interdisciplinary Approach: Reflecting legal realism's recognition of the law's interconnection with societal factors, there is a growing recognition of the value of an interdisciplinary approach to legal education. This approach involves incorporating insights from fields such as sociology, psychology, economics, and political science into the legal curriculum. By understanding the broader social, economic, and psychological factors that influence legal outcomes, future legal practitioners are better equipped to navigate the complexities of the law and to advocate for their clients effectively. For instance, courses on the psychology of decision-making can provide valuable insights into how judges and jurors might interpret evidence and make decisions.

Critical Thinking and Flexibility: Legal realism challenges students and practitioners to question assumptions about the law and to recognize the role of discretion and interpretation in legal decision-making. This perspective encourages critical thinking and flexibility, qualities that are essential for lawyers who must navigate an ever-changing legal landscape. Legal education informed by realism emphasizes the importance of adapting legal arguments and strategies to the specific circumstances of each case, rather than relying solely on established doctrines or precedents.

The influence of legal realism on legal education and practice is evident in the increasing recognition of the need for lawyers to be not just technicians of the law but also thoughtful practitioners who understand the law's broader social implications. By preparing students to think critically about the law, to apply it in diverse and changing contexts, and to consider the social impact of legal decisions, legal education can better fulfill its role in shaping competent, ethical, and socially aware legal professionals.

6.2. Policy and Reform

The insights derived from legal realism have significant implications for legal policy and reform, particularly in how laws are crafted, interpreted, and applied to ensure justice and fairness. Legal realism's emphasis on the influence of societal, economic, and psychological factors on judicial decision-making encourages a more nuanced approach to policy development and legal reform, one

that takes into account the complexities of human behavior and societal change.

Reform of Legal Processes: Recognizing the discretionary nature of judicial decision-making and the influence of extrajudicial factors, as evidenced in studies by Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011), suggests that legal processes can be reformed to minimize bias and enhance fairness (Danziger et al., 2011). This might include reforms aimed at increasing transparency in how judicial decisions are made or implementing guidelines that help mitigate the impact of cognitive biases and extraneous factors on judicial rulings. For example, structured decision-making processes and checklists could be introduced to ensure that judges consider all relevant factors systematically, reducing the likelihood of decisions being influenced by irrelevant considerations.

Policy Making Informed by Empirical Research: Legal realism advocates for policy making that is informed by empirical research into the actual workings of the law and its impact on society. This approach involves using data and studies from the social sciences to understand the effects of laws and legal decisions on different segments of the population, thereby enabling policymakers to craft laws that are more equitable and effective. For instance, empirical studies on the socio-economic impacts of sentencing guidelines can inform more nuanced approaches to criminal justice reform, addressing concerns about systemic bias and the disproportionate impact on marginalized communities.

Adaptive and Responsive Legal Frameworks: The dynamic nature of society and the evolving nature of social norms and values highlighted by legal realism necessitate legal frameworks that are adaptable and responsive to change. This implies a move away from rigid legal doctrines towards more flexible legal standards that can accommodate new social realities and technological advancements. For instance, the rapid development of digital technologies and the internet has raised new legal challenges that traditional laws were not designed to address. Legal realism supports the development of legal frameworks that are capable of evolving in response to such challenges, ensuring that the law remains relevant and effective in regulating new forms of behavior and interaction.

The application of legal realist principles to policy and reform emphasizes the need for a legal system that is not only technically proficient but also deeply aware of the social context in which it operates. By grounding legal policy and reform efforts in a thorough understanding of the law's societal impacts and the factors that influence judicial decision-making, it is possible to create a legal system that is more just, equitable, and effective in serving the needs of society.

6.3. Future Directions

The influence of legal realism on contemporary legal thought and practice opens up several avenues for future research and exploration. By acknowledging the complexities and uncertainties inherent in law and its application, legal realism encourages ongoing inquiry into how law interacts with societal dynamics, individual behaviors, and technological advancements. This section outlines potential future directions that can further elucidate the implications of legal realism for the legal field.

Empirical Research on Judicial Behavior: There's a growing interest in empirical legal studies that seek to understand judicial behavior through quantitative and qualitative research methods. Future research could expand on the work of Danziger, Levav, and Avnaim-Pesso (2011) by exploring how various psychological, social, and environmental factors influence judicial decisions across different legal systems and cultural contexts (Danziger et al., 2011). Such studies could provide deeper insights into the extent and ways in which extrajudicial factors affect legal outcomes, thereby informing strategies to enhance judicial fairness and objectivity.

Technology and Predictive Analytics in Law: The application of machine learning and artificial intelligence to predict judicial decisions represents a significant area of interest, as highlighted by Katz, Bommarito, and Blackman (2017) (Katz et al., 2017). Future research could explore the ethical, practical, and theoretical implications of using technology to predict legal outcomes. This includes examining the accuracy of predictive models, the potential for these technologies to reinforce existing biases, and their impact on the perception of judicial impartiality and independence.

Interdisciplinary Approaches to Legal Studies: Legal realism's emphasis on the law's interconnectedness with societal factors calls for more interdisciplinary approaches to legal studies. Future directions could

include collaborative research that integrates insights from psychology, sociology, economics, and technology to understand the multifaceted influences on the law. This interdisciplinary research could lead to more holistic legal theories that account for the complex interplay between law, society, and individual behavior. Legal Education and Professional Development: The impact of legal realism on legal education and practice suggests a need for ongoing curriculum development that prepares law students and practitioners to navigate the complexities of modern legal systems. Future efforts could focus on incorporating practical skills training, critical thinking exercises, and interdisciplinary studies into legal education. Additionally, professional development programs could emphasize ethical decision-making, cultural competence, and awareness of biases, equipping legal professionals to address the challenges highlighted by legal realism.

Legal Reform and Public Policy: Legal realism underscores the importance of basing legal reform and public policy on empirical evidence and societal needs. Future work could involve conducting comprehensive studies to assess the impact of laws and legal decisions on diverse populations, with a particular focus on marginalized and underserved communities. This research could inform policy changes and legal reforms aimed at promoting equity, justice, and responsiveness in the legal system.

In sum, the future directions inspired by legal realism reflect a commitment to a more empirical, interdisciplinary, and reflective approach to legal scholarship and practice. By continuing to explore these areas, scholars and practitioners can contribute to the development of a legal system that is more attuned to the complexities of human behavior, societal change, and technological innovation, ultimately promoting justice and fairness in an ever-evolving world.

7.   Conclusion

The exploration of legal realism and its impact on the predictability of judicial decisions reveals a nuanced understanding of the law that transcends traditional legal formalism. Legal realism, with its emphasis on the "law in action" and the myriad external, social, and psychological factors influencing judicial behavior, offers a profound critique of the notion that legal outcomes can be predicted solely based on statutes and precedents.

This review has illuminated the complexity of legal decision-making, underscoring the role of judicial discretion, the influence of societal norms and values, and the inherent uncertainty within the law itself.

The implications of legal realism extend far beyond academic discourse, touching upon legal education, practice, policy, and reform. It challenges legal educators to incorporate practical skills and interdisciplinary approaches into their curricula, preparing students for the realities of legal practice in a complex and dynamic society. For practitioners, legal realism advocates a more reflective and context-aware approach to law, emphasizing the importance of understanding the broader social implications of legal decisions. In the realm of policy and reform, the insights from legal realism highlight the necessity of grounding legal changes in empirical evidence and societal needs, ensuring that the law remains relevant, equitable, and effective in addressing contemporary challenges.

Future directions inspired by legal realism suggest a continuing evolution of legal scholarship and practice. Empirical research on judicial behavior, technological advancements in predictive analytics, interdisciplinary studies, and reforms in legal education and policy all represent areas ripe for further exploration. These endeavors promise not only to enrich our understanding of the law but also to enhance the justice and fairness of legal outcomes.

In conclusion, legal realism offers a critical lens through which to examine the predictability of judicial decisions, revealing the complex interplay between law, society, and human behavior. By embracing the insights and challenges presented by legal realism, scholars, practitioners, and policymakers can contribute to the development of a legal system that is not only more attuned to the realities of human experience but also more capable of achieving justice in an ever-changing world. The journey towards understanding and applying the principles of legal realism is ongoing, requiring a commitment to empirical inquiry, interdisciplinary collaboration, and continuous reflection on the nature of law and its role in society.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed. Given the focus on published academic literature and public domain sources, the review did not involve primary data collection from human participants, thereby minimizing ethical concerns related to privacy and consent. However, ethical considerations were paramount in the interpretation and reporting of findings

References

Cahill-O'Callaghan, R. (2013). The Influence of Personal Values on Legal Judgments. *Journal of Law and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2013.00642.x

Danziger, S., Levav, J., & Avnaim-Pesso, L. (2011). Extraneous Factors in Judicial Decisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018033108

Dyèvre, A. (2010). Unifying the Field of Comparative Judicial Politics: Towards a General Theory of Judicial Behaviour. *European Political Science Review*. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1755773910000044

Gibson, J. L., & Caldeira, G. A. (2011). Has Legal Realism Damaged the Legitimacy of the U.S. Supreme Court? *Law & Society Review*. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00432.x

Katz, D., Bommarito, M. J., & Blackman, J. (2017). A General Approach for Predicting the Behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States. *PLoS One*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174698

Rosili, N. A. K., Hassan, R., Zakaria, N. H., Kasim, S., Rose, F. Z. C., & Sutikno, T. (2021). A Systematic Literature Review of Machine Learning Methods in Predicting Court Decisions. *Iaes International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (Ij-Ai)*. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijai.v10.i4.pp1091-1102

Tampubolon, M., Situmeang, T., & Saragih, P. (2023). Judicial Breakfast as an External Factor in Judicial Decision Making in Courts. *F1000research*. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.126482.1

Timoshina, E. V., & Kraevsky, A. (2021). Law and Logic: E. Bulygin's Deductive Pattern of Judicial Reasoning. *Wisdom*. https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v1i1.673

Tumonis, V., Šavelskis, M., & Žalytė, I. (2013). Judicial Decision-Making From an Empirical Perspective. *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics*. https://doi.org/10.2478/bjlp-2013-0007