



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF LAW, GOVERNMENT
AND COMMUNICATION
(IJLGC)

www.gaexcellence.com/ijlgc



REFRAMING LEGAL EDUCATION FOR HERITAGE PROTECTION: A CRITICAL LEGAL STUDIES PERSPECTIVE ON INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN MALAYSIA

Nurulhuda Adabiah Mustafa*¹, Rasyikah Md Khalid², Nuraisyah Chua Abdullah³

¹Centre of Foundation Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA. 43800 Dengkil, Selangor, Malaysia

 adabiah@uitm.edu.my

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7839-9984>

²Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

 rasyikah@ukm.edu.my

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6328-5520>

³Faculty of Law, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

 nuraisyah@uitm.edu.my

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8587-3764>

*Corresponding Author

Article Info:

Article history:

Received date: 24.05.2026

Revised date: 07.06.2026

Accepted date: 30.07.2026

Published date: 10.09.2026

To cite this document:

Mustafa, N. A., Khalid, R. M., & Abdullah, N. C. (2026). Reframing Legal Education for Heritage Protection: A Critical Legal Studies Perspective on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Malaysia. *International Journal of Law, Government and Communication*, 11(45), 21-35.

Abstract:

Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) is living, community-based heritage that is continuously practised, recreated, and transmitted. In Malaysia, its protection operates within a legally plural environment in which civil law coexists with Islamic legal administration. This study aims to critically examine the limitations of existing legal and educational approaches to ICH protection and to propose a transformative legal education framework. The study adopts a qualitative design combining doctrinal analysis of the National Heritage Act 2005 (Act 645) and relevant UNESCO instruments with qualitative content analysis of selected publicly available Malaysian law curricula and syllabi. Critical Legal Studies (CLS) is used as the analytical lens to examine how legal and educational structures may reproduce state-centric, formalistic, and fragmented approaches. Three interrelated limitations are identified: state-centric heritage governance that can marginalise community agency; limited integration between civil and Islamic legal perspectives; and predominantly doctrinal legal education that provides insufficient attention to the socio-cultural, religious, and interdisciplinary dimensions of ICH. The study develops a context-sensitive, transformative framework that integrates ICH across the legal curriculum, socio-legal and interdisciplinary learning, Islamic jurisprudential perspectives, experiential and clinical learning, digital and technological literacy, and institutional reform. The framework extends CLS scholarship into ICH governance and legal education

while offering practical directions for more inclusive and culturally responsive heritage governance in Malaysia and comparable plural legal settings.

DOI: 10.35631/IJLGC.1145002 **Keywords:**

Critical Legal Studies, Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH), Islamic Law Administration, Legal Education, Malaysia



© The authors (2026). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact ijlge@gaexcellence.com.

Introduction

Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) has emerged as a significant focus in contemporary law and public policy, particularly in response to globalisation, technological development, and evolving socio-cultural dynamics. ICH includes oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, and traditional knowledge and skills that communities identify as integral to their cultural heritage. In contrast to tangible heritage assets, ICH is maintained through ongoing practice, transmission, adaptation, and active community involvement. The 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage foregrounds this living and community-based dimension within international safeguarding discourse (UNESCO, 2003).

Malaysia offers a particularly salient context for examining ICH governance due to its legally plural environment. The National Heritage Act 2005 serves as the primary statutory framework for heritage protection, while Islamic legal administration functions in parallel with the civil legal system. Numerous cultural practices are deeply embedded within religious, social, and community norms. As a result, the protection of ICH goes beyond statutory designation or administrative preservation and encompasses issues of cultural identity, community agency, legal pluralism, and the relationship between formal law and lived practice (Ahmad, 2018; Aziz & Abdullah, 2021).

However, existing scholarship identifies several systemic limitations. Heritage governance frequently remains predominantly state-centred, with institutional decision-making and formal registration processes that may reduce living cultural practices to rigid legal categories (Blake, 2020; Hafstein, 2021). As a result, community participation may be less robust than the participatory approach advocated to safeguard living heritage (Bortolotto, 2021; Mustafa & Abdullah, 2021). Additionally, the coexistence of civil and Islamic legal systems accentuates

the requirement for improved normative and institutional dialogue, especially where cultural practices intersect with Islamic traditions and values (Ismail & Abdullah, 2017; Kamali, 2019). Another limitation relates to legal education. While doctrinal and black-letter methods provide students with fundamental knowledge of legal rules and reasoning, these approaches might inadequately prepare them for complex socio-cultural challenges in which law intersects with community practices, religion, history, and technology (Twining, 2009). This issue is especially pertinent to ICH, as effective heritage governance requires practitioners to comprehend both the legal provisions and the impact of legal categories on communities and cultural practices.

Thus, Critical Legal Studies (CLS) offers a suitable conceptual framework for addressing these concerns, as it challenges the notion that law functions as a neutral, objective system independent of social, political, and cultural power relations (Unger, 1983; Kennedy, 2006). When applied to ICH, CLS helps examine how legal definitions, institutional processes, and professional education may privilege certain cultural viewpoints while marginalising community-based or non-Western perspectives (Thinking Through Heritage Regimes, n.d.). Accordingly, this study considers three questions: (1) What limitations characterise current legal and educational approaches to ICH protection in Malaysia? (2) How does CLS explain these limitations? (3) How can legal education be reframed to promote more embracing and context-sensitive heritage governance?

The study pursues three objectives consistent with these questions. First, it thoroughly analyses the shortcomings of existing legal and educational approaches to ICH protection. Second, it analyses these limitations employing a CLS perspective, focusing on institutional power, formalism, community participation, and legal pluralism. Third, it proposes a transformative, context-sensitive legal education framework to foster better sustainable heritage governance.

Literature Review

The literature is organised around five connected themes: the conceptual foundations of ICH; state-based constraints in heritage law; CLS and heritage governance; legal pluralism and Islamic legal perspectives; and the limitations of doctrinal legal education. Together, these strands establish the conceptual and analytical basis for the proposed framework.

Conceptual Foundations of Intangible Cultural Heritage

The international understanding of ICH developed significantly with the adoption of the 2003 UNESCO Convention. ICH refers to practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills that communities recognise as part of their heritage and that are continually recreated and transmitted from generation to generation (UNESCO, 2003). This definition emphasises the living character of heritage and distinguishes it from the conception of heritage as a static object amenable to straightforward preservation.

Recent scholarship further treats heritage as socially constructed and context specific. Rather than being merely an object waiting to be protected, heritage is shaped through social practices, institutional discourse, and relations of power (Smith, 2006; Hafstein, 2021). This perspective poses a basic challenge for law: regulatory systems require categories and procedures, whereas living heritage may change with community practice and social circumstances. The tension between legal classification and cultural fluidity therefore necessitates attention to how legal institutions define, recognise, and value heritage.

Law and State-Centred Constraints

International and domestic heritage regimes provide important mechanisms for safeguarding ICH, but the literature has identified a persistent tendency towards administrative and state-centred governance. Formal authority can privilege institutional control over community participation, particularly when heritage identification and registration are treated primarily as administrative processes (Blake, 2020; Lenzerini, 2020).

In Malaysia, the National Heritage Act 2005 (Act 645) constitutes the principal legislative framework for heritage protection. Although it provides an official mechanism for identifying and protecting heritage, scholarship has raised concerns about the extent to which decision-making remains institutionally driven and whether communities are sufficiently positioned as active custodians rather than passive subjects of regulation (Ahmad, 2018; Aziz & Abdullah, 2021; Mustafa & Abdullah, 2022). Formal classification may also risk reducing fluid cultural practices to fixed legal categories, creating a gap between statutory recognition and lived cultural practice ([Kanellopoulou et al., 2024](#)).

Critical Legal Studies and Heritage Governance

CLS challenges the view that law is a neutral, coherent, and objective system. It draws attention to the influence of political, social, and ideological relations on legal institutions and legal reasoning (Unger, 1983; Kennedy, 2006). For heritage governance, this approach is useful because legal definitions and institutional procedures do not merely describe culture; they can shape which practices are recognised, whose knowledge is authoritative, and how cultural value is determined.

Applied to ICH, CLS therefore shifts the analytical question from whether a legal framework exists to how that framework distributes authority. It also provides a basis for examining the dominance of doctrinal approaches in legal education. Where legal education prioritises formal rules and procedural reasoning without sufficient attention to context, it may reproduce a conception of law that is poorly equipped to engage with living cultural practices. This makes CLS relevant not only to heritage law but also to the education of those who will administer, interpret, and reform that law.

Islamic Legal Perspectives and Legal Pluralism

ICH governance in Malaysia must also be understood against the background of legal pluralism. Civil law coexists with Islamic legal administration, and cultural practices may intersect with both legal orders. Existing scholarship notes the limited integration of statutory heritage law with Syariah-based perspectives, despite the close relationship between certain cultural practices and Islamic traditions (Ismail & Abdullah, 2017; Kamali, 2019).

Islamic jurisprudential concepts, particularly Maqasid al-Shariah and maslahah, offer normative resources for considering the protection of identity, knowledge, social cohesion, and community welfare (Auda, 2021; Kamali, 2019). The purpose of incorporating these perspectives is not to displace statutory law but to encourage a more coherent understanding of the complementary normative dimensions relevant to heritage governance in Malaysia.

Doctrinal Limitations and Legal Education

Legal education remains an important mechanism through which professional assumptions about law are transmitted. Doctrinal and black-letter approaches provide indispensable foundations in legal knowledge, but a predominantly doctrinal model may give insufficient attention to the social settings in which legal rules operate (Twining, 2009). This limitation is particularly relevant to ICH, where effective governance requires sensitivity to community practices, cultural meaning, religion, and interdisciplinary knowledge.

Contemporary legal education scholarship increasingly supports interdisciplinary, experiential, and socially responsive approaches that complement doctrinal competence (Sullivan et al., 2007; Chhabra, 2022). However, the integration of ICH into legal education remains underdeveloped, particularly in plural legal settings. The literature therefore supports the need for a model that connects doctrinal legal knowledge with critical reflection, socio-legal analysis, public participation, Islamic jurisprudence, and emerging technological issues.

Research Gap

The literature shows three interrelated gaps. First, ICH governance remains substantially state-centred, creating a potential mismatch between administrative regulation and community-based heritage practice. Second, the coexistence of civil and Islamic legal systems is not matched by sufficient integration in heritage governance and legal education. Third, legal education remains substantially doctrinal, with limited systematic attention to the socio-cultural and interdisciplinary dimensions of ICH.

Although these issues have been discussed separately, the relationship among the legal structure, legal pluralism, and legal education remains under-examined through a critical theoretical perspective in the Malaysian context. There is limited work that connects CLS with ICH governance and legal education as mutually reinforcing sites of institutional power and potential reform. This study addresses that gap by using CLS to analyse both legal and educational structures and by developing a transformative legal education framework which integrates socio-legal, Islamic jurisprudential, experiential, technological, and institutional dimensions.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design combining doctrinal legal analysis and qualitative content analysis. The methodology was selected because the research seeks to examine the structure, assumptions, and operation of existing legal and educational frameworks rather than to measure attitudes or outcomes statistically. The analysis proceeds in three connected stages: (1) examination of primary legal and policy materials; (2) qualitative content analysis of selected Malaysian legal education materials; and (3) critical interpretation through the CLS framework.

Doctrinal Analysis

The doctrinal component examines primary legal and normative materials relevant to ICH protection, with particular attention to the National Heritage Act 2005 and the 2003 UNESCO Convention. The analysis considers the scope and structure of the statutory framework, the means through which heritage is identified and protected, and the extent to which community participation and the living character of ICH are reflected in the regulatory approach. The

international instrument provides a normative reference point for assessing the relationship between domestic regulation and the more extensive safeguarding principles associated with ICH.

The doctrinal analysis is interpretive rather than merely descriptive. It asks how legal rules allocate decision-making authority, how heritage is categorised, and whether the structure of regulation illustrates a state-centred model. These questions provide the foundation of the subsequent CLS analysis.

Qualitative Content Analysis of Legal Education Materials

The educational component uses qualitative content analysis of selected publicly available law curricula and syllabi from Malaysian law schools. The materials were examined purposively with attention to core subjects relevant to the research problem, including constitutional law, administrative law, and Islamic law, as well as identifiable heritage-related content where available. The analysis centred on whether and how the materials engage with ICH, socio-legal perspectives, interdisciplinary learning, community participation, and Islamic jurisprudential perspectives.

The analytical procedure involved identifying recurring patterns in the selected materials, particularly the relative emphasis on doctrinal knowledge, the presence or absence of heritage-related content, the treatment of law in its social context, and opportunities for engagement with Islamic jurisprudence and community-based learning. One illustrative example identified in the reviewed materials is the positioning of Heritage Law as an elective at postgraduate level in the UKM programme discussed in the manuscript. This observation is used to illustrate the wider issue of limited curricular integration rather than to generalise about all Malaysian law schools.

Analytical Framework: Critical Legal Studies

CLS is used as the principal analytical framework to connect the doctrinal and curriculum findings. Three analytical questions guide its application. First, the study considers whether state-centred legal structures privilege institutional authority over community agency. Second, it considers whether doctrinal legal education reproduces formalistic and hierarchical conceptions of law that understate social and cultural context. Third, it asks what alternative forms of legal education could redistribute attention towards participation, pluralism, interdisciplinarity, and lived experience.

This operationalisation ensures that CLS functions as more than a general theoretical label. It provides specific criteria for interpreting the materials: the distribution of institutional power; the treatment of community knowledge; the degree of formalism; the recognition of plural normative perspectives; and the capacity of legal education to prepare students for context-dependent problems. The same criteria are then used to inform the proposed transformative framework.

Methodological Limitations

The study has two principal methodological limitations. First, the curriculum analysis is based on selected publicly available materials and therefore cannot capture the full variation among

Malaysian law schools or all recent curricular changes. Second, the study does not include interviews or fieldwork with educators, students, heritage practitioners, or government officials. Accordingly, the findings should be understood as an analytical and conceptual assessment of legal and educational structures rather than an empirical evaluation of implementation outcomes. Future research should extend the analysis through stakeholder interviews, fieldwork, and pilot curriculum evaluation.

Findings and Discussions

The analysis identifies three principal and interconnected findings: state-centric heritage governance, limited integration between civil and Islamic legal perspectives, and the persistence of doctrinal legal education. These findings are not treated as isolated deficiencies. Together, they reveal a broader disconnection between formal legal structures, legal education, and the lived socio-cultural realities through which ICH is sustained.

State-Centric Heritage Governance and Community Agency

The first finding concerns the state-oriented structure of ICH governance. The National Heritage Act 2005 provides an important statutory foundation for identification, registration, and protection (Mustafa & Abdullah, 2022), but the operation of heritage governance may place substantial authority within governmental and administrative institutions. Where designation and protection depend heavily on formal procedures, communities may have a less influential role in defining the meaning and priorities of heritage protection (Ahmad, 2018; Aziz & Abdullah, 2021; Mustafa & Abdullah, 2021).

This creates a tension with the living character of ICH. ICH is continuously practised, transmitted, and adapted by communities; it cannot always be adequately represented through fixed categories. Formal registration may therefore provide legal visibility while simultaneously creating a risk of reducing fluid practices to static descriptions (Hafstein, 2021). The issue is not whether formal legal protection is necessary – it is – but whether the legal framework sufficiently recognises communities as active custodians and participants in decision-making. Previous work on community participation in Malaysian ICH similarly indicates the importance of strengthening the role of heritage communities within legal protection mechanisms (Mustafa & Abdullah, 2021).

From a CLS perspective, the issue is therefore one of institutional power. The central question is not simply whether the law protects heritage, but who has the authority to define heritage, determine its value, and decide how it should be safeguarded. A more community-responsive approach would complement statutory authority with meaningful participation and recognition of community knowledge.

Fragmentation between Civil and Islamic Legal Perspectives

The second finding concerns the relationship between civil law and Islamic legal administration. Malaysia's plural legal environment creates opportunities for diverse normative traditions to contribute to heritage governance. However, the analysis shows that these perspectives are insufficiently integrated into the legal and educational treatment of ICH. This may lead to parallel approaches in which statutory heritage protection and Islamic legal

perspectives are viewed separately, even when cultural practices are embedded in both social and religious contexts.

The significance of this fragmentation is both practical and conceptual. Practically, limited coordination can create uncertainty regarding the interpretation and governance of culturally embedded practices. Conceptually, it may encourage treating heritage as an object of statutory regulation rather than as a lived practice shaped by religious and social values. Islamic jurisprudential concepts such as Maqasid al-Shariah and *maslahah* can provide complementary normative resources for thinking about the protection of identity, knowledge, welfare, and social cohesion (Auda, 2021; Kamali, 2019; Mustafa & Abdullah, 2022).

The finding does not suggest that civil and Islamic law should be collapsed into a single system. Rather, it supports greater dialogue and curricular integration so that future legal practitioners can identify where different normative frameworks intersect and how they can contribute to culturally appropriate governance.

Doctrinal Rigidity and the Preparation of Future Legal Practitioners

The third finding concerns legal education. The analysis indicates that legal education remains substantially organised around doctrinal knowledge and formal legal reasoning. Such knowledge is indispensable to legal practice and should not be displaced. However, when doctrinal training is insufficiently complemented by socio-legal, cultural, religious, and experiential learning, graduates may be less prepared to understand heritage as a lived and contested social phenomenon.

This matters because heritage disputes cannot always be resolved by identifying the applicable rule alone. Questions may arise about community identity, participation, cultural meaning, intellectual property, digitisation, ethical use of cultural knowledge, and the interaction between statutory and religious norms. These issues require lawyers who can connect doctrinal analysis with social context and competing forms of knowledge.

CLS helps explain this educational limitation as an epistemological issue (Modiri, 2013). If legal education consistently presents law as a self-contained body of authoritative rules, students may have fewer opportunities to question how legal categories are constructed or whose interests and assumptions they reflect. A more critical model would preserve doctrinal competence while creating structured opportunities for students to examine power, context, participation, and alternative normative perspectives.

Synthesis of Challenges

Table 1: Challenges in ICH Governance and Legal Education

Dimension	Identified Issue	Explanation	Implication for ICH Protection
Legal Framework	State-centric orientation	Institutional and administrative control is prominent in formal heritage protection.	Community participation may be limited and living practices may be translated into fixed legal categories.
Nature of ICH	Dynamic and community-based	ICH evolves through practice, transmission, and adaptation.	Rigid legal categories may not fully capture cultural fluidity.
Legal System	Civil–Islamic fragmentation (Mustafa, 2025)	Civil and Islamic legal perspectives operate within a plural legal environment with limited integration in heritage governance.	A lack of coordination may weaken holistic and context-sensitive protection.
Legal Education	Doctrinal emphasis	Black-letter law and formal reasoning remain central to legal training.	Graduates may have insufficient interdisciplinary and cultural understanding.
Knowledge Framework	Limited recognition of plural perspectives (Mustafa, 2025)	Islamic jurisprudence and community knowledge receive limited systematic integration.	Legal interpretation may be less culturally grounded.
Governance Outcome	Law–practice disconnection (Mustafa, 2025)	Formal frameworks may not fully align with community realities.	Heritage protection may become less inclusive, flexible, and sustainable.

Source: Authors' synthesis of the doctrinal, curriculum, and CLS analysis.

Recommendation: Reframing Legal Education for Intangible Cultural Heritage Protection as a Transformative Framework

The findings suggest that reform should not be confined to adding a standalone heritage topic to the curriculum. Instead, legal education should be reframed as a critical intervention that connects legal doctrine with the social, cultural, religious, and technological contexts in which heritage governance occurs. The proposed framework is grounded in CLS and is designed to complement, rather than reject, doctrinal legal competence.

Embedding ICH Across the Core Legal Curriculum

ICH should be integrated horizontally across foundational legal subjects rather than confined primarily to specialised or elective offerings. Constitutional law can address cultural identity and rights; administrative law can examine state authority and participatory governance; Islamic law can explore cultural practices through Maqasid al-Shariah and maslahah; and intellectual property and technology law can address ownership, digitisation, cultural appropriation, and data governance. This approach allows students to encounter ICH as a cross-cutting legal issue rather than as an isolated field.

Integrating Socio-Legal and Interdisciplinary Approaches

Students should be introduced to relevant insights from anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, and related disciplines. Such integration can help them examine how legal rules operate within communities, how power affects heritage recognition, and why cultural practices may not fit neatly within formal legal categories. From a CLS perspective, interdisciplinarity is important because it exposes assumptions that may remain invisible within purely doctrinal analysis.

Incorporating Islamic Jurisprudential Perspectives

Legal education in Malaysia should systematically introduce Islamic jurisprudential perspectives where they are relevant to heritage governance. Maqasid al-Shariah and maslahah can be used to examine questions concerning identity, knowledge, welfare, and social cohesion (Auda, 2021; Kamali, 2019). This approach promotes greater coherence within a plural legal environment while allowing students to understand the relationship between statutory law and other normative traditions.

Expanding Experiential and Clinical Legal Education

Experiential learning can bridge the gap between theoretical legal knowledge and the realities of heritage communities. Possible activities include heritage-focused legal clinics, field-based documentation projects, community consultations, policy exercises, and collaborations with cultural institutions. These activities can develop stakeholder engagement, ethical decision-making, legal research, and policy-analysis skills while positioning communities as active partners rather than passive objects of study (Aurelio, 2024).

Leveraging Digital and Technological Literacy

Digital technologies are increasingly relevant to the documentation, preservation, dissemination, and commercialisation of ICH. Legal education should therefore prepare students to address intellectual property, ownership, access, data governance, cultural appropriation, and the ethical use of artificial intelligence and digital documentation. Technological literacy should be accompanied by critical reflection on how digitisation can change the meaning, accessibility, and control of cultural practices (Burri, 2021).

Institutional and Policy Reform

Curriculum reform requires institutional support. Universities, accreditation bodies, policymakers, and cultural institutions should collaborate to encourage interdisciplinary competencies, heritage-related research, community partnerships, and experiential learning. Academic – community partnerships can provide students with meaningful exposure to heritage practices while allowing communities to contribute knowledge to legal education. Without institutional support, curriculum innovation may remain isolated and difficult to sustain.

Table 2: Transformative Legal Education Framework for ICH Protection

Framework Component	Features	Theoretical Basis	Expected Outcome
Curriculum Integration	Embed ICH across constitutional, administrative, Islamic, IP and related core subjects.	CLS; interdisciplinary learning	Holistic understanding of ICH within legal systems.
Socio-Legal Approach	Integrate anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, and contextual analysis.	Socio-legal theory; CLS critique of formalism	Context-sensitive legal analysis.
Islamic Jurisprudence Integration	Apply Maqasid al-Shariah and maslahah where relevant to heritage governance.	Islamic legal theory	Greater normative coherence within legal pluralism.
Experiential Learning	Use clinics, fieldwork, community engagement, and policy exercises.	Experiential legal education	Practical skills and community-oriented practice.
Digital & Technological Literacy	Address digitisation, IP, data governance, AI, and cultural ethics.	Law and technology scholarship	Preparedness for digital-era heritage challenges.
Institutional Reform	Strengthen curriculum standards and academic–community partnerships.	Governance and policy reform	Sustainable and impactful legal education.

Source: Authors' synthesis based on the findings and proposed reforms.

Theoretical and Practical Contribution

The study contributes to literature in three related ways. First, it extends the application of CLS into the intersection of heritage governance and legal education. Rather than treating CLS solely as a critique of legal doctrine, the study demonstrates how its concern with power, formalism, and institutional authority can be used to examine who defines and governs living heritage. Second, the study offers a conceptual contribution through the proposed Transformative Legal Education Framework. The framework connects six dimensions – curriculum integration, socio-legal and interdisciplinary learning, Islamic jurisprudence, experiential learning, digital and technological literacy, and institutional reform – within a single context-sensitive model. This addresses the research gap in literature, where legal governance, legal pluralism, and legal education have often been examined separately. Third, the study has practical implications for Malaysian legal education and heritage governance. It

suggests that universities and policymakers can strengthen future legal practitioners' capacity to address ICH by combining doctrinal competence with critical, culturally grounded, and community-responsive learning. The approach may also offer a transferable conceptual framework for other plural legal systems in which civil law, religious norms, and community-based cultural practices intersect.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine the limitations of current legal and educational approaches to protecting intangible cultural heritage in Malaysia and to develop a transformative legal education framework from a Critical Legal Studies perspective. The analysis identifies three interrelated problems: a state-centric orientation in heritage governance, limited integration between civil and Islamic legal perspectives, and the persistence of predominantly doctrinal legal education. These findings demonstrate that protecting living heritage requires more than the existence of formal legal rules. It requires legal institutions and legal professionals capable of recognising community agency, engaging with legal pluralism, understanding cultural context, and responding to technological change. Accordingly, the proposed framework reframes legal education as a potential site of transformation rather than merely a mechanism for transmitting doctrinal knowledge.

The framework is not intended to replace doctrinal legal education. Rather, it complements doctrinal competence with critical and contextual approaches that are better aligned with the dynamic nature of ICH. By integrating heritage across the curriculum, incorporating socio-legal and Islamic jurisprudential perspectives, expanding experiential learning, developing technological literacy, and strengthening institutional partnerships, legal education can contribute more directly to inclusive and sustainable heritage governance. The study remains conceptual and exploratory because it relies on selected publicly available curriculum materials and does not include stakeholder interviews or fieldwork. Future research should therefore empirically test the framework through interviews with educators, students, policymakers, and heritage practitioners, as well as through pilot curriculum initiatives. Such research can assess whether the proposed model produces measurable improvements in students' critical, interdisciplinary, and community-oriented competencies.

Ultimately, the protection of living heritage requires a form of legal education that is itself responsive to lived realities. The central proposition of this study is therefore simple: to protect living heritage, we need a living legal education.

-
- Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to Universiti Teknologi MARA for providing the necessary resources and institutional support throughout this research. Special appreciation is extended to colleagues and peers who contributed valuable insights and constructive feedback that helped strengthen the manuscript.
- Funding Statement:** No Funding
- Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. All authors have contributed to this work and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission to the International Journal of Law, Government and Communication (IJLGC).
- Ethics Statement:** This study did not involve human participants, animals, or sensitive personal data requiring ethical approval. The authors confirm that the research was conducted in accordance with accepted academic integrity and ethical publishing standards.
- Author Contribution Statement:** All authors contributed significantly to the development of this manuscript. Nurulhuda Adabiah Mustafa handled data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results. Rasyikah Md Khalid contributed to the literature review, drafting, and critical revision of the manuscript. Nuraisyah Chua Abdullah was responsible for the conceptualisation, methodology, and overall supervision of the study. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.
-

References

- Adabiah, M., Nurulhuda. (2022). Legal framework for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Malaysia: with special reference to makyung and wayang kulit / Nurulhuda Adabiah Mustafa [Universiti Teknologi MARA]. In UiTM Institutional Repositories (Universiti Teknologi MARA). <https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/72798/2/72798.pdf>
- Auda, J. (2008). Maqasid Al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=022361858&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA
- Aziz, A. S. A., & Noor, N. A. M. (2018). Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage In Malaysia: A Legal Analysis On The National Heritage Act 2005. □The □European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences, 841–848. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.12.03.86>
- Aziz, N., & Abdullah, M. (2021). Heritage governance and legal pluralism in Malaysia. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 11(3), 345–360.
- Blake, J. (2015). International Cultural Heritage Law. In Oxford University Press eBooks. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198723516.001.0001>
- Bortolotto, C. (2021). Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage: A critical appraisal. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 27(5), 451–465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1731859>
- BRAKNI, A.-E.-B., & Djabri, N. (2025). Intangible Cultural Heritage: Significance and Stakes. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i4.7038>
- Chhabra, D. (2022). Sustainable heritage tourism and cultural preservation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 92, 103335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103335>
- Colby, A., Wegner, J. W., Shulman, L. S., Bond, L., & Sullivan, W. M. (2007). Educating Lawyers: Preparation for the Profession of Law. In Issue Lab (Candid). Candid. <https://issuelab.org/permalink/resource/7129>
- Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage / UNESCO. (2003). https://doi.org/10.29171/azu_acku_pamphlet_ds353_c698_2003
- Giudici, D. (2021). Beyond Compassionate Aid: Precarious Bureaucrats and Dutiful Asylum Seekers in Italy. *Cultural Anthropology*, 36(1). <https://doi.org/10.14506/ca36.1.02>
- Ismail, R., & Abdullah, M. (2017). Islamic law and cultural practices in Malaysia. *Malayan Law Journal*, 5, 112–130.
- Kamali, M. H. (2008). Shari'ah Law: An Introduction. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=016464027&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA
- Kanellopoulou, E., Panayiotopoulos, A., & Pavlidis, S. A. (2024). Cultural heritage beyond juridification: towards a place-first research agenda. *Liverpool John Moores University*, 17(2), 220–236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jpmd-05-2023-0045>
- Lee, Y.-J., Park, S.-E., & Lee, S. Y. (2024). Machine Learning-Driven Topic Modeling and Network Analysis to Uncover Shared Knowledge Networks for Sustainable Korea–Japan Intangible Cultural Heritage Cooperation. *Sustainability*, 16(24), 10855. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su162410855>
- Lenzerini, F. (2011). Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Living Culture of Peoples. *European Journal of International Law*, 22(1), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chr006>

- Liu, S., & Pan, Y. (2023). Exploring Trends in Intangible Cultural Heritage Design: A Bibliometric and Content Analysis. *Sustainability*, 15(13), 10049. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310049>
- Ma, Y., & Roosli, R. (2025). Research on the Adaptive Development of Traditional Architectural Decorative Crafts: A Case Study of Chaozhou Inlaid Porcelain. *Sustainability*, 17(4), 1541. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17041541>
- Mustafa, N. A. (2025). Conflict of Law in the Safeguarding of Malaysian Intangible Cultural Heritage: A Way Forward. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 350–360. <https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2025.120800032>
- Mustafa, N. A., & Abdullah, N. C. (2021). Peoples' Participation in the Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Malaysia: The Legal Perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(11). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i11/11473>
- Mustafa, N. A., & Abdullah, N. C. (2022). Preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage under the National Heritage Act 2005 [Act 645] vs UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(11). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i11/15776>
- Rasyikah, M. K., Sarah, S., Siti, Noraziah, A. B., & Suhaimi, A. R. (2013). Revisiting legal framework for sustainable tourism in Taman Negara Malaysia. *Universiti Putra Malaysia Institutional Repository (Universiti Putra Malaysia)*. <http://psasir.upm.edu.my/id/eprint/28382/1/Revisiting%20legal%20framework%20for%20sustainable%20tourism%20in%20Taman%20Negara%20Malaysia.pdf>
- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263>
- Thinking Through Heritage Regimes. (n.d.). <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.409>
- Twining, W. (2009). *General Jurisprudence: Understanding Law from a Global Perspective*. Medical Entomology and Zoology. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0903/2008053264-t.html>